



Mail
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449-5310

Location
128 Market Street
Stateline, NV 89449

Contact
Phone: 775-588-4547
Fax: 775-588-4527
www.trpa.org

MEMORANDUM

Date: September 16, 2015

To: Regional Plan Implementation Committee

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan (PCTBAP) and Tahoe City Lodge Project, Discussion and Possible Direction on Alternatives to be included within the Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Requested Action: This is an informational item. Staff requests the Regional Plan Implementation Committee (RPIC) review and provide comments on the range of alternatives for consideration in the PCTBAP and Tahoe City Lodge Project EIR/EIS.

Background: Placer County has developed a Draft PCTBAP in coordination with TRPA staff and stakeholders. The Draft PCTBAP covers the entire Tahoe Basin portion of Placer County and focuses on implementation of the TRPA Regional Plan, primarily involving Town Center redevelopment incentives. A Draft Area Plan and Code, and a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for environmental documents, were released for public review and comment from June 3 – August 3, 2015. Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report and Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) is underway and plan adoption is anticipated in 2016 by the Placer County Board of Supervisors and TRPA Governing Board. The draft PCTBAP and associated background documents are available online at:

<http://www.placer.ca.gov/departments/communitydevelopment/planning/tahoebasinareaplan>

During preparation of the PCTBAP, TRPA and Placer County received an application for the Tahoe City Lodge Project, which would redevelop an existing commercial complex into a 120-unit lodge within Tahoe City. TRPA and Placer County are preparing a joint EIR/EIS that would evaluate both the PCTBAP and the Tahoe City Lodge Project in order to maximize efficiency and to allow the Tahoe City Lodge Project to provide a specific example of the implementation of PCTBAP standards.

Alternatives Concepts: Conceptual alternatives have been developed for evaluation in the EIR/EIS pursuant to both TRPA and CEQA requirements. TRPA Code (Sec 3.7.1) requires that an EIS “study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action for any project that involves unresolved conflicts...” Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines specifies that an EIR “shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project... which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project...”, and that an EIR

“shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project...”

Therefore, the conceptual alternatives include variations in plan and project features intended to avoid or reduce possible significant environmental effects. The alternatives also address specific comments and concerns raised during public scoping.

Four conceptual alternatives have been developed for the PCTBAP, and four conceptual alternatives have been developed for the Tahoe City Lodge Project. For purposes of the EIR/EIS analysis, each PCTBAP alternative has been paired with a Tahoe City Lodge Project alternative. The resulting four alternatives each include a variation on the PCTBAP and the Tahoe City Lodge Project. An overview of the themes of the alternatives is provided in Attachment A, and a comparison of the major differences between the alternatives is included in Attachment B. The conceptual alternatives include the following:

- **Alternative 1: Proposed Area Plan/ Proposed Lodge:** This alternative would include the proposed PCTBAP, which focuses on implementing the Regional Plan and includes several substitute standards and map revisions intended to better achieve the Area Plan’s objectives. The proposed PCTBAP would be paired with the proposed Tahoe City Lodge Project, which includes 120 tourist accommodation units and 4 story buildings.
- **Alternative 2: Area Plan with No Substitute Standards/ Reduced Scale Lodge:** This alternative would implement provisions of the Regional Plan, but would not include substitute standards or map revisions that were not specifically contemplated in the Regional Plan or its EIS. This alternative would respond to public scoping comments and would avoid any environmental impacts associated with map revisions or substitute standards proposed in the draft PCTBAP. This alternative would be paired with a reduced-scale Tahoe City Lodge Project that would include a smaller project area and less than half the number of tourist accommodation units included in the proposed PCTBAP and analyzed in Alternative 1.
- **Alternative 3: Reduced Intensity Area Plan/ Reduced Height Lodge:** This alternative would reflect a modified version of the proposed PCTBAP with targeted adjustments to reduce possible effects on scenic resources, housing, Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) and associated impacts, and water quality. This alternative would be paired with a reduced-height lodge alternative that includes the same number and mix of tourist accommodation units as the proposed Tahoe City Lodge Project, but within 3 story buildings. Both the Reduced Intensity Area Plan and the Reduced Height Lodge project seek to reduce impacts on the resources that are most likely to be affected, and respond to scoping comments.
- **Alternative 4: No Project:** This alternative would include no Area Plan. The existing 6 Community Plans, 51 Plan Area Statements and Placer County zoning regulations would remain unchanged. This alternative would be paired with the no Tahoe City

Lodge alternative that would reflect likely future use of the existing structures on the project site.

TRPA staff and Ascent Environmental, the environmental review consultant, will provide an overview presentation on the conceptual alternatives, and request feedback from RPIC members.

For additional information, contact or Lucia Maloney, Senior Planner, at (775) 589-5324 or LMaloney@TRPA.org; Adam Lewandowski, Ascent Environmental Senior Planner, at (702) 596-5957 or Adam.Lewandowski@ascentenvironmental.com; or Crystal Jacobsen, Placer County Principal Planner at (530) 745-3085 or CJacobse@placer.ca.gov.

