



Incline Village Crystal Bay Citizens Advisory Board

DRAFT: Approval of these draft minutes, or any changes to the draft minutes, will be reflected in writing in the next meeting minutes and/or in the minutes of any future meeting where changes to these minutes are approved by the CAB.

Minutes of the Incline Village/Crystal Bay Citizens Advisory Board meeting held via teleconference on July 5, 2022

1. CALL TO ORDER/ DETERMINATION OF QUORUM - Diane Becker opened the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

Members in attendance included: Denise Davis, Kevin Lyons, Judith Simon, Diane Becker, Chris Wood, and Roxanna Dunn (alternate)

Kathie Julian was appointed to Board of Adjustment and Chris Wood was appointed at-large CAB member.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - Diane Becker led the Pledge.

3. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT –

Sarah Schmitz said I know the public comment isn't intended to be interactive, but Tahoe Regional Planning Agency representatives and Commissioner Hill are here. I know the application for 947 Tahoe Blvd. was approved; when I reviewed it, it seemed the answers to questions were inaccurate. The section specifically impacts to Recreational Facilities. And they responded on it that they would have no impact on Recreational Facilities. Considering Ordinance 7, there could potentially be up to 400 recreation passes allotted to these properties. If they incorrectly responded to those questions on the impact it has on the application, I'd like someone to could get back to me about that question.

Debbie Nicolaus said my comment is regarding the proposed location for the dog park. I had a couple of concerns. The current dog park is located in an area bordered on all sides with commercial properties and has two extensive parking areas. My concern is this other parcel is located with three sides boarding residential and the other side boarding Village Blvd. which is an extremely busy street, as we all know. People drive fast on that road. There will be interactions with pedestrians, animals, and cars. I understand the Bear League has come out against this location because the wildlife has a safe place with a stream. That is my two cents on that. I wonder if it will be on a future agenda.

Ann Nicols said when I was at a TRPA meeting, I was disappointed that Jeff Collin or Alexis Hill hadn't warned us 947 Tahoe Blvd. was going to be on a consent calendar which is usually reserved for items that are not continuous. There was no warning for the public, and left us dangling. She said she had made numerous complaints about piles of dirt that weren't covered and holes in the ceiling. There is garbage, a dumpster, and furniture on the site. We have complained about the debris, garbage, and uncovered dirt. If we had a property like this, we would be in trouble.

4. CHAIR / VICE CHAIR ELECTIONS – CAB members will nominate and elect the IVCB CAB chair and vice-chair. (ACTION ITEM)

MOTION for Chair: Chris Wood nominated Diane Becker for Chair. Kevin Lyons seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

MOTION: Diane Becker nominated Kevin Lyons for Vice Chair. Kevin Lyons agreed. Chris Wood seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

5. INCLINE VILLAGE JUSTICE COURT UPDATE – Kate Thomas, Assistant County Manager, will provide a brief update on the transition of the Incline Justice Court on Tahoe Blvd. to the community Center on Alder Avenue. (Non-Action Item)

Kate Thomas said I wanted to give a brief verbal update on the Incline Village Justice Court renovations and move. Most of you are familiar with the existing location; it's been there for a long time. And in 2021, we were notified that the owner intends to sell. And we were asked to negotiate a lease that was not as long as the one we've been enjoying. So we currently have a lease through September of this year. As such, we started to explore where we might put the Justice Court. I've been working with Judge Tiras for some time on online courts; we worked together during the pandemic to make sure that folks have access to justice. He's a big proponent, actually made me read a horribly boring but very effective book called online court and access to justice. And so he and I had lots of conversations about how to continue court functions, but virtually in a physical environment.

So long story short, we decided to combine the Justice Court with the existing site that we have for the community center that I know most of you are familiar with. That's 855 Alder Avenue. As those of you who have been in town, are aware, that location has previously been occupied by several county functions, the United States Forest Service TRPA, and others. During the pandemic, the Forest Service had shown interest in vacating the property, they have moved their functions to be mostly online. And so we went through the process of terminating the lease with the Forest Service in preparation for moving the justice court over to that location. We will enjoy having Justice court share that location that currently houses several human service agency functions and the senior center and the community center is that we will have full-time staff there now with the combination. So we feel the ability to open that facility up to the community as it was intended is going to be increased. So it's sort of a win-win with the Justice Court and their existing staff helping the human services agency that does not have full-time staff in Incline Village to provide services and a location for the community to enjoy. So that being said, we have been going through the construction planning process and architectural process. After several walkthroughs and iterations, we've come up with a nice facility layout, which basically has our court configured in the middle area for those of you who have been in the building. And you all know it is the former library site. So the courtroom will be in the middle area with some modular judicial components so that we can move them around. And we're going to have some court clerk areas with service windows providing lots of access for the public. There's adequate parking in that location, which is great. And we will have the southern edge offices configured for the judge in his judicial offices. We're going to be putting in more robust electrical and data systems so that we can increase that access to justice I talked about with online court. Then in the future, it'll provide us some opportunities if the court does combine at some point with a project with the sheriff's office. I know that it's been talked about in that area. So really, what we wanted to do was maximize the existing space; we had to create a safe and effective court project so that we can have lots of access for the public when and if there are jury trials in there, it will be adequate for that. And so we work constable judge Tiras space for support security, we've included human services agencies so that they can have existing offices and spaces there,

