Original Comments:

1. California Tahoe Conservancy (CTC), 10.11.13

2. South Tahoe Refuse and Recycling Services letter, 10.7.13

3. California State Transportation Agency (Caltrans) letter, 10.16.13

4. Tahoe Area Sierra Club (TASC) letter, 7.30.13

5. The League to Save Lake Tahoe letter, 12.30.2013

6. The League to Save Lake Tahoe letter, 1.06.14

7. TASC Table Height and Density Examples, 1.08.14
Below please find comments submitted on behalf of the California Tahoe Conservancy regarding the Draft Meyers Community Plan. In addition to the comments below, the Conservancy continues to work with Adam Lewandowski to refine and identify Conservancy Asset Lands (and potentially the Conservancy’s Regional Land Bank role). My contact information follows this message in the event any clarification is required.

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the area planning process!

Lisa O’Daly

CHAPTER 2 - Land Use

B. Zoning Districts
(Page 2-2) Request: Please modify the land use district for the former Tahoe Pines Campground from MAP-4 (Recreation) to MAP-5 (Upper Truckee River Corridor). The purposes of acquisition for this property included recreation, but were also wildlife and restoration and the Conservancy-proposed project recognizes this. The site is better suited for the MAP-5 district.

(Page 2-2) Suggestion: Modify the description for the Meyers Community Center (MAP-1) to add Recreation uses to the list. The existing Meyers Visitor center, a Recreation use, is currently located in the area.

C. Land Use Goals and Policies
(Page 2-5) Policy 3.1. Suggestion: Change “approvals of” to “review of applications for” to better clarify that approval of events is discretionary and not simply automatic upon submittal of an application.

D. Land Use and Zoning Ordinance

(Page 2-7) 30 Exempt Activities -- F.2. Suggestion: Recognize that certain public agencies have MOUs that enable tree removal on their public Recreation and Conservation lands.

(Page 2-9) 50 Planning Permit requirements. Question: With all Resource Management uses (except Range uses) being permitted in the Area Plan by right in all MAP Zones, can the caveat “as long as such practices are consistent with the Meyers Area Plan” be further clarified? How is such consistency determined for a forestry project, a stream restoration project, and an erosion control project? For example, if a large river restoration project did not require an EIR or EIS, then it would not require a public hearing or any special findings, and could it be approved at the staff level?

(Page 2-15) Catalyst Project Program -- C. Question: Was it assessed whether the four options, for which a catalyst project must select one, are of generally equal value?

(Page 2-17) 100 Special Events and Temporary Uses.
100A.1. – Question: Why is there a restriction to events sponsored by charitable, non-profit, or community organizations? Why not a government or for-profit sponsored event?

100B. – Suggestion: Provide further clarification for this section. Does it apply to temporary uses and special events proposed for areas outside of Tahoe Paradise Park? If so, application of Condition A.1> appears inappropriate.

CHAPTER 3 -Transportation
Suggestion: Ensure consistency between Figure 3-1, Goals and Policies, and Project Summaries. For example, the Class 1 trail proposed along SR 89 is shown Figure 3-1, mentioned in Policy 6.4, and identified as SR 89 Class 1 Trail in the Project Summaries; however, the Bike Route displayed on Figure 3-1 on the west side of SR 89 is not described elsewhere. Note that Policy 6.4 describes a bike route along South Upper Truckee Road as existing, and Figure 3-1 displays it as a Proposed Facility.

CHAPTER 4 – Environmental Conservation Element
Protections related to the special Sierra junipers (Goal 2; Policy 2.1; Environmental Conservation Implementation actions, Vegetation and Wildlife #14) appear inconsistent. The Implementation Action “discourages” removal of junipers when they don’t pose a risk to health and safety, while the policy language provides more protection. There is no ordinance. Which standard will be applied during project review?

CHAPTER 5 – Recreation Element
(Page 5-4) Clarification: As noted in the Project Summaries but not discussed here, the Conservancy-proposed project for Tahoe Pines does not include a multi-use trail undercrossing at the U.S. Highway 50 bridge within its Purpose and Need.

CHAPTER 6 – Public Services Element
(Page 6-3) Question: This section describes the Meyers Interagency Visitor Center as a Public Service Use. Isn’t a Visitor Center classified as a Recreation Use under the TRPA Code? This center was not staffed during the 2013 season.

ATTACHMENT C – Project Summaries
The Project Summaries elaborate upon certain of the projects more summarily described in the Area Plan, itself. Within the list is a project entitled “Tahoe Pines Day Use Area.” The Conservancy’s project name can be more accurately described as the “Tahoe Pines Campground Rehabilitation and Access Project.” The Conservancy requests that its proposed project be separated from non-Conservancy project components that are currently included, and if the separate components are proposed by others, that the appropriate lead agency be identified. The funding currently reserved for this imminent project does not include the off-site improvements contemplated and the agency would prefer to separate the vision components from that which will be proposed for construction next season.

