

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

TRPA/Zoom

April 24, 2024

Meeting Minutes

CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Mr. Hoenigman called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

Members present: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Diss, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Hoenigman, Ms. Leumer, Mr. Settelmeyer

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Fink stated that there were no changes to the agenda.

Mr. Hoenigman deemed the agenda approved as posted.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Aldean moved approval of the March 27, 2024 minutes as posted.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

III. Discussion and possible recommendation for approval of the proposed Amendments to the Code of Ordinances Supporting Climate Resilience, Affordable Housing Requirements for Condominiums, and Design Standards for Mixed-Use Development

Mr. Hoenigman said they've received written public comments on this item.

Mr. Stock provided the presentation on adaptive code improvements that are amendments to the Code of Ordinances focused on climate best practices, including outdoor lighting standards, mixed-use developments, and affordable housing in condominiums. Staff has incorporated feedback and suggestions from previous discussions into this proposal.

These amendments respond to board directives and are divided into two main parts: Climate best practices and mixed-use/affordable housing. These amendments originated from the Sustainability Action Plan, with input from stakeholders and University of California, Davis graduate students. Staff refined these proposals based on stakeholder input and are now presenting a draft recommendation.

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

April 24, 2024

Mixed-Use Standards for Development: The Regional Plan identifies mixed-use development as a tool for energy conservation and greenhouse gas reduction. The concept is to integrate multiple uses on a site to reduce auto dependence. Previously, we lacked a definition or standards for mixed-use development, but it's crucial given its role in the Regional Plan and recent developments like the Nine 47 Tahoe permitting process and the amendment to the Washoe Tahoe Area Plan. Staff received direction from the Regional Planning Committee and the Governing Board to develop mixed-use standards, including affordable housing mitigation, which we're proposing today.

Affordable Housing Proposal for Condominiums: Responding to direction from the Governing Board, Advisory Planning Commission, and the Regional Planning Committee, following the amendment to Washoe Tahoe Area Plan, we're proposing affordable housing in condominium developments. There's recognition of the need to mitigate the impact of new market-rate housing on the existing workforce housing gap. We're proposing that ten percent of units in condominium subdivisions be deed-restricted affordable or moderate housing, with details outlined in the packet. These affordable units can be built on or off-site and can utilize bonus units and incentives. However, there won't be an in-lieu fee option; new equivalent units must be built.

The ten percent figure comes from analyses by the Mountain Housing Council and Tahoe Prosperity Center, which found a gap of over 5,000 workforce housing units for lower and moderate income residents, representing about ten percent of total units in the basin. This requirement aligns with Placer County and Incline Village and falls within the range adopted by the city of South Lake Tahoe in their inclusionary zoning ordinance. Importantly, this proposal won't replace Placer County and the city's requirements but will apply to jurisdictions without existing programs.

Exhibit A, included in the packet, contains track changes to Section 39.2.3 of the Code, which pertains to the requirement for a 1:1 replacement of affordable housing when new housing is built. These changes are not substantive to the requirement but rather align the section with our current income definitions. It's not a change of policy but an adaptation to our current definitions.

Presentation: [Regional-Planning-Committee-Agenda-Item-No-3-Code-of-Ordinance-Amendments-for-Climate-Affordable-Housing-and-Mixed-Use-Standards.pdf](#)

Committee Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean believes in adaptive management and has a suggestion under the proposed code changes in Section 36.14, Mixed-use Design Standard. Mr. Settelmeyer's example of how this could interfere with the flexibility that developers might need to locate or relocate the commercial component of the mixed-use development to a rooftop. In Paragraph A, it states that the ground floor shall include one or more permissible pedestrian-oriented non-residential uses. Then in Subparagraph C, it states deed-restricted affordable and moderate housing may be substituted for non-residential uses on the ground floor. She suggested adding "If the development still has a mixed-use component elsewhere in the building." Otherwise, it's not mixed-use and the entire building becomes residential in nature.

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

April 24, 2024

Mr. Settelmeyer appreciated the changes. He's curious about Section 34.4.1, addressing EV capable facilities in the 20 percent rule. Does that automatically kick in even if an older premises and older business would have to resurface or if they dug up their lot to repave it? Is this triggered then, or would they still be grandfathered in? If you look at some of these older establishments and businesses, they may not be electrically set up to accommodate EV charging, whereas a new one can integrate it into their system more easily. Are they exempt, or does this trigger them to have to do it just by repaving?

