

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
GOVERNING BOARD

Via GoToWebinar

January 27, 2021

**Meeting Minutes**

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Mr. Bruce called the meeting to order at 12:16 p.m.

Members present: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Hicks, Ms. Hill, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Bruce deemed the agenda approved as posted.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Aldean provided minor edits to staff and made a motion to approve the December 16, 2020 minutes as amended.

Motion carried.

V. TRPA CONSENT CALENDAR

1. December Financials
2. Resolution in Recognition of National Radon Action Month
3. APC Membership appointment for the City of South Lake Tahoe Lay Member, Susan Chandler and reappointment for the Carson City Lay Member, Kevin Hill
4. Appointment of a TRPA Governing Board Delegate and Alternate to the Tahoe Transportation District Board of Directors
5. Governing Board Committee Membership Appointments

Board Comments & Questions

None.

Public Comments & Questions

None.

Ms. Novasel made a motion to approve the consent calendar.

GOVERNING BOARD

January 27, 2021

Motion carried.

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

A. Presentation on Nevada and California Governors' Proclamations and Tahoe Commemorative Coin

TRPA team member Mr. Cowen provided the presentation.

Mr. Cowen said heading into 2020 there were grand plans for in person events to help celebrate the many milestones and the achievements for Lake Tahoe. These came out because the two states came together over five decades ago and signed the Compact. We found ways to recognize the challenges and successes with Spirit of TRPA awards and others who have helped the agency work towards its mission. The Lake Tahoe Coin project was also a part of the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary program. TRPA has received special commendations on the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary from Governor's Sisolak and Newsom.

Mr. Bruce said they humbly accept these commendations today on behalf of TRPA, the Governing Board, and numerous partner agencies that have joined our commitment to preserving and restoring this beautiful Lake. It's been incredible looking back over 50 years of this Agency and these special commendations from both Governors and are the capstone on our year long anniversary program. The strong relationships born out of the Compact continue to provide the positive momentum for Lake Tahoe and its communities. The future holds many challenges, but the spirit of collaboration and partnership are the wind at our backs. These commendations underscore the importance of the Lake, to the state of Nevada, the state of California and the nation.

Ms. Gustafson read the Nevada proclamation into the record.

*"WHEREAS, for half a century, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, known as TRPA, has been at the forefront of the mission to conserve and restore Lake Tahoe's spectacular natural environment, which has inspired so many Nevadans and Americans nationwide; and*

*WHEREAS, the State of Nevada , with cooperation from the State of California, took bold action to create TRPA, and the collaboration that led to the historic formation of the Agency was a landmark public policy achievement; and*

*WHEREAS, following congressional ratification and signature of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact into law by U.S. President Richard Nixon, the agency has led the way in landscape-scale conservation and restoration initiatives for 50 years, and remains a unique example of watershed-based governance in the United States; and*

*WHEREAS, since its creation, TRPA has helped foster a growing spirit of partnership and collaboration by bringing together Nevada, California, federal and local governments, the Washoe Tribe, academic institutions, non-profit organizations, the private sector and the public at large to save and restore Lake Tahoe; and*

## GOVERNING BOARD

January 27, 2021

*WHEREAS, today, all sectors work together with TRPA to protect this outstanding natural resource and ensure that it remains a national treasure for future generations to enjoy; and*

*WHEREAS, TRPA was the first bi-state, regional environmental planning agency in the country, and is a model of what is possible when government, business, and people come together for the common good of resource conservation and environmental protection; and*

*WHEREAS, the State of Nevada commends the TRPA and all its partners for a job well done, and wishes the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency continued success in years to come;*

*NOW, THEREFORE, I, STEVE SISOLAK, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, do hereby recognize the 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency.*

*December 16, 2020.”*

Mr. Bruce said it's very heartening to know that we have both governors standing behind us especially during this 50<sup>th</sup> year and difficult times that we're facing. He appreciated staff helping put this together and helping us celebrate this 50<sup>th</sup> year.

Mr. Middlebrook said they're very grateful to board member Ms. Aldean for this idea that happened about two years ago to mint Lake Tahoe Commemorative Coin. They just wrapped up the coin campaign and the coins were a first of its kind to be minted on the historic Carson City mint press number one at the Nevada State Museum. There were 1,000 coins minted and claimed by donors which raised over \$106,000 for local environmental education projects.

The commemorative coin project was a celebration for Lake Tahoe and TRPA but also demonstrated during these crazy and somewhat dark times over the past year, Lake Tahoe still has a wide reach and appeal. The comments and feedback received were very inspiring. There were 643 unique donors across 30 states and 295 unique zip codes. A lot were clustered in the Northern California and Northern Nevada area but had donors as far away as Hawaii.

This was a fund raising effort to spread the word about Lake Tahoe and to help support TRPA's Tahoe In Depth environmental news letter that goes out twice per year to all the homeowners in the Tahoe Basin and key businesses around the Lake. It also benefits the League to Save Lake Tahoe's Eyes on the Lake program to combat aquatic invasive species, the Nevada State Museum, and the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California. A special thanks to the Parasol Tahoe Community Foundation for being the fiscal sponsor, the Nevada State Museum for minting the coins, and Ms. Aldean for the idea.

Mr. Bruce gave a special thank you to Ms. Aldean for all her work on this project.

Presentation can be found at:

[Agenda-Item-No.-VI.A-Proclamations-and-Tahoe-Coin.pdf](#)

### Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean appreciated all of the recognition but said it's one thing to conceive of an idea but is another to implement it. Mr. Middlebrook, Ms. Regan, and other staff did a yeomans job not

only in promoting the sale of these coins but ensuring that they were received by donors in a timely fashion. The various methods of presentation were beautiful. Not only do they have a symbolic importance but an intrinsic value.

Mr. Lawrence commended staff for all of their work on the entire 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary. Unfortunately, there were plans that couldn't be implemented due to the circumstances. Staff was very flexible and responsive the entire year between the commemorative coins, the Spirit of the Lake awards, the proclamations, etc. Hats off to staff to being able to adapt to these changing conditions.

Mrs. Cegavske thanked staff and said the coins are beautiful and hats off to all the work that was done to produce those.

Mr. Bruce thanked Ms. Regan for all of her work on the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary. We're missing her and are looking forward to her coming back to Tahoe. It's not been easy, and our thoughts are with her.

Public Comments & Questions

None.

VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. Discussion and possible recommendation on the Tahoe Valley Area Plan Amendments in the City of South Lake Tahoe: Modify various policies, design standards, and substitute standards including roof pitch and height, corner building design, parking demand, coverage transfer, and related topics to encourage workforce housing development

TRPA team member Mr. Conger provided the presentation.

Mr. Conger said the proposal is a package of amendments to the Tahoe Valley Area Plan. These amendments would help maximize design opportunities for an important affordable housing project, which will be before your board later today. The area plan amendments deal with building design and related development standards and were drafted so that they would not negatively impact environmental thresholds.

Affordable housing is a key component of TRPA's Regional Plan, which includes goals and policies that call for development of housing for Tahoe's workforce in close proximity to walkable and bikeable Town Centers. This land use strategy is essential to TRPA's approach for attaining and maintaining environmental thresholds.

The Regional Plan also calls for TRPA to regularly review its policies and regulations to promote construction of affordable housing. After having an area plan in place for a period of time, we get the opportunity to test the design and development standards against real projects. When they do this, they often learn that improvements are needed to further redevelopment and meet housing goals. This package of amendments is an example of a small set of adjustments that will help facilitate good, environmentally consistent housing projects that align with our sustainable communities strategy.

