City of South Lake Tahoe

2014–2022 Housing Element Update

Draft
February 2014

Prepared by:

PMC®

2729 Prospect Park Drive, Suite 220
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670
Phone: (916) 361-8384
Fax: (916) 361-1574

PART I
CITY OF SOUTH LAKE TAHOE
HOUSING ELEMENT BACKGROUND REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

4.1 INTRODUCTION 4-1

OVERVIEW OF STATE REQUIREMENTS 4-1
GENERAL PLAN AND HOUSING ELEMENT CONSISTENCY 4-3
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY OVERVIEW 4-3
CONSISTENCY WITH SOUTH LAKE TAHOE'S REDEVELOPMENT IMPLEMENTATION PLAN 4-4
NOTIFICATION TO RETAIL WATER/SEWER PROVIDERS 4-4
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION 4-5
Community/Stakeholder Input 4-6
Response to Input 4-7

4.2 NEEDS ASSESSMENT 4-9

HOUSING STOCK AND DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE 4-9
Demographic and Employment Characteristics and Trends 4-9
Local Housing Needs in the Context of the Lake Tahoe Basin 4-9
Population/Demographic Trends and Employment Characteristics and Trends 4-12
Housing Characteristics and Trends 4-20
Housing Inventory/Supply 4-20
Vacancy Rates and Rental Housing 4-22
Age of Householders 4-23
Overcrowded Housing 4-24
Household Size 4-26
Housing Size 4-27
Housing Conditions 4-28
Housing Affordability 4-36
EXISTING HOUSING NEEDS 4-46
Special Housing Needs 4-46
Homeless Persons 4-46
Farmworkers 4-48
Persons with Disabilities 4-50
Senior Households 4-54
Large Families/Households 4-55
Single Female-Headed Households 4-57
Extremely Low-Income Housing Needs 4-58
Seasonal Employees and Students 4-58
Tourist-Based Employee Housing Needs 4-59
Workforce Housing Needs 4-60
FUTURE HOUSING NEEDS 4-61
Regional Fair Share Allocation 4-61
Comparison of Housing Production with Projected Housing Needs 4-63

4.3 RESOURCE INVENTORY 4-65

AVAILABILITY OF LAND AND SERVICES 4-65
South Lake Tahoe's Setting, Zoning, and Development Procedures 4-65
Survey of Available Land 4-75
Description of Criteria for Identifying Housing Sites 4-75
Inventory of Vacant Sites 4-76
Adequacy of Public Facilities, Services, and Infrastructure 4-85
Water 4-85
Sewer 4-86
Infrastructure Financing 4-86
Summary 4-86
INVENTORY OF LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL HOUSING AND FINANCING PROGRAMS 4-87

Current City Programs 4-87
Rental Housing New Construction Program *4-87*
Illegal Unit Conversion Program *4-87*
Current El Dorado County Programs 4-88
The Housing Choice Voucher Program *4-88*
Mortgage Credit Certificate Program *4-88*
CDBG First-Time Homebuyer Loan Program *4-88*
Assisted-Housing Projects in South Lake Tahoe 4-89
Private, State, and Federal Funding Programs 4-89
Preserving At-Risk Units 4-91
Preservation and Replacement Options *4-92*
Federal Programs to Preserve At-Risk Units *4-96*
State Programs to Preserve At-Risk Units *4-96*
Local Programs to Preserve At-Risk Units *4-97*
ENERGY CONSERVATION OPPORTUNITIES 4-97