Attachments:

Attachment A – Alternative Theme Comparison

Attachment B – Alternative Summary Comparison Table

Attachment A: Alternative Theme Comparison

Alternative Concepts

Alternative 1 Proposed Area Plan/ Proposed Lodge	Alternative 2 Area Plan with No Substitute Standards/ Reduced Scale Lodge	Alternative 3 Reduced Intensity Area Plan/ Reduced Height Lodge	Alternative 4 No Project
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Placer County proposed Area Plan • Implements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RPU mixed-use and compact land use concept - Contains substitute standards and map changes not analyzed in RPU EIS • Proposed Tahoe City Lodge project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responds to certain scoping comments • Consistent with effects contemplated in RPU EIS • Avoids potential impacts associated with substitute standards • Use of existing standards would result in reduced scale Lodge alternative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modified versions of changes in Area Plan • Responds to certain scoping comments • Responds to Plan Team input related to height • Adjustments to reduce potential effects relative to Alt 1. Targets reductions to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Air Quality - GHG - Scenic - VMT - Water quality (coverage) • Further promotes affordable housing • Reduced height Lodge to minimize potential scenic impacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Area Plan • Does not fully implement RPU • Community Plans and PASS remain unchanged • No Lodge, property to remain commercial center

Themes for each Alternative

Attachment B: Alternative Summary Comparison Table

Alternatives Comparison	Alternative 1 Proposed Area Plan/ Proposed Lodge	Alternative 2 Area Plan with No Substitute Standards/ Reduced Scale Lodge	Alternative 3 Reduced Intensity Area Plan/ Reduced Height Lodge	Alternative 4 No Project
AREA PLAN				
Coverage Limits in Town Centers (Max Transferred Coverage)	Up to 50% within 300' of the lake; up to 70% elsewhere	Same as Alt 1	50% max on all parcels	Up to 70% on vacant parcels; up to 50% on redeveloped parcels
Height Limits in Town Centers (Max Height)	56' in core areas 46' in transition areas (subject to special plan area and scenic limits)	Same as Alt 1	<u>Tahoe City TC:</u> Similar to Alt 1, except height limited to 46' lakeside of SR 28 <u>Kings Beach TC:</u> 48' mountainside of SR 28 36' lakeside of SR 28 <u>North Stateline TC:</u> 48' mountainside of SR 28 36' on lakeside of SR 28; CalNeva at 48'	42'
Max Number of Stories	<u>Inside Town Centers</u> 4 stories in core areas, 3 stories in transition areas <u>Outside Town Centers</u> Number of stories controlled by height limits	Same as Alt 1	<u>Inside Town Centers</u> <u>Tahoe City TC:</u> 3 stories <u>Kings Beach/North Stateline TCs:</u> Number of stories controlled by height limits <u>Outside Town Centers</u> <u>West Shore</u> 2 stories for Sunnyside and Tahoma 2 stories for Homewood, except 3 stories in specific areas <u>Tahoe Vista/Carmelian Bay:</u> 3 stories mountainside of SR 28 2 stories lakeside of SR 28	Number of stories controlled by height limits

Alternatives Comparison	Alternative 1 Proposed Area Plan/ Proposed Lodge	Alternative 2 Area Plan with No Substitute Standards/ Reduced Scale Lodge	Alternative 3 Reduced Intensity Area Plan/ Reduced Height Lodge	Alternative 4 No Project
Density Limits in Town Centers	Tourist: 40 Residential: 25 (subject to special plan area limits)	Tourist: 40 Residential: 25	Similar to Alt 1, except residential density can be increased up to 25% for affordable housing	Tourist: 15-40 Residential: 15
Map Designations				
Tahoe City Town Center Boundary Change	Yes	No	Yes	No
Updated Uses in Mixed-Use Areas	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
New Special Planning Areas	Yes	No	Yes (with additional environmental performance standards)	No
CFA Conversion to TAU'S	Yes (with limitations; max 400 units)	No	Yes (Similar to Alt 1, except limited to max 200 units and size of TAU)	No
Non-contiguous project areas	Yes	No	Yes	No
Secondary Housing on < 1 acre	Market rate within 0.25 mile of transit subject to limitations (requires allocation + dev right)	Deed-restricted affordable allowed with proposed TRPA-certified housing program (TRPA bonus unit incentive applies)	Market rate allowed wherever residential is allowed (requires allocation + dev right)	Not allowed (County does not have a TRPA-certified housing program)

Alternatives Comparison

Alternative 1 Proposed Area Plan/ Proposed Lodge		Alternative 2 Area Plan with No Substitute Standards/ Reduced Scale Lodge		Alternative 3 Reduced Intensity Area Plan/ Reduced Height Lodge		Alternative 4 No Project	
TAHOE CITY LODGE							
Uses on Lodge Property	Hotel rooms	40 units	56 tourist units (mix TBD) Commercial use (mix TBD)	Similar to Alt 1, but limited to 3 stories with larger footprint	Retain and rehabilitate the center under existing rules. No additional CFA; existing CFA verified at 33,800 sf. Increase in occupancy rates through renovation.		
	1-bedroom suites	30 units					
	2-bedroom suites	50 units					
	Total	120 units					
	Restaurant	3,840 sf					
	Lobby	636 sf					
	Terrace/pool/bar (Roof Top)	6,587 sf					
Tahoe City Golf Course Clubhouse							
Relocation and expansion?	Yes	No	Yes	No			
Clubhouse size	6,738 sf	Same as Alt 4	Same as Alt 1	2,880 sf			