

**From:** Ellie <tahoellie@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** 5/20/2024 12:32:27 PM  
**To:** Public Comment <PublicComment@trpa.gov>  
**Subject:** May 22, 2024 Tahoe Regional Planning Agency General Public Comment  
**Attachments:** [GB 5-22-2024 Wildfire General Comment.docx.pdf](#)

---

Please accept and distribute this opening public comment for the May 22, 2024 Tahoe Regional Planning Governing Board meeting  
Thank you, Ellie Waller

**These articles highlight very important issues: License to Burn. Wildfire as the Ultimate Private Public Partnerships. Excerpts included, please read all articles in their entirety.**

**Part One** <https://thenevadaglobe.com/articles/license-to-burn-wildfire-as-the-ultimate-private-public-partnership/>

**The federal government owns over 86 percent of land in the Silver State and the consequences of these alliances can be seen in the Tahoe basin**

As the infernos rage and havoc ensues, a sacred alliance is forming in Sacramento to fight fire with even more fire—this fueled by a plethora of shared and shadowy public and private “partnership” memorandums of understanding (MOUs). The [alliances extend](#) into Nevada as the federal government owns over 86 percent of land in the Silver State, and the consequences of these alliances can be seen in the Tahoe basin.

This is a story of how public [private partnerships](#), like those that proliferate around Lake Tahoe,

**Part Two** <https://thenevadaglobe.com/articles/license-to-burn-wildfire-as-the-ultimate-public-private-partnership-part-two/>

**These forest graveyards will never return to their former glory**

On the night of August 14, 2021—exactly 365 days after the announced Fire Stewardship [MOU](#)—a small fire flared up a few miles from Grizzly Flats—a simple brushfire. Residents had no reason to believe the United States Forest Service (USFS) would not easily put it out. But USFS was unresponsive, inexplicably pulling a half dozen Cal Fire engines and crews off the fire in the early hours, ostensibly for firefighter protection. But two days later, the fire exploded into the mountain town, a monstrous inferno. Grizzly Flats was leveled in 15 minutes.

The [60 Minutes](#) investigation cites evidence of mismanagement, outdated tactics, and overgrown forest service land. Curiously, in a USFS agreement 10 years earlier, the forest service had promised to provide the critical clearance and mitigation measures needed to protect the town from wildfire in a high-risk fire zone. But USFS failed to deliver.

After torching Grizzly Flats, the Caldor fire began its trek to Tahoe.

**Part Three** <https://thenevadaglobe.com/articles/license-to-burn-wildfire-as-the-ultimate-public-private-partnership-part-three/>

**How a fire that started in Sacramento ends with a sawmill in Carson City**

The far-reaching public-private partnership arising from the historic [Agreement for Shared Stewardship](#) of California’s Forests and Rangelands presaged profound environmental and economic impacts on the Tahoe region. The expressed commitment of all parties and partners to develop “innovative markets and investment opportunities for Wood Products and Recycled Forest Byproducts” set the table for a host of new enterprise and incentives for “investment in wood processing facilities.”

Spearheading this endeavor, [The Tahoe Fund](#) (TTF) convened a carefully chosen group of sawmill project leaders, including CEO Jon Shinn and Kevin Leary, CEO of a Reno-based private investment firm, Hallador Investment Advisors. In February 2021, it commissioned a study that [examined how much supply would be available for a sawmill operation in the region](#). It cites recent funding and planning by the state of California and the United States Forest Service (USFS) to increase fuel reduction treatments such as thinning, as well as prescribed fire. “That support should help keep the supply of logs for the sawmill flowing,” said Tahoe Fund CEO Amy Berry. “Everyone has a role to play here.”

**From:** preserve@ntpac.org <preserve@ntpac.org>  
**Sent:** 5/18/2024 8:44:07 AM  
**To:** Public Comment <PublicComment@trpa.gov>  
**Subject:** please distribute to APC and GB  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

<https://mailchi.mp/fa1fb783bf3c/kingsbarn-39-degrees-project-is-off-course>



**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](https://www.tiktok.com/@northtahoepreservation?t=8XCElbNFbSt&_r=1)

