From: Pamela Tsigdinos <ptsigdinos@yahoo.com>
Sent: 11/12/2024 3:58:59 PM
To: Public Comment <PublicComment@trpa.gov>
Cc: Graham St.Michel <gstmichel@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>; Dan Segan <dsegan@trpa.gov>;
Subject: Public Comment for APC meeting 11.13.24

Please share with the APC committee members, and include my comment in the public record for the November 13, 2024 APC meeting.

RE: Agenda Item V.A.

It's critically important that the APC decision makers NOT move forward with the latest proposed amendments. Doing for would result in modifying Building Design and Minimum Development Standards under a "may approve" TRPA mandate that will undermine the approval process in connection with specific proposed height and density alternative proposals.

How? Without proper public noticing the public will not have reasonable time to evaluate future development.

Instead, it's imperative that TRPA change its language in all proposed code sections under consideration from "may approve" to "may consider."

The "may approve" language is a change in building design standards and land use applicability within town centers, regional centers and high-density tourist districts that was not previously part of the TRPA code alternative approval process.

Further, TRPA has consistently failed to provide substantial evidence within the Initial Environmental Checklist that its proposed amendments will result in a Finding of 'No Significant Impact.'

Unfortunately, TRPA staff is working against public transparency by pushing for Regional Plan and Code of ordinances amendments without a comprehensive public hearing and noticing process. Chapter 3 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances states that the agency must complete a comprehensive Environmental Impact Statement per the compact.

Fnally, in light of recent wildfires threatening the Tahoe basin, TRPA is overdue in including requirements that each Area Plan conduct a roadway-by-roadway wildfire evacuation capacity analysis to help determine how long it will take to get residents and visitors out of harm's way during a 'no-notice' ninety-five percentile fast moving wildfire under a variety of scenarios.

This evacuation need grows in necessity with the increasing possibilities of wildfire ignitions resulting from increasing populations within the basin and growing visitation from surrounding metropolitan areas.

Please do not make it harder for people to escape deadly fires.

Thank you,
Pamela M. Tsigdinos
Full-time Tahoe Resident

From: Rusel Heckert <rustyheckert@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: 11/12/2024 2:38:46 PM
To: Public Comment <PublicComment@trpa.gov>
Cc: Ann Nichols <preserve@ntpac.org>;
Subject: STOP TRPA FROM CHANGING REGIONAL PLAN WITHOUT COMMUNITY INPUT & ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

Having been a long time resident of North Lake Tahoe, my perception of TRPA has completely changed from what I thought was its' purpose. I thought the agency was conceived to protect the lake and it's residents and visitors from environmental effects of over-development.
That means that regular working citizens have had a difficult time obtaining approval and permits for simple projects like building a garage or cutting a tree. Remember the moratorium?
I have attended numerous meetings with TRPA, Placer County and developers. Very frustrating. Locals always line up to express concern for the quality and sustainability of life at Lake Tahoe. These comments fall on deaf ears. The leaders that be are indifferent. Greediness pervails. What's next? Skyscrapers with a 360 degree view? Shall we become a modernized South Shore? We're going to need flying cars to get around above our two lane roads. Forget about evacuations when the fires come.
Who's gonna protect us now that these governing bodies have money and powers beyond our control?

Rusty Heckert Notary Public (530) 386-2068

From: Al Miller <syngineer1@gmail.com>
Sent: 11/12/2024 2:37:49 PM
To: Public Comment <PublicComment@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>; Cindy.Gustafson <cindygustafson@placer.ca.gov>
Subject: Opposition to Agenda Item V.A. TRPA APC Meeting on 11-13-24
Attachments: Public Comment TRPA APC Mtng Agenda Item V.A. on 11-13-24.pdf

---

For the record in the matter in the above subject line, I hereby forward and incorporate the attached comments from Tahoe Sierra Clean Air Coalition dba Tahoe Clean Air *as though they are my own*.

Further, it is a new day in America for federal Executive agencies such as the TRPA, in case you didn't notice. This kind of unsupported globalist agenda promotion by subterfuge is slated for widespread demolition, and for good cause. I may send a little letter about my experiences with the TRPA to President Trump, to him to consider for a re-appointment of the TRPA Presidential board member. Wake up, TRPA . . . prepare to be held accountable for your nefarious and illegal actions large and small destroying our communities and the Lake Tahoe environment! Not just by the new Administration, but by an informed and outraged public. Forget about these amendments or you'll be done in the public eyes, no longer able to control the narrative, your specialty . . . failing badly, Ms. Regan.

Alan Miller, Civil Engineer

TAHOECLEANAIR.ORG

November 12, 2024

Dear APC Members,

Please make this email and attached comments part of the record and the minutes in connection with Item V. A. during your November 13, 2024 APC meeting.

TahoeCleanAir.org objects to the APC approval and recommendation of Agenda Item V.A. for the following reasons:

The TRPA Staff report obfuscates, gaslights and misleads the public and the APC, by concealing the true intent of the proposed amendments.

The proposed amendments actually change Building Design and Minimum Development Standards under a "**may approve**" TRPA mandate that will glidepath the approval process in connection with specific proposed height and density alternative proposals. This without proper public noticing thereby denying the public reasonable time to evaluate this far-reaching set of proposed amendments.

If the purpose of the proposed TRPA code changes were truly to remove the need for multiple TRPA code amendments and increase transparency as stated directly below, TRPA must change the language in all proposed code sections listed below from **"may approve" to "may consider".**

TRPA has failed to provide substantial evidence within the Initial Environmental Checklist that the proposed amendments will result in a Finding of No Significant Impact. Further, the IEC is not signed by a TRPA representative. Why not?

Further TRPA is promoting Regional Plan and Code of ordinances amendments without a comprehensive public hearing and noticing process and must complete a comprehensive Environmental Impact Statement per the compact and Chapter 3 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

Current Staff Report Language

"The proposed amendments to the Regional Plan and Code would remove the need for multiple TRPA Code amendments every time TRPA approves an exception and would also increase transparency by codifying the requirements for local jurisdictions to follow when requesting increases to height and density in their area plans".

Taken individually and cumulatively, the proposed amendments and the current amendment process actually neuters public transparency under the trojan horse guise of avoiding duplication, but instead actually gives area plan partners assurances by right that the TRPA **"may approve"** development alternatives for increased height, and density alternatives under subjective future criteria. This "**may approve**" language is actually a change in building design standards and land use applicability within town centers, regional centers and high-density tourist districts that was not previously part of the TRPA code alternative approval process.

