

## **Tahoe Living:** Housing and Community Revitalization Workgroup

Workgroup Meeting #6

Wednesday, March 30, 2022

9:30 AM to 12:30 PM

Via Zoom

### **Draft Meeting Minutes – these minutes have not yet been approved**

#### **AGENDA ITEM**

##### **I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM**

Chair Mr. Ferry called the meeting to order at 9:32 a.m.

Members present: Ms. Balmin, Mr. Booth (present by 9:40 am), Mr. Diaz, Mr. Feiger, Mr. Ferry, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Hitchcock, Mr. Janvrin, Ms. Kang, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Kerrigan (alternate for Mr. Nadeau), Ms. Novasel, Ms. Purvines (present by 9:40 am), Ms. Simon, Ms. Victor, Ms. Yanish, Ms. Zuardo (present by 9:40 am)

Members absent: Mr. Friedrich, Mr. Young, Mr. Prior

##### **II. WELCOME AND COMMENTS BY THE CHAIR**

Katherine Hangeland called the roll and determined that there was a quorum.

##### **III. INTRODUCTIONS**

##### **IV. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

##### **V. ZOOM PROTOCOLS**

##### **VI. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES**

Ms. Novasel made a motion to approve the minutes. Minutes approved unanimously.

Ms. Kerrigan abstained.

##### **VII. TAHOE LIVING DISCUSSION ITEMS**

A. Development Standards Discussion, including discussion of height, coverage, and density standards

Cascadia Partners presented the results of a pro-forma feasibility analysis for multi-family housing for three zones in the Tahoe Basin. The analysis showed the impact of development standards, return on investment, and sales price per unit for typical multi-family parcels in Kings Beach, Incline Village and the Ski Run area of the Tourist Core Area Plan under test scenarios with different development standards. Key development standards included in the analysis were coverage, height, density, parking, and setbacks.

Questions/Comments from the Working Group and the Public:

*Chase Janvrin*

Clarified that there was a typo in the minimum feasible sales price for the test scenario. Clarified that market feasible rents in Zone 2 for a 2-bedroom was almost \$6,000. Cascadia said that yes, the units would be very small, but you do see at least a small decrease in rents. Chase pointed out that even with these meaningful changes, we would still be creating housing priced well beyond the missing middle.

*Meea Kang*

Highlighted a couple of barriers that she has found through her work as an affordable housing developer in the Basin that were not identified in the analysis. Even though you have the allowable coverage, only 30 percent is allowed by-right, but you have to go out and source the remaining 40 percent and pay a fee to transfer it in. If TRPA is truly thinking about incentivizing missing middle or multi-family, then coverage has to be a by-right 70 percent, because the cost to transfer in is completely infeasible.

California state law says you can build up to 4 units, you don't need residential units of use or anything, and it's by-right. But here you have to get 4 residential units of use, but an individual can build up to 15 bedrooms and not have to get another unit of use.

Density is absolutely a barrier, so it needs to be addressed. But mechanically, we need to do some other scenarios. The cost of building parking on the ground level and residential above, absolutely increases the cost of housing. You have to have a fire separation between cars and residential. So, tuck-under parking adds significant cost. The absolute least expensive way to provide parking is to pull it out. So, are we looking at providing housing for people or housing for cars? Also, a 4-story building is an elevator building. Not sure if they factored in an elevator. That's another subsidy barrier and cost issue that needs to be folded in. Great to look at increasing by-right density and by-right coverage, and flexibility with the roofline. The highest height you can get is the top of the roof pitch. In Tahoe we like to see chalets, but in reality you can't fit units under that roof, you need to widen it up.

*Jean Diaz*

Applauds TRPA for looking at these issues and trying to find alternative ways to make housing make sense. Gave Riverside project as an example that highlights the issues that Julia brought up. Riverside is three adjacent lots for housing. On the surface it seems like a great opportunity, but because the lots are bounded by three public streets, the setbacks made multi-family infeasible. They spent a lot of time trying to figure out how to maximize the number of units. But they were stuck with providing just three single-family homes, because the setbacks really prevented their ability to add more units. That's an example of trying to find ways to be more flexible. Was it absolutely necessary to have these exact setbacks in that situation?

