

**LATE DISTRIBUTION 10-27-14****BOS 10-28-14**

EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

---

**Fwd: Meyers Area Plan Input**

1 message

**The BOSFOUR** <bosfour@edcgov.us>

Mon, Oct 27, 2014 at 8:48 AM

To: EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Bruce Brant** <bbrant.b2@gmail.com>

Date: Sun, Oct 26, 2014 at 10:51 AM

Subject: Meyers Area Plan Input

To: bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosone@edcgov.us

I was heartened to read in the Tribune that the Meyers Area Plan may be moving forward again. It was extremely disturbing to attend all those meeting where a small vocal minority pushed their "progress is bad" agenda on the community. They are very good at using misinformation and fear to whip local residents into a frenzy in support of their agenda. This group, which appears to be lead by the Sierra Club, represents itself the The Myers Community. But they certainly don't represent this Meyers resident (me). Since moving to the SLT area a few years back, I have been amazed by the attitude that change itself (no matter how progressive) is bad.

I read the Meyers Area Plan from cover to cover and was impressed by all the hard work and intellectual effort that it represented. Clearly, the volunteers who put this together care deeply about Meyers and want to see the community improve. But, the nay-sayers clearly do not share this interest because they did not participate in the process - easier to just throw stones after the hard work is done by those who do care.

Please keep the faith. There are many of us who want to see Meyers develop into someplace we can be proud to say we live, someplace more than just that cruddy town we want to get through as quick as possible to get to the Lake. I understand that this will require Meyers to modernize our antiquated, restrictive regulations to make itself attractive to businesses that can help us move forward. To that end, I STRONGLY SUPPORT:

The incentive program - these types of programs have proved very successful in other areas while protecting local interests

The re-zoning - without it, the existing build-out of the east end strangles any hope of any further improvements  
The larger occupancy rates - how can businesses survive if we don't encourage some kind of lodging? (its not financially feasible with current restrictions)

The greater height allowances - this opens up up to all kinds of possibilities that are otherwise excluded and, tied to the incentives and other restrictions, protects us from overdevelopment.

Thank you for listening - Bruce Brant

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.

The January draft of the Meyers Area Plan allows major increases in the size and scale of buildings in Meyers. The One Globe Catalyst Project provides an example of what the Area Plan could allow (*in fact, p. 61 of the Catalyst report says it would meet TRPA requirements*).

- Does the community want a project of that size and scale? Or do we want something smaller or different?
- Do we want to see our local businesses prosper, or do we want to support large resorts?

There are undisputable rules we can put in the new Meyers Area Plan now, or we can rely on promises from the agencies that we'll have a say on future projects. **Why not just get the rules we want now, in black and white?**

The following blue text responds to information being circulated by the agencies to advertise the current draft of the Meyers Area Plan (January 2014).

#### **The “Catalyst Project” concept is not part of the Meyers Area Plan.**

- The Meyers Area Plan does not include any reference to specific private sector projects. The concept of the project and allowances for the extra height/density/etc. are still in the January draft of the Meyers Area Plan – the name was simply changed from “Catalyst” to “Incentive” project. (*See p. 2-13 to 2-17*)
- The Meyers Area Plan includes no provisions intended to make a large-scale development projects easier to approve. The Meyers Area Plan includes new zoning (compared to the 1993 Community Plan) that allows more height, more density (crowding), new land uses (like hotel rooms), etc., which all tend to favor larger projects (*see draft Plan, Chapter 2*);

The requirements for the “Incentive Projects” (previously known as Catalyst Projects) are also very expensive – this also favors larger projects.

#### **The Meyers Area Plan gives the local community greater control over the future of Meyers.**

- The Area Plan establishes a formal Meyers Community Advisory Council (MCAC) comprised of local residents with different backgrounds (Implementation Policy 1.2, page 7-1)  
There is no legal requirement for the agencies to vote the way the MCAC recommends; and as the 3 example projects show from the 2/6 meeting handout, communities can spend years trying to get big projects smaller and get overruled in the end.