Additionally, the Conservancy is listed as a Supporting Agency and Potential Funding Source for numerous trail projects in the project summaries (SR 89 Class 1 Trail, the East San Bernadino Trail, the Meyers Loop Trail and Trailhead, and the East Meyers Trailhead). Please note that the Conservancy participates on the Regional Bike Coordinating Group and that regional bikeway priority segments have been the recipients of the Conservancy’s funding. The Agency suggests that the Meyers team ensure that their proposed trail projects are listed in the TRPA’s Lake Tahoe Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan (BPMP), as the Conservancy seeks to fund projects that would help complete the highest priority projects in the regional bike network and such projects are identified in the BPMP.
The Conservancy is also listed as a Supporting Agency (including design assistance) and a Potential Funding Source for TRCD’s Upper Truckee River Enhancement Project, a Supporting Agency/Organization and Potential Funding Source for TRCD’s project entitled Monitoring and Treating Invasive Species, as a provider of potential snow storage locations for the Caltrans US 50 Snow Removal and Storage Operational Improvements Project, and as a Supporting Agency (and possible funding source for trailheads) for the Backcountry Access – Rock Climbing and Winter Trails Inventory project, lead by non-profit groups. Note that the Conservancy has Snow Storage Guidelines that outline the types of properties that are eligible for consideration as licensed snow storage sites and that Conservancy funding, when available, is awarded competitively based upon identifiable project benefits and consistency with Conservancy program guidelines.

Lisa O’Daly  
Senior Environmental Planner  
Resources and Public Access Program  

California Tahoe Conservancy  
State of California >> Natural Resources Agency  
1061 Third Street, South Lake Tahoe, CA 96158

Phone  530.543.6037  
Fax  530.542.5567  
Email lodaly@tahoe.ca.gov
October 4, 2013

Meyers Area Plan
PO Box 5310
Stateline NV 89449

Re: Draft Meyers Area Plan

We appreciate the opportunity to submit the following comments to the Public Review Draft of the Meyers Area Plan:

ATTACHMENT A: Meyers Area Plan Design Standards, Section B 1.b.h Provide Bear-Proof Trash Facilities:

Provide Bear-Proof Trash Facilities. Trash and garbage facilities shall be secure from bears. For residential uses, garbage shall be cleaned up and made unavailable to bears. For all other uses, garbage cans and dumpsters shall be ‘bear-proofed’ with metal lids that are latched with a minimum of two latches. Examples are shown below:

Recommended modification to this section:

Provide Bear-Proof Trash Facilities. Trash and garbage facilities shall be secure from bears. For residential uses, garbage shall be cleaned up and made unavailable to bears. For all other uses, garbage cans and dumpsters shall be ‘bear-proofed’ with metal lids that are latched. Examples are shown below:

Delete picture of tote (bin); insert picture of latchable dumpster

Comment: Recently we have seen an increased use of totes, including ‘animal resistant totes’, throughout the service area. While we appreciate that some customers are purchasing them with the best intentions of addressing wildlife issues, we are not currently equipped to service them.

Totes are heavy and awkward to lift and are designed to be lifted and emptied by a different type of hydraulic equipment. Trying to lift and unload them without the proper equipment will lead to damage to the totes and injury to our employees. Totes are not an available option for our customers at this time.

Thank you for your consideration of our input. Please feel free to contact us at 530-541-5105.

Truly yours,

Jeff Tillman
President

Cc: Norma Santiago, District 5 Supervisor, El Dorado County
October 11, 2013

Mr. Adam Lewandowski  
Principal Planner  
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency  
P.O. Box 5310  
Stateline, NV 89449

Dear Mr. Lewandowski:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments regarding the draft Meyers Area Plan (Plan). The draft Plan seeks to achieve the specific long-range vision of the Meyers community through proposed goals, policies, and projects in conjunction with the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency’s (TRPA) Regional Plan Update. We understand the direction of the community vision and the critical role of Highway 50 relative to community needs to meet this vision. Highway 50 also serves as a transcontinental highway supporting interregional travel, and as a gateway into the Tahoe Basin. Any proposals involving Highway 50, as part of the California State Highway System, must balance the context sensitivity of serving the Meyers community with accessibility – and include consideration of safety, feasibility, and the environmental conditions in the Tahoe Basin. We look forward to continuing to work with the Meyers community and all stakeholders in the refinement and implementation of the Meyers Area Plan.

Our specific comments are as follows:

- Since Caltrans has not yet concurred with any of the changes referenced in the draft Plan relative to Highway 50 beyond existing programmed projects, the language naming Caltrans should only reference needed interagency coordination or approvals.

- The draft Plan includes numerous references to Caltrans having additional right of way along Highway 50 traveled lanes that is not needed for State Highway System purposes. The draft Plan assumes that Caltrans can relinquish property to the County, or other entities, for new or alternative uses. Caltrans does not agree that there is right of way along Highway 50 that is not needed for State Highway System purposes. Please note that Caltrans currently has no excess Right of Way parcels identified for relinquishment along Highway 50.