4.4 POTENTIAL HOUSING CONSTRAINTS 4-101

POTENTIAL GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS 4-101
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Potential and Actual Governmental Constraints 4-101
Background and Regional Authority − The Bi-State Compact *4-101*
Housing Goals and Policies of the Existing Regional Plan *4-102*
Constraints Analysis 4-103
Zoning *4-103*
Growth Controls *4-105*
Land Coverage Limitations *4-108*
Water Quality Requirements *4-110*
Density *4-111*
Height Standards *4-112*
Design Standards *4-113*
Building Season Limitations/Grading Requirements *4-114*
Impediments to Housing for Persons with Disabilities *4-114*
Subdivision and Condominium Requirements *4-115*
Fees and Other Exactions *4-116*
Project Processing and Permit Procedures *4-118*
TRPA Preemption of State Housing Law *4-119*
City of South Lake Tahoe Potential and Actual Governmental Constraints 4-119
Land Use Controls *4-119*
Airport Safety Areas *119*
Annexation Restrictions *4-123*
Mobile Homes/Mobile Home Parks *4-124*
Motel Conversion Regulations *4-126*
Vacation Rental Regulations *4-127*
"Illegal Unit" Program *4-127*
Building Height, Setback and Minimum Lot Size Requirements *4-128*
Condominium Regulations *4-130*
Timeshare Conversion Regulations *4-131*
Building Codes and Their Enforcement *4-132*
On/Off-Site Improvements *4-132*
City Fees and Other Exactions *4-134*
Density Bonus *4-136*
Development, Maintenance, and Improvement of Housing for Persons with Disabilities *4-137*
Buy-Out Programs *4-137*
Article 34 ....*4-138*
POTENTIAL NON-GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS 4-138
Land Costs *4-138*

Availability of Financing and Insurance *4-139*
Development Costs *4-139*
Environmental Constraints *4-140*
Prevailing Wage *4-140*
Developer Trends *4-140*

4.5 EVALUATION 4-141

2008 TO 2013 ACCOMPLISHMENTS 4-141
REVIEW OF EXISTING HOUSING ELEMENT 4-141
TABLE 4-60 SUMMARIZES THE CITY'S RHNA FOR THE PERIOD FROM JANUARY 2006 THROUGH DECEMBER 2012 AND THE NUMBER OF HOUSING UNITS BUILT OR APPROVED DURING THAT TIME PERIOD. DURING THAT TIME FRAME THE CITY CONSTRUCTED OR APPROVED 251 UNITS. OF THESE UNITS 17 WERE FOR LOWER INCOME HOUSEHOLDS AND WERE PART OF THE SKY FOREST ACRES PROJECT. 4-142

REFERENCES 4-165

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A – PUBLIC MEETING PARTICIPANTS A-1
APPENDIX B - VACANT PARCELS B-1
APPENDIX C – GLOSSARY C-1