There are no rules about who's on the MCAC – who will be on it in the future, and how can the community be guaranteed full representation?

- The MCAC would review any proposed project before it can be permitted to see if it is consistent with the policies, guidelines, and standards agreed upon in the Area plan. Yes, the MCAC will review projects to make sure they meet the Area Plan's requirements – so that's why we need to make sure the Area Plan's requirements are what the community wants.
- The agency reviewing permit applications (the County or TRPA) would be required to consider the MCACs recommendation in their project review. (Land Use and Zoning Ordinance section 70.B, page 2-15)  
Yes, but 'considering' recommendations does not mean they have to follow them.

Also, if someone applies for a permit for a project that is consistent with the Meyers Area Plan's rules, the agencies can't just say no – otherwise, they could get sued by the person who wants the project. This is another reason that getting what we want in the Area Plan's rules before it's approved matters.

- This is an improvement over the existing Community Plan under which no local review of projects is required, and projects can often be approved at a staff level or after a hearing in Placerville.  
But the existing (1993) Meyers Community Plan did not allow the taller, high-density buildings and new uses throughout most of the Meyers "Town Center" that the January draft of the Meyers Area Plan currently allows. *It's comparing apples and oranges.*

Under the draft Area Plan, even more projects can now be approved at a staff level (*as noted on the handout on 2/6; also see <http://www.trpa.org/wp-content/uploads/January-29-2014-Governing-Board-Packet.pdf> starting on page 158*).

- The Area Plan would ensure that there is a local say in any future project applications, and would ensure that public hearings are held in Meyers for any proposed project. "Local say" doesn't mean "final say."

It is unclear what the public hearings will be – either way, none of this guarantees the community will get a final say. The Counties and TRPA are not known for saying "no" to big projects when there are ways to make projects fit the regulations.

#### **The Meyers Area Plan favors small local businesses.**

- The Area Plan reserves about half of the available Commercial Floor Area (CFA) for smaller projects less than 2,500 sq. ft. (Land Use and Zoning Ordinance section 80.B & C).  
CFA can be transferred from other places, converted from other uses, etc. – something that's in TRPA's Regional Plan rules (Code Chapter 50), but which applies to the entire Basin – Meyers included.

Also, the draft Meyers Area Plan does not include much to help small businesses do upgrades, like remodeling a building so the colors and design blend into Meyers, putting solar panels on, or doing required landscaping (“BMPs”). *Regardless of how you feel about the size of future projects, let’s also talk about ways we can help our current owners do some improvements, too!*

- Under the existing Community Plan, one big project could potentially apply for all of the CFA available to Meyers. The Area Plan would ensure that cannot happen. Because CFA can be transferred, converted from other uses, or even ‘created’ in the future by the agencies (TRPA Chapter 5), this doesn’t provide any real limit.
- The Area Plan also only allows projects to receive the maximum height and density limits if they meet a series of requirements to ensure they improve walkability, benefit the environment, and provide other community benefits (Land Use and Zoning Ordinance section 90). At the same time, the Area Plan streamlines permitting for small-scale projects. Usually it’s the big resorts/large corporations who can afford to meet those extra requirements. As for the streamlined permitted, that’s not relevant to the issue of height, density, and land use changes.

### **The Meyers Area Plan reduces maximum allowable building height.**

- The existing Community Plan allows for maximum building heights of up to 48 feet in some cases (TRPA Code section 37.5.3).  
Due to rules for lower height, lower density, and limits on CFA (and other items) in the 1993 Community Plan, *this is comparing apples to oranges.*

Also, this 48 foot height was only allowed in areas the 1993 Plan identified “as being suitable for the additional height being proposed” (as stated clearly in Code section 37.5.3 noted above).