continue and actually have increased utilization, which will be great. And then we're going to do like I said, some things just they have to do some wall framing and some HVAC modifications, as well as court furniture. Some doors are back-ordered. So the project, including the soft costs, which the stock price or your contractor costs, you've got your permits, you've got the furniture, fixtures, and equipment that data, the architecture, and engineering fee that comes in the right about between \$600,000-700,000.00. So somewhere in there, we're hoping it's not cheap to do this stuff on the lower end. But at the same time, we want to do a project that again allows us the long term continuation of that facility for Washoe county, the members of that community. So with that, that's my quick verbal overview. I'd love to answer any questions that you might have about the facilities or how it will quote you work.

Chair Becker said thank you so much, Kate. I do have two questions that are more requests, than questions. I had spent quite a bit of time at the community center with TRPA representatives when TRPA was still occupying a room in the center. And we were never able to get decent internet. The TRPA representative said that that building could not get decent internet. I do know there are new extended services. So could one of the things you look at be to ensure we have very good internet service there? Because I think one of the most important things about good access to justice is that the internet is workable, especially when you're doing internet filings. And the second thing I would ask is, could the Incline library have one terminal for local residents to do legal research on westlaw, even if it was just one or two days a week of online legal research so that we could do it up in Incline. I do a fair amount of legal research on different community projects, and every time I do, I have to drive down to Reno, which is difficult in the winter. And if that would be possible. I think those of us who'd like to use the legal research service would even prefer to pay a fee to use it in the local library rather than drive down to Reno to use it. So both of those would be requests to think about.

Kate Thomas said Thank you, Diane. And yes, wrapped into this. Us the electrical and the data and corresponding electrical. As far as the Law Library goes, let me explore that. I know. I will look into the law library for sure. We have law library grants that we have received down here and have expanded our facilities in this area. So I'll see what we can do.

Denise Davis said I just had a question. To clarify, once the court moves to that building, is there any other public use of that building? Ms. Thomas said yes, we anticipated having the same public use that we have right now with the cards game rooms, and we expect to have more use of that facility in addition to the court function. And we're open if you have suggestions for additional opportunities there since we will have staff

Chris Wood asked whether you have a deadline by which this work needs to be done. Ms. Thomas said as soon as I get done by September, October, but with the reality of the supply chain, we're looking at probably at the end of the calendar year.

Chair Becker asked what that means if you can't get it done until the end of the calendar year and you're supposed to be out by September, will the current landlord allow the Court to stay there? So we still have some court facility here, or will there be none during that interim? Ms. Thomas said we are working with the current property owner to do a month-to-month lease. They were not interested in a longer-term lease because they felt it would inhibit the sale of the property. So they've been very amenable to doing month to month. We don't anticipate having to seize court options. Worst case scenario, we would do online court for a couple of months until we were up and functioning. Depending on where we are with construction at the Alder Avenue location, we could also do some limited capacity stuff. So I

hope that helps.

Kathy Julian said just a suggestion. And maybe I'm blind, but I don't see very good signage at that building. So it's always been a mystery to me what is in that building? And I knew there was something to do with seniors in that building. But I don't see very good signage boards. So I would encourage you to improve the signage, so we know exactly what's there. Kate Thomas said we do have exterior improvements with signage and wayfinding graphics that will hopefully greatly improve knowing what that building is and what functions are there for ease of use.

6. TRPA'S TAHOE HOUSING AND COMMUNITY REVITALIZATION INITIATIVE – Karen Fink, AICP, Housing Program Manager/Housing Ombudsperson, will present an overview of TRPA's Tahoe Living Housing and Community Revitalization Initiative, regional housing goals, and progress to-date, including recent and proposed policy changes. (Non-Action Item)

Karen Fink acknowledged the participants in the working group and those who attended the meetings.

She said "Why is TRPA Looking at Housing?" TRPA's regional plan has three specific housing goals identified. And two of them are related to providing sufficient, affordable, moderate-income housing. And the third one is the one that I've put up here. And it says that TRPA should update our policies and ordinances if necessary to achieve state, local, and regional housing goals. So this is where our regional plan directs us to work with local communities to help provide that sufficient amount of housing in accordance with their local goals. And that's really important for local communities to have sufficient housing to thrive and support local businesses and communities as a whole. And then further, residential development influences other key regional plan goals like reducing vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions. The location of residential development is critical to that goal in particular, as well as meeting water quality goals. So having compact development, so we're reducing runoff to the lake and also supporting viable transit.