*Gavin Feiger*

Question: the proposal is to give these incentives to deed-restricted units in the Bonus Unit Boundary. Did the return on investment take deed-restriction into account? Julia answered: Scenario 1 and 2 did not assume deed-restriction. The only deed-restricted scenario is Scenario 3.

Gavin: If we weren't trying to build homes for people and cars, a lot of these issues wouldn't be issues. We're looking at the same square footage for cars as for people, and that doesn't seem to be one of our goals.

*Kim Carr*

On the California side, the California Tahoe Conservancy has provided dollars to the local jurisdictions to install erosion control projects and stormwater runoff, and Nevada has a similar program, and the local jurisdictions are on the hook to meet the TMDL standards. We all know that Tahoe was formed with cabins and no stormwater runoff. It's not like modern developments where there's curb and gutter and ways to capture the runoff. So we've been playing catchup for a long time. The 30 percent coverage rules came in around that older development scenario. And years later, we now have many of these systems in place that capture the runoff. Do we still need to be held to the 30 percent coverage rule, when so many neighborhoods in the basin have stormwater treatment? An analysis on that could help support loosening up the 30 percent rule.

*Natalie Yanish*

Looking at area-wide treatments by community rather than on a parcel-by-parcel basis makes so much more sense. We want a lot of redevelopment to happen, but the conversation has been about redevelopment on raw land. Can the conversation be about redevelopment, taking down some of these older structures that are harmful. How can that be incorporated?

*Sharon Kerrigan*

If you think about techniques for smart growth, it might be that density could be based upon certain town centers and areas, where TRPA and local governments decide to look at increasing density. Ways to have more infill development, or increased density. Don't look at raw land all the time, so we preserve our open space, green space.

Alyssa Bettinger presented TRPA's recommended changes related to height, coverage, and density. The proposal included the following recommendations:

1. Density. Allow a minimum of three deed-restricted units per parcel for parcels zoned for multi-family development, regardless of the allowable density.
2. Coverage. Allow up to 70 percent of a parcel to be covered for deed-restricted multi-family development and ADUs. All additional coverage impacts must be mitigated, through onsite BMPs or regional stormwater treatment, and transferring coverage, excess coverage mitigation fees, or alternative mitigation options.
3. Height: Update or remove roof pitch standards to reflect modern designs and energy efficiency needs. Change height limits to measure height as the vertical distance from the highest point of the structure to the average of the highest and lowest points where the exterior walls touch the natural grade. Change height limits in Town Centers from four stories "and" 56 feet to four stories "or" 56 feet.
4. Pilot projects: Consider pilot programs for allowing higher density, height, and coverage and reduced parking in targeted areas.

Questions/Comments from the Working Group:

*Meea Kang*

The Chipmunk project in Kings Beach that we showed was 30 units to the acre. That density worked on most of their Kings Beach sites. We now talk about form-based code, around height, allowing property owners and developers to be creative about how you fit units in an envelope is really helpful. An artificial cap is just that, a cap. There are a lot of motel units used as permanent housing in Kings Beach. In some cases those motels are up to 90 units per acre, because you have really small units that five people were living in. Would really encourage TRPA – if you are ok with additional height, maybe be a little more flexible on density and don't cap it just because that's comfortable. Ok with the minimum three units.

On SEZs, on many of their sites they are finding these little strips of SEZ that were mapped back in 1986, back when the urban core was really different than it was today. Some of these don't even seem to function as SEZ anymore. When you have

SEZs on multi-family zoned land, maybe there's a little creativity around allowing developers to do 100 percent BMPs, otherwise it really takes a lot of sites out of commission. As far as coverage mitigations – one of the most straightforward ways for developers is just assume 100 percent BMPs. Developers are already assuming this. In her opinion that would be a great way to mitigate the coverage issues.