Mr. Stock said as we currently have it proposed, this would apply for anyone who is applying for a permit to grade a parking lot. It would include older legacy development as well. It's a great point, and it's something that we can explore further.

Mr. Hoenigman said under Multi-family in Section 90.2, that lobbies count as the space along with gyms and other things as long as they're open to the public. He doesn't think we want to make the lobbies publicly accessible because once people are in the lobby, they can more easily access units. We have to say that they can count towards space, but they don't have to be publicly accessible. It was brought up about some of these sites being irregular and it's hard to make it work. He hopes that staff have discretion to make variances and allowances for these things in real-time because every project is different. Some of the requirements we're requiring may not work for every development. Some sites are long and narrow, and you're going to have a driving aisle for cars, a walking path, and a lobby for pedestrians, and then there's nothing left. We don't want to preclude those from being able to get permits.

Regarding the EV parking spaces, it says that 20 percent are wired, he doesn't think it said how many must have chargers put in now.

Mr. Stock said the proposal is for that 20 percent EV capable of receiving wire, just putting in the conduit. There's no requirement to put in wire or to put in a charging unit. Studying this and talking to folks in the industry is that is often done by another vendor, not the property owner. For example, someone would be repaving their parking lot, putting in conduit, and then someone like Tesla or EVgo would come in and put in the wiring and the charging unit.

Ms. Leumer said if you put the wiring in advance of the stations, there's a risk that they're going to get damaged, and you'll end up losing money on it.

Mr. Hoenigman said was concerned because we asked to increase that to 20 percent wired. It used to be 10 percent was actual devices, and somehow, we got rid of those in the process.

Mr. Stock said the proposal and the analysis have been for conduit only since we brought this forward.

Mr. Hoenigman said regarding motion detection lighting, maybe we can say technologies such as motion detection. He doesn't know if there are any other available technologies but would hate to force someone's hand.

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

April 24, 2024

Ms. Gustafson said regarding the mixed-use development definition, I think what we're trying to get away from in the Placer County Area Plan amendments was having the first floor not open to the public in some manner. How she read this was lobbies don't count toward mixed-use unless they are open to the public. To get to the mixed-use definition, you could keep it closed to the public for security, but then you'd have to propose something else to get the mixed-use. Is that correct?

Mr. Hoenigman said as a developer, if it makes sense to build commercial, you will because you get money for that. If it doesn't, what you want as a city is a lively street facade that has activity, and you can see into it, and it looks nice. So, most cities give you credit for lobbies even if they're not open to the public. We're building a project in San Diego, and we get to count our gym even though it's not open because they recognize that it's not a great retail street, but it still gives some transparency into the building and makes it almost seem public. Flexibility is good because I would hate to make people build retail and then just have it sit vacant.

Ms. Gustafson's concern is that they've seen way too many first floors locked off. This is adaptive management and can see where you're correct, but at the same time, what we want in mixed-use is to have that activation of something and not have people say, oh well, retail didn't make sense when they built it, but maybe a year later it does make sense.

Mr. Marshall said the other issue we need to track is the need to have a mix of uses to be mixed-use. What gets the mixed-use is other commercial.

Mr. Hoenigman said we could possibly set a limit on how much of that space could be used. With different shaped properties we're going to be making something not work unless we give staff the authority to correct. It would be nice to have your lobby on a secondary street and have the commercial on the primary, but not every property is on a corner or something like that. If you have to take access for cars off the retail frontage because you have to put in parking and you have to take the lobby off that same street, then you could be down to a smaller percentage of common area. But with the changes suggested, you could possibly put it on top or elsewhere.

Ms. Gustafson agreed and said that was a great discussion last meeting about rooftop bars. You'd gain a view, a place that the public wants to come in but then the lobby is open to the public because the public has to be able to get up there.

Mr. Hoenigman said it's always separate lobbies, you never mix but it's still a mixed-use lobby. No builder would build a building with a public lobby. You either take it out and make it not allowable as part of that space.