And then this slide, "Regional Housing Need to 2026," here shows some of the overall regional housing needs. And the Tahoe living working group is oriented around finding ways to help the region meet approximately this amount of housing. And so, the Tahoe Prosperity Center and Placer County have conducted regional housing needs assessments that have identified how much affordable, moderate, workforce housing is needed by 2026 to meet local needs. And you can see the South Shore and Placer need about 1800 homes over the next three to five years. And Washoe Tahoe housing needs assessment showed in need of about 785 homes, and these could be new homes, or there could be homes that are provided from the existing housing stock that is maybe pulled back from homes currently being used as second homes. And these numbers are the number of homes needed for households who can't afford the homes the market is currently providing.

So the region has been making progress toward providing new housing. And since August of 2020, we kind of looked back to August of 2020 to see new housing that's been brought online recently or permitted. And we found that since August 2020, 112 new rental units have been constructed or operationalized. And then, another 305 income-restricted units were permitted by TRPA. And those will be constructed in the next two years approximately. And then in addition to that, TRPA has received applications for another 116 units of rental or deed or income-restricted housing. So those are units that are in the pipeline. So, this is about 500 units, about 10% of the total housing need I showed in the last slide. So that's

starting to move along towards the goal, but it's not enough to meet the total housing need.

And the next few slides just show some of the issues we've been noticing with housing lately and some of the problems we're trying to manage and understand. So the Tahoe Prosperity Centers Envision Tahoe report showed that in 2021, the median home price region-wide was approaching \$1 million. So a resident household would need an annual income of \$264,000 to afford the price of a home in the basin. And then another thing we've really been looking at is a trend of increasing home size. So this slide here is specific to Washoe County, some data that we have from the Washoe Tahoe housing needs assessment, but this is a trend that we see region-wide that homes are becoming larger and larger. So over the last ten years in Washoe County, about 70% of the new homes built in the Washoe Tahoe area were classified by the Washoe County Assessor as high-value homes, and their average size was 5,000 square feet. So that's much larger than what most working households need. And so this also is kind of where TRPA is, is trying to look at our regulations in particular, and trying to understand to what extent our regulations are kind of encouraging this trend of large homes. In June of this issue, the TRPA governing board, in June of 2020 appointed this working group, the Tahoe living housing and community revitalization working group, to address the regional aspects of this issue. It's a committee of our advisory Planning Committee, where we house working groups or committees with a technical focus. And so, the stakeholders that served on this committee represent groups of people that are either impacted by the housing situation or have expertise in trying to provide affordable and workforce housing in the Tahoe Basin. And the group meets every three to four months as needed to advise staff as we're developing proposals. And as I mentioned, this is the group where Judy Simon and Eric Young serve on this and serve the working group. We do have representatives from each of the local governments on the working group; we have four Governing Board members, two from the regional planning implementation committee, and two from the local government and Housing Committee. We have representatives from the affordable housing development community, the building community, social services, the environmental community, realtors, etc. And so, early on, as this group started rolling, the staff brought some technical analysis to the group. And the group provided input on that, where we were really looking at the costs components, which are part of what it costs to build affordable housing in the Tahoe basin, and which elements of these can TRPA have a role in changing improving. And so these areas that you see on the screen are the priority actions that the working group identified, where TRPA could have the biggest impact either in providing the newest, affordable, and workforce housing units or in most significantly reducing the cost to build new units. So the near-term items that the group identified were to increase flexibility for accessory dwelling units and also looked at our density regulations because our analysis really showed that by providing more units on a parcel, particularly when that's paired with reducing parking requirements, that's where you could see the most significant reduction in cost for affordable housing. So last year, the group tackled some of the near-term items. So the TRPA governing board in July of 2021, approved allowing accessory dwelling units on all residential parcels on the California side. And they also approved some changes to our density regulations, particularly related to the redevelopment of old tourist properties. So they approved allowing tourist properties to grandfather in their tourist densities when converting to residential projects. So many of our older motels have really high densities, like about 100 units per acre. And if those properties were redeveloping to residential, they were forced to comply with our residential densities, which are much lower, and they were losing a lot of units. So there was no incentive to redevelop to residential just wanted to keep all those units and would remain tourist units. And now, moving forward, we are looking at continuing to work on density in this kind of phase we're in. And we're pairing that with looking at our coverage regulations. And our height regulations, particularly in town centers and areas zoned for multifamily, are trying to

understand how the combinations of these regulations could be modified to ensure that we're not hindering the development of small, more affordable units.