Chapter 13 of the proposed amendments states:
C. Building Design: Standards shall be adopted to ensure attractive and compatible development. The following shall be considered:
i. Outside town centers, **regional centers, and the High-Density Tourist District,** building height shall be limited to two stories (24 - 42 feet). Within town centers, building height may be allowed up to four stories (56 feet) as part of an Area Plan that has been found in conformance with the Regional Plan. **Subject to TRPA approval pursuant to Section 13.5.3.B.5 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, additional height beyond 56 feet "may be approved" in town centers as part of a conforming Area Plan if it meets the requirements of Chapter 13.**

Additionally added to TABLE 13.5.3-1: MINIMUM DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR AREA PLANS:
Additional density and height "may be approved" in an Area Plan, pursuant to Section 13.5.3.B.5.

The amendments go on to offer Alternative Density and Height **APPROVAL** Standards within Centers of Area Plans:

TRPA "**may approve**" density standards above the maximum set forth in Table 13.5.3-1 in town

centers, regional centers, and the High-Density Tourist District. TRPA "**may approve**" height standards above the maximum set forth in Table 13.5.3-1 in town centers. Area Plan proposals to exceed density or height standards consistent with this paragraph "**may be approved**" provided that:

a. The alternative standards are consistent with, and further the Goals and Policies of the Regional Plan;

b. The lead agency prepares the required environmental documentation, as set forth in Chapter 3 of the TRPA Code, that demonstrates the alternative standards will not have a significant environmental impact;

c. Building height above 56 feet "**may be approved**" in a town center of an area plan, further provided:

1. The Area Plan includes the requirement that for all buildings over 56 feet in height all applicable findings in Chapter 37 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, including Findings 1, 3, and 9, must be made at the time any project subject to the area plan is reviewed and before it is permitted;

2. Residential buildings subject to additional height must not be subject to the density maximums in Table 13.5.3-1; and

3. The local jurisdiction has adopted design standards.

And finally, TRPA must include a requirement that each Area Plan conduct a roadway-by-roadway wildfire evacuation capacity analysis to help determine how long it will take to get residents and visitors out of harm's way during a no-notice ninety-five percentile fast moving wildfire under a variety of scenarios. This, in all areas adjacent to California, Very High Hazard Severity Zone and Wildland Urban Interface (WUI). Additionally, the analyses must achieve the recommendations of the California State Attorney General Best Practices for Analyzing and Mitigating Wildfire Impacts of Development Projects Under the California Environmental Quality Act especially on the California side of the basin. https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/attachments/press_docs/Wildfire%20guidance%20final%20%283%29.pdf.

This, in addition to providing analyses regarding the increased possibility of wildfire ignitions as a result of increasing populations within the basin and within dense town centers.

No public agency, including the APC and TRPA, should be allowed to make it harder for people to escape deadly fires.

For reference purposes, in the form of new information, please find the link to the now complete Independent Lake Tahoe Basin Wildfire Evacuation Analyses commissioned to assist the public and land use planners during project planning considerations. Link: https://drive.google.com/file/d/18fRMqrc1XvCfz9235iqEJ1imDYgMSyNd/view

Sincerely,
Doug Flaherty, President
Tahoe Sierra Clean Air Coalition (DBA TahoeCleanAir.org)
A Nevada 501(c)(3) Non-Profit Corporation
774 Mays Blvd 10-124
Incline Village, NV 89451

TahoeCleanAir.org Organizational Purpose

Tahoe Sierra Clean Air Coalition (DBA TahoeCleanAir.Org) is a Nevada 501 (c) (3) non-profit corporation registered to do business in the State of California. Our organizational purpose extends beyond protecting clean air, and includes, among other purposes, protecting and preserving natural resources, including but not limited to clean air, clean water, including lake and stream clarity, soils, plants and vegetation, wildlife and wildlife habitat including wildlife corridors, fish and fish habitat, birds and bird migration, insects, forest and wilderness from adverse environmental impacts and the threat and potential of adverse environmental impacts, including cumulative adverse impacts, within the Nevada and California Sierra Range, and its foothill communities, with corporation/organization geographical purpose priority being that of the Lake Tahoe Basin. Our purpose further extends to all things incidental to supporting environmental impact assessments and studies, including the gathering of data necessary to analyze the cumulative adverse environmental, health and safety impacts from public and private projects inside and outside the Lake Tahoe Basin, and addressing and supporting safe and effective evacuation during wildfire. Our purpose further extends to supporting transparency in government to ensure that our purpose and all things incidental to our specific and primary purposes are achieved.

From: Sophia Heidrich <sophia@mapf.org>
Sent: 11/12/2024 1:16:45 PM
To: Public Comment <PublicComment@trpa.gov>
Cc: Alexis Ollar <alexis@mapf.org>;
Subject: Comments Re: Agenda Item V.A, APC 11.13.24
Attachments: APC 11.13.24_Agenda Item V.A_MAP Comments.pdf

Hello TRPA Staff,

On behalf of Mountain Area Preservation, please find comments regarding Agenda Item V.A for tomorrow's APC meeting attached to this message.

Thank you,

MAP
mountain area preservation

Sophia Heidrich
Advocacy Director

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 25, Truckee, CA 96160
Physical Address: 10098 Jibboom St., Truckee, CA 96161
Office: 530.582.6741

www.MountainAreaPreservation.org | Like us on Facebook & Instagram

Please consider the environment before printing this email.
CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE - DO NOT FORWARD OR COPY: The contents of these communications and any attachments are intended solely for the personal and confidential use of the recipient(s) named above. This communication is intended to be and to remain confidential. Unauthorized interception, review, use or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication.

mountain area preservation

November 12, 2024

Advisory Planning Commission
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
128 Market Street, Stateline, NV
Submitted via Email

Re: Agenda Item V.A. — Amendment to the Local Jurisdiction Approval Process for Additional Density and Height in Centers

Dear Advisory Planning Commissioners,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the proposed amendments to the local jurisdiction approval process for additional height and density in centers. Mountain Area Preservation (MAP) is a grassroots environmental non-profit organization that has been engaging the community and advocating for sound land-use planning, the protection of open space and natural resources, and the preservation of mountain character in Truckee Tahoe since 1987.

On behalf of MAP, I am writing to express several concerns related to the proposed amendments. First, these amendments pave the way for local jurisdictions to propose additional height and density in centers with less TRPA oversight. At present, these changes require (at a minimum) the completion of an Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC), with more thorough environmental review, if deemed necessary. In effect, this proposal does not streamline the process as any area plan amendments are still required to be reviewed by the Advisory Planning Commission, the Regional Planning Committee, and the Governing Board. An IEC needs to be completed as part of that process so that any environmental impacts can be more thoroughly understood.

