Letter: Meyers development needs more scrutiny

Publisher's note: ***This letter was sent to the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and is reprinted with permission.***

I am writing to oppose the hearing and potential approval of the subject proposed project as the impacts analysis are inadequate and improper notice of the project to neighboring uses. Unfortunately, I cannot make the meeting on May 25 as I am working in Sacramento with a full schedule of meetings that day.

My family lives at 2648 Wailaki St., in the neighborhood below the proposed facility known as Tahoe Par 60. Our neighborhood falls just outside the Meyers Area Plan of January 2014. The proposed project is only about 2,500 feet away and is approximately 200 feet higher in elevation from the residential uses in Tahoe Par 60, which is outside the Meyers Area Plan.

This recreational group facility project was previously approved in 1995 by TRPA Governing Board. After 20 years of languishing, residents of the immediate area received no public notice this was being reconsidered. It is inconsistent with California public agency transparency laws to run this application through without notifying impacted residents. Constructive notice by publishing of an agenda in a newspaper without providing actual notice to impacted residents does not meet the intent of the law.

In looking at the recommended action, I find the TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) that was completed to be inadequate. Staff prepared a finding of no significant effect. The scale and intensity of the use are determined to be appropriate for the surrounding area without creating

conflicts with adjacent land uses. This appears to mean immediately adjacent. However, the neighboring owners outside the Meyers Area Plan must use the same ingress/egress and are not considered when analyzing impacts. No consideration was given to the noise impacts from this proposed project or its proximity and/or elevation to the residences of our community. Noises include, but not limited to, daily noise from playing hockey, such as fans cheering, coaches yelling out instructions, slapping sticks and bouncing pucks, as well as proposed tennis court noises of similar traits will affect the peace and quiet enjoyed by nearby neighborhoods.

The findings mentioned the project will generate 116 daily vehicle trip ends which they considered a minor increase in traffic by the Code of Ordinances. The new vehicle trips will be mitigated by payment of an air quality mitigation fee. No traffic mitigation has been indicated. This is totally inadequate given it is already too difficult to exit the area via South Upper Truckee Road during peak traffic to get to our daily tasks of school, shopping and jobs. The 2010 peak traffic count for the area is over 15,000 daily trips in the immediate vicinity. The Level of Service (LOS) is already at E for many hours during peak traffic on weekends and holidays. This would add more back-ups, congestion and pollution to our quiet lifestyle chosen for this area. When combined with the proposed traffic roundabout that intends to slow traffic in Meyers on USD 50, this would be a complete traffic nightmare for residents on or near South Upper Truckee Road. The pavement condition will only worsen beyond its current Pavement Condition Index (PCI) of approximately 45 percent with additional traffic, especially if heavy vehicles are included as proposed.

I propose the TRPA table the agenda item until further study and notice of proceedings be made to the affected residents and proper hearing of impacts to those living outside the Meyers Area Plan and proposed mitigations be inclusive of

those residents.

The TRPA put this on their consent calendar with barely a word about it. It could have easily slipped through the process. This calls to question the transparency and representation of Lake Tahoe residents by TRPA in other matters in our region.

Jeffrey Spencer, Meyers