That's really the overview, kind of the high-level overview that I wanted to give about the work that TRPA is involved with and the housing picture as a whole throughout the basin.

And then, just to address the question that Ms. Becker raised, she asked me to cover a little bit about the differences between California and Nevada housing legislation. So I included a few bullets here in areas I'm pretty familiar with, but I'm not an expert on Nevada and California legislation. So I would encourage you to reach out to the Nevada Coalition for Housing because they advocate for housing legislation at the state level in Nevada, so they probably wouldn't be able to give you a more in-depth picture of upcoming legislation related to housing in Nevada. But just a couple of points here. So California housing legislation has had a requirement that local jurisdictions have to meet what's called the regional housing needs assessment, which means that every California city is required to provide its fair share of the state's affordable housing need. So they need to show in their general plans that they have sufficient parcels to provide affordable housing and that their zoning allows enough affordable housing to be built. More recently, California has passed legislation that requires jurisdictions to allow accessory dwelling units and duplexes on most residential parcels. And then, when development is close to transit, they require reduced parking requirements and density bonuses, just to name a few. There are other things that they have put in place as well. And then they also have some funding pots for housing projects, particularly when they're paired with transit improvements. And then Nevada Housing Law has focused on clarifying eviction proceedings and tenants' rights. Also, recently, they've allowed legislation to allow local governments to reduce impact fees for affordable housing. And they're also currently developing an affordable housing fund and others here; Commissioner Hill may have additional information to add to that in the questions and comments. So I'm happy to take any questions that people have. And if anyone is interested in tuning into the Tahoe, living, housing, and working group meetings, they're very much open to the public. And we encourage the public to participate. We have several sections devoted to public input throughout the meetings. And so you can email me, and I can add you to my email list. And I also let people know through that email list about other housing, events, and meetings that are going on related to housing at the regional level in the basin.

Judy Simon said it's been very interesting to serve on this committee because of issues in Washoe County, one of which I think people know, but in case they don't, ADUs cannot exist on parcels smaller than one acre. So that takes care of some of the issues, though, not all of it. One of the main concerns in our committee, which the Housing Committee is aware of, is that we've had a proliferation of short-term rentals. And the last thing we want to do is help people create accessory dwelling units for workforce housing that will end up being high-end tourist accommodations. So that rests with the county, rather than the Housing Committee, because the laws are so different, or maybe even the state, I'm not sure. But it's a very interesting committee. We've had good background and studies, and I urge the CAB members to look at them.

Chris Wood said one concern is the density increase and how that may increase coverage issues in the basin. TRPA is here to ensure that coverage is not maximized, that we prevent runoff into the lake, and stay very focused on Lake quality. I'm sure this is something you're going to be grappling with or have already. Can you tell us a little bit more about that? Ms. Fink said so that is one of the things we're specifically looking at right now. And what we're finding is that, so we cannot have a one-size fits all, coverage regulation, particularly in areas that are just in the vicinity of town centers where it's zoned for multifamily, but it's not a town

center. In the town center; we have some coverage incentives, where we do allow more coverage in town centers to encourage more compact development with more units, but we're really finding that outside of town centers, there are a lot of areas that are intended to have multifamily development, kind of like light density, like maybe duplexes or four plexes. But they still have to comply with the same coverage regulations that were designed for single-family homes. Such as maximum of 30% coverage of a parcel, lots of times much less. And for multifamily housing, that does not pencil for anybody who wants to build a house. So if they want to do a duplex, and you're squeezing it into that small part of the parcel, the units just come out way too small, like nobody really would want to buy a unit that's that small. We're going to be doing some analysis to determine whether we could increase the coverage and maybe the number of units that we allow on parcels in those zoned multifamily areas, we would absolutely have to mitigate that additional coverage. So that means if we allow more coverage for multifamily, we have to take it away from somewhere else, or people would have to transfer that coverage and like they do now in town centers. Or we'd have to reduce somewhere else that we allow additional coverage, or we'd have to show that our regional our major regional plan environmental analysis to see if there was more coverage than is allowed now in the basin. We'd have to see whether the additional coverage that could be added through to multifamily would be within what was already analyzed in the regional plan. Mr. Wood asked if this would lead to higher buildings because the coverage would be the same. Ms. Fink said not necessarily only if we increased our height regulations. We are looking and have heard, particularly in town centers, that height regulations are pretty limiting and maybe need to be adjusted somewhat. We've heard that we don't need any more heights in neighborhoods. And that's our analysis bears that out as well; that height becomes an issue when looking at housing developments that have six units or more. If people are interested, we will discuss this more at our July 27 governing board meeting. We will be looking at possibly changing the roof pitches that we allowed to allow more modern roof pitches, which would also be better for energy efficiency and give developers a little more flexibility in their roof pitches. And so for town centers, we're looking at that we may look at a little bit of height increase for areas that are zoned multifamily, maybe that is adjacent to town centers or along arterioles. But suppose they're really kind of like in a neighborhood. In that case, we're probably not going to be proposing additional height or some more flexibility with roof pitches, but probably not adding height in like local neighborhoods.