- The draft Plan references requesting that Caltrans begin to haul snow in the Meyers community as part of our snow removal operations. Caltrans is not funded to provide snow haul services in the Meyers Highway 50 corridor. Although we are able to further discuss this proposal, the concept is probably not feasible.

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
• Chain control locations along Highway 50 in Meyers are optimized to serve travel across both Echo Summit and Luther Pass (State Route 89). These locations also provide for turning movements when trucks must turn around, or when vehicles are being held from traveling across these highway segments during inclement weather conditions. Any proposed relocation of a chain control location must consider and fully address these factors.

• Policy 2.1 in the draft Plan calls for maintaining Level of Service (LOS) of D or better at the Highway 50/Pioneer Trail and Highway 50/State Route 89 intersections in Meyers. Currently, the Highway 50/Pioneer Trail signalized intersection operates at LOS F during seasonal peak periods. While operational improvements at this intersection could reduce the severity of the LOS F peak period conditions at this intersection, it is likely, without major capacity improvements, that LOS F conditions would still exist in the area. The Highway 50/89 intersection could be improved in the future, with control of the Highway 50 traffic through this intersection, but elimination of all congestion in the area is unlikely. Please note that Caltrans has no capacity improvement projects planned in the Tahoe Basin.

• The draft Plan references various concepts for major and smaller scale Highway 50 transportation projects and facility changes. Please note that most of these project concepts would need to be implemented with a local agency project lead. Major project proposals, such as the pedestrian undercrossing of Highway 50, or customized transportation facility enhancements, such as utilizing non-standard concrete/asphalt treatments, would require project approval by Caltrans and could be expected to require Cooperative Agreements and/or Maintenance Agreements between Caltrans and a local agency. Proposals for new or alternative uses within the State Highway Right of Way (ROW), including signage, require a Caltrans Encroachment Permit.

• Caltrans requires that roadway signage and striping be consistent with the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) and Caltrans policies. We note that MUTCD requires retro-reflective signs be used for highway signage. Caltrans can work with local agencies to consolidate excessive highway signage, and to develop common standards for way finding signage programs; however, Caltrans retains the ultimate decisions and responsibility for appropriate signage placed for highway users.

• The draft Plan suggests the relocation of the existing Department of Food and Agriculture inspection station. Aside from costs associated with the inspection station building, there could also be significant costs to shift any Highway 50 traveled lanes at this location. Please note that the California Department of General Services directly oversees property at this site, and would need to be involved in any future changes or negotiations.

• Plans for any proposed gateway monument signage along State Highways should be provided to Caltrans for review and approval, or denial, with primary considerations to safety (location), appropriateness, aesthetics, and access for maintenance purposes. The preferred location for gateway monuments is outside of State Highway ROW, for reasons including,
but not limited to, highway operations, maintenance, and safety. All considerations for off-site locations should be documented prior to proposing a location within the State Highway ROW. The proposed site for integration of any preliminary or final gateway monument must be reviewed and approved by Caltrans prior to the approval of an Encroachment Permit or Cooperative Agreement. Please note that proposed gateway monuments should: (1) be located well beyond the clear recovery zone, placed such that there is minimal likelihood of being struck by an errant vehicle, (2) be located where maintenance can safely be performed and (3) follow standards for placement of discretionary fixed objects. Proposed gateway monuments should not be located in the median of a Conventional Highway with posted speeds of greater than 45 miles per hour. Please see the following guidelines for more information: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/gateway/gm_guidelines_final_11-2011.pdf

- While the Community Based Transportation Planning (CBTP) grant application for the Meyers Sustainable Mobility Plan was not among those awarded for the 2013-2014 grant cycle, we look forward to working with El Dorado County in seeking viable and sustainable transportation enhancements in the Meyers community. The Caltrans CBTP Program is one of our most competitive planning grant programs. For this grant cycle 118 applications were submitted statewide, totaling approximately $15.4 million, and 15 applications were awarded approximately $2.9 million in funding. The technical complexities of the Highway 50 corridor in Meyers did not make this proposal the most competitive in this program.

- Caltrans proposes to begin a feasibility study next July that would examine the Highway 50 corridor in Meyers to identify and prioritize candidate corridor mobility improvement projects. This could potentially include some of the projects identified in the draft Meyers Area Plan. Projects prioritized through this process which are advanced for funding will already have planning-level scope and cost estimates prepared, which will significantly streamline preparing the projects for construction.

Please contact me at (916) 274-0638 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

MARLO TINNEY
Chief, Office of Transportation Planning – East

cc: El Dorado County
Subject: Administrative Draft of Meyers Area Plan

The Tahoe Area Sierra Club (TASC) appreciates the opportunity to participate in the process for the Meyers Area Plan (MAP) development. We also appreciate the extensive effort that the members of the Meyers Community Advisory Council (MCAC) have put into reviewing the detailed draft language of the Meyers AP update, and commend the MCAC members for their keen interest and efforts to ensure that the natural values which make Meyers unique are protected, including the recommendations of the MCAC to minimize the increases in new and redevelopment when compared to what was allowed in TRPA’s December 2012 Regional Plan Update (RPU).

