TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION
NOTICE OF MEETING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Advisory Planning Commission of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct its regular meeting at 9:30 a.m. on October 13, 1999, at the North Tahoe Conference Center, 8318 North Lake Boulevard, Kings Beach, California. The agenda for the meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

October 4, 1999

Jerry Wells
Deputy Executive Director

This agenda has been posted at the TRPA office and at the following post offices: Zephyr Cove and Stateline, Nevada, and Stateline and Al Tahoe, California. The agenda has also been posted at the North Tahoe Conference Center in Kings Beach, the Incline Village GID office, and the North Lake Tahoe Chamber of Commerce.
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All items on this agenda are action items unless otherwise noted.

AGENDA

I.  CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II.  APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III.  PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS (No Action)

   Any member of the public wishing to address the Advisory Planning Commission
   on any agenda item not listed as a Public Hearing or a Planning Matter item, or on
   any other issue, may do so at this time.  However, public comment on Public
   Hearing and Planning Matter items will be taken at the time those agenda items
   are heard.

   NOTE:  THE ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION IS PROHIBITED BY LAW FROM
   TAKING IMMEDIATE ACTION ON, OR DISCUSSING ISSUES RAISED BY THE PUBLIC
   THAT ARE NOT LISTED ON THIS AGENDA.

IV.  DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

V.  PUBLIC HEARINGS

   A.  Amendment of Plan Area Statement 171, Tavern Heights, to Allow
       Government Offices (Restricted to Regional Post Office Only) as a
       Special Use in Special Area #1  PAGE 1

   B.  Adoption of Code Chapter 83, Source Water Protection, and Related
       Amendment of Code Chapter 2, Definitions, and Code Chapter 12, TRPA
       Regional Plan Maps, and Code Chapter 25, Best Management Practice
       Requirements  PAGE 9

VI.  PLANNING MATTERS

   A.  Determination of Lands and Parcels Suitable for Multi-Residential
       Development in Douglas County  PAGE 31

   B.  United States Postal Service Master Plan Progress Report  PAGE 55

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

   A.  The Role of the Advisory Planning Commission  PAGE 57
B. Status Report on Streamlining Activities – 11:45 a.m.
C. Status Report on Local Revenue Generation

VIII. REPORTS
A. Executive Director
B. Legal Counsel
C. APC Members

IX. ADJOURNMENT
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

The Chateau
955 Fairway Boulevard
Incline Village, Nevada

September 8, 1999

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

APC Member Alice Baldrica called the regular September 8, 1999, meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission ("APC") to order at 9:50 a.m.

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Ms. Baldrica stated that recognizing that we do not have a quorum and that we have people on the road trying to make their way to the meeting. Ms. Baldrica commented that we could not move on the agenda or dispose of the minutes, so we will move on to the Public Hearing items.

II. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Ms. Sue Rae Irelan, Planning Consultant for the United States Postal Service, stated that she would be addressing the APC later about a plan area amendment application, but there is another item that the Postal Service is working on here in Lake Tahoe that she wanted to bring to the APC's attention because it will be coming before them in the next couple of months. This is the Tahoe Regional Master Plan effort which is underway right now. It is a joint TRPA-Postal Service document that is intended to look at the broad scope of postal service activities in the entire Region. The current document, which covers postal service activities in Tahoe, is called the "Post Office Action Plan", and it almost exclusively deals with activities in the South Shore. It is the document that has directed and first established and then expanded home mail service throughout the South Shore/California area. It also provided policy input when home mail was instituted in Incline Village.

Ms. Irelan commented that the purpose of the master plan is to extend that kind of policy to the rest of the region. The primary issue that the master plan will be addressing is how can future post office activities help to reduce VMT, and as part of that, we have completed an extensive regional survey of travel patterns and desires of postal customers in order to be able to establish real numbers for what existing VMT effects are between postal activities. There is a number that TRPA has used and been refined over the years that is a compilation of trying to use some national standards and apply them to the region, but we didn't really have a comprehensive look at how people respond to this area. The survey will be helping to answer those, and also to gage where the interest is with the public of expanding home mail delivery. The survey is completed, and the data is in the analysis stage now.

The point where the APC will be asked to participate is at several places along the way. Ms. Irelan said that they are developing the information from the survey and putting it into a needs analyses which will be ready around the beginning of October. The needs assessment will go out to public workshops, both in the North and South Shores, and the Governing Board and APC for input and guidance on how to develop master plan policies specific to each postal service area resulting from that needs assessment, and then a working team will be taking that information and putting it into a draft plan format that will come back to the APC as well, and then the final. A focus EA will accompany that also.
Ms. Baldrica asked the newest APC member, Ron McIntyre, to introduce himself.

Mr. Ron McIntyre introduced himself, stating that he is the Director of Infrastructure and Transportation Development for the North Lake Tahoe Resort Association. He has lived in Lake Tahoe for about 35 years. He was originally in the engineering business and then in the real estate development business here and in other areas. Mr. McIntyre commented that he was an elected member of the Tahoe City Public Utility District for 18 years before they kicked him off this last election. He currently is the Chairman of the Tahoe Transportation District and when this seat was discussed, it appeared as those that the powers that be felt that the Tahoe Transportation District and the new Tahoe Transportation Commission would be a logical group to serve, had an internal discussion, and decided that the effort would fall to the Chair. Since he was the Chair, Mr. McIntyre has assumed the position. He considered it necessary and something he is very interested in doing and happy to have the opportunity to help.

Ms. Baldrica stated that the APC is very glad to have him, especially since transportation currently has a lot of big issues.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

C. Regional Transportation Plan/Air Quality Plan Public Scoping Process for an EIS

Associate Transportation Planner Jim Allison presented the scoping of the Regional Transportation Plan/air Quality Plan EIR/EIS and elements of the Plan for TRPA, federal and state purposes. In addition, staff was requesting that the APC solicit public comments through a public hearing on the scope of the proposed EIR/EIS and the content (policies, programs, projects) of the plan at the meeting.

Ms. Baldrica opened the meeting up for a public hearing.

Ms. Zona Sahgian, a member of the public, questioned because of the snow area, is TRPA doing any comparisons to other resort areas, such as Aspen, so the public could get an idea of what they are assessing.

Mr. Allison replied that as it relates to other resort areas in mountain communities with snow, TRPA would be taking that into consideration. We are similar, but at this point in time, we are slightly different. Mr. Allison stated that Aspen is a destination area and not within two or four hours drive from metropolitan areas. We will be looking at some of the policies they have in terms of parking and those kinds of concepts. But we would have to tailor them to Tahoe because we have a large driving population; not a large population, at least at this point in time, who are coming here and staying. We will also be addressing such things as ski shuttles and those things that relate to the industry at that time of the year.

Mr. Don McKay, with the California State Parks, stated that he was concerned about the waterborne transportation system that is being proposed. His specific concern is as an example would be the Vikings Home in Emerald Bay. He stated that right now, they are not equipped to handle the possible input of 100 or 200 people at one time. Their sewer and water systems cannot accommodate those kinds of impacts. In addition, there are several other areas around the Lake that could be exposed to this kind of impact. The Department in general supports the use of mass transit to and from the parks. The concern is that the parks are not yet funded to provide this service to the facilities. In addition, their concern is they will be required, because
of the public interest, to develop different kinds of facilities with greater bus access, greater bike access, and public access in general from both directions. Mr. McKay believed that they needed additional time to do this.

Mr. Jim Feelan, with the Tahoe City Marina in Tahoe City, stated that he is in favor of waterborne transit, and he agreed with Mr. McKay's comment about not having the capability of handling waterborne transit, but he believed that it should be considered seriously as a method of reducing VMTs. He commented that in the master plan that the Marina is preparing, the marina expansion is very strongly headed in the direction of providing services for waterborne transit for both short term and North Shore to South Shore. He was in favor of finding ways in which to partnership with other entities to make this happen.

Agency Counsel John Marshall commented that he had just heard from Julie Frame of TRPA and the APC would probably not have a quorum today because the members who were stuck in the traffic because of the accident and not able to turnaround won't be coming to the meeting. As a result, we won't have a quorum so there isn't much more that the APC could do today. Mr. Marshall stated that we would have to reschedule the APC items for the meeting next month.

Ms. Baldrica apologized to the members of the audience who came to the meeting. This was something completely unforeseen.

Ms. Joyce Nolan, a member of the public, questioned if the meeting was being cancelled, and Mr. Marshall replied yes. In addition, she questioned if everything on the agenda would be heard at the next APC meeting and not be on the upcoming TRPA Governing Board meeting. Mr. Marshall stated that those items that require APC action first would be heard in October, and then again at the October Governing Board meeting.

Ms. Baldrica commented that the only item that would not be on the next APC agenda would be the Regional Transportation Plan because it was heard today and it is just a scoping meeting.

Mr. Popoff commented that he has never seen the Regional Transportation Plan, much less the EIS, and staff is asking for comments, which is hard to do in this situation. Mr. Allison stated that this is a process, and we are at the start of the process, putting ideas down in terms of priorities. If a comment were received saying that we should prioritize transit operations above all else, that would be a guiding principle behind the plan. We will be coming forward with subsequent comments on a draft EIS/EIR for the plan and the APC would have an opportunity to see it and comment on the content of it and know the direction it is going.

Mr. Popoff was of the opinion that in order to make any intelligent comment, the APC has to know not only the elements of the plan, but have some idea of the environmental impacts. He felt that a lot needs to be done before anybody can make any intelligent comments.

