

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

Virtual Meeting  
Via GoToWebinar

April 22, 2020

**Meeting Minutes**

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Vice Chair Mr. Bruce called the meeting to order at 9:31 a.m.

Members present: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Bruce, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Laine, Mr. Lawrence, Mr. Yeates

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Bruce deemed the agenda approved as posted.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Aldean moved approval of March 25, 2020 as presented.  
Motion carried.

IV. Item No. 3: Nomination and Appointment of Chair

Mr. Lawrence said he wanted to acknowledge all the great work that Mr. Shute did. His work on the Regional Plan Implementation Committee was instrumental in getting items done such as the commodities, the shoreline initiatives, along with area plan adoptions, and many other major projects.

Committee Comments & Questions

None.

Public Comments & Questions

None.

Ms. Aldean moved approval to nominate Mr. Yeates as the Regional Plan Implementation Committee Chair.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Bruce, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Laine, Mr. Lawrence, Mr. Yeates  
**Motion carried.**

REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

April 22, 2020

- V. Item No. 4: Discussion and possible recommendation for Tourist Core Area Plan, Pioneer/Ski Run Plan Area Statement 092 and Lakeview Heights Plan Area Statement 085 Boundary Line Amendments

Ms. Gustafson recused herself from this agenda item.

TRPA team member Ms. Fink and Mr. Hitchcock, Planning Manager, City of South Lake Tahoe made the presentation.

Ms. Fink said there is a focus on addressing the shortage of workforce housing in Lake Tahoe. Even with the Covid-19 pandemic, affordable and workforce housing will continue to be an issue moving forward. This amendment provides additional opportunities for workforce housing by providing additional height, density, and coverage needed so workforce can pencil in this location which is in close proximity to jobs, transit, and amenities. The three lots that are subject to the amendment are among the sites being considered for housing mitigation for the US 50 Revitalization project that the Governing Board approved in November. However, the intent is to build affordable housing in this location regardless of the outcome of the US 50 project.

Mr. Hitchcock said the Tourist Core Area Plan was adopted by the City of South Lake Tahoe and TRPA's Governing Board in 2013. It is bounded by Fairway Avenue on the west and Stateline on the east with a portion of it going down Ski Run Boulevard to Pioneer Trail.

This area plan is the primary tourist commercial center in the south shore. The land use policies and guidance from the area plan focuses on promoting a mixed land use while supporting residential development within close proximity to employment centers, commercial uses and providing access to recreational opportunities.

The City of South Lake Tahoe received an application from Pacific Development Group who specialize in building affordable housing projects. They requested an amendment to incorporate three parcels that they currently have ownership to include those in Tourist Core Area Plan Mixed Use Corridor. This amendment would affect the Tourist Core Area Plan boundary as well as the boundary for Plan Area Statement 092 and 085. Of the three parcels, one is vacant, one has two small cabins on it, and the third parcel is an existing dirt road that provides access to five parcels east of the subject parcels. The proposed amendment would incorporate those three parcels into the Tourist Core Area Plan.

Pacific Development Group holds fee title to the three parcels as well as the two parcels that are currently located in the Tourist Core Area Plan at the intersection of Ski Run Boulevard and Pioneer Trail. The developer is proposing to combine these three parcels to build a 77-unit multi-family project on 3.19 acres. The proposed amendment would incentivize multi-family development and make affordable housing more feasible. By incorporating these three parcels into the Tourist Core Area Plan they would be eligible for increase in density from 15 dwelling units per acre to up to 25. They would be able to have an increase in height from 42 feet to 56 feet. They would also be able to transfer in coverage up to 70 percent to develop the affordable housing project when transferred at a ratio of 2:1. As part of this amendment they're prohibiting tourist and commercial uses on those three incorporated parcels, only residential development would be permitted.

## REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

April 22, 2020

The three subject parcels are ideal for developing high density housing, multi-family is already permissible. It is in close proximity to bus stops and transit routes. There's a primary transit route that runs from Pioneer Trail and Ski Run Boulevard as well as seasonal bus routes that go to Heavenly Ski Resort California base. This subject parcel is also in close proximity to the Aspen affordable housing project located west of the subject parcels. By incorporating these three parcels to develop high density affordable housing makes sense from a land use perspective.