Mr. Wood asked about policies to encourage second home users or people who are not making their housing available. What policies might you consider? And let me narrow the scope of that question. The town of Truckee has this program of paying people to rent long term. Is that something you're looking at? Ms. Fink said TRPA tries to partner where possible and build on a set of proposals. A lot of different agencies are doing things to encourage housing, and some of those things that you're talking about that Truckee is doing, those are not really within TRPs purview; I would say that's more of something that a local jurisdiction would do. So we aren't specifically looking at like offering rents or cash incentives to rent. But that's something that we've seen. The City of South Lake Tahoe is doing a pilot program on that right now. So we kind of just trying to watch that and see how it could kind of complement things that we're working on. Mr. Wood said Washoe County would have to be the jurisdiction to offer such an incentive. Is that what they wanted to do? Ms. Fink said I think so now we're thinking about it.

Kevin Lyons said I had a kind of a quick question, kind of for baselining. So like right now, as you guys looked at it, how long does it take for a new house to be permanent? And how much does it cost? And if you want to generalize or compare El Dorado to Washoe or anything else, that'd be great. Single-family home but also you've been alluding to the taller,

smaller is how you make housing affordable. And what is the comparison there? Ms. Fink said timewise, most of our projects are a five-month timeline for permitting projects. From the time they're determined to complete, we have a 30-day review period for completeness and then 120 days to review the project. And that's for all projects. So once we get a complete project application, we should be able to permit it within 120 days. That's it, if it's a really big project and needs an EIS, that could be a longer timeframe. But generally, projects that go through the regular permitting process should take around five months. And then, as far as cost, these are sort of region-wide numbers, and within the last year or so, prices have gone up a lot, but our previous analysis was showing that even to build like a moderate density apartment building, those apartments were costing around \$590,000 to build. And so that's still pretty high. Suppose you allow more density, going from moderate to slightly higher of density. In that case, we were showing a cost reduction, I think, down to about \$530,000 per unit, which doesn't sound like a lot, but that's kind of what TRPA could do just by looking at density regulations. And that's combined with many other actions all the other partners take. So that's kind of where the prices were in about 2020. They're probably higher now. Kevin Lyons said I was asking about the permitting costs. Ms. Fink said the permitting costs kind of vary. For multifamily, we have some fee waivers. It depends on the size of the home and how much coverage they're looking at; I would say permitting and mitigation fees probably, on average, run around \$10,000 to \$20,000. And then, for your deed, if your income restricts the home, we have a lot of waivers for application fees and mobility mitigation fees. So you can save up to \$10,000 if your deed restricts the home.

Mr. Lyons asked if the 5-month timeline runs parallel to the county one. Or is that you said after it's complete? Ms. Fink said that's TRPA complete. I believe TRPA is permitting projects in Washoe County, currently. So there, that's the TRPA permit, and you still need to go to Washoe County for a building permit. And I don't know whether that can be concurrent or not. That'd be a question for Washoe County staff. Commissioner Hill said my understanding is it's concurrent. But I don't know if we have any staff to validate that. Ms. Weiche said that's correct. It's concurrent in, generally speaking, Washoe County, in the state of Nevada, has a much tighter timeframe for turning around building permits in my experience from coming from the City of Salt Lake.

Chair Becker said I do have a couple of questions. Can either Washoe County or TRPA limit ADUs to workforce housing only in Nevada? Ms. Fink said that the regulations that TRPA is passing for the most part are kind of setting the regional envelope. Then local jurisdictions can pass further, more restrictive regulations related to that in their own area plans. So Washoe County could restrict them to being used for income-restricted housing are not being used for short-term rentals.

Chair Becker asked has it been determined that that it would be enforceable under Nevada law to limit ADUs to workforce housing? Ms. Fink said I don't believe that a Nevada law dictates what communities can do with accessory dwelling units. But again, Washoe County Staff might be able to answer that better than I.