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

**From:** leah kaufman <leah.lkplanning@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** 5/17/2024 3:58:48 PM  
**To:** Crystal Jacobsen <C.Jacobse@placer.ca.gov>; Stacy Wydra <swydra@placer.ca.gov>; Heather Beckman <hbeckman@placer.ca.gov>  
**Cc:** DarcieGoodman-Collins <Darcie@keoptahoebblue.org>; Alexis Ollar <alexis@mapf.org>; Public Comment <PublicComment@trpa.gov>; Gavin Feiger <gavin@keoptahoebblue.org>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>; John Hester <jhester@trpa.gov>; Cindy.Gustafson <cindygustafson@placer.ca.gov>;  
**Subject:** 39 Degrees North Kings Beach Community Meeting  
**Attachments:** [39 degrees North Kings Beach Meeting minutes summary #1.docx](#)

---

Enclosed please find my comments regarding the community meeting for 39 degrees North held on May 14, 2024. Please distribute to the Placer County BOS and to the TRPA Governing Board. Thank you to Placer County staff for attending.

Leah Kaufman- Planner

LEAH KAUFMAN PLANNING AND CONSULTING

PO BX 253

CARNELAIN BAY, CALIFORNIA, 96140

May 15, 2024

RE: 39 Degrees North- Lake Tahoe Community Meeting

Dear Crystal, Stacy, and Heather,

It was an amazing turn out of passionate locals at the May 14<sup>th</sup> informational meeting with the 39 Degrees North Lake Tahoe Kings Beach project unveiling by the developer team. Apparent was the time and effort that the Kingsbarn Realty Capital and Clark developers have put into creating **their** concept for Kings Beach. The project proponent stated the project would consist of 179 hotel rooms with 195 parking places in a parking structure, 62 workforce housing units with 50 surface parking spaces and 38 townhomes with two car garages and 30 additional surface parking spaces.

This letter reflects my recap of the meeting I did not speak during public comments as I wanted to hear what the Kings Beach locals had to say.

My impression is that the community is receptive to a hotel/workforce mixed-use project with the assurance that the housing component would be affordable to the workforce employed by the hotel plus replacement of the 12 units that will be demolished as part of the project. (Hotels employ front desk, housekeeping, maintenance, food and beverage, security, administration, management personnel etc.).

The consistent theme of 98 plus percent of those in the room (only exceptions were other developers or those in construction), is that this project as proposed is too massive, has too much height, is too dense, and is out of scale with the character of the Kings Beach community. It belongs on South Shore, in a ski resort, or would look nice in an urban city. Six stories with 23% of the project at 75 feet of height in a building 450 linear feet long located close to the highway does not meet the vision of the Tahoe Basin Area Plan (TBAP) or the community. It is almost twenty feet taller than the TBAP allowable height and 27 feet higher than any other existing structure in town. (Domus is currently the tallest building at the eastern end of town at approximately 46-48 feet and Safeway has the most building square footage at approximately 35,000 sf).

Attending last night's meeting were approximately 12 of the original 35 plan team members who crafted the TBAP. At the time, the community wanted heights of 48 feet on the mountainside and 36 feet on the lakeside. The Board of Supervisors (BOS) ultimately

approved 56 feet of height for both sides of the highway. (This additional height was not advocated for by the community members and to date, I have not attended a single meeting where the community is supportive of more height than what is currently allowed).

The County should clarify to the public if these amendments are truly site specific as represented at the meeting by the developer or if they will apply to other parcels in Town Centers within Kings Beach and Tahoe City. (I have email from Placer County staff stating that the amendments are not site specific).

Additionally, in terms of height, I believe that there are no TRPA codes or findings crafted for allowing additional height above what is approved in the Community Plan except for the TRPA Phase Two Housing Amendments recently passed for 65 feet if deed restricted for workforce housing. Please advise me if I am wrong.

Also present were members of North Tahoe Regional Advisory Committee (NTRAC), three out of the five North Tahoe Public Utility District (NTPUD) Board Members, North Tahoe Business Association (NTBA) member representatives, Mountain Air Preservation (MAP), NT Preservation Alliance, Tahoe Clean Air Association, Strong Town representatives, Resort Association etc. and over 150+/- residents.

The community presented concerns but also offered solutions including.