TASC also supports the MAP’s focus on emphasizing the outdoor recreation available in the Meyers area and surrounding communities. Many changes have been proposed to the Area Plan language to support this interest, however, additional information is recommended to guide future planning efforts (e.g. regarding the proposed Catalyst Project concept).

MCAC discussions have also been related to the protection of the unique scenic vistas in the Meyers Area. Although mentioned in the Area Plan in a few locations, the Environmental Conservation Goals and Policies section regarding scenic quality does not emphasize the natural scenic environment, focusing instead on desires to improve the built environment. TASC recommends the section be revised to first and foremost call out the unique scenic values in Meyers, as well as the direction of the TRPA Compact to protect natural scenic values. The built environment can affect scenic resources, but it is not the dominant value that the Compact requires be protected, nor the primary scenic value in Meyers.

Detailed comments and suggestions are included in these comments. Please feel free to contact Jennifer Quashnick at jqtahoe@sbcglobal.net or Laurel Ames at laurel@watershednetwork.org if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Laurel Ames, Jennifer Quashnick
Conservation Co-Chair, Technical Consultant,
Tahoe Area Sierra Club Tahoe Area Sierra Club

1 Although TASC does not believe TRPA’s Compact allows the delegation of authority to local governments, we provide this input as it relates to the community’s update of the local plan for Meyers.
Although TASC will continue to participate in the MAP process and provide additional comments, we hope these concerns and suggestions assist TRPA and El Dorado County staff in revising the Administrative Draft of the Meyers Area Plan. We encourage staff to contact us to discuss these comments.

1. **Upper Truckee River Corridor (MAP-5) [page 14]:**
   When initially discussed in the MCAC meetings, these areas were zoned for Conservation – which did not prevent the types of low impact recreation desired for these areas. TASC recommends this district include identification conservation uses, although we recognize limited existing and dispersed recreational uses will be allowed (e.g. improving access to hiking trails).

2. **The Ongoing Role of the Meyers Community Advisory Council (MCAC):**
   Maintaining MCAC will help provide a better sense of community, promote community planning efforts, etc., however, TASC is concerned that as membership changes in the future, new members may not have the same perspective, understanding, or intentions as the existing MCAC group. Guidelines, criteria, or some other type of standards should be adopted to ensure that the MCAC maintains the pro-community and pro-environment views and intentions of the existing group members.

3. **Area Plan and Town Center Boundaries:**
   a) TASC supports the proposed reduction in the Town Center boundary to recognize the sensitivity of the land adjacent to the Upper Truckee River.
   b) With regards to the Area Plan boundary, the map on page 15 does not reflect the proposed extension to include the neighborhood area along S.R. 89 that was discussed by the MCAC. TASC supports this proposal by the MCAC and believes, based on information provided to date, that this may be an appropriate location to encourage affordable housing due to its (walkable) proximity to the Meyers Community Center, to recreational opportunities, and to easily accessible transit options. The MAP needs to identify this change, and provide additional information regarding the zoning for this ‘leg’ in the Area Plan.

4. **Environmental Analysis of Land Use Changes:**
   TASC expects that the environmental documentation for the MAP will evaluate all land use changes, including where any prohibited uses are changed to P or CUP, or uses requiring a CUP are changed to P, within each area. We note the May 17th Tables titled “[MAP] Preliminary Draft Table of Permissible, Conditional, and Prohibited Uses” and “[MAP] Preliminary Draft Development Standards” include the original uses and level of permit review associated with the 1993 Community Plan and Plan Area Statements 119, 136, and 122. The environmental documentation must analyze all changes in these uses. Further, uses in the PAS associated with the extended Area Plan boundary need to be added to the table.
a) **Waiver of Requirements:**
For those uses with a footnote to number 6,\(^2\) it is unclear what this entails. What level of review will be guaranteed if the MCAC and PC were to ‘waive’ these requirements? Would this only be after the public review process associated with a CUP?

b) **Accessory Uses and Permitting:**
The MAP should include more information on what type of uses are considered ‘accessory.’\(^3\) Also, we recommend the MAP include a process to notify adjacent property owners when an accessory use associated with uses other than residential is being considered.

c) **Employee Housing in Recreation Areas:**
It is unclear what this will entail. TASC is concerned that allowing employee housing in Recreational areas as a CUP may encourage new development on recreational lands. Will the environmental document analyze this change?

d) **Commercial Uses as “Permitted” (P):**
We are concerned that incompatible uses may result from the designation of many commercial service uses as “Permitted” (P) (p. 20-21, MAP-1). For example, if a broadcasting studio were going to move in next door to a health center, or in general, a noise-generating use proposes to move next to a residence, there should be public notification and review associated with this use. This serves not only to protect existing residents and businesses in Meyers, but also to assess any possible environmental impacts as well.