Second, allowing for additional height and density in Centers across the board weakens the Phase 2 Housing incentives, which allow for more height, density, and coverage for deed-restricted housing in Town Centers. I understand that this proposal does not, in and of itself, change the height or density standards in any of the area plans, but it does create a path for that to more easily occur.

During the Advisory Planning Commission hearing on August 14th (where the commission first reviewed these proposed changes along with proposed amendments to several of the City of South Lake Tahoe's area plans), one of the city planners was justifying why they are proposing more density. He stated that the City is exceeding its numbers for deed-restricted housing, but is behind on its numbers for moderate and market-rate housing. These are not either/or categories. Under its current definition, achievable housing is just market-rate housing for locals. If developers in the City need more density to build market-rate housing, they can already get that density by deed-restricting the housing to community members.

The bigger issue, it seems, and one that wasn't discussed on August 14th is that developers don't want to be encumbered by deed restrictions. While I understand that perspective, we need a culture shift in Tahoe. Housing that is deed-restricted for locals must become the norm, or we'll never improve the housing crisis; we will just have more luxury, market-rate units. And this will not become the norm if the TRPA and local jurisdictions weaken the incentives for developers to build deed-restricted housing.

Third, this proposal will remove the requirement that density/height outliers be included in the Regional Code. One of the benefits of the current system is that all of the height/density variations can be found in one place rather than having to scour each local jurisdiction's area plan for potential increases.

Finally, this proposal must consider the cumulative impacts of concentrating additional density in centers basinwide. I understand that the Regional Plan supports redevelopment in Town Centers, directing development from more sensitive areas to the core of each town and encouraging densities and development patterns that promote alternative modes of transportation and increased demand for transit. That said, when the Regional Plan was adopted, the environmental review didn't contemplate having unlimited amounts of the remaining density concentrated in centers as that was not allowed by code.

During the Phase 2 process, adding density incentives adjacent to Town Centers was removed from the proposal due to the lack of environmental analysis. At the time, the Governing Board determined that the existing environmental analysis was adequate in analyzing the unlimited density for deed-restricted housing in Town Centers because the number of remaining bonus units would limit the overall increase in density. The current proposal makes it easier for local jurisdictions to propose additional density in centers for all housing. The City of South Lake Tahoe (with a proposed 65 dwelling units/acre) is likely to be the first of several density increases. Overall, this may be the right general approach for minimizing environmental impacts in outlying areas, but the public safety impacts (especially as they relate to evacuation) have not been thoroughly considered nor mitigated.

The IEC admits that the City's proposed amendments would result in "changes to the overall density and distribution of the region's population and gradually increase the density of the population within the centers…" It goes on to conclude that these changes would have a less than significant impact. The issue is that this approach makes it difficult to analyze cumulative impacts. Density increases in the City may not have a significant impact on the basin as a whole, but how does that change when the other local jurisdictions follow suit? If this is to be the TRPA's new direction, the impacts should be fully analyzed. The

same goes for height increases. These standards were set for a reason—to limit the impacts of future Tahoe Basin development. If the TRPA wants to provide "flexibility" or a path forward to change the guardrails set in place, the impacts should be understood at the onset.

I often read staff reports or attend public hearings and hear planners say that the proposal will merely clarify the process, or streamline approvals, or formalize an existing practice. While that may be true, it is critical to understand what that will ultimately mean, what kinds of proposals will come forward as a result, and whether the impacts are fully understood. In this case, the intent is to formalize an existing process and make it easier to complete that process. On its face, this sounds mundane. In practice, I would argue that the TRPA is setting the stage for more height and density in centers across the Basin, the impacts are not fully understood, and the appropriate mitigation is not in place.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments,

Sophia Heidrich
Advocacy Director

From: Doug Flaherty <tahoesierracleanair@gmail.com>
Sent: 11/12/2024 2:04:08 PM
To: Public Comment <PublicComment@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>; John Hester <jhester@trpa.gov>
Subject: Opposition Agenda Item V.A. TRPA APC Meeting on 11-13-24
Attachments: Public Comment TRPA APC Mtng Agenda Item V.A. on 11-13-24.pdf

---

Dear APC Members,

Please make this email and attached comments part of the record and the minutes in connection with Item V. A. of your November 13, 2024 APC meeting.

Sincerely,
Doug Flaherty, President
Tahoe Sierra Clean Air Coalition (DBA TahoeCleanAir.org)
A Nevada 501(c)(3) Non-Profit Corporation
774 Mays Blvd 10-124
Incline Village, NV 89451

TahoeCleanAir.org Organizational Purpose
Tahoe Sierra Clean Air Coalition (DBA TahoeCleanAir.Org) is a Nevada 501 (c) (3) non-profit corporation registered to do business in the State of California. Our organizational purpose extends beyond protecting clean air, and includes, among other purposes, protecting and preserving natural resources, including but not limited to clean air, clean water, including lake and stream clarity, soils, plants and vegetation, wildlife and wildlife habitat including wildlife corridors, fish and fish habitat, birds and bird migration, insects, forest and wilderness from adverse environmental impacts and the threat and potential of adverse environmental impacts, including cumulative adverse impacts, within the Nevada and California Sierra Range, and its foothill communities, with corporation/organization geographical purpose priority being that of the Lake Tahoe Basin. Our purpose further extends to all things incidental to supporting environmental impact assessments and studies, including the gathering of data necessary to analyze the cumulative adverse environmental, health and safety impacts from public and private projects inside and outside the Lake Tahoe Basin, and addressing and supporting safe and effective evacuation during wildfire. Our purpose further extends to supporting transparency in government to ensure that our purpose and all things incidental to our specific and primary purposes are achieved.

TAHOECLEANAIR.ORG

November 12, 2024

Dear APC Members,

Please make this email and attached comments part of the record and the minutes in connection with Item V. A. during your November 13, 2024 APC meeting.

TahoeCleanAir.org objects to the APC approval and recommendation of Agenda Item V.A. for the following reasons:

The TRPA Staff report obfuscates, gaslights and misleads the public and the APC, by concealing the true intent of the proposed amendments.

The proposed amendments actually change Building Design and Minimum Development Standards under a "**may approve**" TRPA mandate that will glidepath the approval process in connection with specific proposed height and density alternative proposals. This without proper public noticing thereby denying the public reasonable time to evaluate this far-reaching set of proposed amendments.