In the TRPA code, you have 30 percent by-right coverage, which is why you have 90 percent single-family homes. You can make 30 percent work great for single-family, but as Julia's presentation shows, that really doesn't work for multi-family. So make the change that allow up to 70 percent by-right for multi-family. For developers, identifying where you're going to transfer the extra coverage from is a big challenge.

Height: another way to look at it is finish floor. So, when we look at modular, what we've got is really long buildings that is on land that's just undulating. As long as you're not in a view corridor, allow developers to do what's done outside the basin. You measure from wherever you grade to the height. We have to shrink the floor to ceiling height, and at some times we're at 7 feet because we have to squeeze everything in. We have to compromise interior spaces because we're held to these arbitrary standards. Even five inches makes a huge difference. When we're building modular, we aren't building regular stick construction, you have double-structures. If you're building modular, you're going to have a taller building because of the way it has to be built. And when you have to think about ductwork, then you have to lower the ceiling. When you have multi-family, you are putting a lot of things into the stack. TRPA heights require development to shrink, but we need it to grow for mechanical, structural needs.

*Jim Lawrence*

In all of these options we are talking about deed-restricted units. What is the thought there? Want to make sure the work we're doing is also for the missing middle. Would it be deed-restricted for a certain income group? Alyssa answered: changes could be significant, and we're trying to keep the impact insignificant, so that's why we've limited it to deed-restricted.

Density: allowing three multi-family makes sense. Agree we should look outside Town Centers, we should, since a lot are outside of town centers.

Heights: likes both of the proposals, including average grade and roof pitches. We've been re-evaluating roof pitches lately with City of South Lake Tahoe and these larger buildings. You just really can't do it with the steep roof pitch.

Coverage: That's going to be tough. I get that coverage is a limitation, also very sensitive to the environmental document behind the Regional Plan. No idea what

the cost would be, but I like the idea of re-evaluating by hydrologic basin unit. Maybe it's where we want affordable housing. Looking at it more larger scale than by an individual lot. Maybe holistically, those lots in those areas are well below the coverage limitations. But individually, we have trouble building. When you transfer, you have to go from more sensitive to least sensitive. Maybe 1 sf of SEZ equals 5 sf of Class 4. As a way to better incentivize SEZ restoration, then moving it to higher capability. But not on that 1:1 ratio. Probably won't help a lot but might help some. Kim mentioned the state grant programs for stormwater. Particularly in Incline Village, if properties weren't BMP'd, there wasn't enough land area to capture runoff. There was barely enough to treat the road water runoff. We have to be very careful there. Perhaps looking at zones, giving credit to those zones that have a stormwater system, or for neighborhoods that have 100 percent BMPs. There should be a way to give credit. Maybe the coverage standards could be increased. It's going to be really difficult if we don't have neighborhood BMPs in place or 100 percent stormwater treatment.

*John Hitchcock*

Triplex option – will the TRPA code amendment override the Plan Area Statements and Area Plans, or will this take a code amendment? John Marshall: we need to figure out the most efficient way to make the change.

Mitigation measure for the BMPs. Support doing the 100 percent BMPs on the site itself. Has TRPA mapped the stormwater projects that have been implemented by local jurisdictions? Because those stormwater projects have been designed to treat roadwater runoff, and not the runoff from private development. If the requirement is that local jurisdictions are going to treat that runoff, all those stormwater systems would have to be redesigned. City does have a system in place to provide coverage for projects. Has TRPA had conversations with the CTC – and would CTC be interested in providing coverage for multi-family.

*Chase Janvrin*

Sounds like this proposal would be based on the federal definition of affordable, why not base it on TRPA's definition of achievable.