e) **Uses within MAP-5:**
Any use in the MAP-5 district should require at least the level of review of a CUP. For example, a X-C ski course is a positive, low impact way to recreate. However, will a course require snowmobiles to groom in an area where motorized equipment is not allowed, and/or could cause impacts to people, wildlife, and the environment? Are there alternative arrangements that could reduce such an impact? In another example, what review will there be for “Day Use Areas” in the MAP-5 district? Such uses should also require the community notification and environmental review associated with a CUP.

f) **Height:**
TASC appreciates that within the MAP’s Town Center, the MCAC has proposed less height than allowed by the December RPU in order to protect scenic views. However, the draft MAP states “up to 42 feet per TRPA Code” for MAP-4 and MAP-5. First, as these are recreation and conservation areas, allowing even more height than in the Town Center

---

\(^2\) (6) These uses are not allowed within the portion of the ground floor of a structure that faces the primary entry point for projects adjacent to US 50. This restriction may be waived if the Meyers Community Advisory Council and the Planning Commission find that the use is otherwise consistent with the intent of the Meyers Area Plan.

\(^3\) “Accessory uses may be permitted per Sections 21.3.1 through 21.3.8 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.” (p. 20).
makes little sense. Second, these are areas where it would be even more important to retain the cherished views of the surrounding mountains. Third, TRPA’s Code may allow up to 42 feet (based on many factors), however the standard maximum height, prior to the RPU, was 26 feet. Additional height could be gained based on slope, roof pitch, and/or other exceptions that were intended to generate additional environmental benefits. TASC recommends the maximum heights for these areas be kept at 26 feet, although any additional buildings in these two ‘districts’ should be discouraged.

\[g) \text{ Congestion from stop and go visitor traffic:} \]
In addition, the desire to increase visitor stops in Meyers (from those coming in the Basin on highway 50) may make sense from an economic standpoint, however, the MAP has not identified how the environmental impacts of this would be dealt with and mitigated. In addition, how will Meyers increase walkability yet encourage more stop and go traffic from visitors stopping and then departing Meyers? Where is the distinction between supporting the residential population in and around Meyers compared to tourists?

\[5. \text{ Catalyst Project:} \]
TASC remains concerned about the proposed Catalyst Project, and the additional height and density that may be allowed in parts of Meyers above previous limits. We appreciate the intentions behind the project, based on what discussions we have had at the MCAC thus far, and look forward to learning more about the proposal. However our experience with similar “special project” concepts in TRPA’s history include the Community Enhancement Program (CEP) projects, which resulted in the approval of extremely large, overwhelming projects that will completely transform the communities they are proposed/approved in (e.g. Homewood Mountain Resort, Boulder Bay, etc.). In addition, the ‘gains’ required for CEP projects were not quantified, creating questions about the extent of benefits for both the public and the developers. The description related to Catalyst Projects remains vague in many areas.

The improvements that have been applied to the current draft MAP section 80 (i.e. identifying the additional stormwater treatment benefits) are appreciated; however there are still several criteria that are not well defined. For example, in 80.B.2 and 3, the MAP does not identify to what extent the project must achieve these requirements. Also, it is unclear why some policies are required and some can be “one of the following.” We have been informed that more information about the Catalyst project will be provided, and will review and provide additional comments at that time. Finally, as recommended during several MCAC meetings, we recommend that the community better identify what is desired for the Catalyst project. For example, MCAC members have been very interested in promoting the outdoor recreation available in and around Meyers, and supporting businesses which cater to these activities. However, without refinement, it may be unclear to a developer what is desired by the community, and a project may be proposed that does not meet the needs or desires of Meyers residents and visitors. Therefore, we recommend that prior to Area Plan adoption, the MCAC develop a list of community interests that can be used to help identify the types of Catalyst Projects that the community will want to see.
6. Transportation:

a) Transit Service:
The Transit Service discussed on page 28 appears to be outdated. On that note, we recommend the MAP encourages working with Kirkwood and Sierra at Tahoe to re-establish/provide transit service, as well as the City of SLT and Carson Valley.

b) Existing Traffic Conditions:
The Existing Traffic Conditions (p. 29-30) should include a discussion of the impacts of other areas on traffic through Meyers. Specifically, the MAP should acknowledge that increased visitation to Stateline and Ski Run – for which their corresponding proposed Area Plans aim to draw - will generate more traffic through Meyers. The City’s future Area Plan to incorporate the SLT “Y” will also likely produce more traffic through Meyers.

c) Parking:
It is well established that more parking spaces will mean more people driving to/from them (increased vehicle use). TASC supports a net reduction in driving through a “park once” concept where possible, however caution must be taken not to increase the use of vehicles by providing a net increase in available (and free) parking. Therefore, we recommend that existing parking capacity be re-situated in some way to support a more desirable “park once” approach, yet not increase the availability of parking in a way that encourages more driving. For example, perhaps a program can be set up to provide incentives to property owners who implement shared parking and reduce the number of spaces available. Those removed parking spaces can be ‘available’ for use or transfer to areas where additional parking may be needed. In addition, if pedestrian access across the highway is improved, it will be more likely that residents and visitors will be interested in parking ‘once.’

d) Increased vehicle use in and around Meyers:
The MAP includes increasing the residential and visitor population in the Meyers area, which will itself generate additional vehicle use and trips. The MAP needs to better identify how impacts will be mitigated.