If the purpose of the proposed TRPA code changes were truly to remove the need for multiple TRPA code amendments and increase transparency as stated directly below, TRPA must change the language in all proposed code sections listed below from **"may approve" to "may consider".**

TRPA has failed to provide substantial evidence within the Initial Environmental Checklist that the proposed amendments will result in a Finding of No Significant Impact. Further, the IEC is not signed by a TRPA representative. Why not?

Further TRPA is promoting Regional Plan and Code of ordinances amendments without a comprehensive public hearing and noticing process and must complete a comprehensive Environmental Impact Statement per the compact and Chapter 3 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

Current Staff Report Language

"The proposed amendments to the Regional Plan and Code would remove the need for multiple TRPA Code amendments every time TRPA approves an exception and would also increase transparency by codifying the requirements for local jurisdictions to follow when requesting increases to height and density in their area plans".

Taken individually and cumulatively, the proposed amendments and the current amendment process actually neuters public transparency under the trojan horse guise of avoiding duplication, but instead actually gives area plan partners assurances by right that the TRPA **"may approve"** development alternatives for increased height, and density alternatives under subjective future criteria. This "**may approve**" language is actually a change in building design standards and land use applicability within town centers, regional centers and high-density tourist districts that was not previously part of the TRPA code alternative approval process.

Chapter 13 of the proposed amendments states:
C. Building Design: Standards shall be adopted to ensure attractive and compatible development. The following shall be considered:
i. Outside town centers, **regional centers, and the High-Density Tourist District,** building height shall be limited to two stories (24 - 42 feet). Within town centers, building height may be allowed up to four stories (56 feet) as part of an Area Plan that has been found in conformance with the Regional Plan. **Subject to TRPA approval pursuant to Section 13.5.3.B.5 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, additional height beyond 56 feet "may be approved" in town centers as part of a conforming Area Plan if it meets the requirements of Chapter 13.**

Additionally added to TABLE 13.5.3-1: MINIMUM DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR AREA PLANS:
Additional density and height "may be approved" in an Area Plan, pursuant to Section 13.5.3.B.5.

The amendments go on to offer Alternative Density and Height **APPROVAL** Standards within Centers of Area Plans:

TRPA "**may approve**" density standards above the maximum set forth in Table 13.5.3-1 in town

centers, regional centers, and the High-Density Tourist District. TRPA "**may approve**" height standards above the maximum set forth in Table 13.5.3-1 in town centers. Area Plan proposals to exceed density or height standards consistent with this paragraph "**may be approved**" provided that:

a. The alternative standards are consistent with, and further the Goals and Policies of the Regional Plan;

b. The lead agency prepares the required environmental documentation, as set forth in Chapter 3 of the TRPA Code, that demonstrates the alternative standards will not have a significant environmental impact;

c. Building height above 56 feet "**may be approved**" in a town center of an area plan, further provided:

1. The Area Plan includes the requirement that for all buildings over 56 feet in height all applicable findings in Chapter 37 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, including Findings 1, 3, and 9, must be made at the time any project subject to the area plan is reviewed and before it is permitted;

2. Residential buildings subject to additional height must not be subject to the density maximums in Table 13.5.3-1; and

3. The local jurisdiction has adopted design standards.

And finally, TRPA must include a requirement that each Area Plan conduct a roadway-by-roadway wildfire evacuation capacity analysis to help determine how long it will take to get residents and visitors out of harm's way during a no-notice ninety-five percentile fast moving wildfire under a variety of scenarios. This, in all areas adjacent to California, Very High Hazard Severity Zone and Wildland Urban Interface (WUI). Additionally, the analyses must achieve the recommendations of the California State Attorney General Best Practices for Analyzing and Mitigating Wildfire Impacts of Development Projects Under the California Environmental Quality Act especially on the California side of the basin. https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/attachments/press_docs/Wildfire%20guidance%20final%20%283%29.pdf.

This, in addition to providing analyses regarding the increased possibility of wildfire ignitions as a result of increasing populations within the basin and within dense town centers.

No public agency, including the APC and TRPA, should be allowed to make it harder for people to escape deadly fires.

For reference purposes, in the form of new information, please find the link to the now complete Independent Lake Tahoe Basin Wildfire Evacuation Analyses commissioned to assist the public and land use planners during project planning considerations. Link: https://drive.google.com/file/d/18fRMqrc1XvCfz9235iqEJ1imDYgMSyNd/view

Sincerely,
Doug Flaherty, President
Tahoe Sierra Clean Air Coalition (DBA TahoeCleanAir.org)
A Nevada 501(c)(3) Non-Profit Corporation
774 Mays Blvd 10-124
Incline Village, NV 89451

TahoeCleanAir.org Organizational Purpose

Tahoe Sierra Clean Air Coalition (DBA TahoeCleanAir.Org) is a Nevada 501 (c) (3) non-profit corporation registered to do business in the State of California. Our organizational purpose extends beyond protecting clean air, and includes, among other purposes, protecting and preserving natural resources, including but not limited to clean air, clean water, including lake and stream clarity, soils, plants and vegetation, wildlife and wildlife habitat including wildlife corridors, fish and fish habitat, birds and bird migration, insects, forest and wilderness from adverse environmental impacts and the threat and potential of adverse environmental impacts, including cumulative adverse impacts, within the Nevada and California Sierra Range, and its foothill communities, with corporation/organization geographical purpose priority being that of the Lake Tahoe Basin. Our purpose further extends to all things incidental to supporting environmental impact assessments and studies, including the gathering of data necessary to analyze the cumulative adverse environmental, health and safety impacts from public and private projects inside and outside the Lake Tahoe Basin, and addressing and supporting safe and effective evacuation during wildfire. Our purpose further extends to supporting transparency in government to ensure that our purpose and all things incidental to our specific and primary purposes are achieved.

From: rondatycer@aol.com <rondatycer@aol.com>
Sent: 11/12/2024 2:18:38 PM
To: Public Comment <PublicComment@trpa.gov>
Subject: Amendments to Chapter 13

Residents lose hope = TRPA loses support

We Tahoe residents continue to watch in disbelief as TRPA 'protects' the Lake Tahoe basin by encouraging greater tourism and allowing denser development and more traffic in our small villages and towns.

It doesn't make sense to those of us who have lived here decades and no longer have access to the lake's amenities or recreational pleasures for the entire summer. We now wait for the millions of annual visitors to return home so we can get to the local beach, hike a wilderness trail communing with nature instead of dodging e-bikes, or enjoy eating at one of our local restaurants.