Ms. Aldean said the language states that there is a list of options but not limited to those options. For example, a project office would go away once the project is completed. That would be a temporary use. She's not sure that we need to necessarily include lobbies, gyms, and project offices because we're giving ourselves some latitude and maybe it should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

April 24, 2024

Mr. Marshall said there were a couple of points made that related to variances. It's very difficult for TRPA to do variances since the findings we have to make are knowing what the parameters are. To come up with the variance, what you're doing is coming up with an exception that's bounded by various rules so staff would lack the ability to have substantial discretion to deviate from Code. What you do is you set up some other mechanism to provide flexibility, but it's got to be written in a way that we can look at the total impact associated with that flexibility. So, up to 10 percent or some way of writing it in that context. If there are site-specific considerations then the applicant may request an additional 10 percent, whatever it is that you're going. Staff will work with you on how that is set up, but it can't be a standard variance procedure like local governments can do.

Mr. Hoenigman asked staff if they felt like that would be necessary. They're currently going through this process in Southern California requesting several variances because it's not possible to do conform to competing requirements that a city has. It is fairly common in other communities.

Ms. Aldean said for example, if 10 percent of the retail space or the mixed-use space can be an accessory use to the primary use. That way it takes in gymnasiums, project offices, and lobbies if it's an accessory use and that accessory language as well. That would give staff some latitude and would limit the number of options that would be available if it has to be accessory.

Mr. Marshall suggested staff take that as direction and discuss that with the project review team.

Mr. Hoenigman said if staff says it's not a big deal that's fine but he doesn't want to stop any projects that otherwise, we would like to see happen.

Ms. Gustafson agreed and said that the public is very skeptical that we'll require this, but then at some point it will transition into private property, first floor closed off and no rooftop bar and it's just residential. How do we incentivize some activation? To the non-developer side that wants to see activation somewhere on the property if they're going to be in the downtown town center where we're trying to promote that pedestrian activity. We have a lot of things closed off, so, what else could we do?

Mr. Hoenigman agreed. We want this to happen, but we can't force people to do things. There's some direction for staff to tell us if we need to build in some kind of flexibility and if so, what that flexibility could look like and put some bounds on it.

Mr. Stock said one other point of flexibility that didn't come up in the presentation is we have the option for 60 percent of nonresidential to be either 60 percent of the building frontage or 60 percent of the first floor. That was intended to help address Irregular lot sizes and irregular lot shapes as well.

Public Comments

Steve Teshara said this set of amendments is pretty focused on building design development. A lot of his work with Sustainable Community Advocates and my clients is

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

April 24, 2024

to let people know what's coming down from TRPA in terms of ordinance and code changes. It's been a challenge because while it may hang together as a package in the mind of many planners, it's not necessarily so much with the general public. Some of the most astute and focused comments on this set of amendments are coming from this committee and is a tribute to the fact that you have a very diverse array of professional backgrounds, skills, and perspectives that lend themselves to a very esoteric set of amendments.

Comments that he provided to Mr. Stock regarding Code Section 22.7.6 Traffic Mitigation related to temporary activities, events, etc. He suggested that TRPA develop a form because if you're asking event producers with over 500 attendees to develop a transportation plan, having a form would provide more consistency in terms of input to staff for their review. He believes Mr. Stock took that comment to heart and would like to see some further consideration of that. Some of these events around the region are nonprofits and they don't always have a phalanx of planners and staff to develop these things. Having a form that the staff could receive with some of the similar requirements for feedback from these event planners would be extraordinarily helpful.

Summary of suggestions:

Staff received guidance to explore whether the conduit needs to be included in a repave.

Mr. Hoenigman said no, it should not.

Mr. Settlemeyer said if it were a legacy property or property that had been around for a long period of time that had sufficient parking spaces and were just repaving their lot, the cost of putting in the conduit or trying to figure out electricity to that site to someday retrofit it may be a little bit extreme. A new building may be easier to incorporate into the project.

Ms. Gustafson asked if it were correct that they would not be excavating and would just be repaving.

Mr. Settlemeyer said they would be potentially grading.

Ms. Gustafson said or to provide BMPs because there could be other requirements that kick in at that point.

Mr. Stock said the trigger for this requirement would be excavation.

Mr. Settlemeyer said he would prefer to have staff look into it or give them some discretion. For example, you decide that some of those slopes are too dangerous at the Chart House for people to be walking on an icy condition, and you want to do something safer. He hopes that we are not going to prevent that. He wants the board to have some discretion to look at some of those legacy establishments. Maybe it should be allowed to do the permit without having to retrofit to the conduit. He'd hope they would choose to, but these are his concerns with some of these older commercial sites.