Mr. Allison replied that he understood Mr. Popoff's concerns, but he believed that the value of having this meeting at this point in time is to hear what's important because otherwise we are operating on somewhat limited knowledge. This is also an opportunity for the public to tell us what they believe is important.

Ms. Kvas questioned if a component was being included to get people from the Bay Area, or Sacramento on some type of highspeed transportation system. Mr. Allison stated that this has been included from the public comment hearings. We can indicate that we should participate in a corridor planning process, such as along Highway 50 or 80, but because we are outside of the
Basin at that point in time, it then becomes an interactive process with Truckee, Auburn, Placer County, Sacramento and to the Bay area. It will be a matter of putting forth a project that has some funding behind it that is deemed to be very important and then prioritized and staff time allotted to it.

Mr. McIntyre believed that the Regional Plan document should be available to the APC members so they can review it. He also hoped that when we reach a conclusion in this process, the so-called priorities would have had an anticipated effect on VMTs so that people were to look at those kinds of major public projects, they would have an idea that this would do some good.

Mr. Barham suggested that more emphasis be put on alternative fuels.

Ms. Rebecca Hail, a member of the public, questioned if there would be a possibility of doing a marketing study of who is actually using mass transit right now. She inquired if there was any hard data. She was of the opinion that a survey should be done before a lot of funding is put into public transit.

Mr. McIntyre stated that some of the things you do in this type of situation relate back to other destination resorts and what they have done and how successful they have been.

Ms. Kvas stated that Yosemite has a really wonderful transportation system and suggested that Mr. Allison check it out.

Mr. Allison commented that in general, the Tahoe Basin has not seriously examined origin-destination behavior which is the foundation of these decisions on how much VMT is saved, perhaps even going into who is using mass transit. The funds have not been available to do this kind of study since 1974 to do a comprehensive study. At this point in time, from looking at those numbers and not having a good track record since 1974 about what those numbers represented, he had a hard time assessing VMT benefits. With the tools we have available, he could give an educated guess as to what VMT reduction might be and this is what we can do. So one of the big things that we need to be doing now that we do have more funding coming in is to identify data gaps so that within the next three years, studies would be done stating we have a better understanding of our transportation system now. Mr. Allison stated that he could not be specific with data at this time.

Mr. Poppoff believed that it would be more advantageous to find out what people actually want to do up here and how they want to do it, and then adapt the mass transportation system to accommodate that.

Ms. Kvas questioned if there was money available for studies, and Mr. Allison replied yes and explained.

Mr. Barham commented that there was a Bill in the Legislature relating to improving the infrastructures at State Parks with an air quality aspect to it. It is a bond venture. He suggested that Mr. Allison checks into that and gets his request in early for money. Mr. Allison believed that the Transportation Coalition was aware of it.

Ms. Lain questioned what the interfacing of the different entities was. Mr. Allison replied that the government level consisted of the Tahoe Transportation District, the TRPA, along with TRPA as the Regional Transportation Planning Authority. There is the Transportation Management Association on both the North and South Shores. This is a non-profit, public, private
partnership. In addition, there is the North Lake Tahoe Resort Association and other entities, such as the Chamber of Commerce and the Gaming Alliance.

Ms. Lain asked Mr. Allison if someone wanted to do a market research, could they, and Mr. Allison replied yes.

Ms. Baldrica stated that if anyone else had questions or comments for Mr. Allison, to call him at (775) 588-4547. Since no one else wished to comment, she closed the public hearing.

Mr. Marshall asked for a roll call.

Members Present: Mr. Barham, Ms. Baldrica, Mr. Poppoff, Mr. McIntyre, Ms. Kvas

Members Absent: Mr. Kehne, Mr. Lohman, Mr. Cole, Mr. McDowell, Ms. Kemper, Mr. Porta, Mr. Lane, Mr. Joiner, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Combs, Mr. Marchio, Mr. Jepsen

IV. ADJOURNMENT - The meeting was adjourned at 10:45 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Mikanovich
Clerk to the Commission

This meeting was taped in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the tapes may call (775) 588-4547 to make an appointment. In addition, written documents submitted at the meeting are available for review at the TRPA office, 308 Dorla Court, Zephyr Cove, Nevada.
MEMORANDUM

August 31, 1999

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment of Plan Area Statement 171, Tavern Heights, Special Designation, to Allow Government Offices (restricted to regional post office only) as a use in Special Area #1

Proposed Action: The applicant, who owns APN 94-253-16, proposes to amend Plan Area Statement 171, Tavern Heights, to designate Special Area #1 as an area eligible for Government Offices (restricted to regional post office only) use. This will be accomplished through a modification to the permissible uses in the public service category and modification of the special policies for Special Area #1.

Refer to “Exhibit A” that shows the vicinity map and surrounding land uses.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Advisory Planning Commission conduct the public hearing as noticed and, based on its outcome, recommend approval of the amendment to the TRPA Governing Board.

Discussion: The subject parcel is located within Special Area #1 of Plan Area 171. This is a residential plan area. The parcel is along State Route (SR) 89 to the north of Cathedral Drive, just south of a portion of the Tahoe City Community Plan area. The commercial uses just to the north of Special Area #1 include various office buildings, a convenience store, restaurants, and retail shops. Special Policy #2 currently reads “Special Area #1 is designated for multi-residential use” and would be changed upon adoption to “Special Area #1 is designated for multi-residential use and Government Offices.”

In the Permissible Uses under the General List, Government Offices will be listed as a special use in the public service category.

The TRPA’s Scenic Quality Improvement Program (SQIP) identifies the roadway unit adjacent to Special Area #1 as an area targeted for scenic and community design restoration. TRPA’s (SQIP) does not identify locations in Special Area #1 as needing to contribute toward such restoration (parcels to the north are identified as such). But, as with any use proposed on this parcel, the project will have to conform to the TRPA Design Standards so that the eventual project does not degrade scenic quality.

The impetus for this amendment came from the US Postal Service. In accordance with the definitions of uses in Chapter 18 of the TRPA Code, regional post offices are defined under Government Offices. There is also a definition of local post offices but this definition is not encompassing of the uses eventually planned for this site. A regional post office would include
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AGENDA ITEM V.A.
sufficient broad representation of US Postal Service activities to include planned postal box
delivery and implementation of carrier service at this site.
To appropriately limit the range of uses suggested by Government Offices to a regional post
office, specific language is proposed as Special Policy #3 and reads as follows:

Government Offices use proposed in Special Area #1, shall be limited as a permissible
use under the definition of Government Offices in the TRPA Code of Ordinances as
regional post offices. No regional post office use shall commence until TRPA approves
an updated US Postal Service Master Plan consistent with Policy 5 F of the Regional
Goals and Policy Plan. Provisions for carrier service shall be required for a regional post
office in Special Area #1. (If the US Postal Service Master Plan is not approved by TRPA
prior to submittal of a regional post office project in Special Area #1, TRPA and the US
Postal Service shall commit to an agreement concerning operations in the Tahoe City
service area alone. Such an agreement would be a component and binding element to
the US Postal Service Master Plan for the Tahoe City delivery area.)

A regional post office use at this location will have a variety of positive transportation impacts.
The use would reduce the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) within the Region by capturing west-
shore postal patrons currently utilizing the Tahoe City post office. This would also reduce
congestion within the Tahoe City core area.

The US Postal Service plans to implement carrier service (business/home delivery or cluster
box delivery) for the Tahoe City area by including an area for sorting mail in any new facility on
this parcel. Implementation of this service is also consistent with TRPA goals to reduce VMT.

This item was noticed for the August 1999 APC meeting. Two letters of concern were received
prior to the cancelled August meeting. They have been included as Attachment A with this
summary.

Placer County Zoning and General Plan Designations: Placer County has adopted TRPA zoning
along Tahoe’s west shore. The plan designations for Placer County are the same as TRPA.

Required Findings: The following findings must be made prior to adopting the proposed
amendments:

A. Chapter 6 Findings:

1. Finding: The project is consistent with, and will not adversely affect
implementation of the Regional Plan, including all applicable Goals
and Policies, Plan Area Statements and maps, the Code, and other
TRPA plans and programs.

Rationale: The proposed amendments to the Plan Area Statement will support
implementation of VMT reduction measures identified in the Regional
Plan.

2. Finding: That the project will not cause the environmental thresholds to be
exceeded.
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The amendment will support efforts to achieve air quality thresholds. Any projects that are proposed due to this amendment will be required to comply with all aspects of the Regional Plan package, including applicable thresholds.

3. **Finding:** Wherever federal, state and local air and water quality standards applicable for the Region, whichever are strictest, must be attained and maintained pursuant to Article V(d) of the Compact, the project meets or exceeds such standards.

**Rationale:** Any new or expansion of development due to this amendment will continue to be subject to federal, state, and local air and water quality standards.

4. **Finding:** The Regional Plan and all of its elements, as implemented through the Code, Rules and other TRPA plans and programs, as amended, achieves and maintains the thresholds.

**Rationale:** For reasons stated in Findings 1 and 2 above, the Regional Plan will continue to achieve and maintain the threshold. It will not utilize any resources, nor have any “project-type” impacts discussed in Section 6.3.B of the TRPA Code.

5. **Finding:** The Regional Plan, as amended, achieves and maintains the thresholds.

**Rationale:** See findings 1 and 2 above

### B. Chapter 13 Findings:

1. **Finding:** Prior to adopting any plan area amendment, TRPA must find the amendment is substantially consistent with the plan area designation criteria in Subsection 13.5.B and 13.5.C.