7. Scenic Resources:
The Scenic Resources section on page 38 needs to include information about the natural scenic resources. This should begin by emphasizing the amazing scenic views from Meyers, and the importance of maintaining the natural scenic quality. The MAP should also clarify that the TRPA Compact requires protection of scenic resources, and acknowledges that this is impacted by the built environment. However, the built environment is not itself the ‘scenic resource’ that the Compact aims to protect.

---

Page 34: “Develop one or more public or shared-use parking areas adjacent to the transit center, commercial establishments, and/or trailheads to promote a “park once” pedestrian environment.”
Improvements to the built environment will provide scenic benefits, but they must not be at the expense of natural scenic views. This includes Catalyst Projects as well.

In addition, TRPA staff informed us that additional visual simulations will be completed regarding the impacts of proposed regulations. We look forward to viewing these images. However, it is difficult to understand the visual impacts from the viewpoints used in the simulations. The simulations should match the viewpoints identified in the 1993 CP, and carried forward in the MAP, in addition to the viewpoints from the bike paths. People driving through Meyers (residents and visitors alike) also expect the open views of the mountains, and will notice if a building is blocking their view.

8. Air Quality:
The California designation for ozone in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin, which applies in Meyers, is “nonattainment – transitional”. There has been no ozone monitoring in South Lake Tahoe since 2009. This section needs to be corrected for accuracy.

In addition, given the increased traffic that will drive through Meyers as a result of multiple Area Plans (including the Douglas County South Shore Area Plan, the City of South Lake Tahoe’s Tourist Core Area Plan, and anticipated future area plans for the SLT “Y” and Vail parcel at the end of Ski Run Blvd.), and congested vehicles will increase air pollution throughout Meyers, TASC recommends air quality monitoring be conducted to ensure residents and visitors along highway 50 in Meyers are not exposed to unhealthy levels of air pollution, especially where the new RPU and MAP will place more residential uses along highway 50 in the Meyers Town Center. We would suggest El Dorado County and the Meyers community seek resources from the other entities that will benefit, economically, from the increased tourism that will generate more traffic through Meyers, including the City of SLT and Douglas County. Further, as TRPA’s RPU will increase residential and visitor populations in the area, we also encourage Meyers to seek cooperation and resources from TRPA.

9. Environmental Conservation Goals & Policies:
In general, it is unclear how the MAP will specifically meet threshold requirements. As noted below, although improvements and projects are encouraged or included, details of how projects will be implemented, how they will meet environmental targets, and how they will be maintained are lacking. Further, although resources are identified (e.g. scenic resources), more emphasis regarding how the MAP will aid in the achievement and maintenance of thresholds.

a) Area-wide BMPs:
TASC is concerned that the MAP does not include adequate information to support the reality of whether an adequate area-wide BMP program for the area can be created (Goal 6, p. 40). In addition, Meyers and the surrounding residential areas are generally very flat, with several intermittent wet areas (and the Upper Truckee River) throughout. Given natural infiltration is the most effective way to reduce pollutants that affect lake clarity, any area-wide BMP should focus on infiltration first. It is unclear what type of area-wide treatment is being sought for Meyers. Further, p. 41 states: “The Meyers Creek
Enhancement Project can be developed in coordination with an area-wide BMP program and/or the Meyers Water Quality Improvement Project.” What will the Meyers Creek project entail and how will this relate to an area-wide BMP? We are specifically concerned that natural areas, and/or areas which can be restored, which provide for infiltration may be ‘replaced’ with engineered water treatment facilities that rely on technology not proven to reduce fine particles or nitrogen.5

In addition, although not within the MAP boundary, the MAP includes direction for many activities that affect the ‘sphere of influence’ around the Meyers community. This includes the Lake Tahoe Golf Course. The MAP should discourage any increases in fertilizer use that may be associated with changes in the Golf Course. Additionally, the sensitive lands around the intersection of highway 50 and Pioneer Trail should be protected, and emphasized for their ability to infiltrate pollutants.

b) Undeveloped Land and Infiltration:
Due to the unique soil types in the Meyers area, even undisturbed high capability land effectively infiltrates stormwater. This is easily observed during rain events. The MAP should acknowledge this benefit, and the protection of undeveloped areas in and around Meyers, even on higher capability lands, should be emphasized.

c) Noise:
TASC recommends the MAP include goals and policies to encourage Caltrans to limit the use of jake brakes on Echo Summit and Luther Pass to emergency situations, as has been done in other mountain communities (e.g. Mammoth Lakes).