## GOVERNING BOARD

January 27, 2021

Housing has also been a focus recently at the California state level. Over the past several years, the state has adopted new streamlining measures and incentives for affordable housing. The state is also looking for ways to use surplus state-owned lands for affordable housing under a 2019 executive order.

We're particularly fortunate in that out of 44,000 possible parcels screened under that executive order, two parcels in South Lake Tahoe owned by the California Tahoe Conservancy received particularly high scores on the suitability criteria. These parcels are considered asset lands, which are buildable parcels that are available to support revitalization of town centers or furtherance of other state or regional goals. Developers were selected last summer, and in the fall, they received an application for a 248-unit residential development on these parcels, to be known as Sugar Pine Village. The project also includes public service uses like child day care and office space for nonprofit organizations. This project will be outlined in further detail in the next agenda item.

As with most affordable housing developments, there are time constraints that Sugar Pine Village must face. To be competitive for grants and tax credits, the project requires an expedited schedule for permitting. The Executive Order also requires that the project start construction within two years of developer selection.

Fortunately, projects like Sugar Pine Village can benefit from state legislation that streamlines permitting and provides incentives to qualifying affordable housing projects. This helps to expedite city level permitting, but there is no parallel regulation at the TRPA level that allows, for example, waiver of a design standard. There is, however, an opportunity to amend the development standards in the Tahoe Valley Area Plan in a way that doesn't affect environmental conditions but does help to provide more design flexibility to affordable housing projects like this. They've developed a package of amendments that they think does just that and would enable this project to meet its deadlines for permitting.

Because the city has the ability to grant concessions and waivers under state law, you won't see the city taking action on this item first, as is normally the case with area plan amendments. The City has requested that TRPA take on the role as lead agency for this amendment.

The Tahoe Valley Area Plan covers almost 400 acres near the intersection of US 50 and State Route 89 in the western portion of the City of South Lake Tahoe. This area is commonly referred to as "The Y." The Sugar Pine Village parcels are located within the area plan's mixed-use zone and are located near Tata Lane and Lake Tahoe Boulevard, just west of The Y.

The Tahoe Valley Area Plan was adopted in 2015 subject to the provisions of the 2012 Regional Plan Update. It is a component of both The TRPA Regional Plan and the City's General Plan. Height and use standards are set based on seven different zoning districts. The Tahoe Valley area includes a Regional Plan designated town center and many of the incentives available to town centers, like increased density and height, have already been included in the area plan. The area plan has its own set of design and development standards, which are the focus of the proposed amendments. Because Tahoe Valley includes a Town Center and has access to existing retail and transit services, the Tahoe Valley area presents an opportunity for infill workforce and affordable housing.

The proposal would amend the Tahoe Valley Area Plan. The changes fall into three categories: Building design, parking, and coverage transfer. The changes are focused on the area plan's design and development standards, and the scope of the effect is limited to the Tahoe Valley Area Plan. There are no changes proposed to zoning, land uses, building height, or boundaries. And there are no changes proposed to the Code of Ordinances. These types of broader changes are likely to come out of the Tahoe Living working group that is currently exploring various policy options to promote workforce housing. As evaluated in the Initial Environmental Checklist, the amendments have been drafted in a way that they would not interfere with attaining and maintaining environmental thresholds.

The first category is building design. The proposal would reduce the minimum roof pitch and eliminate a minimum roof height standard. By doing this, development of a third story could occur without increasing building heights.

The proposal would also amend a standard that requires buildings to be built to corner setbacks with an angled entrance. This standard would no longer apply to residential buildings to allow design flexibility. It would also no longer apply where it would result in encroachment on a Stream Environment Zone.

**Parking:** The proposal would allow flexibility to reduce the minimum parking requirements, such as the number of spaces per unit. It does this by modifying the substitute standard to allow the City to approve reduced parking ratios when a parking study supports the reduction and ongoing parking management is ensured. In circumstances where the city is prohibited from imposing parking standards, TRPA would take on the responsibility for approving reductions in parking.

**Transfers of Coverage:** This deals with a technical issue that stems from the fact that many affordable housing developments also include support services like child day care, which are classified as public service uses. Individually, residential and public service uses are eligible for 1:1 transfer of hard, soft, and potential coverage. But taken together, they are then considered mixed-use and lose that eligibility. The proposed language would change this by allowing mixed-use developments to transfer hard, soft, and potential coverage at a 1:1 ratio when all of the component uses are eligible for such transfer. Mixed use development involving commercial and tourist accommodation uses would continue to follow TRPA Code of Ordinances procedures for those uses.

An Initial Environmental Checklist was completed for the proposed amendments. The document relies largely on the environmental analysis done for the area plan adoption, for the Regional Plan Update, and focuses on the specific changes being proposed as part of the amendment. The IEC concludes that no significant impact would occur from the amendments. Staff also reviewed the proposal in relation to threshold indicators and compliance measures and concluded that no significant effects would result from the amendments. Documentation is included in the staff report.

The Regional Plan Implementation Committee and Advisory Planning Commission both reviewed the proposed amendments at their December meetings and recommended approval of the amendment package as presented.

## GOVERNING BOARD

January 27, 2021

To summarize, the Tahoe Region has been presented with a major affordable housing opportunity that aligns with Regional Plan goals and policies. To maximize project opportunities and provide design flexibility, a few amendments are needed to the Tahoe Valley Area Plan. These amendments can be accomplished without negatively impacting environmental conditions.

The amendments are focused on the Tahoe Valley Area Plan, which includes a designated town center. Facilitating development of housing in this area closely aligns with the Regional Plan's strategy of locating housing near walkable and bikeable town centers.

State legislation has streamlined and incentivized affordable housing development, and this amendment provides a mechanism for TRPA to align with state policy by providing additional flexibility to the Tahoe Valley Area Plan. This can be accomplished without causing environmental impacts.

Staff recommends Governing Board approve the Findings in Attachment D, including a Finding of No Significant Effect and adopt the ordinance amending the Tahoe Valley Area Plan as set forth in Attachment H.

Ms. Roverud, City of South Lake Tahoe said the City is subject to California Senate Bill 35 which dictates the city's procedure for reviewing eligible affordable housing projects. Part of that is projects are able to request concessions or waivers of development standards of the local jurisdiction. SB 35 also prohibits the local jurisdiction from requiring more than one parking space per unit for eligible projects and also prohibits them from subjecting the project to any discretionary review.

The proposed amendments have not been processed by the City as area plan amendments. However, they have issued the Sugar Pine Village design review permit that includes the concessions that were requested by the developer and are consistent with the area plan amendments that are being considered today. They found that those concessions and amendments are consistent with the City's general plan and consistent with the intent of the Tahoe Valley Area Plan.

In the broader context, recognizing that they would apply to future affordable housing projects, not just the Sugar Pine Village project they did a review of the amendments with respect to the entire Tahoe Valley Area Plan. These amendments would still be consistent with the City's general plan and also furthered the goals for stream environment protection promoting non-vehicle travel modes, increasing mixed-use density in town centers and also consistent with the City's climate action plan. The City has requested that TRPA process these amendments as the lead agency. She thanked TRPA staff for bringing these through the process efficiently. They anticipate presenting these amendments to the City Council and to look at all of the City's regulations applicable to residential development to create objective standards and to streamline the process for housing projects.