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 4-1 PLACE OF RESIDENCE OF DOUGLAS COUNTY AND SOUTH LAKE TAHOE EMPLOYEES 4-10
TABLE 4-2 PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT FOR LOW-INCOME WORKERS 4-11
TABLE 4-3 POPULATION, HOUSEHOLDS, HOUSING SIZE AND HOUSING UNITS, SOUTH LAKE TAHOE AND EL DORADO COUNTY, 1990, 2000, 2010, AND 2012 4-12
TABLE 4-4 POPULATION BREAKDOWN BY AGE, SOUTH LAKE TAHOE AND EL DORADO COUNTY 4-14
TABLE 4-5 POPULATION BREAKDOWN BY RACE AND ETHNICITY 4-15
TABLE 4-6 VACANT UNITS BY TYPE OF VACANCY 4-17
TABLE 4-7 HOUSEHOLD INCOME DISTRIBUTION 4-18
TABLE 4-8 LARGE EMPLOYERS 4-20
TABLE 4-9 HOUSING STOCK BY TYPE 4-21
TABLE 4-10 HOUSING TYPE FOR RENTERS 4-22
TABLE 4-11 HOUSING JOBS RATIO 4-22
TABLE 4-12 HOUSEHOLDERS BY AGE AND TENURE 4-24
TABLE 4-13 OVERCROWDED HOUSING 4-25
TABLE 4-14 HOUSEHOLD SIZE BY TENURE, SOUTH LAKE TAHOE AND EL DORADO COUNTY 4-26
TABLE 4-15 NUMBER OF BEDROOMS BY TENURE 4-27
TABLE 4-16 AGE OF HOUSING STOCK & HOUSING STOCK CONDITIONS BY TENURE 4-28
TABLE 4-17 HOUSING UNITS IN NEED OF REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT 4-30
TABLE 4-18 HOUSING CONDITIONS SURVEY RESULTS 4-31
TABLE 4-19 OVERALL MOBILE HOME AND RV CONDITIONS 4-34
TABLE 4-20 OVERALL MOBILE HOME PARK CONDITIONS 4-34
TABLE 4-21 MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY HOUSEHOLD SIZE 4-37
TABLE 4-22 HOUSING COST BURDEN BY HOUSEHOLD INCOME CLASSIFICATION 4-39
TABLE 4-23 HCD INCOME LIMITS BASED ON PERSONS PER HOUSEHOLD 4-40
TABLE 4-24 ABILITY TO PAY FOR HOUSING BASED ON HCD INCOME LIMITS 4-41
TABLE 4-25 HUD FAIR MARKET RENT 4-42
TABLE 4-26 MEDIAN CONTRACT RENT AND MEDIAN GROSS RENT 4-43
TABLE 4-27 AVERAGE RENTS 4-44
TABLE 4-28 MEDIAN SALES PRICE OF SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES 4-44
TABLE 4-29 MEDIAN SALES PRICE BY NUMBER OF BEDROOMS 4-45

TABLE 4-30 MEDIAN SALES PRICE OF SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES 4-45
TABLE 4-31 FARMWORKERS 4-49
TABLE 4-32 SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME RECIPIENTS BY CATEGORY 4-51
TABLE 4-33 PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES BY DISABILITY TYPE 4-52
TABLE 4-34 POPULATION WITH A DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITY 4-52
TABLE 4-35 SENIOR POPULATIONS AND HOUSEHOLDS 4-55
TABLE 4-36 LARGE HOUSEHOLDS 4-57
TABLE 4-37 FEMALE-HEADED HOUSEHOLDS 4-58
TABLE 4-38 REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATION BY INCOME 4-62
TABLE 4-39 PROGRESS TOWARD MEETING HOUSING NEEDS 4-63
TABLE 4-40 PLAN AREA STATEMENTS AND COMMUNITY PLAN DISTRICTS RESIDENTIAL IMPLICATIONS 4-69
TABLE 4-41 VACANT LOTS IN PAS/CP ALLOWING SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT 4-78
TABLE 4-42 VACANT PARCEL ANALYSIS 4-80
TABLE 4-43 UNDERUTILIZED COMMERCIAL SITES 4-81
TABLE 4-44 LOT CONSOLIDATION SITES TO MEET THE LOWER-INCOME RHNA 4-84
TABLE 4-45 FINANCIAL RESOURCES FOR HOUSING ACTIVITIES 4-89
TABLE 4-46 AT-RISK AFFORDABLE HOUSING STOCK 4-91
TABLE 4-47 RENTAL SUBSIDIES 4-93
TABLE 4-48 PROJECTS RECEIVING GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE 4-95
TABLE 4-49 TRPA DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS 4-104
TABLE 4-50 TRPA DENSITY LIMITATIONS FOR RESIDENTIAL USES 4-111
TABLE 4-51 TRPA BASE FEES FOR NEW RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION 4-116
TABLE 4-52 TRPA FEE MULTIPLIERS 4-117
TABLE 4-53 OTHER TRPA FEES 4-117
TABLE 4-54 STATEWIDE PARKING STANDARDS FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING 4-121
TABLE 4-55 CITY DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS 4-129
TABLE 4-56 SETBACK EXCEPTIONS 4-130
TABLE 4-57 PARKING STANDARDS FOR RESIDENTIAL USES 4-133
TABLE 4-58 FEE SCHEDULE 4-135
TABLE 4-59 TOTAL PROCESSING AND IMPACT FEES FOR SINGLE- AND MULTI-FAMILY UNITS, SOUTH LAKE TAHOE 4-136
TABLE 4-60 PROGRESS DURING PREVIOUS PLANNING PERIOD 4-141
TABLE 4-61 EVALUATION OF 2008–2013 SOUTH LAKE TAHOE HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS 4-142