We simply do not comprehend why TRPA continues to ignore the clear need for constraints on building and development designed to increase population density given the increasing wildfire risk.

We would like to work WITH TRPA to protect the lake, but we don't want to join TRPA's current misguided mission and thereby become part of the problem.

Unfortunately, for the last several years, it seems TRPA has its agenda—undoubtedly tied to money—that puts priority on visitors and developers.

We would be more supportive if we saw even ONE new regulation from TRPA that acknowledges the finite capacity of the lake basin. Instead we are asked to join in and 'give opinion on' and provide 'public comment' for TRPA regulations that we know will increase traffic and/or tourism.

In my many years of presenting to—and communicating with—TRPA I have not seen even ONE regulation that will decrease traffic or tourism. I am not the only long-time resident who realizes resident voices no longer count. Only lawsuits work. Sad, but true.

Ronda Tycer, PhD
34 year resident

From: Ellie <tahoellie@yahoo.com>
Sent: 11/12/2024 12:15:21 PM
To: Brendan Ferry <Brendan.Ferry@edcgov.us>; EllerySTahler <estahler@lands.nv.gov>; Jennifer Carr <jcarr@ndep.nv.gov>; zthomas@cityofslt.us <zthomas@cityofslt.us>; Jason Drew <jdrew@ncenet.com>; Susan Chandler <susankesslerchandler@gmail.com>; Crystal Jacobsen <CJacobse@placer.ca.gov>; James McNamara <JCMcNamrno@aol.com>; Kevin Hill <nvwlfpack@icloud.com>; Ben Letton <ben.letton@waterboards.ca.gov>; Eric Young <EYoung@washoecounty.us>; Kmoneil <Kmoneil@douglasnv.us>; Heather Ferris <hferris@carson.org>; Kevin Drake <kevin@alibi.beer>; Garth Alling <galling@sierraecotonesolutions.com>; Chad Stephen <stephen@lakevalleyfire.org>; ExecutiveAssistant Washoe <executive.assistant@washoetribe.us>; Steve Teshara <SteveTeshara@gmail.com>; Public Comment <PublicComment@trpa.gov>; Jacob Stock <jstock@trpa.gov>; Graham St.Michel <gstmichel@trpa.gov>; Alyssa Bettinger <abettinger@trpa.gov>; Karen Fink <kfink@trpa.gov>
Subject: Public Comment Agenda Item V.A. November 14, 2024 TRPA APC meeting
Attachments: APC 11-13-2024 Public Agenda Item V.pdf

Please accept this Public Comment for Agenda Item V.A. November 14, 2024 TRPA APC meeting. Thank you, Ellie Waller

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency November 13, 2024 Ellie Waller Public Comment for the Record Item V.A Chapter 13 Area Plan Propose Alternative Density and Height limits in Town Centers, Regional Centers, and the High-Density Tourist District

SO THIS IS THE "NEW" NORMAL? REALLY?

1). APPROVE A PROJECT THEN FIX THE CODE?

2) PROVIDE AN APPLICATION(s) FOR AREA PLAN PROPOSED EXCEEDANCES OF HEIGHT AND DENSITY STANDARDS (Table 13.5.3-1) TO ACCOMMODATE KNOWN/PERCEIVED PROJECT(s) REQUESTS BEFORE THEIR APPROVAL?

THE PROPOSALS BEFORE YOU TODAY AND SUBSEQUENTLY THE REGIONAL PLAN COMMITTEE AND GOVERNING BOARD NEED AND MUST BE FURTHER VETTED BEFORE PROVIDING RECOMMENDATIONS.

THESE REQUESTS COULD/WILL HAVE REGIONAL SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON SCENIC FOR EXAMPLE.

August 14, 2024 packet May 8, 2024 draft minutes

https://www.trpa.gov/wp-content/uploads/August-14-2024-APC-Packet.pdf

Mr. Stock continued to the next item, mixed-use development, detailed in Exhibit A to Attachment A in the packet. The Regional Plan identifies mixed-use development as a tool for energy conservation and greenhouse gas reduction. The idea is that combining multiple compatible uses on a property reduces the need for residents to use private automobiles to access services. **Despite its importance, we haven't previously had a definition or specific standards for mixed-use in the TRPA code. This need was highlighted in the permitting process for the 947 Tahoe project, and the associated Washoe Tahoe Area Plan Amendment. We received direction from the APC and the Governing Board to develop mixed-use standards and affordable housing mitigation for condos in Incline Village, later expanding this to a regional level**. We are following up on that direction with this set of amendments.

This particular change (underlined above) should have been done years ago (in my opinion) and now it's 2024 and it's time to fix it?. The SUBJECTIVITY and ALLOWED INTERPRETATION of current code by TRPA staff, led the Advisory Planning Commission, Regional Plan Committee and Governing Board on a path to approval of far too many projects.

Let me remind you of the Latitude 39 project: The VMT perceived exceedance that should have not allowed the project to be approved requiring additional impact analysis, and was urged by more than one Governing Board member to have VMT count re-verified, was ultimately approved without re-verification of the convenient 1298 count where 1300 count. This would have triggered additional analysis.

And above the 947 Tahoe Project housing mitigation a sham.

Donating land doesn't get a project built.

Since February, both APC and RPC suggested changes to make these requirements more flexible. Tahoe has many irregularly sized and shaped properties, unlike the grid layouts in other areas, so flexibility is necessary. Following APC direction, we've clarified that these standards are not retroactive and only apply to new construction after the effective date of adoption. **Existing mixed-use properties won't need to comply and won't be considered non-conforming uses.**

When a person or developer purchases an irregular lot, they know what they are getting.

Why, now is it so important to allow flexibility?

From: Kristina Hill <tahoehills@att.net>
Sent: 11/12/2024 10:41:43 AM
To: Public Comment <PublicComment@trpa.gov>
Cc: Tobi Tyler <tylertahoe1@gmail.com>; Graham St.Michel <gstmichel@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>; Dan Segan <dsegan@trpa.gov>;
Subject: Public Comment for APC meeting 11.12.24
Attachments: TRPA APC comment 11.13.24 .2.doc

Hello,

Please see attached public comment for the above referenced meeting.

Please circulate to the APC members and appropriate staff.

Thank You,
Kristina

Kristina Hill
Hill Planning, Inc.
P.O. Box 6139
Incline Village, NV 89450

c: (775) 544-4345

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

MEMO

Date: **October 13, 2024**
To: **TRPA APC**
From: **Kristina Hill**
Subject: **Chapter 13 Proposed Code Amendments to Allow More Building Height and Density**

Hello, my name is Kristina Hill. I'm a former TRPA planner, a long time planning consultant and a 40 year full-time Tahoe Basin resident. I'm speaking on behalf of the Sierra Club.