*Jean Diaz*

As a non-profit developer of workforce housing, we support efforts to be more flexible, as to how it can be developed but still meet standards. So, with form-based standards, we want to look at what's the purpose of this standard. If we're mitigating what the coverage was intended to deal with, there should be some relaxation of coverage. What's the purpose of that standards and are there alternatives that can meet that.

SJCLT's mission is primarily focused on 80-120% of area median income for ownership housing. If we are really relaxing the standards, maybe it makes sense to limit it to moderate, and maybe for some it goes up to achievable. But mainly we need to be careful about deed-restriction language for for-sale housing. The language in that deed-restriction needs to carefully consider different considerations for ownership versus rental.

*Shawna Purvines*

Support the direction this is all going. Love the idea about being more flexible for multi-family. When talking about duplexes and triplexes, Placer has some questions about how that applies on single-family, and whether we're going to be able to look at that as we try to meet our state objectives for duplexes and triplexes for single-family zones.

*Gavin Feiger*

League doesn't have a problem with the height or density proposals. Coverage is tricky, but as long as the mitigation is done and we can demonstrate that scientifically with data, no problem. Starting with deed-restricted units in the Bonus Unit Boundary is a really good idea. Could benefit from starting out with pilot projects and bonus unit boundary. Again, parking is identified as a major barrier and it's not on the list. Coverage was identified as a long-term approach, but we're tackling it now, so I hope that parking would come up sooner rather than later.

*Natalie Yanish*

Allowing the minimum of three units should be applicable whether it's for a deed-restricted unit or not. A big problem that we suffer from here is that we don't have enough housing in general, whether it's for affordable or achievable. If we're limiting the impact of what these policies are going to do, we're just doing a little bit, we're not doing as much as we possibly could be. By incentivizing people to build more units on a property, even a non-deed-restricted triplex, that will become housing. In a perfect world, we shouldn't have to deal with deed-restrictions. A lot of these would be built by mid-size investors. Putting a deed-restriction on a property is a non-starter for 90 percent of these units. Deed-restrictions make it a non-starter for lots of people.

*Meea Kang*

Loves the idea of a coverage bank. As a developer, if you have to identify where all this coverage is coming from. Having a source, where it's clear – this is how much I need, this is how much you're going to get. It's frustrating because it's such a barrier. Whatever you end up doing – if you do require people to transfer the coverage. It has to be absolutely reduced or free, and it has to all be available upfront. For the average person, you see 70 percent and you have no idea you

have to transfer it in. Maybe test not having to transfer it in, through a pilot. There's a reason why we're not building multi-family in Tahoe.

Is it possible to do by-right or up to 70 percent or would that require a full EIS?  
John Marshall: depends on the number of parcels. We've tried to limit it to deed-restricted up to achievable. That might be a more manageable environmental analysis to accomplish. In the basin we call what Meea is calling "by-right" "base allowable." Meea: there are not that many parcels that are zoned multi-family. It would be incredibly helpful to make the base allowable up to 70 percent.

*Jim Lawrence*

We talk about coverage pools. We have a land bank on the Nevada side. For the land banks – there is a cost to this. Someone has to subsidize this. Someone has to go out and find a willing seller who wants their coverage restored. It's not free. Where's that money going to go to the cities or the states to get that money to do the restoration work and put it into the bank. Perhaps there's an ability to move away from parcel to parcel. Maybe it's possible to get up to 70 percent, if within that neighborhood or geographic area, we have other parcels that are way below their base allowable and are never going to go to their base allowable, and at a hydrologic zone basis it all comes out in the wash. Don't want to lose sight of the groundwater recharge. It's not enough to cover something 100 percent, put BMPs on there and then put it into a storm drain system. You're having environmental harm because you have no groundwater recharge, and that impacts [couldn't hear], impacts wildlife, it impacts the environmental system.