During the public hearings of the Advisory Planning Commission, Regional Plan Implementation Committee, and the City council and planning commission meetings had some questions and concerns on scenic. They believe that redevelopment of these sites would improve the scenic quality of roadway unit 45, Pioneer Trail North. They did an analysis of the tree canopy height on the parcels that ranged from 15 to 122 feet. Any proposed height within the project site would be well below two thirds of the tree canopy. Any future proposed project would have to be in compliance with the California Fire Code for defensible space. Another question raised was about the public parcels that are located in close proximity to this parcel. The California Tahoe Conservancy has indicated that they will be doing fuels management treatment of their parcels that are south of the subject parcels.

A public information meeting was conducted in November 2019. Individuals that attended were mainly interested in the project itself and not the amendment. Prior to circulating the initial study for the California Environmental Quality Act purposes, the City did do a tribal consultation. They received one comment from the Auburn Tribe who deferred comment to the Washoe Tribe. The City staff reached out to the Washoe Tribe to get comments on the amendment but received no response. The initial study was circulated from December 2019 to January 2020. The City Planning Commission took action on this item on February 20, 2020 and the City Council took action on March 10, 2020. They found the initial study negative declaration to be technically adequate. They found that the Tourist Core Area Plan as amended is consistent with the City's General Plan and adopted the Tourist Core Area Plan specific plan for City purposes.

The project will require design review and approval by the City's Planning Commission and approval by TRPA because it's greater than 50,000 square feet of new floor area. Although, the City has not received a full application they've held a pre-application meeting with the Pacific Development Group and went over some of the initial conceptual ideas for the project. The City will hold additional public workshops once the project application is submitted for design review.

Ms. Fink said they held a public information meeting in November 2019. All properties within 300 feet were noticed for this meeting with about four people attending the public information meeting. Most people were in support of the project. One person wanted to continue to receive information as the project design moves forward. On March 11, 2020, the Advisory Planning Commission recommend approval.

TRPA completed an area plan conformance checklist, findings, and a thresholds and compliance spreadsheet based on the Initial Environmental Checklist and the application that was submitted. These were used to support the findings of conformance with the Regional Plan and consistency with the Thresholds. One item that was raised at the December 2019, Regional Plan Implementation Committee meeting was to ensure that these three parcels were consistent with the requirements of Chapter 13. It requires that if parcels are being amended into a town center, they need to be within one quarter mile of commercial and public services that support the use of

April 22, 2020

transit and must be developed parcels or surrounded on three sides by development. These parcels meet this criterion, they are directly adjacent to transit and within one quarter mile of a fire station, multiple restaurants and other services. One parcel is currently developed with two units and the second is a dirt road that provides access to the adjacent parcels, and the third parcel is surrounded by those other two developed parcels as well as another developed parcel to the east.

Presentation can be viewed at:

[Agenda-Item-No.-4-TCAP-Amendment-Ski-Run\\_Pioneer.pdf](#)

#### Committee Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean referred to page 266 of the staff packet. She asked if the dirt driveway that provides access to the adjacent parcels will not prohibit access to these parcels and is not part of three parcel package.

Mr. Hitchcock, City of South Lake Tahoe said yes, that's correct. The parcels will continue to have access. As part of the project they'll be looking to the project developer to improve that driveway by paving it.

Mr. Lawrence referred to the table on page 264 of the staff packet. Employee Housing, Multiple Family Dwelling, and Multi-Person Dwelling can be affordable housing but is there a guarantee that with this plan area amendment will be affordable housing or does the amendment allow something else to be developed.

Mr. Hitchcock said it doesn't prohibit other residential type developments. Pacific Development Group specializes in development of affordable housing projects. They own fee title to the property and it's their intention to build affordable housing. The City has also been in discussion with them and will enter into a development agreement. They're interested in using the City's home income funds and federal tax credits pursuant to state and federal law has affordability requirements for using those funds.

Mr. Lawrence said but it wouldn't preclude a different type of project.

Mr. Hitchcock, City of South Lake Tahoe said yes, that's correct.

Mr. Lawrence asked if there was any discussion on the timing of this amendment and the Main Street Management project for some extra certainty as opposed to doing this now and waiting for the other pieces to fall into place.

Mr. Hitchcock said they haven't had that discussion, but they are interested in moving forward and are prepared to submit an application to the City and TRPA as soon as the amendments are adopted and become effective.