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 4-1 AVERAGE ANNUAL GROWTH RATE OF POPULATION AND DWELLING UNITS 4-13
FIGURE 4-2 HOUSEHOLD TYPES 4-16
FIGURE 4-3 OWNER-OCCUPIED AND RENTER-OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS 4-17
FIGURE 4-4 EMPLOYEES BY MAJOR INDUSTRY 4-19
FIGURE 4-5 HOUSING STOCK CHARACTERISTICS 4-21
FIGURE 4-6 PREFERRED AFFORDABLE HOUSING AREAS 4-73
FIGURE 4-7 MULTI-RESIDENTIAL INCENTIVE AREAS 4-74
FIGURE 4-8 VACANT/UNDERUTILIZED HOUSING INVENTORY 4-77
FIGURE 4-9 VACANT/UNDERUTILZED HOUSING INVENTORY INSIDE THE TOURIST CORE AREA 4-82

4.1 INTRODUCTION

State housing element law (Government Code Section 65580) mandates that local governments must adequately plan to meet the existing and projected housing needs of all economic segments of the community. This section provides current information on household characteristics, housing needs, housing supply, land inventory for new development, housing programs, constraints, and incentives for new housing development. It also evaluates progress made since the last Housing Element was adopted in 2008.

The housing element is one of seven state-mandated elements that every general plan must contain. Although the housing element must follow all the requirements of the general plan, the housing element has several state-mandated requirements that distinguish it from other general plan elements. Whereas the state allows local governments the ability to decide when to update their general plan, state law sets the schedule for periodic update (four- or eight-year time frame based on timeliness of previous housing element certification) of the housing element. Local governments are also required to submit draft and adopted housing elements to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for state law compliance review. This review ensures that the housing element meets the various state mandates. Should the city satisfy these requirements, the state will "certify" that the element is legally adequate. Failing to comply with state law could result in potentially serious consequences such as reduced access to infrastructure, transportation, and housing funding and vulnerability to lawsuits.

The current (2014–2022) Housing Element is a comprehensive update of the 2008 Housing Element. The planning period is for June 15, 2014, through June 15, 2022. The City of South Lake Tahoe (City) last updated its Housing Element in December 2008. That Housing Element had a planning period from January 1, 2006, to June 30, 2013. Prior to the 2008 Housing Element, the City adopted a 2003 Housing Element.

Overview of State Requirements

State law recognizes the vital role local governments play in the supply and affordability of housing. The law acknowledges that in order for the private market to adequately address housing needs and demand, local governments must adopt land use plans and regulatory systems that provide opportunities for, and do not unduly constrain, housing development. As a result, housing policy in the state rests largely upon the effective implementation of local general plans, local housing elements in particular.

The purpose of the housing element is to identify the community's housing needs, to state the community's goals and objectives with regard to housing production, rehabilitation, and conservation to meet those needs, and to define the policies and programs that the community will implement to achieve the stated goals and objectives.

State law requires cities and counties to address the needs of all income groups in their housing elements. The official definition of these needs is provided by HCD for each city and county within its geographic jurisdiction. Beyond these income-based housing needs, the housing element must also address special needs groups such as persons with disabilities and homeless persons.