- ✓ The 1993 Plan did not identify the areas roughly south of the Lira’s parking log (E side of 50) and Chevron (West Side) as areas this extra height was allowed; but the January Meyers Area Plan allows the 45 foot height throughout the entire Meyers “Town Center” area. *It’s another apples vs. oranges comparison.*
- The Area Plan reduces maximum height limits to 35 feet for most projects, and in limited cases allows for up to 45 feet for projects that meet a series of requirements to ensure they improve walkability, benefit the environment, and provide other community benefits (Land Use and Zoning Ordinance section 70).  
*More apples and oranges.* The ‘starting point’ height under the 1993 Plan was 26 feet; TRPA’s Town Center zoning raised it to 56 feet, so the draft Area Plan is simply *less of an increase* compared to the 1993 Community Plan. **Regardless, the question now is, does Meyers want 45 foot tall (approx. 4 stories) buildings?**

### **Development potential is limited by the number of Tourist Accommodation Units (TAUs) and Commercial Floor Area (CFA) available in Meyers.**

- The Area Plan does not change development potential or authorize any new TAUs or CFA that are not already available under the existing Community Plan.  
This is irrelevant, because TRPA’s 2012 Regional Plan changes the development potential by allowing conversions of use, transfers, etc., and encouraging more of this in Town Centers.
- Only 10 new TAUs are available for use in Meyers, plus 17 TAUs banked from a previous hotel in Meyers.  
TAUs (e.g. hotel rooms) can be transferred, converted, or given as Bonus Units if TRPA decides to.
- 33,650 sq. ft. of new CFA is available for Meyers, although the Area Plan would reserve 15,000 sq. ft. of this for separate projects up to 2,500 sq. ft.  
See notes above.

**The Meyers Area Plan focuses on improving sustainability with a walkable and improved bicycle access in Meyers and getting community projects on the ground.**

1. The Area Plan includes numerous new projects to improve downtown Meyers including main street improvements along the Hwy 50 corridor to make it more pedestrian friendly, new trailheads and bike trails connecting Meyers to surrounding neighborhoods, crosswalks across Hwy 50, a welcome sign, and relocation of the bus station (Implementation Element, pages 7-3 to 7-6).  
No one is debating the draft Area Plan includes good projects.
2. Approval of the Area Plan sets the stage to get these projects going and makes them competitive to receive funding.  
Delaying the Area Plan a bit so the community can have a say doesn't seem like a stretch; but also, this Plan sets the stage for our future – **let's make sure it's a future we want for Meyers *before* it gets approved!**

For More Information, visit: <http://www.edcgov.us/Meyers/>



or, contact:

Brendan Ferry, El Dorado County  
Principal Planner  
530.573.7900  
[Brendan.ferry@edcgov.us](mailto:Brendan.ferry@edcgov.us)

Adam Lewandowski, TRPA  
Acting Long Range Planning Manager  
775.588.4547  
[alewandowski@trpa.org](mailto:alewandowski@trpa.org)

PC 10/16/14  
#1

# Meyers Residents and Business Owners Distributed by

Jennifer Quashnick  
during meeting

El Dorado County Development Services  
2850 Fairlane Court, Building "C" Placerville, CA 95667  
3368 Lake Tahoe Blvd, Room 302 South Lake Tahoe, CA

October 16, 2014

Dear Members of the El Dorado County Planning Commission:

Thank you for opportunity to provide comments regarding the process surrounding the update of the draft Meyers Area Plan. This memo aims to summarize our key issues and efforts.

First, we want to clarify that we are not against new growth. Although we came together over concerns about the large, out-of-scale developments that would be allowed by the September 2013 draft the new Meyers Area Plan, we quickly learned the public had not been well-engaged in the update process, and had not been provided the information necessary to understand many of the changes to Meyers land use and zoning brought by the TRPA Regional Plan Update's Town Center "overlay." Our top issues are:


1. We want the community to have an informed say in the plans for our future growth.
2. We are a small community having a new plan pushed on us by TRPA, a bi-state agency of unelected, appointed Board members.
3. Our key interest is that a clear and transparent process be undertaken to ensure the Meyers community decides its own future. This requires information be provided in a form that is *clear and understandable* to the general public.