Presentation can be found at:

[Agenda-Item-No.-VII.A-Tahoe-Valley-Plan-Amendments.pdf](#)

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean suggested that under the Substitute Coverage Standards, Item B where it states “Notwithstanding Subparagraph 30.4.3.A.2.c of the Code of Ordinances, projects comprised of any mix of multi-residential facilities of five units or more, *“with”* public service facilities and/or recreation facilities shall be eligible to transfer coverage at a ratio of 1:1, until the total coverage reaches the maximum allowed.” You can read it to mean that with any mix of various types of multi-residential facilities or with any mix of public service facilities, or with any mix of recreational facilities, the same substitute coverage standards apply. She feels the intent was to accommodate in particular this development, was mixing multi-use facilities of five units or more with public service facilities and/or recreation facilities. She asked if that correct.

Mr. Conger said they had a broader outlook on where they would allow any mix of uses that allow the 1:1 transfer would be eligible. For example, a mix of a recreation project with a public service project would also be allowable under the language as written. The intent was that there shouldn’t be a punitive effect from combining uses that individually would be qualified to transfer 1:1 ratio.

Public Comments & Questions

Steve Teshara on behalf of the Tahoe Chamber said that they have been actively engaged in the development of these amendments and are fully supportive of these amendments for approval.

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Yeates said the Regional Plan Implementation Committee unanimously recommended approval of these amendments.

Mr. Yeates made a motion to approve the required findings, including a Finding of No Significant Effect, for adoption of amendments to the Tahoe Valley Area Plan as provided in Attachment D.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates

**Motion carried.**

Mr. Yeates made a motion to adopt Ordinance 2021-\_\_\_, amending Ordinance 2015-05, as previously amended, to amend the Tahoe Valley Area Plan to include the changes referenced in Attachment H.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates

**Motion carried.**

VIII. PLANNING MATTERS

- A. Sugar Pine Village project, 248-unit affordable multi-family housing project, 1029 Tata Lane, APN:

## GOVERNING BOARD

January 27, 2021

032-291-031, (East Village) and 1860 Lake Tahoe Boulevard, APN: 032-291-028, (West Village), City of South Lake Tahoe, California  
TRPA team members Ms. Fink and Ms. McMahon provided the presentation.

Ms. Fink said the Sugar Pine Village project directly implements the affordable and workforce housing goals of the Regional Plan and the Tahoe Valley Area Plan specifically by locating mixed-use residential housing in a town center in close proximity to neighborhood services and transit. This project is part of the overall goal to create a walkable bikeable community in the Tahoe Valley area. Multiple partners worked together to align their incentives to support the project. The new affordable homes in today's presentation are key in helping South Lake Tahoe meet their California regional housing needs assessment requirement. This is one of several workforce and affordable housing projects that are planned in the near term for the City of South Lake Tahoe. All of these planned projects will go into one of the two town center areas of Y or the Tourist Core. This project is requesting final approval and a finding of no significant effect.

Today's presenters are Ms. Kang, Related California, Ms. Wackenhut, California Tahoe Conservancy, and Ms. McMahon, TRPA will provide an overview of the project. Mr. Brueck, Hauge Brueck and City of South Lake Tahoe staff, Ms. Roverud, Mr. Thomas, and Mr. Hitchcock are available for questions.

Ms. Kang said Related California is a fully integrated real estate firm with a 30-year track record for delivering top quality affordable housing across California. As long term property owners they are committed to sustainability, affordability, and stewardship. Prior to joining Related she was with Domus Development where she also led the development of Kings Beach Housing Now, 77-units scattered sites, deed restricted affordable workforce housing project that was completed in 2012.

Their development partners for Sugar Pine Village are St. Joseph Community Land Trust, 501(C)(3) nonprofit organization with a mission to provide high quality permanently affordable homes and supportive programs to Lake Tahoe's low and moderate income community. St. Joseph's successfully completed Sierra Gardens, a 70-unit renovation of an affordable housing development near the Y in South Lake Tahoe.

Ms. Wackenhut said in January 2019, Governor Newsom issued an executive order that directed the California Department of General Services to identify excess state properties as potential affordable housing development sites. The California Tahoe Conservancy owned these two sites and were designated as asset land in 2014. Under this executive order the two parcels were selected by the state of California. This was an opportunity to fulfill the governors order to provide local cost effective and innovative housing solutions to support housing production while thinking about the overall impact of the housing crisis throughout the state. This is the second site that was selected under this executive order. The first one was in Stockton, California.

Before embarking on the competitive selection process the Conservancy, the Department of General Services, and the California Department of Housing and Community Development hosted two community meetings to understand the needs and some of the opportunities in the surrounding neighborhood and general community. They wanted to think more about what they could integrate through the developer selection and into this site design once the developer was selected. Related California and St. Joseph Community Land Trust were selected at the conclusion of this process in July 2020.

## GOVERNING BOARD

January 27, 2021

The project area consists of approximately 11 acres at 1860 Lake Tahoe Boulevard and 1029 Tata Lane. Both of these project sites are comprised of high capability lands, class 7, suitable for urban development and infill. Both sites are vacant and have several informal trails throughout. There are a lot of adjacent land uses in this site to think about the town center. To the west and south there are residential neighborhoods but also quite a few commercial buildings surrounding the area. This includes South Tahoe High School and other commercial uses and small businesses that are regularly used. This project is also in walking distance to the South Y Transit Center.

This is currently an urban forested lot that will need to have trees removed for the project. It is a second grove pine forest that is within the town center and is typical of the land in the South Shore.

This process was coordinated by the Tahoe Prosperity Center with consultants to form the Housing Tahoe Partnership. It was a coordinated approach to understand the extent of the housing crisis in the South Shore and then developed some of those strategies to implement solutions throughout the area. In phase one, the housing needs assessment was developed in June 2019 and completed in November 2019. There are 1,880 below market units needed by 2026. Sugar Pine Village would enhance and reduce that number of the overall need and would serve a wide range of needs for the South Shore community. In phase two of the Housing Tahoe partnership the housing action plan was completed in March 2020 that developed 20 strategies that were identified and prioritized with Sugar Pine Village being one of those priorities.

Ms. Kang said the vision for Sugar Pine Village builds on all of the work that's been done with the Tahoe Valley Area Plan and Regional Plan. Sugar Pine Village will deliver critically needed workforce housing at a time when California faces an unprecedented housing crisis and Covid-19 pandemic that has rapidly created escalating home prices in the Tahoe region. Sugar Pine Village is envisioned to be a new residential mixed-use community that compliments the existing neighborhood while preserving native species and sensitive land.

The housing will include 248 energy efficient studios, one, two, and three bedroom apartments targeted to working families earning between 30 and 80 percent of area median income. The project also proposes to include a new licensed child care facility and office space for South Shore nonprofit social service agencies. Sugar Pine Village has been designed to reduce vehicle trips through reduced parking minimums, secured bike parking, active transportation infrastructure such as sidewalks and multi-use trails. With its close proximity to public transit at the Y it creates an unbeatable transit oriented development. The project also plans to restore the stream environment zone area on the west village site and implement best management practices such as rain gardens, reduce energy and water use through efficient green building design.