State housing law (Government Code Section 65580) requires an assessment of housing needs and an inventory of resources and constraints relevant to meeting those needs. The assessment and inventory must include all of the following:

- Analysis of population and employment trends and documentation of projections and a quantification of the locality's existing and projected housing needs for all income levels. Such existing and projected needs shall include the locality's share of the regional housing need.
- Analysis and documentation of household characteristics, including level of payment compared to ability to pay, housing characteristics, including overcrowding, and housing stock condition.
- An inventory of land suitable for residential development, including vacant sites and sites having potential for redevelopment, and an analysis of the relationship of zoning, public facilities, and city services to these sites.
- The identification of a zone or zones where emergency shelters are allowed as a permitted use without a conditional use or other discretionary permit.
- Analysis of potential and actual governmental constraints upon the maintenance, improvement, or development of housing for all income levels, including land use controls, building codes and their enforcement, site improvements, fees and other exactions required of developers, and local processing and permit procedures. Analysis of local efforts to remove governmental constraints.
- Analysis of potential and actual non-governmental constraints upon the maintenance, improvement, or development of housing for all income levels, including the availability of financing, the price of land, and the cost of construction.
- Analysis of any special housing needs for the elderly, persons with disabilities including those with developmental disabilities, large families, farmworkers, families with female heads of households, and families and persons in need of emergency shelter.
- Analysis of opportunities for energy conservation with respect to residential development.
- Analysis of “at-risk” assisted housing developments that are eligible to change from low-income housing uses within 10 years of the beginning of the Housing Element planning period.

The Housing Element Background Report identifies the nature and extent of the City’s housing needs, which in turn provides the basis for the City’s response to those needs in the Housing Element Policy Document. In addition to identifying housing needs, the Background Report also presents information on the setting in which the needs occur, which provides a better understanding of the community and facilitates planning for housing.

The Background Report satisfies state requirements and provides the foundation for the goals, policies, implementation programs, and quantified objectives. The Background Report sections draw on a broad range of informational sources. Information on population, housing stock, and economics comes primarily from the data sets prepared by the Sacramento Council of Governments (SACOG) with sources from the 2000 and 2010 US Census, American Community Survey, and regional sources. In addition to

the SACOG packet, data was drawn from the California Department of Finance, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA, Agency), and City of South Lake Tahoe records. Information on available services for housing comes from numerous public agencies. Information on constraints on housing production and past and current housing efforts in South Lake Tahoe comes from City staff, other public agencies, and a number of private sources.

General Plan and Housing Element Consistency

The Housing Element is a component of the General Plan, which provides guiding policy for all growth and development within the City. The General Plan consists of seven elements that address both state-mandated planning issues plus optional subjects that are of particular concern within South Lake Tahoe. These elements are:

- Land Use and Community Character Element
- Economic Development Element
- Transportation and Circulation Element
- Housing Element
- Natural and Cultural Resources Element
- Public/Quasi-Public Facilities and Services Element
- Recreation and Open Space Element
- Noise Element
- Health and Safety Element

State law requires consistency among elements of the general plan. As such, goals and policies contained within the Housing Element have been developed to be consistent with the goals and policies of the 2011 General Plan. The City will continue to assess consistency between the Housing Element and other General Plan elements so that policies introduced in one element are consistent with other elements. If it becomes apparent that, over time, changes to any element are needed for internal consistency, such changes will be proposed for consideration by the Planning Commission and City Council. Due to the passage of Assembly Bill (AB) 162 the City may be required to amend the Safety and Conservation Elements of the General Plan. If amendments are needed the Housing Element will be amended to be consistent with the Safety and Conservation Elements.

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Overview

Lake Tahoe was designated as an *Outstanding National Resource Water* under the Clean Water Act. The TRPA was formed in 1969 through a bi-state compact between Nevada and California. The TRPA's mission is to preserve, restore, and enhance the Lake Tahoe Basin (Basin, Tahoe Basin). The Agency's

Regional Plan is the long-term plan for the development of the Lake Tahoe Basin. In some cases, regulations that further the realization of the Regional Plan can preempt California and Nevada state law. One of the Agency's main tools for protecting the environment is growth control regulations, which limit the amount of development that occurs in the Basin each year. While the TRPA employs some measures to promote affordable housing in the Basin, many of the environmental regulations limit the feasibility of affordable housing projects for lower-income residents.