Upon realizing the community was generally unaware of the new Plan's changes, we began a volunteer effort last February to bring information to the public and request TRPA and others lead a transparent and clear process. Our efforts include, but are not limited to:


- Walking neighborhoods and speaking with the public and hosting a public meeting on 2/6;
- Preparing comments, flyers, Letters to the Editor, and obtaining signatures on petitions;
- Creating an email list, website, and Facebook page<sup>1</sup> in order to inform the public; and
- Working with the South Tahoe Chamber of Commerce to inform the public and request more engagement, including a validated survey, to obtain feedback from the Meyers area community.

We support new development in the Meyers area. However, we do not believe the parameters of our future growth should be dictated by non-local, unelected officials, nor by large corporations wanting to build projects in our area. There are many unresolved issues that have not been properly vetted among the Meyers area community, and a great deal of confusion remains. Our primary interest is ensuring that future growth in our area is based on what the majority of the community wants to see.

Sincerely,

  
Jennifer Quashnick  
13-year resident

  
AMBER OLSON

  
Diane Verwoert  
44 yrs resident



<sup>1</sup> [meyersresident@live.com](mailto:meyersresident@live.com); [www.meyersresident.com](http://www.meyersresident.com); Meyers for Meyers (Facebook page)

### **Results of Meyers Resident Community Survey, March 19th:**

According to over 30 surveys you have filled out for us (now online) as well as the County, it appears the community favors:

- Retaining regulations which keep developments on the SW end of town less dense;
- Limiting height to buildings similar in size to Bob Dog's Pizza and Century 21;
- A blend of existing and new businesses which retain the smaller scale of Meyers and fit within our community;
- Notification when large projects are proposed;
- A new Meyers Community Advisory Council (MCAC) elected by local residents.

In fact, the majority of the responses to the Community survey affirm that the 1993 Community Plan appears to be more in line what the community wants (not that we all don't want some tweaks to it!).

---

### **Results of TRPA and El Dorado County Survey, March 19th:**

From a review of approximately 80 surveys (details below), your feedback suggests:

- Most people do not support the Community Incentive Program (CIP) as is;
  - o About 1/3 would support fee waivers for incentives;
  - o About 1/3 do not support the CIP;
- A large majority support heights 35 feet or less;
- About 1/3 support variances, with many comments that any variances must be approved by community;
- Most people want to prohibit or minimize new hotel/tourist uses.



Here is a summary of responses to the TRPA/EDC survey:<sup>1</sup>

**Community Incentive Program (CIP): 78 responses:**

	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
1. Fee waiver but no Ht./density extras:	29	37%
2. Remove CIP	29	37%
3. Maintain CIP as is:	19	24%

**Height: 78 responses on options:**

	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
1. 35' max., no incentive	42	54%
2. 30' max.	15	19%
3. 40' max.	0	0%
4. 45' max. if CIP:	20	26%

**Height Variance? Y or N**

87 total surveys, 31 checked yes = 34%

**Hotel: 79 responses:**

	<u>Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
1. Allow everywhere at 15units/acre	11	14%
2. Don't allow anywhere in Meyers	30	38%
3. Allow only in NE, as in 1993 Plan	10	13%
4. Allow everywhere at 30-40 units/acre	18	23%

---

<sup>1</sup> We did our best to review the scanned surveys provided on El Dorado County's website and count up the choices; in some cases multiple boxes were checked then scratched out. We attempted to decipher the results as closely as possible.

# Meyers Residents and Business Owners

---

El Dorado County Board of Supervisors  
330 Fair Lane  
Placerville, CA 95667

10/26/14

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors:

**We feel that the Meyers community deserves a clear and transparent process for updating our community/area plan.** Our efforts, along with others in the community, have focused on engaging the public, repeatedly requesting the County and TRPA to ensure full community involvement, including the use of a validated survey, and attempting to help 'convert' the acronyms, ever-changing terminology, and "TRPA-speak" into terms the general public can better understand. There are many issues which have not yet been vetted with the Meyers Community. In addition, the Meyers Community extends well beyond those who were able to attend a 9 a.m. meeting on a workday (10/16), and members of the NV-side's Tahoe Chamber.

We were told by our County Supervisor that our community gets to decide what we want built here.