The large site on Lake Tahoe Boulevard is the west village and the small site is Tata Lane known as the east village. Both sites are accessible off of Lake Tahoe Boulevard, Julie Lane, and Tata Lane. Off of the main entrance on Lake Tahoe Boulevard is a community center building that will house the property management offices and community amenities. Adjacent to the community center is the public service center known as the "hub." It will be the location for a child care facility on the ground floor and a collaborative nonprofit office space on the second floor. The west village has been designed to include 210 residential units in seven, 3-story buildings with 311 car parking spaces, 336 indoor secured bike parking spaces, and 90 outdoor bike parking spaces. The stream environment zone area will be restored and the existing foot trails through the SEZ will be

returned to a natural state and coverage has been relocated to outside of the SEZ area. The east village has been designed to include 38 affordable units in two buildings; one, 3-story building and one 2-story building, 56 car parking spaces, 64 indoor secured bike parking, and 20 outdoor bike parking spaces. It has well distributed BMPs and snow storage areas located throughout both sites. The BMP designs include excess capacity to ease flooding concerns. Additionally, the SEZ restoration component could also aid in flood management for the immediate vicinity. The community building is located at the main project entrance off of Lake Tahoe Boulevard. The community building will feature a bike centric entrance off of Lake Tahoe Boulevard connecting to the new class 1 bike trail. Rain gardens will be one of the featured BMPs in the design. These are landscaping elements that will surround all the buildings and are designed to take the runoff from the building roofs and hardscapes.

There is a class 1 bike trail that connects to the multi-use trail that connects to the child care center, picnic and children's play areas, and community gardens. The pedestrian circulation routes were developed from the informal foot trails on the site. The new multi-use trails and sidewalks were designed for safe and accessible circulation. Also, the multi-use trail does terminate at Margaret Avenue at the southern end of the property but is open to the public to connect to Lake Tahoe Boulevard through the property. They've coordinated the site plan to work with fire and emergency vehicle access and will be installing traffic calming measures to keep speeds low while traveling through the property.

A range of pedestrian paths and trails are provided for site circulation. The primary multi-use trail will be eight foot wide for walking, jogging, or low speed cycling. This publicly accessible all weather pathway connects the community and the adjacent neighborhood to the new class 1 bike trail. The multi-use trail will be kept open and useable year round. Exterior site lighting will subscribe to dark light principals, light fixtures shall meet all governing requirements and minimum egress lighting levels will have integrated photo cell control to ensure that there are good dark skies.

For the landscaping there are two key primary areas. The main amenity area is in the southern part of the site where the residence will be able to gather in the community garden and play area. The Sugar Pine meadow area will serve as the heart of the project in conjunction with the community center and public service building. Native species such as Jeffrey and White Pine will be distributed throughout the site and the reintroduction of Sugar Pines will be focused in the Sugar Pine meadow area adjacent to the community center plaza.

The village hub and community center have bike welcome areas, curb parking for drop off and short term parking. In addition, the community center building will feature a large meeting hall with a fireplace and if funding can be secured, they're planning to include photovoltaic panels for onsite solar power generation along with a battery back up storage system. Ideally, the community center will include an emergency back up power for the building to serve as a shelter during blackouts if funding is secured. The hall opens through a gallery connecting the main entry through the plaza. This building also has a property management services counseling office and a learning center for older children onsite.

All the buildings are designed in a Tahoe rustic architectural style with craftsman influences for a timeless regional quality utilizing durable materials such as stone, fiber cement board, and Corten

## GOVERNING BOARD

January 27, 2021

metal. All structures will have pitch roofs capable of supporting photovoltaic panels. Special consideration for snowshed and fire safety features are incorporated throughout. Covered entries are generous with attention to safe snowshed away from all pedestrian entry ways. The community and public service buildings will be entirely site built in order to allow for larger spans and open floor plans.

The public service building in the community hub is envisioned to include an early child care program on the ground floor for about 25 to 30 children. The second floor will have office space for the South Shore nonprofits and social services agencies.

The residential buildings will have a central mail area and secured indoor and outdoor bike storage. All residential buildings will utilize modular construction which will reduce onsite noise and construction waste. All the exterior materials will be applied on site. The parking will be surface parking and will use ample tree planting for shade, and all outdoor bike parking will be located under eaves. The indoor bike parking will be located in shared lockers on each floor.

The buildings will be three stories in height under the maximum height allowance at 41.6 feet. Each of the residential buildings is 30 units; 10 units per floor with two external staircases, a common hallway, laundry on site, and locker storage on each floor. The project will be designed to provide a minimum of five percent accessible housing and plan to make the entire ground floor ADA adaptable and accessible. All units are designed to provide maximum light and ventilation.

Sugar Pine Village has embarked upon a very robust community outreach process and has strong local support. They've worked with many of the nonprofits in the area to help develop their program and are targeting around income. They've had discussions with the Tahoe Prosperity Center, the Tahoe Chamber, Barton Hospital, Family Resource Center, the Boys and Girls Club, Advance, and Tahoe Youth and Family to structure the housing and social services programs to serve the community and that missing need of the 30 to 80 percent of county median income. Rents will range from around \$450 to \$1,800 per month depending on the income per year and the project size.

Sugar Pine Village is designed to maximize the states goal of leveraging the surplus land to address the housing crisis. They anticipate starting construction by Spring of 2022 which meets the governors executive order requirement to start construction within two years. They anticipate completing construction of all units within two construction phased cycles and to be complete by late summer of 2024.

Ms. McMahan said herself and Ms. Fink worked with the project team on the development of the proposed Sugar Pine Village project. They reviewed the project application on behalf of the Agency to ensure that it was in compliance with TRPA's Regional Plan Goals and Policies, the environmental thresholds, the Tahoe Valley Area Plan, and the Code of Ordinances.

Based on TRPA review and input from the City of South Lake Tahoe the proposed project is consistent with the design guidelines and development standards in the Tahoe Valley Area Plan as amended earlier today. The proposed buildings do not exceed the maximum height limitations established in the area plan. The project includes the removal of coverage and restoration of a stream environment zone. The land coverage proposed for the project is within the limits established in the Tahoe Valley Area Plan and the Code of Ordinance. TRPA's stormwater team

reviewed the proposed best management practices plans to ensure compliance with the 20 year-one hour stormwater event. They found that in many cases the infiltration basins have been oversized and exceed TRPA requirements.

One of the issues raised during public comment was potential flooding from the project. With these oversized infiltration basins, they don't anticipate any flooding problems resulting from the project and anticipate that they may address flooding issues in the immediate vicinity of the project.

Another issue raised in a comment letter was snow storage. The stormwater team reviewed this, and it's been designed to meet the requirements of the Best Management Practices handbook. The oversized infiltration basins will also help with snow storage. At the request of TRPA and the City the applicant prepared a parking analysis in which Related California is proposing to provide parking spaces beyond what was required in the parking analysis to ensure adequate onsite parking. They're also proposing to provide both indoor and outdoor bike parking facilities. This project is exempt from a vehicle miles traveled (VMT) analysis because it is in town center. It's near transit, it's a proposed deed restricted affordable housing project, and the applicant is proposing to utilize parking rates less than the minimum established by the city. The project applicant will have to pay mitigation fees to offset the impact of trips generated from the project.

A California Tahoe Conservancy registered professional forester prepared the tree removal plan for the project. Bruce Barr, TRPA's registered professional forester reviewed that plan on behalf of the Agency.

Exterior lighting was also raised as a concern in a public comment letter. TRPA will require that the exterior lighting be dark sky friendly by shielded on the top and facing down and will only allow the minimum necessary to ensure public safety.

In addition to the five letters of support they did receive three letters from members of the public which have been provided to the Governing Board.

Based on the review of the application and input along with the findings that were made in the Initial Environmental Checklist, TRPA has made the project findings including the environmental threshold related findings and are recommending approval of the project.