**Rationale:** The amendment will not expand the area of residential, commercial or public service uses beyond that which presently exist and for which the area is zoned. The proposed new use for Special Area #1 would enhance the Region's ability to implement reductions in VMT that would occur due to relocation of west-shore postal patrons and (required) implementation of carrier service. Provision of Government Offices, regional post office use only, in a residential plan area is compatible with the residential patrons who are expected to utilize either the carrier service or a more convenient post office location than currently exists. Although the special designation is to provide scenic restoration within this plan area, the TRPA Scenic Quality Improvement Program does not target parcels in the vicinity of Special Area #1 for restoration. Adherence to the TRPA Design Standards will ensure that future projects do not conflict with the scenic restoration.
goals identified for PAS 171. The opportunities for screening a future use from view is high due to the forested cover adjacent to SR 89. In addition, scenic design standards would be applied to any structure planned for the parcel, including a regional post office.

Environmental Documentation: Staff has completed an Initial Environmental Checklist for the proposed action. Staff recommends that a Finding of No Significant Effect (FONSE) be made based on the following:

1. The amendment will have limited applicability.

2. Threshold-related improvements that have been discussed with the applicant are anticipated and required as part of project development (including air, scenic, and water quality).

3. The amendment would not approve development greater than contemplated by the Regional Plan.

4. VMT and traffic congestion will be reduced by project development.

Staff will begin this item with a brief presentation. Please contact Jim Allison at (702) 588-4547, extension 229 or via email at Jim.Allison@Trpa@sierra.net, if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Attachment
To Whom It May Concern,

We live directly across the street on the corners of Olmpic and Tarvern Drs. We are very concerned with more traffic problems this post office site will create. As it stands now, there have been traffic tie-ups stemming from the "Y" which is a mile down the road. The back-ups have been a regular nuisance beginning at 11:00 am and does not subside until 4:00 pm. This gets worse during the summer season, especially on weekends. As a result many of the cars have been using Tarvern Dr. as a bypass. They are usually speeding down this street where many of the small children reside.

Our opposition to this proposal are:

1) This will create more traffic jam along highway 89 and causing more delays.
2) These delays will cause vehicles to use Tavern Dr. as a means of a "short cut" and sending traffic down our neighborhood street.
3) These vehicles drive at fast speed down the street where young children could be outside and become endangered.
4) This also will create more noise to disturb our peace and tranquility as they rumble through in our neighborhood.

We come up here to get away from the hustle and bustle of city life. We want a place of refuge and not a mere extension of the urban blight. Find another suitable site closer to the heart of Tahoe City where one can do the mailing along with their other chores at the same time.

Sincerely,

Stanley and Shirley Woo
P.O. Box 873
690 Tarvern Drive
Tahoe City, Ca 95730
(530) 583-1032

Dear Sirs,

Re: Proposed Project: Amendment of Plan Area Statement 171, Tavern Heights, to permit Government Offices in Special Area #1 (regional post office use only)

Applicant: David Achiro and Mary Achiro-Collins

As homeowners of 601 Steeple Court, Tahoe City we would like insist on the following conditions:-

- no access by either vehicles or pedestrians to the PO via Steeple Court.

- no increase in the traffic both vehicular and pedestrian using Steeple Court.

- no parking of vehicles in or near Steeple Court.

- assurance that noise, smell and any other form of pollution will not increase as a result of the project.

- normal working hours of 8am to 6pm excluding Sundays and public holidays.

- no negative impact to the environment or living conditions that are currently enjoyed by us at this time.

Thanking you in advance for your careful review of these matters.

Yours truly,

Kevin and Maureen Walsh

Maureen Walsh

Kevin Walsh
Exhibit A
Vicinity and Surrounding Land Uses
07/28/99

Commercial
Single Famil
Multi-Famil

SUBJECT PROPERTY
MEMORANDUM

October 4, 1999

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Adoption of Code Chapter 83, Source Water Protection, and Related Amendment of Code Chapter 12, TRPA Regional Plan Maps, and Code Chapter 25, Best Management Practice Requirements

Proposed Action: TRPA will present in workshop fashion the background, purpose, and benefit of adopting the proposed ordinances (see Attachment A) which would implement the Protection Plan Element of the Lake Tahoe Source Water Protection Program. TRPA staff will solicit comments and direction from the APC and interested stakeholders with regards to implementation of this element.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends pursuing adoption of the attached ordinances which would strengthen protection of drinking water sources. Staff has identified the elements and language of a proposed ordinance in coordination with the US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and the Lake Tahoe Source Water Group.

Background: Before proceeding further towards development of a proposed source water protection ordinance, TRPA staff requests comments to determine if the Commission and interested stakeholders are receptive to moving forward with this protective measure. Because Lake Tahoe is a source of drinking water for the basin, the USEPA has provided funding under the Safe Drinking Water Act to TRPA to ensure protection of public health. The Lake Tahoe Source Water Protection Program includes development of a Coordination Plan that will integrate the preparation of state source water assessment and protection plans in the Lake Tahoe Region. USEPA anticipates using this plan as a model for application to other interstate watersheds in the United States. This program is one of several Presidential Commitments described in the status report entitled "The Clinton-Gore Commitments of the Lake Tahoe Presidential Forum."

One program product currently being developed is a Source Water Assessment Map. A Geographic Information System (GIS) inventory database is being compiled which forms the basis for this map. This GIS product includes the generation of buffer zones around each drinking water source (Protection Zones). When certain proposed projects are located within a Protection Zone, project planners could be alerted and review these projects to insure protection of the nearby drinking water source. However, to implement this protective measure, ordinance amendments must be adopted.
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Memorandum to Advisory Planning Commission
Adoption of Source Water Protection Ordinances
Page 2

Findings: Prior to amending the ordinances, TRPA must make the following findings:

Chapter 6 Findings:

1. Finding: The project is consistent with, and will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan, including all applicable Goals and Policies, Plan Area Statements and Maps, the Code, and other TRPA plans and programs.

Rationale: The proposed amendments to the ordinances will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan.

The Tahoe Regional Planning Compact finds that the maintenance of the social and economic health of the Region depends on maintaining public health values provided by the Lake Tahoe Basin (Article I – Findings and Declarations of Policy.) This includes the value of drinking water. Article I is echoed in the TRPA Goals and Policies, Chapter 1. Article V(d) of the Compact states that the Regional Plan shall provide for attaining and maintaining Federal, State, or local air and water quality standards, whichever are strictest, in the respective portions of the of the region for which the standards are applicable. Article VI(A) of the Compact states that the governing body shall adopt all necessary ordinances, rules, and regulations to effectuate the adopted regional plan.

2. Finding: The project will not cause the environmental thresholds to be exceeded.

Rationale: Amending the ordinances will not cause the environmental thresholds to be exceeded. The amendments implement the Goals and Policies referred to above, and will provide for the protection of surface and groundwater resources, thereby maintaining water quality thresholds if not moving thresholds towards attainment.

3. Finding: Wherever federal, state, and local air and water quality standards applicable to the Region, whichever are stricter, must be attained and maintained pursuant to Article V(d) of the Compact, the project meets or exceeds such standards.

Rationale: See findings 1 and 2 above. The proposed amendments reflect goals and policies to achieve and maintain water quality standards, including state drinking water standards.
4. **Finding:** The Regional Plan and all of its elements, as implemented through the Code, Rules and other TRPA plans and programs, as amended, achieves and maintains the thresholds.

**Rationale:** See above findings. The proposed ordinance amendments, by design, shall apply only to projects that threaten source water which are proposed to be located in an identified protection zone. Such projects proposed will be required to meet all other applicable standards of the Code and implement mitigation measures as necessary to achieve and maintain the thresholds.

**Ordinance 87-8 Findings**

1. **The amendments are consistent with the Compact and with attainment or maintenance of the thresholds.**

   **Rationale:** This amendment has limited application and where it can be applied, the affected projects must meet all environmental standards which includes mitigating any potential impacts to a less than significant level.

2. **That the amendment provides for an equal or better means of attainment or maintenance of the thresholds.**

   **Rationale:** The amendment provides for additional protection of groundwater resources consistent with water quality threshold WQ-6 – Surface Discharge to Groundwater.

3. **Finding:** One or more of the following.

   a. There is a demonstrated conflict between provisions of the Regional Plan package, and the conflict threatens to preclude attainment or maintenance of thresholds; or

   b. The provision to be amended has been shown through experience to be counter-productive or ineffective and the amendment is designed to correct the demonstrated problem and is an equal or better means of implementing the Regional Plan package and complying with the Compact; or

   c. Legal constraints, such as court orders, decisions or Compact amendments, require amendment of the Goals and Policies or Code; or

   d. Technical or scientific information demonstrates the need for modification of a provision of the Goals and Policies or Code; or
e. The provision to be amended has been shown, through experience and time, to be counter-productive to or ineffective in attainment or maintenance of the thresholds; or

f. Implementation of the provision sought to be amended has been demonstrated to be impracticable or impossible because of one or more of the following reasons:

   (1) The cost of implementation outweighs the environmental gain to be achieved;

   (2) Implementation will result in unacceptable impacts on public health and safety; or

   (3) Fiscal support for implementation is insufficient and such insufficiency is expected to be a long-term problem.

Staff proposes to make Finding b.

Rationale: Currently, the Code of Ordinances could be improved with respect to the protection of groundwater resources and source water. The proposed amendments strengthen existing groundwater and surface water protection measures, and provide for the protection of public health and safety.

Environmental Documentation: Based on the above analysis and completion of an IEC, and because the proposed ordinance amendments implement the goals and policies, staff recommends a Finding of No Significant Effect (FONSE).

Requested Actions: Staff recommends the Advisory Planning Commission take the following actions:

1. Motion to make a recommendation to TRPA staff to continue the pursuit of amending the ordinances to protect source water.