Mr. Feldman on behalf of Pacific Development Group said this has been in the works for some time. They've been before the Regional Plan Implementation Committee, the City of South Lake Tahoe's Planning Commission and City Council and are looking forward to concluding this amendment. In order for an affordable housing project to compete for the type of funding that's

April 22, 2020

required to make it viable, the zoning and entitlements needs to be in place, and have a complete submittal. This is a critical step in that process. The strip parcel is included but is not a critical component, it helps for density but they're not looking for height as it's already 100 percent covered with compacted dirt. They're talking about parcels 04 and 02 that abut the corner parcel at Ski Run Boulevard and Pioneer Trail and the intervening parcel. The uses allowed today on the corner parcel at Pioneer Trail and the adjacent parcel include tourist accommodation and they're in the tourist core area plan.

Today, the property owner could develop at 40 units per acre to 56 feet of height and utilize outside of the tourist core area plan, 02 and 04 for ancillary uses. There are no reasonable asks for us now to restrict uses on 02 and 04 to limit what could happen in the extremely unlikely event that this project for whatever reason that we cannot foresee despite a huge investment, good faith, and collaboration. If it can't be economically viable at the end of the day to have restricted parcels to affordable housing when it can't be developed as affordable housing economically effectively renders that land worthless. They're not looking to anything other than construct 77-units of deed restricted affordable housing under tax credit program, home funds, and other traditional subsidies between 30 to 80 percent of the median. If that proves economically impossible in the next few years, they need an exit strategy and to burden the land with an exit strategy that says you can't use it because it's not economically viable, is an unreasonable ask.

While there's a modest increase in permissible density for a multi-family residential as a result of this amendment that increase in density excludes the use of tourist accommodation which has a higher permissible density. To some degree, they're down zoning but are prepared to move forward and respectfully request the committee to adopt the staff recommendation and not further burden the zoning.

Mr. Yeates asked if there's something we can do in the approval of this plan amendment that gives the developer all the entitlements but if in fact for some reason they are not able to do an affordable housing project, that it could go back to the use that exist prior to the amendment. He believes it would still be within the Tourist Core Area Plan and can we figure out a balance between what the developer says is not going to be fair if they can't develop it as an affordable project, then they would like then to take advantage of being a property owner. He didn't get the sense from Mr. Lawrence's proposal that it would leave the developer with nothing.

Mr. Lawrence said he's trying to find the balancing point. If this amendment is approved, is this going to mean an affordable housing project or are we approving something else that could be constructed there with no guarantee for the affordable housing project. He doesn't doubt the intent that a project needs to be done there but is looking at the timing. If the project is questionable to pencil out, do we do the area plan amendment now or wait until there's more certainty that a project pencil out.

Mr. Feldman said there's a sequence to this process that initiated long ago which is to perfect the zoning. To the Pacific Development Groups credit ordinarily it would perfect the zoning before one would invest in the site development costs. They've taken that leap of faith and have developed the conceptual plans and spent the money in advance of the zoning. They need to keep the process moving so they are eligible to compete for the various funding opportunities. There seems to be a fear that in the event for whatever reason the affordable concept is economically impossible that an increase in multi-family residential density at the exact place that it ought to be

April 22, 2020

by about 16 units is antithetical. If you understand this land area, affordable housing density is based on unit sizes that are not the same as market rate units. The increase on these parcels gives the potential for another 16 or so units. If this became a market rate project which it could be today, you won't get that type of density because you would have much larger units to be a market rate project. This fear about what might happen in the future if affordable housing that has driven this entire process, this developer is entitled to have an exit strategy if this fails.

Mr. Lawrence said these are complicated projects and everything can't be lined out exactly but still struggles some with the timing. He would like more certainty about the affordable housing.

Ms. Laine said this project a top priority for the City. They've been working with Pacific Development Group for two years. They have every reason to believe that this is a top priority for them to create a deed restricted affordable housing project. In order for them to be able to bring this project to the state and get credits that are necessary to help make this pencil out, they need these certainties. The City is prepared to make a cash investment to help with this project. The Regional Housing Needs Assessment numbers that were issued by California are mandating that the City produce somewhere in the neighborhood of 3,600 new units of housing across the spectrum. The City not only needs affordable deed restricted housing but also need work force housing, etc. She's 90 percent certain with the support of the Tahoe Transportation District and the City this can be done. Affordable housing is what the Pacific Development Group does.

Mr. Bruce asked where they're at with resolving the funding gap.