In addition, with the changes in land use proposed, it may be appropriate to lower the noise standards in areas where additional residential uses will be encouraged, and in recreation/conservation areas where quiet outdoor activities are encouraged.

d) Lighting:
The Design Standards should include the requirements discussed in the MCAC meetings regarding preventing new sources of light pollution. Although included in the Design Guidelines, new development should be required to meet these standards, and therefore TASC recommends they be moved from the guidelines section to the standards.

5 TASC has repeatedly submitted the technical information associated with this statement to TRPA; we will not repeat herein.
Date: December 30, 2013  
To: Adam Lewandowski, Senior Planner  
From: The League to Save Lake Tahoe  

Re: Meyers Area Plan  

Dear Mr. Lewandowski,

The League to Save Lake Tahoe appreciates the opportunity to comment and provide input on the planning stages of the Meyers Area Plan (MAP). After reviewing the Revised Public Review Draft, the League has comments regarding the catalyst project program, area-wide best management practices, and soil conservation. Also, as suggested in a previous comment letter, the League believes there are highlights of the MAP that should be acknowledged in the plan itself.

Catalyst Project Program

The MAP has provided for a unique program that will encourage economic and environmental revitalization for the Meyers community. It incentivizes a project that will encourage public gathering, exceed water quality and energy efficiency standards. The description and implementation of this project should include language as to how either El Dorado County or TRPA will conduct an environmental analysis when the project is submitted for approval and provide information to the public detailing the environmental gains associated with the project. This is an opportunity for the MAP to create a positive precedent for future Area Plans.

There could also be consideration within the policy language to limit the scale and size of the project. The program should capture the desires of the MAP Advisory Council. They have voiced the need for an area for environmental improvement that can also be a gathering area for recreational or community needs. Future proposals for this project must not only be in conformance with the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency’s (TRPA) Regional Plan Update (RPU), but also reflect these desires and meet the requirements outlined in the policy.

Area-Wide BMP Program

The League commends the MAP Advisory Council and TRPA staff for including an Area-Wide BMP program as priority for this plan. The MAP could set precedent and demonstrate improvement to water quality through this program for other area plans. The language, “to include funding mechanisms and assurances for on-going maintenance of Area-Wide BMP improvements. Priority areas include commercial properties without completed BMPs. The Area-Wide BMP Program can be developed in coordination with

the Meyers Water Quality Improvement Projects and/or the Meyers Creek Enhancement Project,\textsuperscript{2} properly identifies the necessary requirements for this future program. The League realizes that this program will likely not be in affect when the MAP is approved and the MAP states that parcel level BMP requirements will be retained until this program is in place. The League requests that the MAP’s Memorandum of Understanding explicitly states which entity, El Dorado County or TRPA, will implement the enforcement or compliance of BMPs until this program is established.

**Soil Conservation**

The MAP has two policies within Soil Conservation that need more detail. The goals to reduce excess land coverage and to restore disturbed stream environment zones both appropriately state requirements for this Area Plan.\textsuperscript{3} However, both of these goals need more description of specific targets. The TRPA recently approved the City of South Lake Tahoe’s Tourist Core Area Plan. There was lengthy discussion regarding these same goals. The MAP should reflect similar language that was approved in that Area Plan so that the MAP is found to be in conformance with the RPU.

**Highlights of the MAP**

Over the past year of Area Plan development, the League has been involved with all planning throughout the Lake Tahoe Basin. The League would like to specifically acknowledge and applaud the dedication and work that has been produced through the MAP Advisory Council. The MAP and its planning process should be used as an excellent example for future Area Plans. The Advisory Council has contributed hundreds of hours in countless public meetings and should be used as a model for community development. The MAP reduced the Town Center boundary from what had been approved in the RPU to further incentivize proper redevelopment. The heights that have been determined for the Town Center are much lower than what were allowed through the RPU to help protect the character of the Meyers community and protect scenic viewsheds. All of these accomplishments should be highlighted in the MAP. This recognition will not only aid in the approval of the MAP at the TRPA Governing Board level, but could also positively guide future Area Plan development for Lake Tahoe.

The League looks forward to continue working with TRPA staff in the final development stages of the MAP.

Shannon Eckmeyer

Policy Analyst

League to Save Lake Tahoe

\textsuperscript{2} Meyers Area Plan, Revised Public Review Draft. December 2013, p. 4-4

\textsuperscript{3} Meyers Area Plan, Public Review Draft. September p. 4-5
Happy New Year Everyone,

I hope everyone had a safe and happy holiday season. In anticipation for the meeting this Wednesday I have reviewed Jennifer’s thoughtful paper on the Catalyst Project, looked over One Globe’s Concept report again, and reviewed the Project Template for the Renewable Energy Regional Exploration Study. I strongly encourage everyone to do the same before our meeting and have specific thoughts and language suggestions so that this meeting can be productive and produce valuable policy. The Catalyst Project has been the topic of discussion for many over the past couple of months. I am not expecting a response to this email, I just wanted to give everyone some food for thought and present the questions I will be asking at the meeting.