2. Motion to present the proposed ordinances to the APC and Governing Board for adoption subsequent to completion of the source water assessment maps and final ordinance language.

Staff will present this item in a PowerPoint format (See printout attached.) If you have any questions or comments regarding the Lake Tahoe Source Water Protection Program or the proposed ordinances, please contact Jon Paul Kiel at 775-588-4547, extension 261.

Attachments
Attachment A – Draft proposed ordinance amendments.
Attachment B - Pilot source water assessment map.
Attachment C - Letters in support of a Source Water Protection Ordinance.
Attachment D - PowerPoint Handout
Draft proposed ordinance amendments are as follows (blue print = new ordinance language, black print = existing ordinance language, red strike-out print = deleted ordinance language):

CHAPTER 83

SOURCE WATER PROTECTION

Chapter Contents

83.0 Purpose
83.1 Applicability
83.2 Source Water Protection
83.3 Source Water Assessment

83.0 Purpose: This chapter sets forth regulations pertaining to recognition of source water, prevention of contamination to source water, and protection of public health relating to drinking water. It strengthens provisions of the Goals and Policies that address groundwater protection, and implements elements of the TRPA Source Water Protection Program.

83.1 Applicability: This chapter applies to projects that are identified as a possible contaminating activity located in identified source water protection zones as depicted on TRPA Source Water Assessment maps, and retrofit of existing development with Best Management Practices.

83.2 Source Water Protection: To protect public health and to insure the availability of safe drinking water, TRPA shall review proposed projects identified as possible contaminating activities to source water which are located within a source water protection zone depicted on TRPA Source Water Inventory maps according to the following standards and procedures:

83.2.A Source Water Defined: Water drawn to supply drinking water from an aquifer by a well or from a surface water body by an intake. Such water may or may not be treated before being distributed by a drinking water system for consumption.

83.2.B Possible Contaminating Activity Defined: Activities equivalent to TRPA primary uses identified by either the California Department of Health Services or the Nevada Bureau of Health Protection Services, regardless of where the project is located, as having the potential to discharge contaminants to surface or groundwaters. Such uses are listed in Table A.

83.2.C Source Water Protection Zone Defined: A zone delineated to provide added protection to drinking water sources as depicted on the TRPA Source Water Assessment maps.

(1) Protection Zone: A protection zone consisting of a fixed 600 foot radius circle shall be initially identified around all parcels in the
Region with wells, springs, or Lake intakes that provide drinking water and that serve five (5) or more user service connections. Protection zone delineations may be modified by TRPA as follows: Upon receipt of source water assessment information collected by the California Department of Health Services, the Nevada Bureau of Health Protection Services, or other public agencies responsible for conducting drinking source water assessments in accordance with state Source Water Assessment and Protection Programs and if recommended by the California Department of Health Services or the Nevada Bureau of Health Protection Services.

83.2.D Review of Proposed Possible Contaminating Activities located in Source Water Protection Zones: Proposed uses determined by TRPA to be projects that are identified as a Possible Contaminating Activity located in a source water protection zone shall not be approved unless TRPA finds that:

1. The project complies with the requirements to install BMPs as set forth in Section 25.2.
2. TRPA has solicited comments from the operator/owner of the source water, and the department of environmental health with jurisdiction over the source water, and all such comments received were considered by TRPA prior to action being taken on the proposed project.
3. If determined by TRPA to be appropriate, a spill control plan is submitted to TRPA for review and approval. The plan shall contain the following elements:
   (a) Disclosure element describing the types, quantities, and storage locations of contaminants commonly handled as part of the proposed project.
   (b) Contaminant handling and spill prevention element.
   (c) Spill reporting element, including a list of affected agencies to be contacted in the event of a spill.
   (d) Spill recovery element.
   (e) Spill clean-up element.

83.3 Source Water Assessment: An inventory of wells, springs, and lake intakes that serve five (5) or more user service connections shall be prepared for the Lake Tahoe Region. An initial inventory shall be prepared in consultation with local and state environmental health agencies. Sources omitted from the initial inventory due to a lack of information provided by local and state environmental health agencies shall be added to the inventory as appropriate if additional source information is received by TRPA. Source water protection zones delineated on the initial source water assessment maps shall be modified pursuant to subparagraph 83.2.C(1).
TABLE A
POSSIBLE CONTAMINATING ACTIVITIES

RESIDENTIAL:

Domestic animal raising

COMMERCIAL:

Retail:
Service Stations

Services:
  Auto repair and service
  Business support services
  Laundries and dry cleaning plant
  Repair services

Light Industrial:
  Batch plants
  Fuel and ice dealers
  Industrial Services
  Recycling and scrap

Wholesale/Storage:
  Storage yards
  Vehicle storage and parking
  Vehicle and freight terminals

PUBLIC SERVICE:

General:
  Airfields, landing strips and heliports
  Collection stations
  Hospitals
  Local public health and safety facilities
  Regional public health and safety facilities
  Power generating
  Public utility centers
  Schools

  Linear Public Facilities
  Transit stations and terminals
RECREATION:

Beach recreation
Boat launching facilities
Developed campgrounds
Golf courses
Marinas
Recreational vehicle parks
Rural sports

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT:

Timber Management:
  Timber stand improvement

Range:
  Grazing
  Range pasture management

Watershed Improvements
  Runoff control

SHOREZONE:

Construction Equipment Storage
Seaplane Operations
Tour Boat Operations
Water-Oriented Outdoor Recreation Concessions

Supporting Ordinance Amendments:

Amendments to Chapter 12:

12.2.C(5). Source Water Assessment Maps: The Source Water Assessment Maps indicate the location of drinking water sources serving five (5) or more user service connections in the Region, protection zones around each source, and uses with a higher propensity to contaminate source water. Approximate scale 1" = 2,000'.

Amendments to Chapter 25:

25.7 Special Circumstances: Where special circumstances occur, alternative BMPs may be approved to meet water quality standards. Special circumstances may include, but not be limited to, streets, highways, and bike trails, existence of high ground water table, unusual up-stream or downstream flow conditions, proximity to drinking water sources, and presence of unusual concentrations of pollutants.
Advisory Planning Commission
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448-1038

Dear Commissioners:

I am writing to you to express our support for the Source Water Protection ordinance that is currently proposed by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA). As you know, the protection of drinking water through the Source Water Assessment and Protection Program is a high priority for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The protection of Lake Tahoe for its varied uses including use as a drinking water source has our full support.

The Source Water Assessment and Protection Program protects both habitat and human health. With this in mind, we were very pleased to fund the development of a local Tahoe Basin Source Water Protection Program as one of the President’s commitments in 1997. Through this program, local stakeholders including water purveyors, health and water quality agencies, federal agencies, and affected industry have defined objectives and tasks that can make a real difference in the protection of Tahoe’s water resources. The development of the Source Water Protection ordinance is the culmination of over a year’s worth of effort by these stakeholders, and provides a mechanism for implementing some of the objectives they developed.

Safe and plentiful drinking water assures the long term success and viability of a community and its members. I hope that you will adopt the Source Water Protection ordinance, an additional tool that can be used to protect the quality of Lake Tahoe and the Basin’s water resources. Thank you for your consideration.

Yours,

Felicia Marcus
Regional Administrator
August 30, 1999

James Baetge, Director
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448

Dear Mr. Baetge:

SUPPORT FOR TRPA'S PROPOSED ORDINANCE TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL PROTECTION TO WELLS, SPRINGS AND LAKE INTAKES IN THE LAKE TAHOE REGION

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the Lake Tahoe Source Water Protection Group. The Lake Tahoe Source Water Protection Program was initiated after being identified as a Presidential Deliverable. The intent of this program is to ensure protection of drinking water sources and public health. The California Regional Water Quality Control Board-Lahontan Region (Regional Board) commends TRPA’s active and successful role in this program. The Regional Board strongly supports the much needed ordinance TRPA is proposing for the long-term protection of source water in the Lake Tahoe Region.

Currently, ground and surface water supplies in the Lake Tahoe Basin adequately serve local and visitor populations. As the populations of both year-around residents and visitors to Lake Tahoe Basin continue to increase, so does the demand for drinking water. Unfortunately, as the population increases, so do the industries, commercial and residential properties, and recreational facilities needed to support these populations. Because current and proposed land uses have the potential to contaminate viable surface and ground water resources, strict management practices must be applied to assure existing and potential sources of drinking water are protected. Regulatory agencies and the community need to implement control measures to secure the availability of safe drinking water. Currently, water consumers in the Lake Tahoe Basin are exercising water conservation because leaking underground storage tanks impacted nearly a third of South Lake Tahoe’s municipal drinking supply.

To avoid future water contamination and water shortage situations, it is necessary to critically review proposed projects that have been identified as possible contaminating activities. If current and proposed projects are associated with contaminating activities (auto-body shops, dry cleaners, horse stables, marinas etc.) then stringent best management practices shall be implemented on-site to prevent source water contamination. The proposed ordinance is designed to ensure a proposed project having
the potential to impact source water complies with certain protective standards including
the preparation of a spill prevention and contamination discharge plan. The proposed
ordinance will also allow nearby residents, the jurisdictional water purveyor, and the
Department of Health Services to comment on the proposed project. All of the above-
mentioned conditions of the ordinance will be necessary to ensure source water
protection.

As part of the Lake Tahoe Source Water Assessment and Protection Program, source
waters in the Lake Tahoe Basin have been identified, inventoried, and mapped. Possible
contaminating activities have been defined and source water protection zones have been
delineated. The Regional Board commends TRPA for its efforts in facilitating this vital
program and supports TRPA's proposed ordinance designed to protect wells, springs, and
lake intakes, in the Lake Tahoe Region.