Commissioner Hill said we're looking into it still, it's not clear. We can talk about this maybe more after you get go through your q&a, but ADUs have a lot of different things that we need to look at for the concern of whether they would turn into a short-term rental. But I'm having the team look into that. Chair Becker said what's good in California and works may not work in Nevada or Washoe County. And I feel that any rush to a decision until you know the difference in what you can and cannot do is unfair to all of the residents here who already live with very restricted streets in the winter. There is no street parking in many areas, maybe in most areas and during snow removal time. On certain days, you're not allowed to park on

other days, if you park, it's risky. We desperately need workforce housing, but ADUs will likely become short-term rentals. That just is not fair to the local community. And one of the reasons I'd wanted you to do a presentation on the differences is I wanted you to see how much research there's been into what restrictions could be even put on this. Now, if we look at affordable housing in Washoe County, let's just say in Incline Village, in the past, there were a number of units that were affordable housing restricted with deed restrictions; those have all been sold as regular housing. And they're not it wasn't enforced, why wasn't it enforced? Because in California, you have this gigantic industry in affordable housing. If you do an affordable housing project in California, you have to do all this reporting to the state. I know because my sister was in that business, and I helped her set it up. And, and you have to report rents, you have to report compliance. In Nevada, there aren't enough taxes, and there isn't enough everything else to have the layers of bureaucracy in California. So you must very carefully and clearly understand the differences between the laws, the regulations, and even the availability of watching whether affordable housing is restricted to the third and fourth sale because we already know what happened here. And I'm not saying that I feel that these people who've paid these ridiculous prices today should be restricted to affordable housing; that's something for the government to do or not do. But I am saying that the likelihood of that occurring in the future unless we put in a pretty big bureaucracy that does not exist in the state is limited. So we must know if ADUs can be limited to workforce housing and if it can be enforced. The other thing is, in looking at a lot of your assumptions on ADUs, I think you have to look at them seriously. Your assumption that financing is going to limit the number of ADUs is irrelevant for Lake Tahoe, not just because of the affluence of some of the people that are building, but also because I would say everyone on this call is probably receiving multiple solicitations from Picaso, and all of the different entities that are doing different kinds of of households, and what at least two of them have sent me the possibility of doing ADUs. They pay the full cost of the ADU. They rent the ADU, and you pay them a percentage. So that really means it's just going to be another business. And we've already been told that there are limitations on what kind of enforcement can be done. And so, if you make decisions without really looking at the realities, not of what's happening in general in the world, in the country, or even in the California ADUs, it isn't going to be a limitation here. Another area I hope you'll look at is when you're assuming the number of ADUs permits, if you limit it to less than one acre, which some people probably push, but there are so many properties. But those properties if you accompany that, with reducing parking requirements, there is nowhere for those people to park. And it's not going to work for us. If you leave it all to Washoe County before they can work with the community to set up restrictions, our lives as community members, as full time residents, will continue to be made less and less of a community. So we hope you're going to look at what you can do, because we need workforce housing. But ADUs may or may not be the solution. And the third point that I wanted to make is in California, there is a lot of government money available to make apartment buildings, multi-unit apartment buildings. The workforce is not paid so much that they can afford a million-dollar home. They need rentals that they can rent. And in California, there are whole industries that do that. But that requires a major input from what would be Washoe County, a lot of money, a lot of staff, and I don't know if that's available. Until TRPA know what's available; we hope that you're not going to make proposals that are just going to say, 'well, it's not up to us; we're going to push on the county,' and the county may not be in a position to do anything. So we really appreciate it if you think about those kinds of concerns, and I don't know if they're valid. But I've been looking at this for a while and am concerned; Commissioner Hill said I think all your concerns are very valid. I want to state that TRPA has decided that many of these issues need to reside within the local government. So that is a relief. And I feel like all of the concerns you expressed, I heard, and I'm taking in because these are decisions that the county needs to make, we would have to change our area plan. We would have to change policies. And we're looking into all these things that you

brought up legitimate concerns, but in Karen's defense and TRPA defense, they are not forcing this on to us. They're not forcing it. It's something that we want to look at as our own jurisdiction. The same thing with Douglas County; they were not forced into ADUs. So I want you to know that as a local jurisdiction, we're looking at all these concerns.

Judy Simon said I just wanted to reiterate that the studies that the Housing Committee has done can serve as models for what goes on because parking is a problem all over the basin, not only in our community, but certainly in South Shore and, and everywhere else. So what we're hoping or what the hope is, those of us from Washoe and Douglas County, is that we can look at what has been successful on the California side. And then we'd have some models that Washoe County could look at.

Ann Nichols said that historically, there's been no enforcement on affordable housing in Incline Village. And I don't see how that's going to change, but the problem also is that they didn't enforce on these big projects that the workforce housing be done. And so we have now it's going to be on the public. The TRPA increased heights, density, and coverage in our 2012 regional plan. So we're going to increase it again? And we have an existing infrastructure that can't really be changed. So how is this all gonna work? We're not thinking big picture. They're just reactionary. And it's not working; it hasn't worked. I worry that TRPA is going to be changing. This is going to be very hard on our communities on traffic and her quality of life and evacuation. So we've already done it. So let's think about this critically.