1. The Meyers Area Plan does allow for extra height for the Catalyst Project, up to 45’, which is 10’ higher than what you have all decided as what you want as the appropriate height for Meyers. While I know this has been thought out and discussed before language was written for the project, we need to make sure this is what MAC wants. Once the Area Plan is approved by TRPA it is very unlikely a project would come through with anything proposed less than this height.
   a. If this is agreed upon, we need to add language (although this may be redundant because it is a requirement in TRPA code, I think it should be explicit here) that the Catalyst Project will be required to go through a Scenic Analysis because it will be an exception to the Meyers 35’ rule. This is necessary to protect the character of the community.

2. I believe the policy language should explicitly state that the Catalyst Project’s permitted and conditional uses must be consistent with what is permitted within the approved Meyers Area Plan.
   a. The MAC spent many hours reviewing what type of uses they would like to see and where within their community. Having this safeguard would prevent a project coming in that may go to TRPA for an amendment to the Area Plan to allow a use in an area that was not intended by the MAC and community. This should not impede a project of any sort, it would be a safeguard for the community.

3. As I have stated in my previous comment letters, the policy language needs to state that the Catalyst Project will complete an Environmental Review.
   a. Again this may seem as a redundancy from TRPA code, but the language should be incorporated into the Area Plan itself.

4. Should there be language in the policy to include the MAC’s review (of or for the approval) of the Catalyst Project?
   a. I do not want to create any undue burden on the MAC. However, it is already within the Area Plan that the MAC will be reviewing updates to the Area Plan. I think the MAC’s involvement, whether it be just to review or aid in the approval of, is a way to ensure that the Catalyst Project actually follows the intent of the Area Plan.

I will see everyone on Wednesday.

Shannon Eckmeyer
### Draft for Discussion on 1/8/2014 MCAC Meeting:

**Information on Building Heights & Sizes for Meyers Area Plan discussion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Max. Building Height (in general)</th>
<th>1993 CP</th>
<th>2012 RPU</th>
<th>MAP - Town Center</th>
<th>MAP - Catalyst Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 feet</td>
<td>56 feet</td>
<td>35 feet</td>
<td>45 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Density:
- **Northern end of Plan boundary = roughly Bike shop/Roadrunner to Lira’s parking lot (both sides highway)**
  - up to # units/acre
  - 40 40 40 40
- **Majority & Southern end = from N end area ~ south); excludes Industrial tract**
  - up to # units/acre
  - 10 40 40 40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building height</th>
<th>Building Size (sq. feet) - approx.</th>
<th>Building + parking lots/sidewalks, etc. (sq. ft. coverage) - approx.</th>
<th>Project Density</th>
<th>Height allowed by Plan? (basic requirements - doesn’t count ‘loopholes’ or land use)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob Dog Pizza 2013</td>
<td>26(^2) 2,600</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>1993 CP = 1993 Meyers Community Plan; 2012 RPU = TRPA Regional Plan Update (Dec. 2012); MAP = Meyers Area Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Starbucks(^1)</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikasa</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>143,800 (combined)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millers Outpost</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Trader Joe's(^1)</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical REI(^1)</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kmart(^1)</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raley's at the 'Y'(^1)</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton Hospital(^2)</td>
<td>36 105,000 270,000</td>
<td>N Yes Yes(^2) Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC building in Meyers(^2)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>N Yes Yes Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalyst Project(^2)</td>
<td>45 180,500 40</td>
<td>N Yes Yes Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 CTC lots (“asset lands”) to be sold - combined at 5.78 acres could allow</td>
<td>45(^**) 90,000 (^4) 176,244 40</td>
<td>N Yes Yes Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. From CSLT Table 8/13/09 GPU Presentation; uncertain if this is current Raley’s size or from before expansions
2. CCC bldg. height from TRPA records and TRPA staff during MCAC meetings; public health and safety bldgs can get more height (old and new Plan)
3. Best estimate from report; per 12/13/13 outline to MCAC; email jqtahoe@sbcglobal.net for copy
4. Estimate assuming buildings cover 50% of allowed coverage (parking lots/walkways the other 50%)
5. For More Information on CTC Asset Lands:
   - Map of Meyers Asset Lands: [http://tahoe.ca.gov/files/2013_VO/Asset_Land_Sales/Potential_Asset_Lands_Inventory.pdf](http://tahoe.ca.gov/files/2013_VO/Asset_Land_Sales/Potential_Asset_Lands_Inventory.pdf) (page 4)
   - CTC Asset Lands Program Info at: [http://tahoe.ca.gov/files/Item9a_TSCIP.pdf](http://tahoe.ca.gov/files/Item9a_TSCIP.pdf) (page 9)

\(^1\) Approx; unconfirmed
\(^2\) Assuming new owner of all lots applied under Catalyst/Incentive regulations
\(^3\) Best estimate from report; per 12/13/13 outline to MCAC; email jqtahoe@sbcglobal.net for copy
\(^4\) Estimate assuming buildings cover 50% of allowed coverage (parking lots/walkways the other 50%)