- Reconfigure the hotel amenities. Eliminate the rooftop bar as the noise from the rooftop bar could attenuate into the backstreets. Suggestions were made to relocate the bar to a lower floor adjacent to the restaurant. Also questioned was the viability of the bar as the current Caliente Restaurant roof top bar is hardly used.
- Remove or shrink the size of the conference center and ballrooms and work with the North Tahoe PUD Event Center across the street. (There is just so much demand for weddings and conferences and this could reduce the mass of the hotel). The Event Center is located on the lake less than 500 feet away.
- “Achievable housing” is not “affordable housing” so suggestions were that a majority of the proposed housing should be for moderate and or low income at at least 120% of Placer County medium income so that the workers created by the project could live here. The developer did not state what market rate rents are proposed to be for the units.
- Build the workforce housing component before the hotel.

- Adhere to the 56 feet of allowable height in the TBAP.
- A few people questioned the townhomes design with backyard garage access which could be impractical for and create additional land coverage, more area for snow removal and less green space. Residents expressed concerns that the ingress and egress to the hotel should be well thought out so that entrances and exits won't create a traffic jam in summer. Currently Highway 28 roadway capacity experiences gridlock and backups all summer long due to tourism, construction traffic and pedestrian crossings. Current traffic is a huge concern without future projects coming online. Also brought up was location for the townhomes.
- Fire evacuation and safety are a big concern as expressed by numerous speakers. Current water consumption in the summer (July and August) is using the maximum amount available for the NTPUD pumping and storage systems. While current storage is sustaining the fire flow protection, in a wildfire emergency this water could be used quickly. (NTPUD )
- Existing roundabouts cause backup traffic due to constant people crossings. These crossings should be reexamined.
- The current capacity of the State Beach in summer is packed now. How will this project address this issue?

**Summary:** The community felt that the design decisions had already been made and that community input was not a priority or given much consideration. The development team talked for over an hour and a half before taking questions from the public. Public comments were limited to two minutes, but some ran over.

Strong Town advocates stated that instead of a "village concept" that the County is pushing, it might be prudent to go back and consider what the community really wants such as smaller developments that are more in keeping with the character of the town.

Erin O'Brien from Grand Pacific Resorts echoed this sentiment, stating that they have successful resorts all over California in communities where they are of a scale and charm that fit in with the existing community character. i.e. Redwolf Lakeside Lodge, Redwolf Palisades, Olympic Village Inn, etc.

Others commented that this project only caters to the tourists. The 8,300 sf of commercial floor area should be reserved for local business enterprises, but question if rents are going to be affordable or sustainable and how this project will impact the other businesses in

town. (Please note the Town of Truckee does not approve any projects that do not have a large community component).

The abundance of Short-term rentals (STR's) that act like de facto hotels was mentioned. The county explained that STR's would be reduced based on each hotel room built. Currently there are 3,900 STR allocations with approximately 3,400 active permits so 500 +/-new hotel rooms would have to be built before any reduction in inventory is made. I question the effectiveness/meaningfulness of this. Others stated STR's should be reduced first before new hotels are built.

Mountain Air Preservation (MAP) brought up the current litigation by MAP and others for both the TBAP and TRPA Phase Two housing amendments and that this project does not meet current allowable height restrictions for either of the plans.

Tree removal was also discussed as most of the site's trees will be taken out for this development. (I believe only 13 trees will be remaining on an over three-acre site).

Shading concerns of the building were brought up for the sidewalks and on adjacent properties.

Also discussed were the next steps and questions by the community on how they can become engaged in a more public process as this is the largest proposed development in Kings Beach in years.

Others stated that cumulative impacts with other projects such as the Cal Neva redevelopment, Brockway North Hotel, future Biltmore project, Neptune Developments etc, should be addressed for traffic, parking, fire safety and circulation, massing, density etc.

The developer stated they would come back at a future date to the community.

Respectfully submitted,

*Leah Kaufman*

Leah Kaufman- Principal Planner

Cc: Placer County BOS, TRPA Governing Board



**From:** Ellie <tahoellie@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** 5/1/2024 10:23:58 AM  
**To:** Public Comment <PublicComment@trpa.gov>  
**Subject:** Please provide this General Public Comment to the TRPA Governing Board members

---

Please provide this General Public Comment to the TRPA Governing Board and Advisory Planning Commission members ~Thank you, Ellie Waller

[Tahoe planning group exerts outsized influence on legislative oversight committee • Nevada Current](#)



**Tahoe planning group exerts outsized influence on legislative oversight ...**

Pamela Mahoney Tsigdinos  
Overtourism, conflicts of interest, developer-initiated blight, vast pollution combined with microplastic contam...