Presentation can be found at:

[Agenda-Item-No.-VIII.A-Sugar-Pine-Village-Project.pdf](#)

#### Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Williamson asked what the funding mechanism would be for the solar panels and has a location been considered for the battery storage.

Ms. Kang, Related California said the current California Building Code does encourage photovoltaic on all the roofs. All the roofs have been designed for photovoltaic panels including the residential, community, and public service buildings. The battery systems are now smaller, and they've identified areas such as closets and possibly under the roof rafters. They'll be working with Liberty Utilities on some grant funding for the batteries and solar. They're also working with the City of

## GOVERNING BOARD

January 27, 2021

South Lake Tahoe to see if they can pursue some other outside funding. State funding is also another possibility. The goal is to create a resilient model because part of the energy code is looking at requiring 100 percent electric buildings. They are trying to design the entire residential building to be 100 percent electric and would need to implement the battery backup storage system for power outages.

Ms. Williamson asked if it was correct that they are not anticipating the installation of any natural gas lines at this time.

Ms. Kang, Related California said at this time, they are still working on getting this to be designed at 100 percent electric but is a challenge and are doing the best that they can.

Ms. Aldean said this is a well-designed and crafted project and thanked everyone for bringing this project forward. She asked how the units will be marketed.

Ms. Kang, Related California said they have a robust partnership with the Tahoe Chamber and nonprofits and will be working with the nonprofits to do early outreach. They're required to have a fair marketing approach because these are federal tax credits and other public sources. They'll do a robust marketing effort to let people know when applications come out and hold workshops with the nonprofits to make sure that everyone knows how to secure one of these apartments.

Mr. Friedrich said the City of South Lake Tahoe is exploring with Related California a variety of zero net energy building opportunities throughout the community with Sugar Pine Village. They hope that this can be a flagship and demonstration project. That's something to highlight and would be a great example cutting edge renewable energy electrification, electric vehicle supporting project. Affordable housing is the top priority and is an acute problem and the local workforce can't afford increasingly to live in the Basin. We need projects like this and is in full support of it.

Mrs. Cegavske asked if there's any possibility that someone could use these as a second home.

Ms. Kang, Related California said no, someone would need to prove that it would be a primary home and what their income was to qualify.

Ms. Novasel thanked Ms. Kang and the development group for this project proposal. Working with the California Tahoe Conservancy has been a great and is excited about having a hub within the project, the addition of child care, and other services. It's critical when you consider workforce housing.

Mr. Beyer encouraged them to make this a renewable energy project as much as possible. There is a lack of affordable housing all over areas where its tourism based. In Santa Cruz County that can't find available housing. It's important to see this project get done and address the affordable component of the community. He supported the idea of being pedestrian friendly and with hub services. He supported the proposed project and its approval.

Mr. Rice asked if they're looking at any properties in Nevada. They have a lot of problems on the Nevada side with affordable housing. One of the reasons Lakeside Casino shut down last year was that they couldn't find any employees because people couldn't afford to live at the Lake. He asked if the old middle school, the area that was the Lakeside Casino, and the old bank near the casinos, were being considered for possible affordable housing.

## GOVERNING BOARD

January 27, 2021

Ms. Kang, Related California said Nevada is an incredible opportunity for housing. Unfortunately, there are slightly fewer incentives in Nevada to try and get housing done but anything is possible with partnerships. All affordable housing is really done with public and private partnerships. So, if there is a willing public agency that has resources like land and money that could help affordable housing get done then there's a strong chance to get housing built.

Lyn Barnett, St. Joseph Community Land Trust said their mission is to provide affordable housing. This past year they decided to focus their efforts on the South Lake Tahoe and Douglas County. The Douglas County area is a harder nut to crack because of the prices. One of the programs that they'll be launching at the end of the year with the help of some of the community foundations is the Tahoe Program. This program will provide down payment assistance or assistance to people buying homes in the South Shore/Douglas County area. St. Joseph will own the land and the person would own the home. They'll be able to sell that home in the future, but it's tiered towards moderate income people. St. Joseph will be buying back some of the housing stock through the Tahoe Program.

Mr. Yeates said this is epic collaboration. The California Tahoe Conservancy getting selected, this is a wonderful project and badly needed. Projects like this are a catalyst and we are truly implementing the Regional Plan. Hopefully, something can be done like this in Douglas County. He's a strong supporter of this project and projects like this.

### Public Comments & Questions

Connie LaCroix on behalf of her daughter Vivia who had been living at Sky Forest Aces and would like to live in these units. She wanted to address the configuration of that building and the new buildings. The new ones appear that they'll have interior corridors with no entry to the outside. The presentation referenced natural lighting and ventilation, one of the issues at Sky Forest Acres was the interior corridor configuration and no air conditioning. Lake Tahoe has changed considerably with climate change. She asked if there will be air conditioning in the units at Sugar Pine Village.

Ms. Kang, Related California said there will be air conditioning in all the public spaces. They were not considering air conditioning because of the way that the air flow is going to be done with fans, etc. It's not out of the question but they're sensitive to the energy load and trying to get this to net zero. It's a balance of all the utilities to ensure that they get the most comfortable spaces in the most efficient design.

Connie Lacroix asked if it was correct that the units are configured with an interior entry way through an interior corridor with nothing opening to the outside.

Ms. Kang, Related California said that is correct.

Connie Lacroix asked how many windows are in the units and are they on more than one side of the unit.

Ms. Kang, Related California said it would depend on if it was a corner unit.

## GOVERNING BOARD

January 27, 2021

Connie Lacroix asked if it were correct that if it was not a corner unit then there would only be windows on one side.

Ms. Kang, Related California said yes, she believes so.

Connie Lacroix asked if there would only be a window in the bedroom, no windows in a bathroom or a kitchen.

Ms. Kang, Related California said she would be happy to discuss this further offline.

Mr. Bruce said if Ms. Kang doesn't have the answers that they're looking for right now, TRPA staff can coordinate getting this information. Public comment is typically just that, not a question and answer session. He asked if they could reach out to TRPA staff then they'll coordinate discussions with Ms. Kang.

Connie Lacroix said if the configuration is what it sounds like it is then the units would have to have air conditioning.

Steve Teshara on behalf of Tahoe Chamber said their organization is a very active member of the Housing Tahoe Partnership who helped to shape the studies that underscore the intense need for workforce housing in our community. They've been engaged in the public outreach process for this project marketing those opportunities and providing their input to the project development team. It's a well thought out, well designed outstanding project. It has excellent features and amenities including integrating with the local trail systems and other opportunities for non-auto mobility in the region. They are making a great contribution to the needs of the local workforce community. Although, the City of South Lake Tahoe asked TRPA to serve as the lead agency for reviewing this project based on the state requirements that the City, the California Tahoe Conservancy, and the project development team are all directed to meet by the state, they commended the City for prioritizing this project as part of the City's housing plan. They urged Governing Board approval of the findings and proposed project.