We look forward to working together to protect source water quality. Should you wish to
discuss this matter further, please contact me at (530) 542-5436 or Mary Fiore at (530)
542-5425.

Sincerely,

Lauri Kemper
Senior Water Resource Control Engineer
August 27, 1999

Jon Paul Kiel
Water Quality Program Manager
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448

Dear Mr. Kiel:

The Nevada State Health Division, Bureau of Health Protection Services wishes to express its support for the proposed ordinance that seeks to protect drinking water sources in the Lake Tahoe region.

Through its Source Water Assessment Program, Nevada is committed to the concept of prevention of contamination of drinking water sources. This is cost effective and prudent public health practice. The ordinance proposed by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency promotes this concept.

The Bureau of Health Protection Services serves as a member of the Lake Tahoe Source Water Assessment and Protection Group along with TRPA, the California Department of Health Services, the United States Environmental Protection Agency, and other interested parties. We appreciate the opportunity to coordinate our source water efforts with this group.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Jonathan C. Palm, Ph.D., P.E.
Manager, Public Health Engineering
Bureau of Health Protection Services

cc: Leah Walker, CDH
Judy Bloom, USEPA
Jon Paul Kiel
Water Quality Program Manager
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448

Dear Mr. Kiel:

The California Department of Health Services, Division of Drinking Water and Environmental Management (DHS) wishes to express its support for the development of a source water protection ordinance for the Lake Tahoe region by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA).

Encouraging source water protection efforts is one of the primary elements of the California Drinking Water Source Assessment and Protection Program developed by DHS and recently endorsed by the US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). The Program describes how DHS will conduct assessments for drinking water sources and encourage protection efforts.

DHS has been pleased to be a member of the Lake Tahoe Source Water Group that has worked with TRPA, the Nevada State Health Division, and the USEPA on the source water protection project and appreciates the opportunity it provides for interstate coordination of source water protection activities.

If you have any questions, please contact Leah Walker of the Drinking Water Technical Programs Branch at (707) 576-2295.

Sincerely,

Alexis M. Milea, P.E., Chief
Division of Drinking Water and Environmental Management

cc: Leah Walker
Bob Hultquist
Jess Morehouse
Judy Bloom, USEPA
Jon Palm, Nevada State Health Division
October 4, 1999

Mr. Jon Paul Kiel  
Associate Water Quality Planner  
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency  
P.O. Box 1038  
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448

Re: Support for Proposed Source Water Protection Ordinance - Chapter 83

Dear Jon Paul:

The South Tahoe Public Utility District supports the source water protection ordinance. The ordinance provides an opportunity for water agencies to review projects that may jeopardize the public water supply. The ordinance will also become an integral part of implementing our Groundwater Management Plan. This ordinance is one of the first to truly recognize the value of the Lake Tahoe Basin's groundwater resources, and we at the District appreciate you guiding its development to a meaningful conclusion.

Sincerely,

Rick Hydrick  
Manager of Water Operations
Lake Tahoe Source Water Protection Program:

- A Lake Tahoe Pilot Program
- A Presidential Deliverable

Lake Tahoe Source Water Protection Program:

- Where we've been.
2. Program Goals:

- &RRUGLQDWLRQ DQG QWHJUWLRQ RI 6DWHPHQW DQG RFDO (IIUHW WR 3URWHFW DQG RXUOLW\\n- &RRUGLQDWLRQ RI 6XUFH :DWHU SYYHVPHQW DQG 3URWHFWLRQ 3DOQV
- QWHJUWLRQ RI & S DOG 8' $ 2REXQWLYHV
- (VWDEOLVKPQLQJ RI D QHFWLYH 5KREDGD\\n- *URXS

&RRUGLQDWLRQ QWHSVWVDW\\n6XUFH :DWHU SYYHVPHQW DQG 3URWHFWLRQ (IIUHW WR 3URWHFWLRQ 3DOQV)
- QWHJUWLRQ & S DOG 19 VRXUFH ZDUWHU DYYHVPHQW DQG SURWHFWLRQ SURJUDP
- 8VH 6XUFH :DWHU SYYHVPHQW QIRUPDWLRQ WR 6WUQGWKHHQ 75331V 6URQFWZDWHU 5QRZII 3DOQ
- Link Stormwater Runoff Control to Groundwater

&RRUGLQDWLRQ (IIUHW WR 3URWHFWLRQ 3DOQV)
- YDOXDWLRQ (IIUHW WR 5XQFII 6WUQGWKHHQ 75331V 6URQFWZDWHU 5QRZII 3DOQ
- Enhance Groundwater Protection Control Measures

&UHDWH D 1HZ *,6 /D\HU WR (QKDQFH :DWHUWRH 3ULRULW\\
- Watersheds must be prioritized to maximize benefits of management efforts to improve watershed conditions
- Create Regional Initial Drinking Water Source Assessment Map

3URGXFUW (SHFWHG)
- 5HILRQDO VLQNYLQJ :DWHU 6XUFH SYYHVPHQW DSS
- 3XEOLF 2XWUDFWK (SHFWHG :DWHUWRH 3URWHFWLRQ 3DOQ
- Regional Protection Plan
- 3URWHFW 5HSRUM
Regional Protection Plan Implementation:

```
3U5RSRWHG 2UGLQDOQPH

Definitions

- Source Water
- Possible Contaminating Activities
- Source Water Protection Zone
- Interim Protection Zone
```

```
3USRVHG RI DQ 2UGLQDOQPH

- 5HFRJQLJR WHK LPSRUWDQFH RI SURWHFWLQJ VRXUFH 2DWHU UDQG
- 7R SURYLGH SURWHFWLQJ RI SXELQF KHDNW
- 7R VVRUHQJWKHQ RI DQG 3ROLFLHV UDQG
- 3ULPDQ RI 753$ 3ULPDQ RI 8VHV KDYH EHHQ, GHWLWLQG EN &S' +6 DQG
- 19%+36 DV EHLQO 9HU
- LJK 3RWHQWLODO 3RVL0EH &QWDEQWQLQJ $FWLYDLV
```

```
753$ *RDOV DQG 3ROLFLHV

- 46XEHUHFRHQW &RDO

- 40DLQWHDQPH RI WHK VRPLDO DQG HPSRQFLF
- KHGWX RI WHK UXJLQG GHSQGQV RQ
- PDLQWHDQPH RI WHK VLUQDYHFLQFH VHFLQF
- UHPRUHDLQDO HUXQFLQDO VGLQWDQG QDQ
- 2QH RI WHQ ILQDQJLQ DQG

- &RPSDFW SPHQFHFW &RPSDFW SPHQFHFW
```

```
3U5RSRWHG 2UGLQDOQPH

(OHFWHQW)
```

```
2UGLQDOQPH (OHFWHQW &RQW

- Source Water Inventory
- List of Possible Contaminating Activities
- Source Water Best Management Practices
```
4. *Ordinance Application and Benefits*
TRPA Potential Contaminating Activities, Very High Potential, Examples:

**COMMERCIAL:**
- Retail: Service Stations
- Services: Auto repair and service, Laundries and dry cleaning plant, Repair services
- Light industrial: Batch plants, Fuel and ice dealers
- Wholesale/Storage: Storage yards, Vehicle storage and parking

5. **QUESTIONS and ANSWERS**
MEMORANDUM

October 4, 1999

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Determination of Lands and Parcels Suitable for Multi-Residential Development in Douglas County.

Proposed Action: Staff requests APC to review the following information regarding the need for multi-residential/affordable housing in Douglas County and consider the ranking of alternative sites on the attached matrix, Exhibit A, for potential multi-residential development within Douglas County.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the APC review and discuss the results of Staff's analysis, and recommend the best means for Douglas County to meet the identified need for affordable housing to the Governing Board.

1. For sites 1, 2, 6, 7A and 9A, put the public on notice that these sites are favored sites for multi-residential development and will be considered as such when completing the Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC).
2. For further consideration of sites like 5, 8, 7B and 9B, TRPA should add a fourth finding to Code Subsection 13.7.D, that allows adjustment to the Urban Boundary that does not result in additional developable urban area.
3. Encourage a land exchange with Nevada State Lands for site 11, for sensitive lands in or out of the Urban Boundary.
4. For sites like 12 and Glenbrook, consider an additional finding to Code Subsection 13.7.D, to allow the addition of multi-residential uses to a Plan Area Statement, if subdivisions are prohibited and special use findings related to neighborhood compatibility are made.
5. Douglas County housing project mitigation in the City of South Lake Tahoe will require the City's approval.

Background: There are limited opportunities for multi-residential development in Douglas County within the Tahoe Region. Currently, TRPA has four applications to re-zone lands for multi-residential development in Douglas County. They are:

1. Zephyr Heights (Alt. 12);
2. Round Hill (Alt. 8);
3. Glenbrook; and

Two of these applications resulted from a recent project approval that requires offsetting mitigation for the loss of 135+ multi-residential units in Douglas County. Consistent with the conditions of that approval and the conclusions reached in TRPA's Affordable Housing Needs Assessment (Fair Share Report), staff investigated the possibilities for rehabilitation of existing housing and potential locations for development of multi-residential dwellings.
Discussion: Affordable housing has two considerations; first, persons earning between 51 and 80 percent of their county's median income are considered to have a low-income and are in need for 'affordable housing' (persons earning less than 51% are considered very low-income); second, housing is considered affordable if the household spends 30% or less of their gross monthly income for rental housing, or if owner housing does not exceed 2.5 times the household's annual income.