*"What can be built in Meyers is up to the community of Meyers." - Supervisor Santiago, 2/23/2014, Guest Opinion<sup>1</sup>*

We were also told the Catalyst Project was gone.

*"The catalyst project is dead. You have my word on it. If you want, I'll put it in writing."  
- Supervisor Santiago, 2/26/2014<sup>2</sup>*

*"There is no catalyst project. There is no large development." - Supervisor Santiago, 2/23/2014 Guest Opinion*

However, the current recommendations to move forward with a Plan that is contrary to most public feedback, that pushes TRPA's new zoning on our community without full vetting with the public, and that recommends the inclusion of the provisions which allowed the "Catalyst Project" in the Plan, run contrary to the promises made to our community.

## **El Dorado Planning Commission Recommendations:**

We are concerned the Planning Commission recommendations before you today do not represent the outcome of a clear and transparent, community-wide process. On 10/16, your Planning Commission was presented with information about different drafts of the new Meyers Area Plan, and provided with 'options' to pick and choose on for height, density, and other issues. However, the results of the feedback that had been obtained to date from the community – a great deal of it from TRPA and EDC's own surveys – were not made clear, nor was the community ever told that once they made a selection, it could be easily overturned by one meeting. Many residents and business owners have volunteered extensive time and resources in an attempt to ensure a transparent and clear update process, as noted in the examples in the attached letter signed by several of us that were able to attend the 10/16 Planning Commission meeting. We also posted a summary of the results of the agencies' own surveys

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.laketahoenews.net/2014/02/opinion-plenty-time-meyers-involved/>

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.laketahoenews.net/2014/02/catalyst-project-gone-meyers-future-undecided/>

along with ours on our website<sup>3</sup> (summary attached) – we encourage you to read the surveys directly, including the hand-written comments. We have also previously submitted petitions with upwards of 200 signatures opposing the larger developments allowed by the January 2014 versions of the “Incentive Program.”

**Comparison: Community’s feedback vs. EDC Planning Commission Recommendations:**

Community feedback:	Planning Commission recommendation:
Retaining regulations which keep developments on the SW end of town less dense (10-15 units/acre)	Making developments throughout the entire Meyers ‘strip’ more dense (40 units/acre)
Limiting height to buildings similar in size to Bob Dog’s Pizza and Century 21 (35 feet or less)	Allowing building heights which are 10 or more feet taller than Bob Dog’s Pizza and Century 21 (42 feet throughout, and 45 feet for the Incentive Program)
A blend of existing and new businesses which retain the smaller scale of Meyers and fit within our community (Design and uses closer to 1993 Community Plan)	Incentives which draw in large corporate/resort-owned developers who can afford the requirements, thereby threatening the viability of existing smaller businesses, not retaining the smaller scale of Meyers, and creating new development that does not fit within our community (More height, more density, more uses)
Notification when large projects are proposed (Conditional Use Permit requirements, MAC required to follow Brown Act for public process)	Not requiring consistent notification when large projects are proposed (Many uses now “Permissible,” and MCAC not subject to Brown Act for public process)
A new Meyers Community Advisory Council (MCAC) elected by <u>local residents</u> (The community already assumed the MCAC would be subject to Brown Act in new plan - the question was whether locals or BOS elect the members)	Not requiring the Meyers Advisory Council (MCAC) to even follow the most basic public meeting laws, let alone to be elected by <u>local residents</u> .

**Continuing Confusion of Terms:**

In the table above, which represents the language in the March surveys, the reference to the CIP “as is” in El Dorado County’s surveys referred to the January 2014 draft, or the “second draft” as it is now referred to, with the height, density, and other incentives (which your staff are now referring to as “the top Tier”); most surveys did not support it as it was outlined in the January 2014 *aka* 2<sup>nd</sup> draft *aka* Tier One of the Community Incentive Program (*aka* Catalyst Program).