Chase Janvrin, Tahoe Prosperity Center said they are in support of the Sugar Pine Village development. The local housing crisis is well documented in the South Shore housing needs and opportunities study that the TPC facilitated last year with support of the local jurisdictions including the Tahoe Chamber and TRPA. The needs assessment concluded that they need over 1,800 below market rate homes in the South Shore by 2026 to meet the current and future expected demand. That was before the pandemic. If they did the needs assessment today, he would expect that number to be even higher. The documented extent of Tahoe's already overstressed housing market has got more acute with Covid-19. These recent changes to our economy and housing market don't negate the need any of the strategies outlined in the housing plan but rather exemplify why these strategies are so important. Recent headlines are calling the Tahoe Basin one big "Zoom town." As mountain towns across the state and country struggle to ensure that their local workforce stays local and that businesses can find and hire the local employees needed. We're in a fortunate position that we have a development like Sugar Pine Village already in progress to help combat this issue. This project just doesn't put a roof over someone's head. With the proposed community and supportive services, on site child care, this development could be a life saver for many working class families in the community. Therefore, a lifeline to the businesses that employ them. The Tahoe Prosperity Center supports this project and

## GOVERNING BOARD

January 27, 2021

applauds TRPA for staying true to the South Shore Action Plan by removing barriers so projects like this can come to fruition. The bigger picture is the continued positive impact that we can all make to the community when we continue to focus on strategic partnerships to address some of these challenges such as workforce housing.

Chris Proctor, Barton Health said a lot has already been said by others. But as the community's primary health care system they feel very fortunate at Barton Health to have been involved of these early stages of the Sugar Pine Village project as well as the housing study with the Tahoe Prosperity Center. One of the biggest social determinants of health is housing and stability. They know that it as a challenge affects all other social determinants of health. When trying to maximize the community's health it starts with the foundational element and that is affordable workforce housing. They're supportive of this type of initiative and others like it and asked that the board consider that in their vote today.

Jonathan Heim, California Department of General Services who works statewide on the Governors housing initiative. The South Lake Tahoe site was selected as one of the first sites under the executive order. This project has been a priority with their program and was mentioned by Governor Newsom earlier this month in his state budget address. The selected developer, Related California along with St. Joseph Community Land Trust has been required to meet an aggressive timeline, include innovative construction techniques, meet community needs, and provide design excellence and is what they've delivered to date. None of this progress could have happened without the dedicated efforts of the staff at the California Tahoe Conservancy, the City of South Lake Tahoe, and TRPA. This will be an extraordinary project once completed and provides an example of what can be done when people work together with a common goal to meet an urgent community need.

Frank Gerdeman echoed the sentiments of comments made by Steve Teshara, Chris Proctor, and Chase Janvrin on the overarching value of this program. He's the director of an education and workforce development program called Advance. This project brings an opportunity to this community to provide stable housing for many of the people we work with. It allows them an opportunity along with a number of other government agencies, social service agencies, and nonprofits to bring their services to the west end of South Lake Tahoe through the inclusion of the child care center and community hub. They're excited about increasing access to their support to help increase the success of their clients and supporting the local industry and employer partners in meeting their current and future workforce needs. He appreciated the work of TRPA and encouraged the approval of the project.

Lyn Barnett, St. Joseph Community Land Trust who is a partner in the Sugar Pine Village project. Standing behind them are hundreds of community land trust members, business owners, and other supporters of their mission to provide quality affordable homes with respect and dignity of the local population. This project will go a long way to ease some of the housing needs for working families and individuals in South Lake Tahoe. As a result of the board's action today, many families including a significant number of children will soon have a decent and affordable roof over their heads with excellent amenities in the years to come. They offer they're heartfelt appreciation for your role in this much needed project. St. Joseph Community Land Trust is also making on progress on other housing projects and programs that can be found on their website <https://www.saintjosephclt.org/>. A special thank you to Meea Kang, Related California, Jessica Wackenhut, California Tahoe Conservancy, and other staff at Related for making this happen in a

tight timeframe. Thank you to those involved in the project design including but not limited to the planners, surveyors, foresters, designers, architects, hydrologists, traffic and structural engineers, building fabricators, and other professionals that they believe will be celebrated asset to this community for years to come. Thank you to Rob Brueck, Hauge Brueck Associates and a special thank you to the Governor of California for making this property available. A thank you to Kevin Prior and Aimee Rutledge and other California Tahoe Conservancy staff that helped along the way. Thank you too to John Heim, with the California Department of General Services, Heidi Hill Drum and the staff with the Tahoe Prosperity Center. John Hitchcock, Hilary Roverud, Joe Irvin, other city staff, and the South Lake Tahoe City Council. A special thank you to TRPA planners; Brandy McMahan, Karen Fink, Joanne Marchetta, and other TRPA staff who assisted. Lastly, a thank you to their executive director, Jean Diaz.

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Friedrich made a motion to approve the required findings, including a finding of no significant effect.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates

**Motion carried.**

Mr. Bruce thanked the Local Government & Housing committee who have done a remarkable and thoughtful job in looking for solutions to the housing crisis.

Mr. Friedrich made a motion to approve the proposed Sugar Pine Village project, including the allocation of 248 residential bonus units and substantial tree removal on the West Village site, subject to the conditions in the draft permit included in Attachment B.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates

**Motion carried.**

B. Priority housing actions for further development by the Tahoe Living: Housing and Community Revitalization Working Group

TRPA team members Ms. Fink and Ms. Bettinger provided the presentation.

Ms. Fink said today's presentations have had a common thread related to workforce housing and meeting our local and workforce housing goals. The regional housing initiative will look at how TRPA can best add value to these ongoing local efforts to meet those local and regional workforce housing goals. The area plan amendments heard today, and the Sugar Pine Village project and other projects are providing on the ground real time experience that the working group is able to incorporate into the regional effort. Today's presentation will include a report on the recommended priority housing action items that have emerged from the Tahoe Living Working Group and the Tahoe Living Strategic Initiative.

The Tahoe Living Strategic Initiative is part of TRPA's operations work plan for 2021. The working group that supports this initiative held its first meeting in August 2020. That meeting included four topics: First was to work with the group to confirm the overall housing need that they're working towards. Some of the needs were mentioned by Chase Janvrin during the Sugar Pine Village agenda item. The group agreed on a process for identifying the key TRPA actions to support meeting that housing need. The tools introduced were the action catalog which is a spreadsheet of previously identified housing actions. It builds on the previous work that has been done by other partners. The action catalog compiled important housing actions that were already identified by the Tahoe Prosperity Center through their South Shore Housing Action Plan. The Mountain Housing Council has done quite a bit of work which have also been pulled into the action catalog. Local jurisdictions also have identified actions in their housing elements and TRPA has identified needed housing actions through some of their previous work.

They also brought forward the housing cost analysis which allows them to evaluate these actions to identify which would net the most benefit to help prioritize them.

In November, TRPA staff met with the local jurisdictions to understand which of the actions in the actions catalog would best complement their work. They further used that housing cost analysis tool to spend more time analyzing those key actions that came out of those discussions with the local jurisdictions. Based on the combination of those two items, they identified a set of about eight priority housing actions that were presented to the working group to confirm that those were the key actions to move into further development.

Ms. Bettinger said In order to help prioritize these, they developed the Housing Cost Analysis Tool. Often when we're talking about housing in Tahoe, they hear that the cost to build is very high. This tool helps understand which actions would have the highest cost reductions.

They looked at five housing types, with various costs components like land and construction shown by color. In addition, they've layered on affordability levels. The horizontal bars show an affordable purchase price by income category on south shore specific to El Dorado County. The tool allowed them to narrow down which actions from the catalog had the most cost reductions to try and meet in the middle with the affordability levels.

In addition to the cost and affordability that they looked at with the Housing Cost Analysis Tool, they also put the most weight on alignment with local jurisdiction actions. To the extent possible, they quantified the number of units that could potentially result from each action.

Using these three criteria they felt that it gave them a broad idea of the total level of impact the actions could have.

The following is the results of the evaluation. The actions are split into two distinct categories. The land use actions focus on the type of units and land uses that can be built on the ground. The policy actions help to remove barriers and can help incentivize those types of land use actions that they want to see.