Ms. Laine said from the City's perspective they're also working with South Tahoe Public Utility District so they can transfer sewer units that the City currently has banked. This will be at no charge as long as it's deed restricted affordable housing.

Mr. Feldman said there are a laundry list of potential funding sources. There are home fund applications, tax credit applications, and community development block grant applications that are highly competitive. The level of competitiveness is enhanced by the level of leverage. For example, when Ms. Laine says that the South Tahoe Public Utility District has consented to the use of these sewer units, that's a contribution that elevates their competitive position. Because this is an affordable housing project, the Pacific Development Group will apply to TRPA for bonus units. Those bonus units have a use value as residential unit of use of approximately \$25,000 each. Again, enhances their opportunity to compete for funds. They need to get through the zoning and the project approval and then monetize what's been contributed from the City and TRPA's award of bonus units. They have confidence with the tools at their disposal that they'll be highly competitive but it's not certain. If they don't succeed in the first round, they do the second round. He's done several affordable housing projects in our market in the past and he's never done one where the developer has bought the land before they obtained the entitlements. They traditionally option the land; they don't put their capital into fee ownership.

Mr. Bruce said the reason some of these questions are being asked are that the Main Street Management Project could hinge on the success in finding that gap money. This is a question of more than the affordable housing units. The affordable housing units are important but it's not the entire picture. They need to be comfortable that the \$7 million dollar gap will be satisfied so they can move forward with the Mainstreet Management Project.

April 22, 2020

Mr. Bruce said he's not requiring a condition but am requiring that the applicant understand the very significant ramification if the affordable housing doesn't occur to a much bigger plan. He understands the issue with the 16 units. Although he wishes that this were tied from a timing perspective. As a committee member he's okay but will need to think about it as a Governing Board member.

Mr. Yeates asked if there could be a condition that the Governing Board could address as a recommendation from the committee.

Mr. Marshall said in general we do not condition zoning. It is either appropriate or not appropriate. If we want to create a special district that takes into account special policies would be how it's done. This is an applicant driven request and they've indicated that they're not interested in having an express condition that somehow limits the residential or multi-family use associated with pulling these parcels into the Tourist Core Area Plan. He doesn't think that there's a way to condition this on the sub use. The use is going to be residential and the discussion is more on what kind of residential use, affordable, market rate, etc. He doesn't see a way in which we can zone this affordable only with the way the zoning is currently set up within the plan area statements and the Tourist Core Area Plan. However, what you're hearing is that it's a timing issue. He's trying to work out whether or not we can condition this boundary line adjustment to be effective for a period of time within which an application has to be submitted. It appears from the applicant's perspective that they are imminent in filing their application and maybe we handle that at the board in that way. The resolution here is in the timing of the subsequent application as opposed to defining the actual use of those parcels when they come into the Tourist Core Area Plan.

Ms. Aldean said she's willing to take a leap of faith. The affordable housing shortage is going to be further exacerbated by this pandemic. There won't be a shortage of people needing this housing. That may compel the federal government and the states to look at new methods to expedite the construction of affordable housing. She gets the impression that the developer will do everything in their power that this project moves forward. She doesn't have any issues with linking the boundary line adjustment to a set period of time if that's deemed acceptable to the board.

#### Public Comments & Questions

Steve Teshara said the Lake Tahoe South Shore Chamber strongly supports the Regional Plan Implementation Committee's recommended approval to the Governing Board of the proposed amendments to the boundary lines of the Tourist Core Area Plan in the City of South Lake Tahoe as detailed in the staff report for RPIC agenda item 4.

Gavin Feiger, the League to Save Lake Tahoe said they'll also comment during Governing Board depending on the outcome of this meeting. They have a couple of concerns about the Tourist Core Area Plan amendment as they found what might be a miscalculation and some things have changed since this item went through the City and the Advisory Planning Commission (updated interim project-level guidance).

First the miscalculation. As the California Attorney General's Office pointed out, the LSC traffic analysis memo uses 17 units and a trip rate of 5.44 for their calculations. The amendment would result in allowing up to 77 units on the properties dispersed between 17 buildings as we

April 22, 2020

understand it. The calculation should then be  $77 * 5.44 = 418$  daily trips. Well over the threshold of significance.