*Emily Setzer*

Appreciated Natalie's comment to open this up to more than just the deed-restricted units. For multi-family, we're talking about rentals. It's important to open this up to developers who want flexibility. We need to think about the conversion of this from rentals to condos. Anything for sale, we need to protect for the local worker provisions. That's why I fully support the expansion of that achievable definition. Being proposed to under 120% AMI, or the local worker with no specific income.

Public Comment:

*Kathie Julian*

In Incline. On deed-restrictions. From what she understands from people in her community, the deed-restrictions aren't really enforced. If they aren't enforced, it seems a bit toothless. In Nevada, we don't have any restrictions on ADUs for short-term rentals. If there are ADUs out there, they will be used for short-term rentals, and any kind of effort to build more housing here, unless state law or county regulations are changed, will simply feed into the short-term rental issue here.

There's mention of general improvement districts. So, would the case be that IVGID would be called up on to expand their wastewater treatment districts to accommodate higher density? Who would pay for that. It would be unfortunate if the overall citizenry of IVGID would end up subsidizing the development of certain properties.

How well are BMPs enforced? And is this a particular problem in Nevada? There is a difference on how the enforcement was done. I do not think that the average workforce person here could possibly pay for a rental at \$5,000 or \$4,000. And I'm wondering – where does the concept of apartment complexes fit into this discussion? Because in Incline Village, our workforce needs apartments.

Alyssa Bettinger: deed-restrictions put in place after 2018 have an enforcement mechanism built in. Area-wide treatment systems are typically paid for through grants, and depending on the area, the parcels that are using the area-wide treatments would help fund those. When someone comes in to do a project, they are required to put BMPs in, and once project is complete, we follow up to see if BMPs have been done. In Scenario 3, Cascadia looked at a larger apartment building. So we're looking at that scenario, and looking at possible changes that could address the challenges there.

*Jean Diaz*

Enforcement of deed-restriction is an important aspect, particularly for ownership housing. The Community Land Trust model structure adds another element of protection to ensure that those homes remain permanently affordable. Some places require deed-restricted units to be placed in the CLT portfolio.

*Patrick Taylor*

Time is money on these developments. Has there been any thoughts in regards to the MOUs, and the bonus units? Instead of them having to do the dual agency processing as they go through the approval process? Karen Fink: Permitting streamlining is part of a later phase of the Working Group action items.

In regards to heights, we are frequently running into problems with the heights. When you're talking about the tree canopy perspective, that seems like a good route. Sometimes you're talking about only an additional three or five feet. We're big believers in having garages. Living here, with the snow, without having covered parking, with these big winters, is horrible. This also takes care of the coverage. The cost of building coverage under the building is pretty insignificant. That cost, in comparison to the coverage use, really offsets itself. So we really need to look at those height calculations carefully.

*Kim Carr*

Thrilled to hear regional stormwater systems, and as Jim mentioned, moving away from parcel to parcel. It's so challenging to try to enforce BMPs, especially on residential properties. There's been a large public investment in the stormwater system. Some of those designs, as John Hitchcock mentioned, they are built with roadway runoff in mind only, and 100 percent treatment of private parcels. So that would be a problem. One area to look at is Stateline, on the California side. Three to four hotels were purchased. There are very large basins there. They don't reach full capacity. Crescent V was actually paying the city to drain their water into a city-managed basin. There is a precedent for regional systems treating private lands. Maybe try it out in certain areas first.

*Justin Broglio*

While the density proposals would help significantly on their lands, especially something like duplexes and triplexes, and getting something like Hopkins Village. Wondering where the rezoning stands, particularly on parcels outside of Town Centers. They have some parcels that aren't zoned for residential. For the district-owned parcels like theirs, that are on the borders, the rezoning would allow for multi-family. That would allow them to be creative. Just bringing that up as part of the longer-term component of density.

*Brandi Brown*

Would we also be able to do other housing types, such as tiny homes? Is there the possibility of putting multiple tiny home units on one parcel under this proposal?  
Karen Fink: if the moveable tiny home ordinance gets approved, then yes.