The Affordable Housing Needs Assessment, February 1997, (Fair Share Report) was produced to assist local jurisdictions within the Tahoe Region in assessing their individual housing needs as they relate to the Region as a whole. This report found that Douglas County's housing conditions demonstrate a lack of affordable housing. The majority of these housing problems can be attributed to renters who are overpaying (more than 30 percent of their income) for housing costs. According to the Assessment, 75% of Douglas County employees earn less than 80% of the county median income. This does not mean they are all in need of affordable housing, but it demonstrates that these are the employees that represent Douglas County's fair share of affordable housing. Note that there is a difference between an individual employee and a household's income. For Douglas County, the median household income (4 persons) is $52,600, while the median individual income is $35,209.

Douglas County has 553 multi-residential units, 289 of which are found in mobile home parks. It is undetermined how many of these qualify as affordable housing units. When looking at the Region's available housing stock, it is important to recognize that a large number of vacant housing units within the Basin are almost entirely vacation rental properties. The result of this ownership structure is that Tahoe's housing market is not driven by what local incomes can support, but rather by the disposable incomes of the tourist trade.

The Assessment came to two regional conclusions relating to Douglas County and affordable housing. Looking at the Tahoe Region as a whole, Douglas County's fair share percentage of affordable housing is 36%, the ideal level of responsibility. Through a long process that considers many factors such as demographics, commuting patterns and employment figures, 36% of Douglas County's responsibility translates into 1,456 affordable housing units. If each jurisdiction could realistically house all of their low and very low-income households, then Douglas County would create 1,456 affordable housing units. This figure reflects only those households actually in need of affordable housing, not the total number of low and very low-income households within Douglas County. The Assessment recognized that constructing all of these units within the jurisdiction of responsibility is not realistic. Therefore, it recommends that local jurisdictions focus their initial efforts on housing rehabilitation and first-time homebuyers programs.

Staff Analysis: While rehabilitation of existing housing stock will meet some of the need for affordable housing, the overall stock of housing available to the Region's residents would not be significantly increased. In theory, enabling a household to purchase a home would 'free-up' a rental unit; however, the vacated unit may or may not meet the affordability criteria.

A small percentage of the identified affordable housing shortfall in Douglas County could be created via new housing construction or rehabilitation/retrofitting of existing structures.

PE/dmc

AGENDA ITEM VI.A
Although the attached matrix (Exhibit A) estimates the number of units that could be constructed, this number is susceptible to fluctuation, depending on the type of units (one or two bedroom) constructed. The total number of estimated units found within Exhibit A is 635. Relating back to the 1,456 units identified by the Fair Share Report, only a portion of the identified fair share units can be realistically constructed within Douglas County.

TRPA staff took an inventory of areas that could be developed and/or rehabilitated for multi-residential housing. These sites were then rated upon zoning and land use criteria, and design criteria such as proximity to mass transit. Note that there may be other locations that TRPA overlooked, especially in the case of developed land wherein the structures could be rehabilitated or converted into residential uses. The attached maps were also used in staffs' evaluation; Exhibit B shows the existing zoning designations, as implemented by the appropriate Plan Area Statement or Community Plan; Exhibit C depicts the current land uses with one-quarter mile circles around the alternative sites; and Exhibit D shows the Land Capability ratings and the land capability challenge areas. Within Exhibit D, detail is lost concerning smaller areas of delineation, due to the scale of the map; staff used smaller scale maps for the analysis. The analysis revealed that potential multi-residential development sites are scarce in Douglas County. Outside the scope of this analysis, there are two other options for multi-residential development, relative to Douglas County meeting their fair share of affordable housing needs. They are the City of South Lake Tahoe and the top of Kingsbury Grade, outside of the Tahoe Region.

Ranking the viability of the various sites for development can be subjective, and susceptible to change over time; a site can possess all of the physical attributes necessary for development, but is located outside of an Urban Boundary, or require a land exchange. After further analysis of a specific project at one of the analyzed locations, it may be determined that the proposed project is inappropriate for that location. Ranking of the sites was determined by the score each site received for each criteria: 0,1, or 2 points were awarded depending upon the sites attributes. Public agency and concerned citizen's comments were also considered.

**Results:** Staffs' analysis of the alternative sites resulted in the following four suitability categories.

**Not Suitable:** 3, 4, 10, 13.
Sites 3, 4, and 13 were eliminated from consideration due to the low scores for both zoning and design criteria. Site 10 was purchased by the USFS via Burton-Santini funds and, according to Dave Marlo of the USFS, residential and commercial uses are prohibited, even if a land exchange were to take place.

**Suitable:** 1, 2, 6, 7A, 9A.
These sites possess the proper zoning and design criteria for multi-residential development. Sites 1, 2 and 9A would need special use findings to be made.

**Administrative Action Required:** 5, 8, 7B, 9B.
One of two actions would be required to amend the Urban Boundary for development at these locations.

1. To make the necessary findings to approve an amendment to the applicable Plan Area Statement or Community Plan to change the Urban Boundary, the project proponent would need to propose a project that would possess elements, on or
off-site, that would result in a net benefit to one or more of the environmental thresholds (sites 5 and 8).

2. Amend TRPA Code Subsection 13.7.D, which would add new criteria for amending a Plan Area Statement or Community Plan to change the Urban Boundary. Two possible additional criteria include:

   A. Amend Urban Boundary for Affordable Housing projects only; or
   B. Land exchanges among private land holders, wherein a private parcel outside an Urban Boundary is exchanged for a parcel that is inside, on a 1:1 ratio, or some percentage (10%) reduction in the Urban Boundary.

Based on the design criteria, the following sites are ranked from high to low suitability: 7B, 9B, 5, and 8. Note that 7B and 9B are currently in public ownership.

Special Considerations: 11, 12, 14, 15.
The following sites are unique in their circumstances and require individual actions, or policy decisions.

1. Site 11, within the Round Hill Community Plan, is owned by the State of Nevada. A land exchange would be necessary before any project could be developed on this site.

2. Site 12 is not zoned for multi-residential use. To amend the PAS for multi-residential use, staff would have to make Transit Oriented Development (TOD) findings, which cannot be made today. Therefore, this site should either be eliminated from consideration for multi-residential development, or a Code amendment to the TOD criteria would be necessary.

3. Site 14 would encourage development outside of the Tahoe Basin to house employees of the Basin. Due to traffic and air quality impacts associated with increased Vehicle Miles Traveled under this alternative, this approach is discouraged as a means of Douglas County meeting its fair share of affordable housing.

4. Site 15 would direct development to the City of South Lake Tahoe. Although it is recognized that Douglas County is unable to develop all of the requisite 1,456 affordable housing units within its jurisdiction, all possible solutions for development within the County should be pursued prior to shifting development to the City.

Attached for APC’s consideration, are letters sent to TRPA from Mr. John Glab, League To Save Lake Tahoe, Round Hill Area Homeowners Group (Joyce Nolan), and Lewis Feldman, Feldman, Shaw & DeVore. These letters are attached as Exhibit E.

Please contact Peter Eichner at (775) 588-4547 if you have any questions or comments regarding this agenda item.

Attachments
## Evaluative Matrix

Multi-residential Development Alternatives in Douglas County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Criteria</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
<th>Alternative 5</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Brdy. Change</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2 no</td>
<td>2 yes</td>
<td>0 yes</td>
<td>0 yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-residential Zoning</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0 no</td>
<td>0 no</td>
<td>0 no</td>
<td>0 no</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp. Housing Zoning</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>1 Special</td>
<td>1 no</td>
<td>0 no</td>
<td>0 no</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAS Amendment</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0 yes</td>
<td>0 yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP Amendment</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2 no</td>
<td>2 NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Criteria</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Capability (1)</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>1 good</td>
<td>2 fair</td>
<td>1 poor</td>
<td>0 fair</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOD Suitable (2)</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>2 good</td>
<td>2 good</td>
<td>2 good</td>
<td>2 good</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 Mile to Services/Work</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 yes</td>
<td>2 yes</td>
<td>2 yes</td>
<td>2 yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Status</td>
<td>disturbed</td>
<td>1 disturbed</td>
<td>1 vacant</td>
<td>0 vacant</td>
<td>0 vacant</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 yes</td>
<td>2 no</td>
<td>0 yes</td>
<td>2 marginal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Information

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonus Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>private</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Value</td>
<td>$29,840</td>
<td>$33,275</td>
<td>$548,100</td>
<td>same APN as #3</td>
<td>$195,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. # of possible units</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Zoning Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Bndy. Change</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-residential Zoning</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp. Housing Zoning</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAS Amendment</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP Amendment</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Design Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Capability (1)</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOD Suitable (2)</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 Mile to Services/Work</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Status</td>
<td>vacant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>developed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>vacant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>developed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>marginal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonus Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>Nevada (UNR)</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>private</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Value</td>
<td>$252,000</td>
<td>$1,731,810</td>
<td>$865,820</td>
<td>$191,100</td>
<td>$155,360</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. # of possible units</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Evaluative Matrix
### Multi-residential Development Alternatives in Douglas County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Bdy. Change</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-residential Zoning</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp. Housing Zoning</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAS Amendment</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP Amendment</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Criteria</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Capability (1)</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOD Suitable (2)</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 Mile to Services/Work</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Status</td>
<td>vacant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>disturbed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>vacant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>disturbed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>disturbed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>marginal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>marginal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>marginal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Information</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonus Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>5,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Value</td>
<td>$39,725</td>
<td>$16,100</td>
<td>$148,890</td>
<td>$63,000</td>
<td>$5,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. # of possible units</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Point System
2 = good/does not require change or has appropriate zoning
0 = poor/requires change or does not have appropriate zoning
18 points total possible

### Notes
1 = fair/marginal/private/special use
(1) See Exhibit D - Land capability, for areas of land capability challenges.
(2) TOD Suitable, Transit Oriented Development, transit and neighborhood services within 1/4 mile, good pedestrian and bike connections, residential infill, adequate public facilities.
(3) site is comprised of two parcels, assessed value is given for both parcels combined.
MEMO TO: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
APC Members, Members of the Governing Body, & TRPA Staff

FROM: John E. Glab, PhD - Former APC Member
P.O. Box 425 (302 Paiute, Round Hill)
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448
Phone: (775) 588-2191

RE: APC Agenda for 8 September 1999 - Item VI. A
Douglas County Parcels Suitable for Multi-Residential Development

DATE: 5 September 1999

I feel that any action to expand urban boundaries to permit multi-residential development on undeveloped parcels outside existing urban boundaries would represent violation of the TRPA Code, the Agency’s mission of preserving the pristine nature of the Tahoe Basin, and universally-accepted land-use planning standards which call for measures to prevent urban sprawl.

