TAHOE BASIN COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE TOWN HALL MEETING February 6, 2013

Questions for Placer County

Q: What is the Master plan overlay over the golf course property?

A: The Plan Area Team wanted a Master plan for this area. They did not determine a specific land use, rather they designated for future visioning efforts to provide opportunity for redevelopment for that site. There is a strong desire from the Plan Area Team for restoration of that site.

Q: We hear developers; you hear restoration.

A: This area is designated SEZ, so restoration is a required in order to redevelop the larger site.

Q: Heard that Rezoning was a voted on from Plan Area Team.

A: Team voted to include those areas as potential expansions of the TRPA Town Center. Currently the 64 acre golf course is not a part of the Town Center. The County Planning Commission could direct staff to propose an expansion of Town Center area. The Plan Area Team voted to include the golf course site as well.

Q: What is typically built in a town center?

A: Town centers allow for Mixed Use. There is a strong desire for mixed use. Mixed Use could include Residential and Commercial Services, Etc.

Q: Tahoe Basin designated as Metropolitan Planning Organizations which means smart growth is pushed. Why are we designated MPO?

A: TRPA might be able to answer this question. In general, smart growth principals are encouraged to reduce sprawl.

Q: The Tahoe City group did not receive copies of the community comments from the last Town Hall meeting. I believe that our comments should go to specific groups as well as being posted on Web.

A: We are fairly certain that each Team did receive copies of community comments, and we will continue to ensure that they receive them in the future.

Q: I'd like to find out more about the widening of highway 89 and how Caltrans' planning ties into process. How can road-widening be compatible with a quaint community?

A: That question is better directed to the Department of Public Works as the lead on road work. However, (per Jennifer Merchant) there is currently no road widening being proposed. There is a drainage project in the works that may require turnouts and such, and one potential alternative suggests widening at Fanny Bridge.

Q: I have a question about Area Team composition. Initially, the team was appointed and some members have alternates. The composition of the Area Team can change

when just the alternates participate. A good balance is needed on the Area Teams. Too many alternates result in changing the direction of the Area Team.

A: The County has noticed the same and is in the process of addressing this concern.

Q: I want to make sure the Community and the County are on the same page regarding the definition of "quaint community".

A: How do you define "quaint community"?

Commenter Response: Quaint Community should be defined as low scale; maintain the visual of Lake Tahoe; don't look like Domus. The community fears developers bringing in big business. The community wants to keep small business and schools intact.

Comment: It appears that the Chamber and the Tahoe PUD have taken over the planning process. I know they have a huge investment in the Golf course, but they don't care for Kings Beach. They've done their own planning and infiltrated the process.

Q: I have a comment about cooperation between the County and TRPA. TRPA would like BMP's and they encourage cost-effective ways of working together. Then you get to the County and there's a block for a year. TRPA has a solution but the County isn't moving fast.

A: That's why we are here...to improve the system. We appreciate community input.

Q: With respect to height, communities could propose restrictive standards but some have proposed higher allowances.

A: Homewood can go to 3 stories. Team is still working on this...see Edmund for more info on scale/height related to Homewood. Everything that is proposed by staff will be in line with TRPA standards.

Q: When you talk about the Tahoe City Visioning, what are you referring to?

A: The Tahoe Visioning by the PUD; they requested consideration by the Plan Area Team. Our team reviewed and discussed that Vision Options Plan. Our Team is an advisory committee only. Ultimately, suggestions by our team will be brought to the Planning Commission for their consideration.

Q: Where can community go to submit comments?

A: Members of the public can speak/comment at all public hearings and meetings. Nicole maintains a distribution list for notification (see Nicole to get on that list and receive one of her business cards).

Q: What about parking in the community core?

A: This has been a common theme (lack of parking). Parking will be addressed in the design standards (at a later date). It was not ignored.

Questions for TRPA

Q: How do you see this 4-year adaptive process working with local area plans?

A: Must do annual recertification of plan. Will have process for reviewing for compliance.

A: IF there is a substantive change to Regional plan there is a process to address this in the area plan.

All Area Plan s must be found in conformance with the Regional Plan. TRPA Code section 13.6 outlines the conformity review procedures for Area Plans, which includes making findings of conformance and a process for conformity review of Regional Plan Amendments, which affect Area Plans. TRPA Code Section 13.8 outlines monitoring, certification and enforcement of Area Plans, which includes annual reporting of necessary development information, TRPA annual review of permitting under the Area Plan, and a four-year re-certification as part of the four-year evaluation of the Regional Plan.

Q: Discuss transferability.