The staff summary states that the proposed amendments to Ch. 13 do not involve or result in any new development.

How can that be true if the amendments allow for increased building height and density over and above what is allowed now?

"The proposed amendments to the Regional Plan and Chapter 13 would "formalize a process" for local jurisdictions proposing density in centers and height in town centers of their area plans above 25 units per acre or 56 feet."

I'm not seeing this "process change" being identified. What new process? The counties would not have to go through APC and GB? Staff approval?

Further,

This "process" was determined not to have any environmental impact based on another Initial Environmental Checklist which cavalierly ticks off the no box under the heading of "Human Health" to the question:

17. Human Health

Will the proposal result in:

a. Creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard (excluding mental health)?
Yes No No, with mitigation Data insufficient

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

b. Exposure of people to potential health hazards?
Yes No No, with mitigation Data insufficient

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

In case you missed it: California's First District Court of Appeal ruled on Oct. 23 to reject a projects revised EIR because developers had failed to account for the risk of wildfire the development would have on an area susceptible to human-caused blazes.

The court concluded: No developer should be allowed to make it harder for people to escape deadly fires.

In truth, the impact on human health is exacerbated by large mixed use projects, like the many proposed on the north shore,
Yet you all keep approving them because you claim fire protection is not your jurisdiction.

Unfortunately, it seems common sense can only be determined in the court system. Meanwhile, our lives are at stake.

It used to be your job was to protect Lake Tahoe; in addition to wildfire evacuation impacts, prior to taking action on this item, you should be aware that high density and high buildings have water quality impacts as well. Regardless of your "science", 100% land coverage resulting from unlimited density, leaves little area for infiltration, resulting in more urban run-off being discharged directly into the Lake resulting in less water clarity and more pollution and algae.

Where is that environmental impact being justified in the "Checklist"?

Since these amendments are blatantly being made to accommodate the City of South Lake Tahoe, why not limit their jurisdiction to the specific area. These amendments have no place in Washoe and Placer Counties.

Please recommend denial of these amendments until the scope is limited to the CSLT.

From: preserve@ntpac.org <preserve@ntpac.org>
Sent: 11/12/2024 12:00:31 PM
To: 'Rusel Heckert' <rustyheckert@sbcglobal.net>
Cc: Public Comment <PublicComment@trpa.gov>;
Subject: RE: STOP TRPA FROM CHANGING REGIONAL PLAN WITHOUT COMMUNITY INPUT & ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

Please send comments to APC on publiccomment@trpa.gov. before 4pm today.
copy my subject line and any content.
Thank you,
Ann

From: Rusel Heckert <rustyheckert@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2024 11:48 AM
To: Ann Nichols <preserve@ntpac.ORG>
Subject: Re: STOP TRPA FROM CHANGING REGIONAL PLAN WITHOUT COMMUNITY INPUT & ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

Thank you. How do I vote?

Sent from AT&T Yahoo Mail for iPhone

On Tuesday, November 12, 2024, 11:26 AM, Ann Nichols <preserve@ntpac.ORG> wrote:

View this email in your browser

STOP TRPA FROM CHANGING THE REGIONAL PLAN WITHOUT COMMUNITY INPUT

11/12/24
TO: TRPA/APC
RE: Discussion and possible recommendation for Discussion/
approval of proposed amendments to Chapter 13 and Possible
of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, and the Goals Action/Recommendation
and Policies of the Regional Plan, regarding the
review and potential approval process for local
jurisdiction Area Plans that propose alternative
density and height limits in Centers
https://www.trpa.gov/wp-content/uploads/November-13-2024-APC-Packet.pdf
https://www.trpa.gov/wp-content/uploads/November-13-2024-APC-Agenda.pdf

1. Insufficient Public Process to Change the Regional Plan:
TRPA is trying to significantly change the Regional Plan and the Goals and Policies without meaningful community input. Only one previous confusing discussion of similar topics has been held at APC in August 2024 (see attached minutes to packet). There have been no community hearings on this specific topic-changing the Regional Plan and Goals and Policies and Chapter 13 regarding height and density, which is what the community really cares about. These changes are not "clarifications", these aren't changes of degrees. They are changes in kind. This continued lack of transparency is the reason so many distrust TRPA.

2. The Regional Plan has fallen into disarray
Master Plans meant something. TRPA has modified the Regional Plan's Code of

Ordinances 44 times since 2013 resulting in 375 changes to existing codes. This is not master planning or following the rules; is it just a bunch of words or is it concessions to whatever a developer desires. The TRPA has been captured by developers. Using 3 previous changes to height and density since 2012 as justification is insufficient. At the time these changes were made the public was guaranteed by TRPA they would not serve as future precedents.

3. TRPA is turning over the management and control of Lake Tahoe Planning to the Counties and the City of South Lake Tahoe through the individual area plans.

TRPA was originally formed to keep Lake Tahoe from local control: local proposals to build a bridge over Emerald Bay and a freeway around the Lake are prime examples. Mindless development of luxury condos without affordable housing components has been the norm. Further empowering the Counties who are solely driven by money is a failure to follow the edicts of the Compact.
Has TRPA become an irrelevant growth machine? What is the purpose of TRPA's $28m/budget? Only $400k/yr is being spent on enforcement of the rules.

4. The APC packet characterizes the Regional Plan change as a project. In that case, the significant change requires an EIR/EIS under CEQA.

Only the environmental checklist is provided, and it is insufficient. Without guard rails and caps on height and density, the environmental consequences are unknown. **The Regional Plan proposed changes to Chapter 13 (Goals and Policies) are inconsistent with the existing Regional Plan and Goals and Policies.**

5. The proposed significant changes are growth inducing.

Lake Tahoe does not have the capacity to absorb more people during peak period. The environmental analysis must consider the results of:

- the Evacuation Study provided by Tahoe Clean Air Coalition
- Lake Tahoe's lack of infrastructure and reliable transportation
- Impacts of short term rentals
- Surrounding growth in Reno, Carson, Ca. foothills
- Capacity Study of Lake Tahoe
- Extensive cumulative analysis
- Traffic increases on SR 431, 267 and 50.

Please vote no on this poorly conceived solution to "clarify the Regional Plan".

Ann Nichols
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/

North Tahoe Preservation Alliance
P.O. Box 4
Crystal Bay, NV 89402
775-831-0625
preserve@ntpac.org

Copyright © 2024 NORTH TAHOE PRESERVATION ALLIANCE, All rights reserved.
You are receiving this email because you exhibited interest in our environmental efforts.