*Rebecca Bryson*

Supports the density and height proposal, and in fact would like to eliminate single-family zoning. Seems like it should be applicable to achievable, and possibly beyond that. But coverage should initially be limited to affordable. But parking keeps coming up and would like some creative ideas on that. Not only do you need parking for the spaces, you need coverage to drive up to the spots.

Final Working Group comments:

*Sue Novasel*

Great information. Anywhere we can incentivize and get more projects in the dirt, the better. Input is very much appreciated and let's move forward.

## VIII. REPORTS

A. City of South Lake Tahoe Report on movable tiny homes ordinance and development rights disposition program

John Hitchcock reported out on new programs to incentive not just new housing but redevelopment in general. City passed an ordinance related to disposition of development rights. Requires the City to do an appraisal every year. They sell the development rights and give them away for free for deed-restricted housing. Also if it's a mixed-use project located in an identified town center, and restricted to tenants who work a minimum of 30 hours per week in the City. Other projects are required to pay the adopted price, which is one-third of the market-rate price. As of today they've sold commercial floor area that's been used to develop a multi-family project in the Tahoe Valley Area plan. They are going to take it back to the Council to make sure it's still aligned with their goals. Any monies generated through this program are then put back toward the workforce housing fund.

City adopted Moveable Tiny Home ordinance which goes into effect April 1. Allows Park Model RV's as single-family and multi-family development. Has to comply with local standards and district standards, including siding. Must be on a pad, must meet snow loads. Cannot be used as a vacation rental.

#### Working Group Comments:

*Jean Diaz*

Saint Joseph benefited from the development rights from the pool for their ownership homes, and they applaud the City for developing this program.

*Meea Kang*

Applauds the City of South Lake Tahoe for their leadership in housing, blazing a great trail. Clarified that the homes on wheels can be used for multi-family also? John Hitchcock: yes, with planning commission approval. Meea: One of the things around tiny homes on wheels, is it's considered a recreational vehicle, so want to appeal to TRPA when thinking about this, that it's different than a home on a foundation, so possibly these could be thought about differently. This is a product that could be delivered in rapid time and could deliver units that are compatible with the existing neighborhood rapidly. These are small units, so implore TRPA to consider that maybe these don't need a full bonus unit. If you have a small unit that might not even use up all the coverage, creating a whole unit for this seems arcane. As long as you can build to site constraints, it shouldn't have to require a full new unit of use. Hope that these don't stand in the same way as a standard building on a foundation. If you've met the housing and you don't need it, then you can pull these units away. Hoping TRPA would be creative in how we look at these. Larger businesses might have a ton of surface parking for which tiny homes could be a part of the solution.

#### B. Achievable Definition and Moveable Tiny Home Update

Karen Fink provided an update on the Achievable Definition and Moveable Homes draft code changes.

Achievable Definition: Add a local employment condition for people who are making over 120% of Area Median income. The condition would be that at least one member of the household must work at least 30 hours a week for an employer with a business license in the Tahoe-Truckee region.

Moveable Homes: Allow moveable homes outside of mobile home parks when allowed by the local code.

Working Group comments:

*Jean Diaz:*

For programs that might be ownership directed – a lot of programs have “income-out” thresholds. If the income increases above a certain threshold, they have to find other housing. For ownership, having the income-out restriction is very onerous. Buying a house, even at a subsidized level, there are costs, including transaction costs at getting into the house and out. Be careful at imposing an income-out restriction. Our ownership programs are intended to be a ladder from rental to full ownership. To force someone out because they got a better job would be onerous. In TRPA’s deed-restrictions, there’s the income test, but there’s no affordability test. HCD has an income test, but the housing cost also has a threshold. Housing cost can’t exceed 35% of the income. Doesn’t see that in the definition.