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

April 24, 2024

Mr. Hoenigman said per his construction estimator, it was only hundreds of dollars per spot. If you put in the device, it's a lot more. But just running the conduit was surprisingly affordable.

Mr. Marshall said it's somewhere between repaving or fixing cracks versus if you're moving a lot of dirt then it seems to make sense at that time to put in the conduit. Maybe that's a direction.

Mr. Settelmeyer suggested leaving it to staff to make those types of judgment calls. Sometimes it's not easy to put a conduit in these areas because you may run into boulders and mountains. You may think that there's nothing there until you start to excavate it. There may be cases where an individual chose not to move a certain amount of dirt in certain areas because they found something and then just put asphalt over it. He'd leave it up to staff to make those judgment calls and provide a little bit of compromise for older legacy type lots.

Ms. Gustafson said they want to encourage people to repave and not let the pavement deteriorate and just become a mess. She suggested that it could be a percentage of expenditure. We agree that we want to get it in, but on these legacy properties, if they're just trying to make some corrections, is there some way to look at the value of the project they're doing and say not to exceed 5 or 10 percent for example. Because there are other requirements that kick in and that's why some of these people don't do anything with their properties until they get taken over.

Ms. Fink said staff has heard the concerns around this and will look to see if there are some exemptions that should be added, or a percentage of cost then bring that back.

Ms. Aldean suggested "excavating down to a certain depth."

Ms. Fink said another suggestion was to build in flexibility for lobbies or for some percentage of accessory space that might not be open to the public, that's an accessory use.

There was a recommended change for the motion detection lights stating that technology such as motion detection technology.

Add to Section 36.14.c, deed restricted affordable and moderate housing units may be substituted and nonresidential uses on the ground floor if the development still has a mixed-use component elsewhere in the building. That way it still falls within the realm of being a mixed-use project.

Mr. Hoenigman said and a comparable unit somewhere else.

Motion:

Ms. Aldean made a motion to recommend approval of the Required Findings, as described in Attachment B, including a Finding of No Significant Effect, for adoption of the Code of Ordinances amendments as described in the staff summary.

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

April 24, 2024

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Diss, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Hoenigman, Ms. Leumer,
Mr. Settelmeyer

Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Aldean made a motion to recommend adoption of Ordinance 2024-___, amending Ordinance 87-9, to amend the Code of Ordinances as shown in Attachment A as amended on the record.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Diss, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Hoenigman, Ms. Leumer,
Mr. Settelmeyer

Motion carried unanimously.

- IV-VI. Discussion and possible recommendation on the update of the threshold carrying capacities (threshold standards) for restoration of stream environment zones, SC11-SC13; Discussion and possible recommendation on the update to the Tahoe Yellow Cress threshold standard, VP21; Discussion and possible recommendation on the update of the Aquatic Invasive Species threshold standards, WQ9-WQ14

Mr. Segan provided the presentation.

Mr. Segan said threshold standards or environmental threshold carrying capacities is a term provided in the Compact which also defines the role of threshold standards within our system. Those standards reside at the top of the regulatory system so everything we do leads back to these thresholds and achieving them.

They are not just TRPA's goals; they are the goals of the entire partnership of the environmental program. They are written into laws like the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act, which directs us to consider threshold gains as funds are allocated through the act.

The proposals being discussed today are not new, they've been discussed at the Advisory Planning Commission, the Threshold Update Initiative Stakeholder Working Group which is appointed by the board and led by the APC, as well as the EIP subcommittees that developed the proposals.

The proposals today are all rooted in the work of the Tahoe Science Advisory Council, which initiated a broad review of environmental goals for restoration programs. They looked at nine programs throughout the country and provided us with broad guidance for what we should be doing as we update our threshold standards.

First is that we should be clear where thresholds lie within our system. Thresholds are not the actions we want to take, nor are they the immediately measurable outputs of those actions. They are long-term goals. For example, the goal is lake clarity. That should be the threshold standard. We shouldn't set threshold standards for the means to achieve that, like street sweeping, or the immediate outcomes of such actions, like the amount of particle recovery. Threshold standards set the long-term vision, and then we adaptively manage towards them.