A: The Regional Plan intends to accelerate restoration of sensitive land and reduce emissions from vehicles by redirecting development away from sensitive land and remote locations towards Centers. Increased coverage, height and density allowances in Centers provides capacity to receive development being transferred.

Q: Discuss TOU's transferability.

A: There are new size and amenity requirements for transferred Tourist Accommodation Units, which are outlined in code section 51.5.2.K. No additional Tourist Accommodation Units (TAUs) were included as part of the commodities in the Regional Plan Update. However, TAUs located in sensitive areas as shown in Map 2 and 3 of the Regional Plan Goals and Policies can be transferred up to a ratio of 3 to 1 to Centers. Approximately 252 Tourist Bonus Units are available for transfer incentives and other bonus unit programs.

Q: How did we become one of the 18 Metropolitan Planning Organizations in California?

A: The TMPO was created in 1999 following an authorization by Congress in the Federal Transportation bill TEA-21 (PL 105-178), and a subsequent designation action

by both California and Nevada Governors. This MPO status allowed Lake Tahoe to qualify for federal transportation planning dollars that would otherwise not be available.

Q: Clarify the no more extra coverage in the 300' shorezone.

A: TRPA Code section 30.4.2.B limits coverage within 300 feet of Lake Tahoe's high water line to 50% of high capability land, except for specifically exempted uses like water quality facilities. Other coverage limitations also apply, resulting in no more than 30 percent coverage in most areas. Previously, certain properties within community plan areas could be developed with up to 70% coverage on high capability lands.

Additionally, code section 13.5.3.B.1 outlines requirements for Area Plans that propose a comprehensive coverage management system as an alternative to parcel specific requirements. This approach is permitted provided it does not increase the amount of coverage otherwise allowed within 300 feet of high water of Lake Tahoe (excluding those areas landward of Highway 28 and 89 in Kings Beach and Tahoe City Town Centers within that zone) and meets other approval requirements.

Q: If there is an area not designated as a town center is there an opportunity to create a new town center?

A: TRPA Code section 13.5.3.E outlines the requirements for when an Area Plan proposes modifications to the boundaries of a Center (including a new Center designation). Properties are required to be already developed (with limited exceptions), be less than ¼ mile from services, and have transit service.

Properties within modified Centers also have to comply with development and community design standards outlined under TRPA Code section 13.5.3 and the approval standards listed under section 13.6.5. These standards include, but are not limited to, existing or planned pedestrian and bicycle facilities, view protection, varied building height and density, pedestrian-oriented design, and strategies to protect sensitive land and ensure open space connections. Lastly, the Area Plan would have to undergo additional environmental review beyond what was completed for the Regional Plan.

Comment: Looking at master plan, on impact: will a project cause impact to historic or cultural value. TRPA is using Lindstrom's document which is false data. The Washoe Tribe did a study, and discovered that there are a lot of cultural/spiritual/social artifacts [in and around the basin]. A lot of information previously submitted by the tribe has been excluded. [commenter provided a hard copy of a "Declaration"]

This update to the Regional Plan did not target any changes to the Cultural Resources Subelement, which is why the Regional Plan Environmental Document did not find a

significant impact on cultural resources. Impacts to cultural resources will still be evaluated through project level analysis, which should identify potential resources whose locations are not presently known. TRPA encourages bringing any suggestions for updates to the Cultural Resources Subelement to the Governing Board who are directing priorities for the next Regional Plan update.

Q: Have you heard about the pipe keepers? There is a film on YouTube on pipes leading into lake, and now they have pipe keepers.

A: The League to Save Lake Tahoe pipe keeper program involves community member volunteers to take water samples and photographs of storm drains entering Lake Tahoe. More information about the program can be found online here: http://keeptahoeblue.org/our-work/Pipekeepers/

The USEPA Lake Tahoe Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) administered by the States of Nevada and California regulates pollutant discharges to Lake Tahoe. Local Jurisdictions and Departments of Transportation within the Tahoe Basin must meet load reduction requirements by developing and implementing load reduction plans that employ a variety of strategies to reduce pollutant loads to the Lake. These strategies include, but are not limited to, infiltrating stormwater runoff where feasible, street sweeping, applying cleaner traction abrasives, as well as filtering runoff to various degrees before it is released through a storm drain to the Lake.

More information about the Nevada Lake Tahoe TMDL can be found online here: http://ndep.nv.gov/bwqp/tahoe3.htm

More information about the California Lake Tahoe TMDL can be found online here: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/rwqcb6/water_issues/programs/tmdl/lake_tahoe/index.s