I, therefore, request that consideration of parcels suitable for multi-residential development on currently vacant lands be limited to those alternatives which fall within existing urban boundaries. Selection of a parcel or parcels outside such boundaries could not, in my opinion, meet requirements for changes in urban boundary delineation as specified by standards set by the TRPA. Violation of existing standards in order to permit dense development on open space would result in degradation of the rural environment of the Basin and diminish the attraction that our area has for people who come from all over the world to enjoy the open space, views, lake, and the pristine nature of a large percentage of the lands in the Tahoe Basin. The current issue of "US News and World Report" features a number of examples of the harm that urban sprawl can cause.

Acceptance of any perceived short-range “needs” cited by developers as justification for removal of additional open space outside the urban boundaries in order to permit construction of more multi-residential housing would constitute, in my judgment and in the considered opinions of many, a gross abuse of TRPA’s proclaimed goal to provide for logical long-range development of the Basin.

In this light, statements in the 31 August Staff Memorandum concerning a “requirement” for “offsetting mitigation for the loss of 135+ units of multi-residential in Douglas County” to replace sub-standard units on Kahle Drive removed by a developer, and the action proposed by TRPA to violate the spirit and letter of its own Code as well as good long-range planning policy represents a specious argument for approval of this unprofessional approach. It may also represent an effort on TRPA’s part to extricate itself from an awkward position caused by premature approval of a project whose full impacts had not been considered before approval.

In my opinion, the solution to the requirement for mitigation could best be met by construction of a significant number of adequate multi-residential units on the site designated as “Alternative 7” (the site from which existing sub-standard units are being removed) and by satisfaction of the remaining requirements on other sites within urban boundaries.
Alternate 7 lies within an area surrounded on three sides by multi-residential units, and it fills all the requirements set for location of a development of this nature. Proposed location of a sedimentation basin on the site of Alternative 7 has been noted, and the developer has indicated what he considers to be the high cost of development in an area with a high water table. These arguments for not using Alternative 7 appear to me to be weak, since the public space directly across Kahle Drive from the site has plenty of space for development of a sedimentation basin, and appropriate construction measures can be taken to build on the site.

I, therefore, strongly urge that the APC and the Governing Body support the TRPA Code by adhering to the existing requirements which authorize adjustment of urban boundaries only in response to specific conditions, and that you, as representatives of the public trust, reject consideration of parcels and lands outside urban boundaries for construction of new multi-residential developments.
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Peter Eichar
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448

Dear Mr. Eichar,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments regarding planning efforts for low-income housing in Douglas County. The League recognizes the difficulty of such a task and commends your effort to address this situation in a programmatic, step-wise manner. The League would like to provide the following comments at this time.

1) Planning efforts did not give enough consideration to redevelopment potential. Of the thirteen alternatives presented, all but two are presently undeveloped and half will require an urban boundary change. Recognizing that even if all of these alternatives were to be developed, the total number of units would only be 635, far short of Douglas Counties fair share of 1,400 units. Potential areas of redevelopment, conversion and/or rehabilitation should be included in this review, both within Douglas County and El Dorado County as will eventually be required to meet low-income housing needs in the Tahoe Basin.

2) The League is strongly opposed to expansion of the urban boundary for project specific needs. Can the required findings for urban boundary expansion be made for the alternatives that require an urban boundary change? If not, then these alternatives should be removed from consideration until the required code amendments necessary to allow these alternatives to be developed are made.

3) The feasibility of each site to accommodate high to medium density low-income housing needs to be considered. Impacts to traffic, riparian areas, scenic quality, flood plains, wildlife, and other thresholds that will result from such development should be included in this review.

The long-term planning for low-income housing is an important issue that will require thorough, comprehensive planning. Thank you again for the opportunity to provide comments on this issue.

Sincerely,

Dave Roberts
Assistant Executive Director
Date: October 1, 1999
To: Peter Eichar, TRPA
From: Round Hill Area Homeowners group as compiled by Joyce Nolan
re: Determination of Lands... Suitable for Multi-Residential Development in Douglas County.

It was our understanding that you wanted any specific input our group had regarding the site matrix for
the above by the end of the business day on Friday, Oct. 1, 1999. The comments below are from a leadership
group discussion and review.

TRPA has eliminated six of the 15 sites by the point ranking system.
It is hard to consider Sites 1 & 2 as even remotely possible sites for this project.
Sites 8 and 9b would require an urban boundary change which would almost certainly result in a lawsuit.
Site 10 is part of a larger parcel purchased with Burton-Santini funds which are limited to recreational
uses even if involved in a land trade.
Site 11 is environmentally sensitive land that was acquired by the State of Nevada under the 1989 Lake
Tahoe Basin Bond Act. All developmental rights to the land have been “erased” to use the
words of the Dept. Of Nevada Lands. The Tahoe basin is positioned to received millions of
dollars from several state and federal sources to purchase parcels in the Basin. Now is not the
time to start removing sensitive parcels already purchased. The argument “...so many parcels
have been purchased that virgin land need to be made available for development...” is not the
message to send at this time. The specific concerns about this site as ranked in the matrix are:

(1) Community Plan Amendment for this site is rated as “No” (2 pts.); R.H. is
not a designated area for affordable housing and should not accrue points on this
criteria.

(2) The TOD for this site was changed from “fair” to “good” between versions of
matrixes. This is shortsighted as an entrance on Hwy 50 (if even permitted)
would be (a) just below a hill and a curve and the entrance to Round Hill Pines
Resort and a proposed research center and (b) immediately before the difficult
entry/exit for the shopping center. This entrance to the shopping center is
congested all the way back to McFaul road. The congestion on McFaul has
already been greatly impacted by moving the mall so far back. The large trucks
now come into that area and parking for the commercial buildings was greatly
reduced. That part of McFaul has now become a parking lot. To anticipate an
entrance to a housing development off a R.H. Village road and across private
property or Burton-Santini USFS land does not merit even a “fair” ranking.

(3) If site 7A is ranked marginal (1 pt) for 1/4 mile to service/work when it is
within walking distance of the major employers, it must have been so ranked on
the basis of “services.” Site 11 would be marginal, not Yes, because of distance to
work.

Site 9a The TOD in the matrix for this site does not take into consideration the current
congestion on Elks Point Road during the summer nor the impact of traffic from
the timeshare project. Commercial establishments in this area already have a
severe parking problem.

Site 7a: Site should at least receive a marginal ranking and points for having 20 bonus units.
October 1, 1999

Via Facsimile

Peter Eichar
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448-1038

Re: Multi-Residential Development Sites in Douglas County

Dear Peter:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the base data distributed on September 9, 1999, concerning the above-captioned matter. As you know, this office is counsel to Falcon Capital, LLC, a TRPA permittee obligated to construct or rehabilitate multi-family residential units in Douglas County, if feasible.

Falcon Capital is concerned with the criteria selected by TRPA staff to rank the 15 parcels identified in the September 9, 1999, matrix. As noted during our September 27, 1999 meeting, it is impossible to fairly present the development potential or desirability of a particular parcel without considering land costs and availability. For example, the top ranked parcel, the .67-acre Thirsty Duck site, is currently for sale for $750,000. Factoring in asbestos abatement and demolition, the potential out-of-pocket land assembly totals $850,000, or $85,000 per unit, prior to development soft costs and construction costs. A per unit land cost in excess of $10,000 renders an affordable housing project questionable. By way of comparison, land cost for timeshare units are typically in the $40,000 to $50,000 range. Obviously, the Thirsty Duck site is financially infeasible and should not be presented as a realistic opportunity for multi-family residential development.

Similarly, the two sites tied for fourth, the 18-acre Borelli site and the 15.7-acre old Gun Club site cannot be considered viable. The Governing Board recently rejected development at the Borelli site. This parcel is currently listed for sale at a asking price in excess of $4 million. The proposed development of 26 high-end units met with overwhelming community opposition. Recent experience reveals construction of affordable housing units at this
location would result in an even greater community outcry. This property is not a realistic candidate for multi-family residential development.

The Old Gun Club site was acquired with restricted funds (Santini-Burton) and cannot be developed. While some people have expressed the view that perhaps the Forest Service may revisit these restrictions if all parties agree, all parties never agree on multi-family residential housing projects. Consequently, it is misleading to include this parcel as a realistic multi-family residential development opportunity.

Several Park Cattle Company parcels have also been identified. Park Cattle does not sell its holdings and therefore identification of these sites simply creates unrealistic expectations for progress toward Douglas County’s obligation to meet its affordable housing shortfall of approximately 1,450 units. The outcome of this analysis should result in the identification of land that is available at a price that would permit development of multi-family units for rental to the Douglas County workforce as distinguished from vacation, tourist and second home markets.