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

April 24, 2024

The Science Council also emphasized that the goals we set for ourselves must be specific and measurable. We're not setting standards like "Tahoe should be clear" or "Tahoe should be as clear as I remember it." We need to have a specific and measurable objective, like 100 feet of clarity that we can objectively evaluate, and anyone can determine where we stand relative to this standard.

The three proposals today were developed in partnership with the Environmental Improvement Program. The Tahoe Interagency Executive (TIE) Committee has several subcommittees organized into different focus areas. The Tahoe Yellow Cress Adaptive Management Working Group, the Aquatic Invasive Species Coordinating Committee, and the Tahoe Watershed Improvement Group are the origins of the standards being reviewed today.

Stream Environment Zone (SEZ) includes all things that owe their characteristics to the presence of water such as wetlands, fens, meadows, and riparian areas. It's a broadly inclusive term. Way back when the original threshold standards were adopted, we established a goal for SEZ restoration of 1,100 acres basin wide. We identified at the time that this was 25 percent of disturbed SEZ within the region that were critically important to restoring the health of our watershed. The good news is we've hit that target and gone beyond it because we also do things called enhancements that don't qualify as full restoration. There are 45 partners listed in the Environmental Improvement Program that contributed to stream environment zone restoration over the last 40 years. These are the reasons we attained this target.

There's more in establishing a new way to measure the quality of the restoration that we do by addressing what a peer reviewer said is don't just count the acres you restore but count the quality of the restoration you do. We engaged in a multi-year effort that resulted in what is called the SEZ condition index, to measure the quality of the work that we do. It takes into account a number of individual factors or underlying factors and those are summed up. Then we get an overall score for every individual SEZ within our region. We then multiply that score by the total area of the SEZ and get the overall contribution of that SEZ to our regional SEZ quality score. This is all available on the SEZ viewer on the TRPA website.

Working with the Watershed Improvement Group, we proposed a ground-up way of establishing a new restoration target for SEZs that asks the individual partners to identify projects they think should be implemented. We added those to all the projects already in LT Info in the project tracker, whether or not they were funded. Then we arrive at the goal proposed before you today, which is to increase the total score from 79 percent where we stand today, to 88 percent of the regional possible value, to a minimum of 100 percent to clarify that restoration beyond that target would be consistent with the threshold standard.

Tahoe Yellow Cress is a small plant that's a member of the mustard family and is endemic to the shorelines of Lake Tahoe and only lives here. Concerns about Tahoe Yellow Cress have been present since about 1974, primarily due to trampling or development over it. The first management plan for Tahoe Yellow Cress was developed around the year 2000, and our standard for that was adopted after three years of surveying. Our current standard says that we would like 26 population sites, which is just over the maximum

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

April 24, 2024

number of population sites observed in the first three years of surveys. Since those surveys began and have been conducted regularly, we've learned that it is highly influenced by lake level.

One of the amendments before you today is to align our threshold standard with the conservation strategy for this species and the imminent extinction strategy. There are two changes primarily that we make here. The first is maybe a small one, but very important to the group. Previously, we referred to population sites. The text now refers to survey sites because the notion of a population site is not well-defined within Tahoe Yellow Cress ecology. It's often hard to determine when one population ends and what the next one begins. Second, we're aligning our expectations for the number of occupied survey sites to lake levels. We expect more occupied sites when the lake is low and fewer when the lake is high. The three zones are consistent with the conservation strategy and the imminent extinction plan for the species.

There are two parts to our Aquatic Invasive Species program: Prevention and Control. The proposed modifications to the threshold standards do not provide any changes to the prevention program. They're all directed at the control program, which is guided by these six statements. None of which have specific or measurable targets.

The Tahoe Science Advisory Council pointed out that none of these were specific and measurable and said that these are really more broad goal statements or visionary statements that should guide a program but are not consistent with establishing specific and measurable targets.

There are two standards being proposed today. One relates to the lake itself, and the second relates to the Tahoe Keys. Both are drawn directly from the programmatic documents that are guiding management in those areas today. The notion of all known sites in surveillance category, as many of you probably know, once you have an aquatic invasive species in the lake, it is nearly impossible to eradicate it. It requires constant vigilance. The surveillance category means that we've controlled the infestation to a level that a dive team can go there and within a day, get that site back down to zero if and when they find species. It's basically no species, no aquatic invasive plant infestations in the lake on any given day. The 75 percent reduction of aquatic invasive plant abundance within the Tahoe Keys is consistent with the goal of the control methods test and division there.