Accessory Dwelling Units: Most of the jurisdictions view ADUs as a priority and anticipate it could provide a significant amount of units in the moderate and achievable housing income level.

Mixed-use residential: Mixed-use development contributes to thriving centers including walkable communities. However, under TRPA's existing density and coverage requirements building these types of projects can be challenging and are disincentivized so they're not seen as much. They heard from three jurisdictions as well as their local developer contacts and feel this is a priority. Paired with some of the policy actions could reduce costs by about 10 percent. The mixed-use residential development and trying to make those more feasible would be concentrated within the town centers or a specified distance from the town center.

Tourist/Commercial Conversions: These look at how they can make it more feasible to turn a dilapidated motel into workforce housing. Tourist and commercial conversion to residential is not currently incentivized due to the density restrictions.

Land Donation: This commonly happens with larger multi-family developments such as the Sugar Pine Development. This was listed as a priority for two jurisdictions and currently has a pretty big cost reduction for the overall project. This would not be an action that TRPA takes on directly, but rather working with the local jurisdiction partners to make it feasible.

The policy actions help make these land use actions more feasible and will need to be considered holistically. For example, when looking at ADUs they'll need to look at coverage because that will likely be a limiting factor in building an ADU on many properties. While they've prioritized these various actions, they'll be looking at many of these simultaneously throughout the process.

Density: Increasing res density in areas zoned for multi-family or town centers was considered a priority in three jurisdictions. They also found that it has a potential for significant cost reduction and can tip the scale to allow projects to pencil out.

Permitting Improvements and streamlining: They're still seeing some barriers for building workforce housing specifically there are additional hearings when building over four deed restricted units. While they found that permitting and streamlining the processes has a bit lower overall cost reduction it leads to more certainty and predictability within the building process and contributes to developers wanting to build in the Basin.

Allowing more flexible Coverage requirements was identified by three jurisdictions as a priority. This would be looking at more flexible standards for coverage in the town centers and finding ways to expand that.

**Fees:** TRPA already waives application fees for deed restricted units. Waiving other TRPA impact fees such as air and water quality impact fees came up but is prioritized further down on the list. TRPA is continuously looking at fees within other projects. While the fees add up, they're not a significant portion of the overall project cost.

Ms. Fink said you've seen the process they went through to generate actions, analyze, and refine the housing actions. That work resulted in being able to prioritize these actions into near-term, medium-term, and longer-term sets. Based on the number of units that they anticipate being able to be produced in the different categories and the actual cost reductions, staff's time will be best spent in the near term focusing on ADUs and encouraging small homes along with looking at the density allowances. To keep the process manageable, they only want to look at two issues at once. Within ADUs or small homes or within each of the land use actions they'll be looking at not only density but looking at permitting, coverage, and potentially fees.

They brought this set of prioritized actions to the working group which endorsed them and to the Local Government & Housing Committee who supported the general framework. They had some questions about whether certain items that have broad consensus could be moved forward more quickly. This will be addressed at the next working group meeting in February.

Presentation can be found at:

[Agenda-Item-No.-VIII.B-Tahoe-Living.pdf](#)

#### Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Bruce said this is a perfectly timed presentation on the heels of a great project on housing. He's encouraged about where TRPA is going with the housing planning and the development of the housing strategies.

Ms. Aldean said she assumes that there's an inventory of existing accessory dwelling units in the Tahoe Basin. It seems that existing dwellings that may be underutilized or maybe not used at all constitute a low hanging fruit in terms of making them available for workforce housing.

Ms. Fink said there are quite a few existing accessory dwelling units many of which were built before the local zoning codes went into effect. They don't know how many of those are being used for workforce house but it's likely that quite a few of them are simply because of their size. In some of the older neighborhoods there are some of these affordable workforce homes.

Ms. Aldean asked if staff could coordinate through the local planning departments to do an inventory of those existing accessory dwelling units.

Ms. Fink said staff can check into this. Some of the ones that were built more recently TRPA would have permits on those.

Ms. Aldean said this could be low hanging fruit. If they could be identified, then approach the owners about making those units available for workforce housing.

Ms. Fink said if TRPA changed their regulations or if the local jurisdictions came into the Local Government and Housing program like Placer County then they could potentially legalize those units. Right now, they currently can't legalize them because in most places because TRPA doesn't allow accessory dwelling units.

Ms. Aldean said we are now allowing ADUs on properties that are less than one acre in size. After an inventory, as long as those code amendments are not in violation of our overall mission and the Regional Plan, we should look at what changes need to be made in order for those available units to be used for the express purpose of housing workers in the Basin. This may be easy an possibly an immediate fix.

Ms. Fink agreed and said that will be one of the first items that the Tahoe Living Working Group will work on. Accessory Dwelling Units and small homes have been prioritized. Accessory dwelling units are allowed on parcels of less than one acre in Placer County because they have a certified local government housing program. They are the only ones who have this program to allow ADUs on less than one acre.

Ms. Aldean asked if it was correct that it's because of the absence of monitoring in the other jurisdictions.

Ms. Fink said in there's quite a significant list of things that local jurisdictions need to do in order to have a local government housing program. They need to have specific design standards for accessory dwelling units and also have a monitoring and compliance program to ensure that the homes aren't being used as a second units. The City of South Lake Tahoe is in the process of passing those standards in the next month or so and El Dorado County is looking into those as well. One hurdle is that the local government and housing program and TRPA's code also requires that those units be deed restricted for affordable, moderate, or achievable incomes. That is one place where the California state law conflicts with TRPA regulations so local jurisdictions are not able to deed restrict those units under California state law. For Placer County, TRPA has agreed to take on issuing the deed restrictions and monitoring.

Ms. Aldean said once there's an inventory and we know how many of these units exist in the jurisdictions, that might be a compelling reason for those jurisdictions to consider developing a housing program of their own to enable the accessory dwelling units to be used for that purpose.

Ms. Novasel said it's been a passion of hers to work on housing for many years. She worked with the Tahoe Prosperity Center and now with TRPA. This working group has done yeomans work and appreciated all the work that Ms. Fink and Ms. Bettinger and all others who have made this possible. El Dorado County is looking at the accessory dwelling units and how they can use them. They can be low hanging fruit and they need to see how to use ADUs not only for workforce housing but also senior housing. Something she's learned through the governor's initiative executive order is that perhaps there are ways that the government can use some of the excess properties for multi-use family type of development within the Tahoe Basin. El Dorado County is looking at some of their surplus land that could be used similar to this pilot project at the Y.

Mr. Friedrich extended his support for expediting the accessory dwelling unit permitting and programs ideally for this year's construction season. In addition to meeting the workforce and affordable housing needs, accessory dwelling units can also provide supplemental income to local residents and put people to work in green construction. There are a number of party's that are interested in that local developer. It's a win win and is supportive of whatever we can do as a board to get a program in place as soon as possible.

Mr. Yeates congratulated staff and said Ms. Novasel has been great on the Local Government & Housing Committee working on the issues and brought the leadership needed. We need to do more!

#### Public Comments & Questions

John Falk, Legislative Advocate for the Tahoe Sierra Board of Realtors said please do approve the further flushing out of these priority actions. The housing working group has done a great deal of the heavy lifting to get it to this point and would like to see this process continue to move forward as productively as it has to date. He agreed the accessory dwelling units is the low hanging fruit. There needs to be some governmental actions to get out of the way in terms of

creating unnecessary artificial barriers to the creation of new ADU units as well perfecting existing but not recognized ADUs. They are out there and suggested bringing them into compliance is a matter of public health and safety as well as providing safe housing both for the workforce, elderly, and those with special needs.