Want to change how you receive these emails?
You can update your preferences or unsubscribe from this list.

From: preserve@ntpac.org <preserve@ntpac.org>
Sent: 11/12/2024 11:05:47 AM
To: Public Comment <PublicComment@trpa.gov>
Subject: Comments on Amendments of TRPA Code Chapter 13 on 11/13/24
Attachments: image001.png

Please distribute to Governing Board and APC

North Tahoe Preservation Alliance
P.O. Box 4
Crystal Bay, Nv. 89402
preserve@ntpac.org
11/12/24
TO: TRPA/APC
RE: Discussion and possible recommendation for Discussion
approval of proposed amendments to Chapter 13 and Possible
of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, and the Goals Action/Recommendation
and Policies of the Regional Plan, regarding the
review and potential approval process for local
jurisdiction Area Plans that propose alternative
density and height limits in Centers

North Tahoe Preservation Alliance has been helping preserve the natural beauty and rural character of North Lake Tahoe since 2007.

1. **Insufficient Public Process to Change the Regional Plan:**
TRPA is trying to significantly change the Regional Plan and the Goals and Policies without meaningful community input. Only one previous confusing discussion of myriad similar topics hearing has been held at APC in August 2024. There have been no community hearings on this specific topic-changing the Regional Plan and Goals and Policies and Chapter 13 regarding height and density, which is what the community really cares about. These changes are not "clarifications", these aren't changes of degrees. They are changes in kind. This continued lack of transparency is the reason so many distrust TRPA.
2. C**The Regional Plan has fallen into disarray**.
Master Plans meant something. TRPA has modified the Regional Plan's Code of Ordinances 44 times since 2013 resulting in 375 changes to existing codes. This is not master planning or following the rules; it's concessions to whatever a developer desires. The TRPA has been captured by developers. Using 3 previous changes to height and density since 2012 as justification is insufficient. At the time these changes were made the public was guaranteed by TRPA they would not serve as future precedents.

3. **TRPA is turning over the management and control of Lake Tahoe Planning to the Counties and the City of South Lake Tahoe through the individual area plans.**
TRPA was originally formed to keep Lake Tahoe from local control: local proposals to build a bridge over Emerald Bay and a freeway around the Lake are prime examples. Mindless development of luxury condos without affordable housing components has been the norm. Further empowering the Counties who are solely driven by money is a failure to follow the edicts of the Compact.
Has TRPA become an irrelevant growth machine? What is the purpose of TRPA's $28m/budget? Only $400k is being spent on enforcement of the rules.
4. **The APC packet characterizes the Regional Plan change as a project. In that case the significant change requires an EIR/EIS under CEQA.**
Only the environmental checklist is provided, and it is insufficient. Without guard rails and caps on height and density, the environmental consequences are unknown.
The Regional Plan proposed changes to Chapter 13 (Goals and Policies) are inconsistent with the existing Regional Plan and Goals and Policies.
5. **The proposed significant changes are growth inducing.**
Lake Tahoe does not have the capacity to absorb more people during peak period. The environmental analysis must consider the results of:
   a. the Evacuation Study provided by Tahoe Clean Air Coalition
   b. Lake Tahoe's lack of infrastructure and reliable transportation
   c. Impacts of short term rentals
   d. Surrounding growth in Reno, Carson, Ca. foothills
   e. Capacity Study of Lake Tahoe
   f. Extensive cumulative analysis
   g. Traffic increases on SR 431, 267 and 50.

Please vote no on this poorly conceived solution to "clarifying the Regional Plan".

Ann Nichols
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/

NORTH TAHOE PRESERVATION ALLIANCE

From: Jody Precit <jprecit27@gmail.com>
Sent: 11/12/2024 8:06:02 AM
To: Public Comment <PublicComment@trpa.gov>
Subject: AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 13

Dear TRPA Board Members,

As a 40 year resident of north lake tahoe, 38 of those years here in Kings Beach.
I am strongly against the latest "TRPA proposal allowing the area plans, run by the 5 counties (Placer, Washoe,El Dorado,Douglas, Carson City) and the city of South Lake Tahoe, to request
any density or height they can environmentally justify. No cap. No environmental statement or report ." Once again I have to ask myself " do any of you actually live & work here in Kings Beach?" Our quality of life has certainly changed over the past 40 years, especially with traffic congestion. We have already lost some of our small town uniqueness and the developers even want more, tourists come and go but the locals are the backbone of our community.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Jody Medina Precit

From: Hilary Jimenez <hilarysjimenez25@gmail.com>
Sent: 11/12/2024 9:23:51 AM
To: Public Comment <PublicComment@trpa.gov>
Subject: AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 13

Good morning,

I am writing to express my deep disagreement with the proposed amendments to Chapter 13. These changes will have significant negative consequences for our community and the environment, and I urge you to reconsider them.

Increasing the height of buildings in this area, coupled with the lack of parking requirements and the proposed density increases, will severely impact the character of our community and our precious local environment. This area is one of the few remaining spaces that offers a natural refuge, and it should be protected from overdevelopment that could damage its ecosystem and reduce its quality of life for residents and visitors alike.

Furthermore, the proposal, as it stands, will drastically compromise the safety of our community. The increased density will exacerbate traffic congestion, making it more difficult for emergency vehicles to navigate, especially during an evacuation in the event of a fire or other disaster. Our area's infrastructure is simply not equipped to handle such rapid growth, and this could put residents at grave risk during an emergency.

I strongly urge you to reconsider these amendments and explore alternatives that prioritize both the safety of residents and the long-term preservation of our environment. This is a critical moment for our community, and I hope you will listen to the concerns of the people who live here and depend on this area for their well-being.

These amendments do NOT hold up your own mission of "leading a cooperative effort to **preserve**, **restore**, and **enhance** the unique natural and human environment of the Lake Tahoe Region." Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

--
Hilary Jimenez
530-412-2772
hilarysjimenez25@gmail.com

From: Ryan Wexler <epicwinter@hotmail.com>
Sent: 11/12/2024 11:40:51 AM
To: Public Comment <PublicComment@trpa.gov>
Subject: regional plan amendments to chapter 13

I object to the proposed expanded capabilities to allow further density, height impacts and changes to plan with no comprehensive environmental impact considered.
PLEASE SLOW DOWN.
You have been following this playbook for some time and it is neither accomplishing your goal of redevelopment or the residents goal of sustainable and careful development without ruining Tahoe in the process. Please reassess. How many times do residents have to tell you this is not what they want before you make a change.
Please follow your own rules and stop making exceptions. Please stop changing the rules as you go.
thanks
Ryan Wexler
Kings Beach Resident

From: amy kacher <amykacher1@gmail.com>
Sent: 11/12/2024 10:47:29 AM
To: Public Comment <PublicComment@trpa.gov>
Subject: Amendments to Chapter 13

Hello,

I strongly oppose increasing height and density limits in the Tahoe Basin. The fire evacuation risk should be top of mind - this should be the absolute PRIMARY consideration in addition to the impact of daily traffic and congestion has on the natural habitat of the area.