If the actual project goes through as described, it will be exempt under the interim guidance if it's 100 percent affordable. We just want to make sure a loophole isn't created to allow market-rate units on the property. If the property can't currently be deed-restricted for affordable housing as a condition of this amendment, maybe TRPA can figure out a way to make sure only affordable housing goes on this property while fixing the daily trip calculation error. Maybe by making "affordable housing" a permissible use in the Code so the property could be deed restricted. They are open to discussions.

Gavin Feiger, the League to Save Lake Tahoe said apologies, he sees now that you calculated an additional 17 units. That makes more sense.

Nicole Rinke said the California Attorney General's Office has been heavily involved in working on vehicle miles traveled issues with TRPA staff and appreciated the commitment that has been made to updating the VMT threshold. They also appreciated the efforts that were made around the event center and a net zero VMT standard for that project. In contrast to the event center this plan amendment declined to analyze the VMT generated by the project because it will generate less than 100 daily trips and therefore, pursuant to the VMT guidance doesn't require a VMT analysis. They disagree that 100 daily trips are an appropriate screening criterion for VMT analysis, trips alone do not equal VMT.

Please reference their May 21, 2019 letter to Ms. Fink, page five for more detail. Particularly at this time when it has been acknowledged that the basin is over the existing VMT threshold there is no support for using 100 or other trip generation threshold to avoid analyzing and addressing a project generated VMT. Any projects for plan amendments being proposed at this time need to be analyzing VMT and complying with a net zero VMT standard in order to make the required findings for threshold compliance. Please also note that the supporting documentation for the amendment is not clear that the plan amendment will not exceed the 100 trip screening level. Table one of the LSC memo, page 128 of the staff packet, indicates that 17 units will generate 78 daily trips which is the total claimed for the plan amendment as a whole. However, the plan amendment would accommodate up to 77 units, reference page 136 of the staff packet. Please clarify that the analysis has accounted for the full number of trips that will be associated with "buildout" aka 77 units of the plan amendment.

While they support the development of affordable housing in this area, they also note that the plan amendment is being proposed ahead of the project. Thus, there is no guarantee that the more permissive development standards that the plan amendment authorizes will in fact be utilized for affordable housing. At a minimum the plan amendment if approved, should be limited to the development of affordable housing. They request that this action on this item be deferred so these issues can be adequately addressed. In addition, in the future that staff keep them engaged on matters that relate to VMT or raise VMT issues as these matters are of ongoing importance to their office. Unfortunately, they were not able to engage earlier with this proposal. They're now aware that this has been before the Advisory Planning Commission and the City of South Lake Tahoe. However, with their focus on the event center and more recently the pandemic they were not aware of this proposed amendment until now. Their preference is to engage early



April 22, 2020

and productively and can do so more effectively when they are made aware of matters earlier in the process.

Committee Comments & Questions

Mr. Yeates asked for further detail on why there wasn't a vehicle miles traveled analysis done for this proposed project.

Mr. Marshall said the various memos including the LSC memo that's in the staff packet on page 387 analyzes the development potential associated with the amendment. That is the difference between what could be approved right now with no change, so the existing condition versus what could happen if the three parcels came into the Tourist Core Area Plan. What could happen is the addition of those 17 units. That's what is analyzed, and the generation of trips associated with that 17 units is less than 100. Less than 100 trips in the code is considered to be an insignificant change and doesn't require additional analysis for VMT. That's not to say if and when the project comes forward they will not have to address some of those additional findings. However, they now exempt affordable housing projects so that TRPA and the Regional Transportation Plan will be responsible for offsetting any additional trips associated with affordable housing developments in the basin. Mr. Feiger is correct, and the California Attorney General's Office was incorrect in its calculations regarding the impacts associated from the asserted buildout of the project which will happen when the project occurs.

Ms. Laine made a motion to recommend Governing Board approval of the required findings, including a finding of no significant effect, for adoption of draft Tourist Core Area Plan, Pioneer/Ski Run Plan Area Statement 092, and Lakeview Heights Plan Area Statement 085 Boundary Line Amendments as provided in Attachment B.

Mr. Lawrence said he appreciated Ms. Laine's comments about the City's commitment and also the comments by Ms. Aldean that sometimes you do need to take some risk. This is a good opportunity for an affordable housing project but feels that there's a little bit of a risk by doing the zoning before having a project application in. He's still concerned with the timing but will support this moving forward to the Governing Board and then will consider it at the full board level.