In other words, the Catalyst Program was renamed to the Incentive Program; then the Community Incentive Program, then the Top Tier of the Community Incentive Program. The January 2014 draft is now referred to by staff as the “second draft,” and the June 2014 as the “third draft.” Worse yet, most people had no idea there were any new drafts until late January when we began our efforts. Therefore, the “new draft” was thought to be the January draft. Further, as most people appeared unaware that TRPA’s Regional Plan called for any changes to Meyers zoning and land use, references to “existing draft” or “existing plans” were often thought to mean the 1993 Meyers Community Plan; however for over 18 months, staff often made references to lowering height or density compared to the “existing

<sup>3</sup> <http://meyersresident.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/March-19-Comments-on-TRPA-EDC-form.pdf>  
<sup>1st</sup> set: <http://meyersresident.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/Resident-Surveys-1-to-21-from-Mar-19.pdf>; <sup>2nd</sup> set: <http://meyersresident.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/Resident-Surveys-22-to-31-notes-from-Mar-19.pdf>

plan,” which to the agencies, generally meant the first draft Meyers Area Plan that represented the RPU’s plan changes. Even professional planners would cross their eyes to follow these terms.

Yet the changes have been advertised in media messaging, as well as handouts for the public, as “reducing” height, density, etc. For example, we’ve attached the technical response to a handout provided to the public at a community-led meeting on 2/6/2014. One obvious example is pasted below:

EDC Handout: “The Area Plan reduces maximum height limits to 35 feet for most projects, and in limited cases allows for up to 45 feet for projects that meet a series of requirements to ensure they improve walkability, benefit the environment, and provide other community benefits (Land Use and Zoning Ordinance section 70).”

Our Response: “More apples and oranges. The ‘starting point’ height under the 1993 Plan was 26 feet; TRPA’s Town Center zoning raised it to 56 feet, so the draft Area Plan is simply *less of a TRPA-proposed increase* compared to the 1993 Community Plan. **Regardless, the question now is, does Meyers want 45 foot tall (approx. 4 stories) buildings?**”

We request you delay your recommendations and submissions for CEQA review until the community has been fully engaged in this process. This would not only provide the information needed to direct planners regarding the community’s interests, but it would also allow our community to have a new Plan we can be proud of, and which supports our Vision for the future.

Sincerely,

Angie Olson  
Jennifer Quashnick  
Diana and John Sanders  
Moya Sanders  
Diane Verwoest



October 27, 2014

Ms. Norma Santiago, Chair  
Mr. Brian K. Veerkamp, First Vice Chair  
Mr. Ron Mikulaco, Second Vice Chair  
Ms. Shiva Frentzen, Member  
Mr. Ron Briggs, Member

**Re: Comments on the Proposed Revised Meyers Area Plan**

Dear Honorable Chair Santiago and Supervisors:

In collaboration with our fifteen member businesses in the Meyers community, the Lake Tahoe South Shore Chamber of Commerce (TahoeChamber) has been an active commenter on changes to the draft Meyers Area Plan. Most recently, we submitted comments in an October 7 letter to the County Planning Commission. Chamber representatives provided information and testimony at the Commission's Meyers Area Plan workshop in South Lake Tahoe on October 16.

Our input is an outcome of multiple meetings with our Meyers members to review and discuss the draft Area Plan. Together, these owners and operators represent approximately 300 jobs in the Meyers community. They clearly have a direct stake in the outcomes of this planning process.

We are pleased to report there is strong support for many elements of the draft Area Plan and general agreement with the recommendations made to your Board by members of the County Planning Commission who participated in the October 16 workshop.

**As reported to the Planning Commission, there is TahoeChamber support for:**

- The Meyers Community Vision
  - Introduction, Page 1-1
- Transportation Goals and Policies
- Transportation Circulation Vision
- Transportation & Circulation Implementation Actions
  - Chapter 3, Pages 3-3 through 3-8
- Provisions Establishing Landmark Tree Protection (Sierra Junipers)
  - Chapter 4, Environmental Conservation, Page 4-4 and 4-6
- Recreation Vision
- Recreation Goals and Policies
- Recreation Implementation Actions
  - Chapter 5, Pages 5-3 through 5-5
- Public Services Vision
- Public Services Goals and Policies
- Public Service Improvements
  - Chapter 6, Pages 6-3 through 6-5