Kathy Julian said I appreciate the Chairman and Chris Wood's comments on this matter. And I know that our commissioner is looking at the challenges of the differential between how Nevada handles property rights and California vis-a-vis STRs and so forth for ADUs. But just stepping back, I am not clear that ADUs are any kind of a silver bullet, although I appreciate that they can be useful if properly regulated. But it seems to me in Incline Village, we need to take an inventory of all the available lands, as limited as it is, and figure out to what extent any parcel is compatible with developing commercially operated rental housing for our workforce, such that if you're a worker there in Incline Village, you show that you're a worker. You can rent a piece of property there. Something like that would probably address some of our workforce housing issues very well. Still, we do need to see an inventory of what lands are available and then what resources might be available to encourage that kind of development, much like 786 Southwood is a purely rental property where everyone rents. The owner is in San Francisco somewhere under some corporation, but but at least it is permanently rented and you're not going to have your units sold out from under you. So I would encourage our community look; thank you very much.

Carole Black said very interesting conversation and an interesting effort. Speaking obviously, as a resident of Incline Village now. I'm picking up on Diane Becker, Kathie Julian's, and others comments. There's an issue here: we know we have workforce housing for people who want to work in the community: Teachers, service people in the commercial establishments, etc., to support the community and, frankly, keep us all safe in many cases. And there's a list of initiatives that I've heard talked about, and levers talked about being pulled with, I believe, good intention, but I'm not convinced, and listening to this. And I've been to some of the meetings; I'm not convinced that the solutions will deliver desired results. And I think that's a key issue that should be sorted out. So that when all is said and done, we aren't to take an extreme position in a situation where, for example, and it's a hot button, I understand everybody's been talking about it. We've built all these ADUs, but we still don't have housing for the people we think to need. One thing to remember, and you know, about Incline is that the income levels are sufficiently high, that the people who qualify for achievable housing are not the people we're really targeting here. They will also qualify

for affordable or, I forget what the middle ones called or achievable housing, many people are will qualify income-wise for achievable housing, but they aren't the workforce that we're talking about targeting. There's a kind of a mismatch. I sort of understand the definitions, but it's a complicated problem. And I guess my message really here is I'm not hearing solutions or levers that are clearly going to deliver the desired results, which I think most everybody shares. So the question is how best to tackle that. And I think that's the crucial issue. Otherwise, we're going to pull levers to make the change, and maybe it'll be worse, which isn't really where any of us wants to go. So back to quality improvement: data, root cause analysis, and ensure we're matching the initiatives to the outcomes we're trying to achieve.

Sarah Schmitz said a couple of things that concern me. First of all, I agree with Carole Black's comments about let's make sure that we're going to solve the problem that we want to solve. And part of my concern is that, as we're solving this problem, we have to realize there is some maximum capacity that the basin can accommodate. We have limited roads, we have limitations. And I think that we need to understand what that capacity level is. Additionally, if you speak with people who are being displaced, at least in our community, that are being displaced because of short term rentals. I understand the whole issue of property rights, but what is happening here is we're potentially trying not to deal with that and try other solutions that have other impacts and have an additional capacity burden to the basin. I think this is a very complex issue. And I agree that we need workforce housing. And I think that we have to look at it, and potentially make some very difficult decisions for the benefit of the basin, the environment, and to solve the problem truly. So I don't know, but I'm hearing people in our community who are being displaced. And that's the root cause of it. And that needs to at least be put into the discussion and the conversation about how you actually address and solve the problem we're trying to solve.

Beth and John Davidson said this question might have been talked about during the meeting. I'd like to ask about the fact that I guess the administrative offices for IVGID are going to move over to where the Rec Center is. And so when that property is vacated, can that three and a half acres be used for workforce housing? Is that in any proposal anywhere?. Ms. Fink said I don't know. We are looking to the local jurisdictions to identify publicly owned properties, which could be good housing opportunities. So that sounds like that could be something that we could look at together.

Sarah Schmitz said that at this point in time, there had not been a decision made by the board related to the administration building. I know there's been a lot of discussion over the years, but perhaps there's some confusion with the Rec Center expansion project. And the Rec Center expansion project will be moving administrative offices that reside in the Rec Center today. It is not my understanding that, at this point in time there's a plan related to a change for the general administration building on Southwood.

7. WASHOE COUNTY LEADERSHIP ACADEMY UPDATE – Candee Ramos, Community Outreach Coordinator, will provide an update regarding the Washoe County Leadership Academy. Applications are available beginning July 5 at www.washoecounty.gov/wcla/ (Non-Action Item)