Presentation: [Regional-Planning-Committee-Agenda-Item-No-4-6-Recommendation-on-Threshold-Standard-Update.pdf](#)

Committee Comments

Mr. Hoenigman said it's great that we're updating these standards. Is this a regular process?

Ms. Regan said yes, we have a lot of standards. We feel these are ready and have been vetted thoroughly. Last year at our strategic planning session, we had a fully separate initiative called the Threshold Update Initiative and we were running multiple tracks on that, but the direction from the board was this should be incorporated into the policy

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

April 24, 2024

side. We shouldn't have this initiative going on in a vacuum. Staff are prioritizing the needs and the ability for us to find consensus around these. We've worked with the Science Council. The creation of the Tahoe Science Advisory Council was to help us in this quest to update these many standards.

Mr. Segan said the next set of updates is a suite in the works for our water quality and forest health standards. We've been working to align both our performance metrics, performance health, and then align those with our overall threshold standards.

Mr. Hoenigman said it's amazing news that we hit some standards and we're doing well. As we set these new future goals, it's important for us to show in our information that we hit the original standard and we've created an even more aspirational ambitious standard. We have to ensure that the message is not lost and what we're doing is successful.

Mr. Settelmeyer said based on the old standard, we're meeting it by 110 percent by the new standard for example and that way we can show that we increased our standards.

Mr. Hoenigman asked if we have a threshold for affordable housing or housing in general for the basin. It seems like it's something that people weren't really thinking about when TRPA was formed.

Ms. Regan said we don't have an affordable threshold standard, but we did add a Sustainable communities standard with the Transportation Sustainable Communities category. We often get questions about the economy but don't have a threshold standard per se for the economy an economic revitalization but the amendment to the Compact that moved through the two states and ratified by Congress makes sure that we consider economic conditions when we do regional planning. A lot of things are embedded but it's an overlap with so many of our land use policies.

Public Comment

None.

Motion

Mr. Settelmeyer made a motion to recommend approval of the required findings (Attachment B) including a finding of no significant effect.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Hoenigman, Mr. Settelmeyer

Absent: Ms. Diss, Ms. Leumer

Motion carried.

Mr. Settelmeyer made a motion to recommend adoption of Ordinance 2024-___, amending Ordinance 2019-02 (Attachment A), updates to the threshold standards for 1) Stream Environment Zone (SEZ) restoration, 2) Aquatic Invasive Species control, and 3)

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

April 24, 2024

Tahoe Yellow Cress conservation with the correction of the typographical error in Special Standard VP22.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Hoenigman, Mr. Settlemeyer

Absent: Ms. Diss, Ms. Leumer

Motion carried.

III. UPCOMING TOPICS

Ms. Fink said we'll have some area plan amendments coming forward, both applicant-initiated and initiated by the local jurisdictions. As part of these, be getting the first area plans that will be incorporating the affordable and workforce housing amendments that the board approved in December.

Some of these have already come forward with informational hearings in the past and will now be coming forward for recommendations for approval. The City of South Lake Tahoe will be bringing forward the Tahoe Valley Area Plan and Tourist Core Area Plan amendments in July for a recommendation for approval. These are the city-initiated amendments to increase opportunities for housing and alignment with the state of California legislation and some compatibility with the general improvements.

In May, the city will also be coming forward with an amendment to their Tourist Core Area Plan to rezone a parcel from recreation to tourist center mixed-use. That's the parcel that was formerly the site of the Colony Inn.

Finally, there will be two separate amendments coming forward to the Douglas County South Shore Area Plan. Those will be coming forward in June for informational hearings and coming back for a recommendation in September. One is to incorporate the affordable and workforce housing amendments and the other is to create a health services sub-district to accommodate the Barton Stateline medical facility.

X. COMMITTEE MEMBER REPORTS

None.

XIII. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

None.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Aldean moved to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Hoenigman adjourned the meeting at 4:55 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

April 24, 2024

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Marja Ambler".

Marja Ambler
Clerk to the Board

The above meeting was recorded in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the recording of the above-mentioned meeting may find it at <https://www.trpa.gov/meeting-materials/>. In addition, written documents submitted at the meeting are available for review. If you require assistance locating this information, please contact the TRPA at (775) 588-4547 or virtualmeetinghelp@trpa.gov.