**There is also support for the key October 16 Planning Commission recommendations to your Board, as follows:**

1. Maximum Height Limits - The Planning Commission favored a maximum height limit of 42 feet, which is consistent with the existing height limits in the existing Meyers Community Plan.
2. Density - The Commission favored the language from the 2nd draft Plan re: 40 units per acre for Tourist Accommodation Units and 20 units per acre for Multi-Family Residential.
3. Land Use - The Commission favored maintaining the Community (Town) Center Land Use designation in the 2nd and 3rd versions of the draft Meyers Area Plan (as opposed to the three special land use designations in the existing Meyers Community Plan).
4. Community Incentive Program - The Commission favored reestablishing the top tier of the Community Incentive Program as described in the 2nd draft Plan version.
5. "Support for Small Businesses" - TahoeChamber agrees with the Commission's suggestion that the policy language in the draft Plan promotes redevelopment while also promoting development of vacant parcels, consistent with the zoning and other Plan provisions.

**Additional Issues**

- California Tahoe Conservancy "Asset Lands" - The California Tahoe Conservancy (CTC) previously purchased nine commercially zoned, developable parcels for an inter-agency visitor center in Meyers. The CTC is no longer pursuing the visitor center and is considering the future sale of these asset lands. The 3rd Draft version of the Area Plan changed four CTC owned parcels and three adjacent Forest Service parcels (approximately 10 acres) from the Upper Truckee River Residential/Tourist zoning district to the Recreation zoning district. This change included CTC asset lands on the west side of SR 89 and at the SR 89/50 intersection and reduced the development potential for these parcels.

El Dorado County planning staff has proposed to maintain the existing zoning on the remaining five CTC asset parcels located within the Meyers Town Center. **TahoeChamber agrees with County planners that CTC parcels within the Town Center should remain as currently zoned and not be limited to recreation zoning.** The Town Center is where commercial development is deemed most appropriate and provides for a consistent look and feel to a community. This approach to development is consistent with the Plan's stated "walkable" community, land use, and related goals. It is our understanding that the CTC intends to use the proceeds from any asset land sales for environmental purposes, consistent with its mission. It is certainly conceivable that these revenues could be used for environmental purposes within the Meyers Area Plan. Furthermore, it is highly unlikely that the notion of reducing the re-sale value of a property owner's assets



would even be being considered by a jurisdiction but for the fact that this land is owned by the C.T.C.

- Commercial Floor Area - There have been a number of policy variations proposed for the allocation of Commercial Floor Area (CFA). Frankly, the current proposal is unclear and would benefit from additional explanation and consideration. TahoeChamber offers the following perspectives:
  - It makes sense to reserve a modest amount of CFA to assist small businesses, understanding that small businesses themselves rarely have the capital or resources to independently buy and then develop small parcels to accommodate their infrastructure and building needs. The Area Plan needs to provide incentives and encourage practical, realistic investment opportunities for small business.
  - It makes sense to leverage CFA as an incentive to help support the implementation of environmental and capital improvements consistent with Area Plan goals and objectives, with a mind toward sooner rather than later.
- The Meyers Community Mobility Plan Project - Earlier this year, El Dorado County was awarded a \$200,000 "On Our Way" grant by the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO). The stated purpose of this grant is to solicit input and prepare "a conceptual multi-modal transportation planning strategy for the US Highway 50/State Route 89 corridor through Meyers, with a focus on bicycle and pedestrian alternatives, streetscape and water quality improvements." Improved community mobility planning and infrastructure is a major goal of the draft Meyers Area Plan and is reflected in many Plan policies, particularly in Chapter 3, Transportation & Circulation. TahoeChamber respectfully encourages the County to identify partners and move forward with the mobility improvement planning eligible for this funding.

With the changes supported and recommended in this letter, TahoeChamber looks forward to working with El Dorado County and the community to advance the Meyers Area Plan.

Sincerely,

Tamara Hollingsworth  
Chairman of the Board

Jason Drew  
Chair, Government Affairs Committee