Candee Ramos, Washoe County Community Outreach Coordinator, would like to give you a brief update. I know time is of the essence. Everyone has a very busy schedule. And I know that Mark has also provided a lot of introductory information to you about the Washoe County Leadership Academy. But I did want to share with you that the applications opened today. And so they will be open through August 1, 3 pm. And so, we do hope to have all of you apply to be a part of the Washoe County Leadership Academy. It's an eight-month program;

it takes place one day per month for eight months is the full day almost all of them are on a Friday, for one month is on a Thursday. We provide the bus, the lunch, all of the great information. The goal is to be a part of the community, learn more about local government works, and provide some behind-the-scenes. We're looking forward to having lots of participants, we only have a maximum of 25 spots. And we are looking to have about five individuals from each district. So that would be five people we're hoping we will be assigning to the inaugural class with the Washington County Leadership Academy from district one, where you all reside. So we really hope that you all will participate in that. I can put the websites where the application can be found in the chat. But I know you're already aware of what the Leadership Academy offers. It's in conjunction with the University of Nevada, Reno Cooperative Extension. We're very, very excited about this. So don't forget open today and closes August 1; we will be kicking off the first day on September 23. And finishing up in April. So we really do hope to see some applications from you all.

Chair Becker said I'm on the County Managers Advisory Council. The Council has visited many of the places the Leadership Academy has been visiting, and I've learned a great deal about Washoe County. The visits and information have been very educational. I would encourage anyone on this call to think about submitting an application to the Leadership Academy and to mention it to any friends who might be interested.

8. CAB BOARD MEMBER/BCC NEWS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS — This item is limited for announcements by CAB members and Commissioner Alexis Hill only*. (Non-Action Item)

Commissioner Hill said I wanted to let folks know that the county is engaging in the Incline Village path planning because of your concerns about where bicycles should go, where E-bikes should go, how to separate pedestrians and ensure that there aren't public safety issues. And so I just wanted to let you know some of the strategies we will be working on this summer, and you'll see these things pop up. We'll be installing trail counters to gather data to understand user types, measure speeds, and perceive versus actual conditions. And it will help us formulate that management strategy. And I know there are concerns of folks who obviously don't want us to outlaw E-bikes. But it's also a way for us to see, if there are conflicts between E-bikes and pedestrians. Is this something we should look at? Should we look at investment in bicycle paths on the roads, if that's the case, or what other things we should be looking at. We're also going to establish immediate slow zones within congested areas. This is going to be the first step toward trail use education. And it will have trail adequate signs. And we'll also have slow zones painted on the ground, I think that you will be seeing those pop up this summer. We just got the signs in and also the paint for the ground. And then, we'll be working to establish relationships up in the basin to also look at planning for these trails, trail docents, print and media notification signage, outreach and neighborhood support. So you'll be seeing all of those efforts unfold. But I wanted to make sure you understood what those slow zones are and what we're trying to do for Washoe County.

We have a CAB member opening because Kathie Julian is no longer on the Incline Village/Crystal Bay CAB. And so we hope that you'll apply, but I can put the link in the chat if folks are interested in applying for the CAB. And then for TTD, we have started the mobility hub committees, both online and in person. And they are the next one will be July 25 at 5:30 pm. And I hope that everyone is having a great summer. And I enjoyed coming down for the parade and the community fair this Saturday and looking forward to continuing the dialogue. Thank you.

Kevin Lyons said some of you may have seen an announcement yesterday by the Village League to have an initiative to potentially create a new city and Incline Village. And a lot of the issues that came up tonight seem like they would fit under certain things that Washoe County is unable to do or not interested in doing. And so, I encourage you to check it out. www.cityofinclinevillage.com is the link to learn more. There's a lot of good information there. So that's my announcement.

Chair Becker said If you look under the CAB agenda, there's a title that says something fun for Incline Village. There is an online map for residents to view construction projects by season. That is a pilot project that Commissioner Hill was able to have Incline Village be the first place they're going to do this pilot study for. I'm not sure how active the site is ow asit's just starting. But by sometime this summer, we'll be able to look there and see all the construction projects locally Take a look at the website address listed on there. Amy Cummings will talk about her study at the August meeting. We've asked her some questions concerning transportation issues that have come up including some very significant issues raised about the project on Tahoe Boulevard, the new condominium project. So we're going to try to get some more answers on transportation. Questions have been raised about where we're painting crosswalks and other things. So we're gonna try to have the speakers at the August meeting concentrate on transportation. And if we have time, we can cover parking issues, so you can come with your questions on Transportation and Parking at that meeting.

9. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING JUNE 6, 2022 (for Possible Action)

- Denise Davis said the June minutes don't have the actual date of the meeting.
- Judy Simon said on Mr. Beatty's comment, it should read 'Old Sacramento,' not all Sacramento. And then, on page seven, Linda Offerdahl's name is misspelled. And it should say that she is a '35 year resident' rather than a '35-year-old resident.'
- Kevin Lyons said there's an S missing on my name.

Motion: Chair Becker moved to approve the minutes of June 6, 2022 which passed unanimously in favor.

10. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT —

There were no requests for public comment.

9. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT — There were no requests for public comment.

10. ADJOURNMENT — The meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.