Ms. Gustafson recused herself.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Bruce, Ms. Laine, Mr. Lawrence, Mr. Yeates

**Motion carried.**

Ms. Laine mad a motion to recommend Governing Board adoption of Ordinance 2020-\_\_\_ , amending Ordinance 2019-03, as previously amended, to amend the Tourist Core Area Plan, Pioneer/Ski Run Plan Area Statement 092, and Lakeview Heights Plan Area Statement 085 to include the changes referenced in Attachment A.

Ms. Gustafson recused herself.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Bruce, Ms. Laine, Mr. Lawrence, Mr. Yeates

**Motion carried.**

April 22, 2020

VI. Item 5, Update on the project level transportation impact assessment and Air Quality Mitigation Fee

TRPA team member Ms. Sloan provided the presentation.

Ms. Sloan said at last month's committee meeting the update to the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) work plan was approved. The work elements being presented today are part of that plan and also a part of TRPA's update to its environmental review process as part of Article VII. That environmental review seeks to further the VMT as an action forcing mechanism to encourage better project design and also to improve how projects mitigate impacts to transportation. Each of the work elements is focused on attaining and maintaining TRPA's VMT threshold. Those work elements include project impact analysis for transportation relative to VMT and update of the air quality mitigation fee. For project level transportation impact assessment, TRPA has and will continue to use VMT for project analysis throughout the basin. The California Environmental Quality Act with Senate Bill 743 now requires California jurisdictions to do the same. Aligning and coordinating these two approaches responds to the request of the board members to work collaboratively on this and also provides a cost effective means of producing consistent basin wide project impact assessment processes.

The air quality mitigation fee is a complimentary tool because it also ensures transportation is not deteriorated with new development but also helps implement projects and programs from adopted plans such as the Regional Transportation Plan and local area plans. The approach to assessing transportation impacts has progressed and the environmental review should also.

The project level transportation impact assessment will incorporate today's best practices by expanding the level of service from solely the automobile to include those walking, biking, and using transit by refining focus on trips to put emphasis on reducing longer trips and by empowering applicants with information that they need to design better projects.

This work element will develop a basin wide project level analytical tool and components of that work will include development and dynamic testing of project level VMT forecasting tool. Mr. Segan had demonstrated a similar tool that the City of Los Angeles uses at previous committee meeting. The work will also develop screening criteria which is the means of identifying which projects will and will not undergo impact analysis as well as developing VMT mitigation or reduction strategies.

The second work element focuses on air quality mitigation fee which has not been updated since 2007. It's timely to do so now and also offers an opportunity to align the update with the Regional Transportation Plan update. It will also better represent current day project costs and to align with the project level work just described. When updated the fee will also align with the VMT threshold work plan and its focus on mobility, mobile source greenhouse gas emissions, and other identified concerns associated with vehicle travel. Work will also include updating associated regulations and guidance. Both of the work items have common elements including stakeholder engagement and each must reflect the collective vision of the broad partnership in the basin. To do so, stakeholder input will be solicited and incorporated at key points. Project level work and mitigation fee work will be completed on parallel time lines and anticipate each to be completed in the fall. The methodology for both work elements will be brought to the Advisory Planning Commission in June and the Governing Board in July.

REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

April 22, 2020

Presentation can be found at:

[Agenda-Item-5-project-level-transportation-impact-assessment-AQM\\_Submitted.pdf](#)

Committee Comments & Questions

None.

Public Comments & Questions

Nicole Rinke, California Attorney General's Office said they appreciated this update and have just a couple of comments on the Air Quality (AQ) mitigation fee. They requested more detailed information about what it means to "... to better align it [the AQ mitigation fee] with the project level transportation impact assessment work." (last page of the staff report). They have previously commented on the AQ mitigation fee, specifically regarding the need to update how the fee is calculated and to better align it with addressing VMT if it is to be used for VMT mitigation. We request that you consider those comments as you go forward - see their May 21, 2019 letter to Karen Fink, pages 5-6.

Committee Comments & Questions

Mr. Yeates encouraged staff to work closely with the California Attorney General's Office as we put together the vehicle miles traveled threshold and associated work plans.

VII. Committee Member Comments

None.

VIII. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

None.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Aldean moved to adjourn.

Chair Mr. Yeates adjourned the meeting at 10:52 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Marja Ambler  
Clerk to the Board

*The above meeting was taped in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the tapes of the above mentioned meeting may call for an appointment at (775) 588-4547. In addition, written documents submitted at the meeting are available for review*