Gavin Feiger, League to Save Lake Tahoe said the league is dedicated to protecting, restoring the environmental health and sustainability, and scenic beauty of the Lake Tahoe Basin. In connection with that mission, they advocate for implementation of the environmentally friendly policies contained in regional land use and planning documents. They've been the only environmental group actively and continuously participating in this working group and the efforts leading up to its formation over the last few years. It's been great working with all of the stakeholders and TRPA, particularly, Ms. Fink and Ms. Bettinger. They feel that their feedback and input has largely been heard.

They want to support affordable housing as much as possible and their concerns have been the same since the start with coverage, density, and transportation impacts. These directly and indirectly impact the natural environment. Addressing the housing issues in Lake Tahoe are top priority but any effort to improve housing must also ensure that we're protecting the environment. After the November 2020, working group meeting, TRPA interviewed local jurisdictions and developers and those four themes came out of the discussions. They're pretty much in favor of three of them. They see the need for accessory dwelling units. The immediate focus should be building them in town centers and near transportation options to minimize impacts on the environment. The coverage theme gives them the most concern. Coverage incentives are estimated to only have a very small effect on the cost of development. The presentation today showed two percent at most. Coverage is also identified as long term action and coverage requirements are critical to addressing lake clarity decline. The effectiveness of changes to coverage regulations made in the 2012 Regional Plan Update, they'd like to see a detailed assessment of that before they can have an informed discussion about making more changes to coverage regulations. Unless they're not working, we shouldn't change them.

The effectiveness in ADUs in reaching the housing and transportation goals also need to be assessed. They have a limited amount of coverage and development rights and want to ensure that they're allocated to the best areas and projects. Similarly, with the eight actions identified they support most of them with some issues with the coverage and density. They would like to see some changes to allow affordable housing but early on be focused in town centers and near transportation options. They would like to see the non-controversial themes and actions prioritized first while we take a longer look at the themes and actions that are likely to have the most significant impact on the environment. He hopes that the Governing Board recommend the approval of these actions but clarify that coverage and density are longer term and need to have their environmental impacts carefully considered.

#### Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Novasel made a motion to approve the Tahoe Living: Housing and Community Revitalization Working Group priority housing actions as described in the staff report.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates

**Motion carried.**

IX. REPORTS

A. Executive Director Status Report

Ms. Marchetta welcomed new Governing Board members Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Hill, and Ms. Williamson. This is a great meeting for them to have jumped in because it has emphasized at least three of TRPA's strategic initiatives: Transportation, housing, and the threshold update.

This pandemic has touched of hundreds of thousands of people in very profound ways, it's touched some of us in harder ways than others. Her heart goes out to Julie who lost her father as a result of the Covid pandemic and looks forward to her return.

B. General Counsel Status Report

Mr. Marshall said last year the board considered and approved the Gonowabie lot line adjustment which is now the Richards v. TRPA case. They're working on the briefings on the merits of the four main claims against the actual decision based on the administrative record. They'll be filing a motion soon on the due process claim. They're going to have a settlement conference next week on the case and hopefully will be able to facilitate a resolution between the neighboring parcels.

TRPA was sued by Monica Eisenstecken who had brought an appeal to the Governing Board about a timber harvest on the neighboring property for some tree cutting for health, safety, and fire protection. The claim and lawsuit have to do with the alleged impacts from radio frequency radiation. There's an application for a cell tower on a neighboring property of Ms. Eisenstecken's that's pending before the Agency. Most of the key claims in this litigation which is brought in federal court in Sacramento are really addressing the intersection between the telecommunications act and the Compact over the human health and the environmental impacts of radio frequency radiation. The lawsuit challenges no specific action of TRPA's but rather alleges that TRPA needs to adopt rules regulating RF radiation in the Tahoe Basin. The complaint was served last month, and the response is due in mid-February. Also sued in the action are Verizon, the Tahoe Prosperity Center, and three members of the Governing Board and staff. They'll be defending this action in coordination with outside counsel for Verizon and hopefully the Tahoe Prosperity Center.

X. GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER REPORTS

Mr. Bruce gave a warm welcome to Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Hill, and Ms. Williamson. They are extremely talented new Governing Board members with fantastic backgrounds who will add a lot of value to this Governing Board.

Mr. Lawrence said he's worked with Mr. Friedrich on various activities in the past and will be a great member and looks forward to working with Ms. Hill and Ms. Williamson.

Last week Governor Sisolak did a State of the State address as well as releasing the states budget to the public. In the governors recommended budget is \$12 million in general obligation bonds to be sold over the next biennium to go towards the Environmental Improvement

## GOVERNING BOARD

January 27, 2021

Program. There's been some concerns with Covid and the economy with what the states debt capacity would be but this \$12 million in the budget is the most since the great recession.

Ms. Hill said the Washoe County Area Plan was approved by the County Commission yesterday and it will go through the TRPA's committees and eventually to the Governing Board in March. She's also requested some additional planning dollars to help Incline Village meet some of these items that have been discussed today for affordable housing and transportation to help the community better feel like they're represented by their area plan.

### XI. COMMITTEE REPORTS

#### A. Local Government & Housing Committee

Ms. Novasel said the committee met on January 6 and recommend approval of today's Agenda Item VIII.B. It was a well-planned process and appreciated Ms. Fink and Ms. Bettinger's work on everything. That same day they had a workshop with Opticos Design which was a conversation about the missing middle housing. It's fascinating to hear about this new model of making homes that look large actually be multi-family homes that will fit into single-family residential areas.

#### B. Legal Committee

None.

#### C. Operations & Governance Committee

None.

#### D. Environmental Improvement, Transportation, & Public Outreach Committee

Ms. Faustinos said the committee will be meeting at the conclusion of the Governing Board meeting today.

#### E. Forest Health and Wildfire Committee

Mr. Hicks said in 2019 and 2020 the committee was busy working on TRPA's ordinances effecting forest health and wildfire matters. The Coronavirus put a crimp in the plan after that. However, it's only four months away from the beginning of the 2021 fire season. He asked staff to coordinate a meeting to discuss possible issues or initiatives that may be appropriate for the committee to address. He welcomed new committee members Mr. Friedrich and Ms. Williamson. If any committee or board members have any ideas or suggestions that they'd like the committee to consider, they're happy to receive those.

#### F. Regional Plan Implementation Committee

Mr. Yeates said they met this morning on the vehicle miles traveled agenda item. The Environmental Improvement, Transportation & Public Outreach Committee will meet this afternoon to discuss the transportation funding items.

GOVERNING BOARD

January 27, 2021

XII. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

John Falk, Legislative Advocate for the Tahoe Sierra Board of Realtors said the state of California legislative cycle is well under way as is the budget cycle. This is the year of housing and the wildfire. When you look at the budget and the dollars that have been directed towards housing, it's unsurpassed in history that he recalls a budget that had a bigger allocation for housing issues in the state of California. This is going to be a top priority. The state Senate also has a group of housing bills that its forwarding and that should be on TRPA's radar because that influences how they do business at least on the California side. In addition to all of the wildfire issues they're also seeing a number of legislative measures or interest expressed to look at the wildland urban interface and defensible space measures. They support defensible space and wishes to see it implemented on all properties public and private.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Faustinos moved to adjourn.

Chair Mr. Bruce adjourned the meeting at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Marja Ambler".

Marja Ambler  
Clerk to the Board