*Meea Kang*

Very much support achievable housing, that’s your missing middle. The 30 hours per week to qualify is one thing – is that going to be a 30 hours per week forever, or is that just to qualify to get in. Everyone’s work life changes, people pass away, there are all kinds of things you can’t predict. Is the enforcement an annual certification, will they need a letter from the employer? The developer will look at all these. They will want to exit. If there’s a trigger around employment, or something that becomes overly burdensome, there needs to be some flexibility.

TRPA has gotten their arms around equivalency, so CFA or TAUs being turned into units of use. Because there is no requirement for what an RUU is, there’s no ceiling to it, it could be 30,000 square feet. Yet there’s a ceiling on a tiny home, it can’t be more than 400 square feet. One ADU that’s 400 square feet shouldn’t take up a whole bonus unit. Is there a way to come up with an equivalency. Maybe it’s 6 ADUs to 1 Bonus Unit.

*Emily Setzer*

Placer County has gotten feedback from teachers that over the course of the year they don't meet the 30-hour a week requirement, unless otherwise approved by agency director, with a letter from the employer. They don't have a maximum cap of someone's income in the future. If they get a job locally and are making \$300,000 they won't get kicked out of their house. So they are trying to be careful. Happy to share offline.

### C. Development Rights for ADUs

Karen Fink provide an update on how ADU permitting is going and how the process of obtaining development rights for ADUs is going. TRPA has received 19 applications for ADUs and has issued eight permits. Six of these obtained bonus units, two obtained residential units of use.

TRPA will issue a memo within a month on how and when the pool of 200,000 square feet of commercial floor area can be distributed. Planning to apply for REAP funding to look at how to make the process more equitable for small homes.

Working Group comments:

*Chase Janvrin*

Someone can rip down a small home and rebuild a huge home without doing an environmental analysis. Doesn't make sense that you have to do a full environmental analysis to put a tiny home on a lot without needing a development right.

*John Hitchcock*

Has there been any consideration for TRPA using their pool of TAUs to convert into Residential Units of Use and using that for ADUs. There are 200 or so bonus TAUs that haven't been used since the adoption of the 1987 plan, and there doesn't seem to be any demand for those.

*Gavin Feiger*

With the CFA, replenishing the Bonus Unit Pool with TRPA's remaining CFA could be a good idea. It's important, before that happens, for the local jurisdictions to true up their CFA. Especially with outdoor dining, there are a lot of commercial uses out there that don't have the CFA. So, hoping that can be included in the memo. Supportive of using the REAP funding. If we can show the difference between a unit and the number of bedrooms and looking at what development rights are required for different sizes of units.

*Jessica Wackenhut-Lomeli*

For the REAP funding, it really needs to include an equity analysis. Important to think about, just because you live in a town center and even if you have a car or don't have a car, that could have a big impact on if you're using transit, and that could be factored into the thresholds as well.

## IX. Working Group Comments

There were no additional Working Group comments.

## X. Public Comment

*Brandi Brown*

For achievable, do people need to have a job within the community and be working in the community, or can they have a job online and be working for anyone? Karen Fink: If they have a business license in the Tahoe-Truckee region, that counts.

Interested in putting a tiny home on her property but confused as to whether she has to purchase the tiny home and then rent it out, versus what is more popular in the tiny home community, is that people own their tiny homes, and then they are looking for a place to put their tiny homes. That makes a lot more sense for the property owner. Is that something that's being discussed.

*Karina*

Clarification with regards to the 30 hours. The language says "or," so either you make less than 120% of AMI or meet the employment requirement. But some remote workers might make less than 120% AMI, so local workers would still have to compete with them.

*Kathie Julian*

What is the range of AMI in the Incline Village area. Did we say that one could qualify one year, working a certain amount, and then if your job were to improve, and you were making \$200,000 a year, you could still keep that house. How would you handle a situation where very clever people could come in and start up a business, and a very skilled entrepreneur, reporting no income, then leverages that business, and it's a money-maker. That opens up the possibility that this could be a benefit to very smart entrepreneurs who are starting up their businesses.

## **XI. Adjournment**