

From: Tobi Tyler <tylertahoe1@gmail.com>
Sent: 11/8/2023 8:42:30 AM
To: Brendan Ferry <Brendan.Ferry@edcgov.us>; Jennifer Carr <jcarr@ndep.nv.gov>; ElleryStahler <estahler@lands.nv.gov>; Hilary Roverud <hroverud@cityofslt.us>; Jason Drew <jdrew@ncenet.com>; Susan Chandler <susankesslerchandler@gmail.com>; Crystal Jacobsen <CJacobse@placer.ca.gov>; Judy Simon <judymike@mac.com>; Kevin Hill <nwmfpack@icloud.com>; Ben Letton <ben.letton@waterboards.ca.gov>; Eric Young <EYoung@washoecounty.us>; Kmoneil <Kmoneil@douglasnv.us>; Heather Ferris <hferris@carson.org>; Kevin Drake <kevin@alibi.beer>; Garth Alling <galling@sierraecotonesolutions.com>; ExecutiveAssistant Washoe <executive.assistant@washoetribe.us>; Steve Teshara <SteveTeshara@gmail.com>; Chad Stephen <stephen@lakevalleyfire.org>; TRPA <trpa@trpa.gov>; Public Comment <PublicComment@trpa.gov>; Alyssa Bettinger <abettinger@trpa.gov>
Cc: Brooke Laine <bosfive@edcgov.us>; Cindy Gustafson <cindygustafson@placer.ca.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>; Shelly Aldean <shellyaldean@gmail.com>; Karen Fink <kfink@trpa.gov>; Jessica Diss <jdiss.trpa@gmail.com>; James Settlemeyer <JSettlemeyer@dcnr.nv.gov>; Alexis Hill <AHill@washoecounty.us>; Vince Hoenigman <vhoenigman@yahoo.com>;
Subject: Sierra Club comments for today's meeting
Attachments: [SC comments on TRPA APC code changes.pdf](#)

Please see the attached comments from the Sierra Club's Tahoe Area Group for today's meeting, Item V.A. Phase 2 Housing Amendments.

Tobi Tyler



Date: November 8, 2023

TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

The Sierra Club objects to the proposal to change the TRPA's Code of Ordinances and requests the APC members vote it down. The Sierra Club fully supports true affordable housing in the Tahoe Basin, but what is being proposed will provide no assurances or enforcement mechanisms that what is built will be truly affordable for the workers of the tourist economy in the Basin. Instead, this is a ruse and a give-away to developers who, through the TRPA-sanctioned Tahoe Prosperity Center, have devised this charade to increase development in the Basin by masking itself to the public as affordable housing, which it is not.

The Sierra Club also opposes the use of the environmental checklist for these proposed changes as they do not come close to adequately evaluating the environmental impacts of these changes and it will severely impact public safety during an evacuation caused by climate-change induced wildfire risks in the Basin. Traffic is already at gridlock levels around the lake much of the year.

Cumulative impacts have not been evaluated and the human carrying capacity in the Tahoe Basin is already beyond strained and is at a breaking level with the Lake's nearshore water quality severely impaired with algae and cyanobacteria blooms, microplastic levels in the lake higher than even in the ocean gyres, lead levels in the lake's waters surpassing the EPA-approved limit by more than 2,500 times, and a trash problem that is now infamous around the world such that travel guides are warning the public to stay away. This developer give-away is unjustified, lacks adequate environmental analysis and increase the already rapid trajectory of lake degradation.

The TRPA needs to develop and provide to the public a new or supplemental EIS/EIR to the 2012 Regional Plan because the proposed amendments will have significant adverse effects that were not considered in the 2012 EIS/EIR. Due to the vast number of changes that have occurred during the last 11 years since the Regional Plan was updated, the proposal to adopt these amendments with the inadequately-justified environmental checklist is a dereliction of TRPA's duty under the Tahoe Compact.

Thank you for your considering these comments.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tobi Tyler".

Tobi Tyler, Sierra Club's Tahoe Area Group

From: Ryan Wexler <epicwinter@hotmail.com>
Sent: 11/7/2023 8:01:49 PM
To: Public Comment <PublicComment@trpa.gov>
Subject: trpa meeting

Please accept my public comments.

Thank you,
Ryan Wexler
Kings Beach, CA

The public, from individuals to agencies, have requested that you first conduct a CURRENT cumulative EIR including existing approved projects before making significant changes. Basing your changes off of old data and partial data leads to bad decision making. We need data on carrying capacity, vehicle traffic and fire evacuation and safety. If you are making decisions off dated data, you could make huge mistakes that ruin the environment or the character of this beautiful area. Worse, you could get people killed.

Make sure you have the right data so your decision is correct. This is 2023. Data is part of everything we do and should be. It is imperative that you make sure you are basing your decisions on updated cumulative data. Please table this vote until you gather accurate cumulative data. Don't conduct the EIR afterwards. Get accurate data first. No Action is better than Bad Action or uninformed action.

I am sickened by the idea that our downtown corridors which currently fit the character of our beautiful mountain environment will be ruined by turning them into urban centers with tall buildings. The public has begged you not to do this. This is too big too fast. The 56 foot building height has barely been used to this point and the buildings that are in this height range are an eye sore.

As far as I can tell, the only reason you are doing this is because the developers aren't developing fast enough. I can only assume theory is because they can't make enough profit on a 56 foot height building. So hence, you are letting them build taller to encourage more development faster. When does it end? When is enough enough?

Please think long term. When I say long term, I am not talking about the next decade, I am talking about when your grandchildren are grown. Will they be happy with the result of what you have done here?

Is the goal to build out Tahoe as fast as possible, or slow and careful?

Achievable Housing is not affordable housing. Achievable housing is a farce. This is based upon fuzzy math and for no reason. There should never be a version of Affordable Housing where a clear income restriction is not attached to it. It is frankly ludicrous and I have yet to hear an explanation of why it would work or why we should even bother considering this category. Don't vote for abstract ideas, vote for clearly enforceable and understandable regulations. I oppose the Achievable Housing category of Affordable.

thanks
-ryan