Please note that the incumbent won but not by as much as you'd expect-this means the incumbent needs to dial back their excitement for density and height increases.

As a homeowner myself, I welcome small, to scale development in creative locations that fits the vernacular of our mountain towns. NOT multi story modern box type incongruous developments- we don't want to end up looking like Incline in 10 years.

Thanks for your time

Amy Kacher

hey, we are all just people

From: Julie Padelford-Jansen <peahead61@icloud.com>
Sent: 11/11/2024 8:59:32 AM
To: Public Comment <PublicComment@trpa.gov>
Subject: Amendments to Chapter 13

I strongly disapprove to the proposed amendments to chapter 13. What could TRPA possible be thinking?? Not good stewardship.
Sent from my iPad
Julie Padelford
Peahead61@comcast.net
954-347-4028

From: Paul Frankel <paulfrankel@yahoo.com>
Sent: 11/11/2024 6:18:14 AM
To: Public Comment <PublicComment@trpa.gov>
Subject: Amendment to Chapter 13

We do not support this amendment!

Paul & Laura Frankel
847 Jeffrey Street
Incline Village, NV

From: Niobe Burden <niobe.burden@gmail.com>
Sent: 11/11/2024 8:30:18 PM
To: Public Comment <PublicComment@trpa.gov>
Subject: APC Meeting Nov 13, 2024- Amendments to Chapter 13

For public record and consideration by the Advisory Planning Commission at their November 13, 2024 meeting.

Why is TRPA now proposing to change the Regional Plan to "clarify the process" of constantly amending the Regional Plan.

If it is left up to the 5 counties (Placer, Washoe, El Dorado, Douglas, Carson City) and the City of South Lake Tahoe, **to request any density or height they can environmentally justify. NO CAP. NO ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT OR REPORT.**
How is TRPA upholding their responsibilities under the bi-state compact?

As has been seen and will show in years of written minutes records, it's never seen that TRPA disagrees with the Counties or rejects a project if it's "gone through the process" of these meetings.

I want to be on record representing a large number of concerned residents of north Lake Tahoe for a strong opposition to this proposal.

What exactly will be left for TRPA to uphold?

Respectfully submitted,
Niobe Burden Austere
Tahoe Vista property owner
Tahoe conservation photographer

From: gingcoltrin77@aol.com <gingcoltrin77@aol.com>
Sent: 11/11/2024 1:32:10 PM
To: Public Comment <PublicComment@trpa.gov>
Subject: Building heights

I fully object to the continued proposal of increased building heights in the Tahoe basin. I've lived in the North Shore for 52 years & have witnessed the increase in building & people. Increasing the building height will allow for more people & obstruct views as well !

Sent from the all new AOL app for iOS

From: ann@annnichols.com <ann@annnichols.com>
Sent: 11/10/2024 7:04:56 PM
Cc: Public Comment <PublicComment@trpa.gov>;
Subject: Local Election Results/TRPA's New Unlimited Height and Density Proposal

---

TRPA, Please distribute to the APC and Governing Board regarding amending Chapter 13

LOCAL ELECTION PRELIMINARY RESULTS-

Placer County's District 5 incumbent Cindy Gustafson appears to have beaten Wayne Nader by 3000 votes out of approx. 20k total voters. Cindy was extremely well funded and ran on allowing more concentrated development/height in Tahoe Town Centers. Challenger Wayne Nader focused on allowing responsible growth only after considering the cumulative impacts of proposed projects.
Washoe County's District 1 incumbent Alexis Hill appears to have surpassed Marsha Berkbigler by 6400 votes out of almost 48k total votes.
These results sent an over resounding message that many of the district's constituents are not happy with the direction things have been going. The most important job of the elected official is to represent their constituents. Winning the election is only the job interview. If anything, the results here are a mandate for Cindy and Alexis to adjust their policies and approach to better represent more of their constituents. We hope they both do, otherwise you can kiss any chance of a rural North Tahoe without traffic gridlock and 7 story buildings goodbye.

TRPA continues to promote more, proposing even more height and density with NO LIMITS!

For context, in 2012 TRPA amended the Tahoe Regional Plan to add more height and density. Allowed height went from 36' to 56' in Town Centers. Crystal Bay casino core went to 75'. South Shore to 195'. Density changed from 15 to 25 units/acre. But there is never enough of "more". The 2024 2nd Housing Amendment changed the height in Town Centers on the North Shore to 65' and unlimited density with deed restricted housing.

NOW AGAIN, TRPA proposes to change the Regional Plan to "clarify the process" of constantly amending the Regional Plan. TRPA proposes allowing the area plans, run by the 5 counties (Placer, Washoe, El Dorado, Douglas, Carson City) and the City of South Lake Tahoe, **to request any density or height they can environmentally justify. NO CAP. NO ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT OR REPORT.** Those of us with historical perspective have never seen TRPA disagree with the Counties or reject a project.

Please EMAIL TRPA WITH YOUR STRONG OBJECTION BEFORE TUES 11/12 AT 4 PM AT publiccomment@trpa.gov WITH THE SUBJECT LINE

“AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 13”
To comment on Wednesday 11/13/24 by zoom, use link
https://www.trpa.gov/2024/11/?cat=13
Or join us in person at Wednesday, November 13, 2024,
9:30 a.m., at the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, 128 Market Street,
Stateline,
NV for the Advisory Planning Commission hearing.

THIS IS THE FIRST STEP TO APPROVAL BY THE GOVERNING BOARD.

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/

Learn More Here

Copyright © 2024 NORTH TAHOE PRESERVATION ALLIANCE, All rights reserved.
You are receiving this email because you exhibited interest in our environmental efforts.

Our mailing address is:
NORTH TAHOE PRESERVATION ALLIANCE
P.O. Box 4
Crystal Bay, NV 89402

Add us to your address book

Want to change how you receive these emails?
You can update your preferences or unsubscribe from this list.