I have enclosed a brief analysis of the ranked parcels for your review and consideration. It is evident multi-acre parcels suitable for employee and affordable housing in Douglas County are scarce. Sufficient land to meet the County’s fair share obligation does not exist, however, limited opportunities do exist on land already owned by Falcon. Falcon takes its obligation to construct additional units in Douglas County seriously and respectfully requests greater weight be placed upon land availability to enable the Agency, Falcon and Douglas County to respond to the unmet housing needs within Douglas County.

Sincerely,

FELDMAN, SHAW & DeVORE
A Law Corporation

By: Lewis S. Feldman

LSF/hs
Enclosure
cc: Randy Lane (via fax)
     Patrick Conway (via fax)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | **9a-Thirty Duck, .67 acres:** TRPA: This is a disturbed, developed parcel with good land capability that can accommodate 10 units. Requires no urban boundary change, multi-residential housing is a special use, and TOD suitability is good. No bonus units are available in this plan area.  
Falcon: This small parcel lists for $750,000 and could accommodate only 10 units, making it too expensive to develop for this use. |
| 2    | **7a-Lake Park Apartment rehabilitation:** TRPA: An already developed and disturbed parcel that could accommodate 50 units. Requires no urban boundary change, multi-residential housing is a permissible use, can make TOD findings. 20 bonus units are available in this plan area.  
Falcon: Makes no economic sense to rehab these apartments. The cost of the rehabilitation would make these units too expensive for even market rate housing. The matrix indicated that the land capability on this parcel is fair however, it is TRPA verified as 1b. Also, TRPA has already identified the demolition of these apartments and rehabilitation of the parcel as an EIP project. |
| 2    | **1-Upper loop road, Park Cattle Company 15.98 acres:** TRPA: This is a disturbed, private parcel with good land capability. Employee housing is a special use. Multi-residential housing is not a permissible use and would require a PAS amendment. TOD suitability is good. No bonus units are available in this plan area.  
Falcon: This parcel is owned by Park Cattle Company and is not available for purchase. 1/3 of this parcel is SEZ. |
| 3    | **2-Park Cattle Company, 3.71 acres on the lake side of the loop road:** TRPA: A disturbed parcel with good land capability that could accommodate 45 units. Employee housing is a permissible use and multi-residential housing would require a CP area amendment. Close enough to goods and services to make TOD findings. No bonus units are available in this plan area.  
Falcon: Too small, bad location-backs to the parking lot of the Horizon. Unavailable due to ownership by Park Cattle Company. Multi-residential is not a permissible use and therefore requires a CP amendment. |
6. Wells parcel, currently the Borelli project, 18 acres:
   TRPA: A privately owned undeveloped parcel with fair land capability
   that could accommodate 45 units. Multi-residential is a permissible use
   and TOD suitability is fair. No bonus units are available in this plan area.

   Falcon: Not economically feasible. It is a privately owned parcel
   currently for sale more than 4 million dollars. Also TOD suitability is
   listed as fair on the matrix. TRPA has been unable to make the findings to
   allow the smaller Borelli project on this parcel.

4. 10-Old Gun Club, 15.7 acres:
   TRPA: A disturbed USFS owned parcel with good land capability, and
   multi-residential and employee housing are permissible uses. Fair TOD
   suitability. No bonus units are available in this plan area.

   Falcon: There is no potential to develop this lot. It is owned by the USFS
   and paid for with Santini-Burton funds, making it unavailable for
   residential development.

5. 11-Next to RH Shell Station, 6.75 acres:
   TRPA: An undeveloped lot owned by the State of Nevada with fair land
   capability, that could accommodate 40 units. Multi-residential and
   employee housing are permissible uses, and this parcel is within the urban
   boundary. TOD suitability is good. No bonus units are available in this
   plan area.

   Falcon: This lot is owned by the State of Nevada and is unavailable for
   purchase.

6. Round Hill, behind TRPA, 9 acres:
   TRPA: This is an undeveloped, privately owned parcel with fair land
   capability that could accommodate 60 units. Developing this parcel would
   require an urban boundary change and a plan area amendment to include
   multi-residential housing or employee housing as a permissible use. TOD
   suitability is good. No bonus units are available within this plan area.

   Falcon: This parcel has good development potential however, requires an
   urban boundary change.

6. 9b-behind Thirty Duck, USFS:
   TRPA: This is a portion of an undeveloped USFS parcel purchased with
   Land, Water, Conservation funds. It has good land capability that could
   accommodate 45 units. Developing this parcel would require an urban
   boundary change and a plan area amendment to include multi-residential
   or employee housing as a permissible use. TOD suitability is good. No
   bonus units are available within this plan area.
Falcon: Unavailable due to ownership by the USFS.

4-South Kingsbury Grade, Park Cattle Company:
TRPA: This is a vacant parcel with poor land capability allowing for the development of 20 units. Developing this parcel would require an urban boundary change and a plan area amendment to include multi-residential housing or employee housing as a permissible use. No bonus units are available within this plan area. TOD suitability is good.

Falcon: No development potential due to the ownership of Park Cattle Company and the requirement of an urban boundary change.

7b-a portion of the 4-H property, University of Nevada:
TRPA: This is an undeveloped parcel with good land capability that could accommodate 60 units and is owned by the University of Nevada. Developing this parcel would require an urban boundary change and a plan area amendment to include multi-residential housing or employee housing as a permissible use. No bonus units are available within this plan area.

Falcon: This parcel is unavailable due to the ownership of the University of Nevada.

12-Zephyr Heights, 8 acres:
TRPA: This is an undeveloped parcel with poor land capability that could accommodate 25 units. Development of this parcel would require a plan area amendment to include multi-residential housing as a permissible use. It is difficult to make the TOD findings. No bonus units are available within this plan area.

Falcon: This parcel has good development potential for multi-residential housing and only requires a plan area amendment to allow as a permissible use. Falcon argues that the land capability is good and can accommodate from 26-39 units.

5-Kingsbury Grade, Park Cattle Company:
TRPA: This is a vacant parcel with fair land capability, allowing for the development of only 50 units. Developing this parcel would require an urban boundary change and a plan area amendment to include multi-residential housing or employee housing as a permissible use. No bonus units are available within this plan area.

Falcon: No development potential due to the ownership of Park Cattle Company and the requirement of an urban boundary change. Also, Falcon
argues that this parcel has poor land capability containing SEZ and no access.

3. Upper Loop Road, outside of the CP. Park Cattle Company:
TRPA: This is a vacant parcel with fair land capability which could accommodate 40 units. Developing this parcel would require an urban boundary change and a plan area amendment to include multi-residential housing or employee housing as a permissible use. TOD suitability is fair. No bonus units are available in this plan area.

Falcon: No development potential due to the ownership of Park Cattle Company and the requirement of an urban boundary change.

13. Middle of Kingbury at entrance to Granite Springs, Douglas County. 3.15 acres:
TRPA: This is actually two vacant parcels that straddle Meadow Drive and is owned by Douglas County. The land capability is poor and can accommodate only 10 units. Development of this parcel would require a plan area amendment to include multi-residential or employee housing as a permissible use. TOD suitability is only fair. No bonus units are available within this plan area.

Falcon: These parcels are owned by Douglas County and therefore are unavailable. The land capability is too poor and the parcel too small to be suitable for this type of development. It would not be economically feasible to develop this parcel for this use.
MEMORANDUM

To: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Advisory Planning Commission
From: TRPA Staff
Subject: United States Postal Service Master Plan Progress Report

Proposed Action: No Action is proposed. This is only an informational item.

Background: The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) and the United States Postal Service (USPS) have been looking for a way to carry out the VMT reducing strategies noted in the TRPA Goals and Policies. Home mail delivery is one method that has been known to be effective. This Master Plan will update the current USPS Action Plan adopted by TRPA, and look at a region wide effort to reduce VMT. The Plan will address each USPS service area in the region, and determine what delivery strategy will have the most VMT reduction in each of those areas. The process includes public participation and environmental documentation on the effects of future USPS operations in the Lake Tahoe Basin.

Sue Rae Irelan, consultant for the USPS, will be presenting the progress of the USPS Master Plan, including the following topics:

1) Survey Results
Approximately 16,000 surveys were distributed to delivery addresses throughout the Tahoe Region between July 12-14, 1999. Box numbers and carrier addresses were chosen at random from those available. See Survey Data Summary attached.

2) Needs Assessment Preliminary Scope
Using the data collected from the surveys, an analysis of Postal Service needs and the relationship between existing postal service and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) will be discussed. Preparation of the Needs Assessment will incorporate user data, USPS planning requirements including budgetary considerations, and TRPA plans and policies.

3) Focused EA Scoping
VMT analysis of the alternatives generated will form the basis for environmental study in a focused environmental document. The focused EA will concentrate on transportation related issues. Environmental documentation necessary beyond this description is outside the scope of the process.

If you have any questions, please call Nick Haven at (775) 588-4547.
MEMORANDUM

August 30, 1999

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: The Role of the Advisory Planning Commission

Staff will be prepared to discuss this with the APC at the meeting on October 13. In the meantime, we are including in the APC members' packets a copy of the pertinent section of the bi-state Compact and minutes from previous APC discussions on this subject.
MEMORANDUM

August 30, 1999

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission
From: TRPA Staff
Subject: Status Report on Streamlining Activities and Local Revenue Generation

Staff will be presenting an update on these two items at the October 13 meeting.