The TRPA completed an update to its Regional Plan and its associated Code of Ordinances in December 2012. The Regional Plan update process involved a collaboration between the TRPA, US Forest Service, Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection to update their 20-year planning documents. The intent of the Regional Plan update was for these agencies to work together to streamline regulations and create common goals for protecting Lake Tahoe. The City of South Lake Tahoe, along with other local jurisdictions, was involved throughout the process. The City continuously voiced the need to balance the housing needs of local residents with the need to protect and improve the clarity of Lake Tahoe.

The updated Regional Plan includes some changes that affect affordable housing in the Basin. The TRPA has altered some regulations to promote affordable housing opportunities including allowing mixed-use development and allowing 70 percent coverage in town and regional centers, allowing additional height with adoption of an area plan, and allowing transfer bonuses for residential unit transfers into town or regional centers. These changes allow denser development in town and regional centers including housing development. The updated Regional Plan also allows local jurisdictions within TRPA to develop area plans to replace existing community plans and plan area statements. The City has recently adopted the Tourist Core Area Plan (TCAP) and is currently preparing the Tahoe Valley Area Plan for this purpose. However, many of the existing regulations that act as constraints to the production of affordable housing remain. The City continues to seek creative solutions to provide affordable housing opportunities that work within the framework of TRPA regulations, and is part of the current TRPA process to provide recommendations on potential changes to TRPA affordable housing policies in order to address these constraints.

Consistency with South Lake Tahoe's Redevelopment Implementation Plan

Per ABX1 26, the South Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Agency was dissolved on June 27, 2011. This dissolution action eliminated the funding mechanism by which the redevelopment agency funded affordable housing and infrastructure development. There will be no future funds available for affordable housing or infrastructure via the former redevelopment agency.

Notification to Retail Water/Sewer Providers

In compliance with Government Code Section 65589.7, upon adoption of the 2014–2022 Housing Element, the City of South Lake Tahoe distributed a copy of the element to local water and sewer providers. The City contacted the following service providers:

- South Tahoe Public Utility District (1275 Meadowcrest, South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150)

- Lukins Brothers Water Company, Inc. (2031 West Way, South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150)
- Lakeside Park Water District (4077 Pine Boulevard, South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150)
- Tahoe Keys Water Company (356 Ala Wai Boulevard, South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150)

Public Participation

As part of the Housing Element process, the City implemented the state's public participation requirements in housing element law, indicated in Government Code Section 65583 (c)(6)(B), that jurisdictions "shall make a diligent effort to achieve participation of all economic segments of the community." City staff and consultants solicited input from individuals and organizations in the community including local residents, housing developers, nonprofit housing development and management organizations, social service providers, neighborhood associations, and the business community. The City distributed announcements of the community/stakeholder workshop as well as the public review draft Housing Element to a mailing list that includes the aforementioned stakeholder groups. The City advertised the community/stakeholder workshop using a variety of methods including an advertisement in the local newspaper, follow-up phone calls with stakeholders and community leaders, fliers posted at various public facilities, Facebook posts, Twitter feeds, and Newsflash broadcasting on the City website and emailed to subscribers. In addition, the City placed a meeting announcement and a copy of the public review draft Housing Element on the General Plan update website. The stakeholders that attended the workshops are listed in Appendix A.

As outlined below, the City's public outreach program has been designed to obtain input from residents representing all income groups, nonprofit and for-profit residential developers, and businesses.

Date **Nature of Meeting**

11/14/13 ***Community/Stakeholders Workshop #1***—The City made a presentation to the general public, local stakeholders, and the Planning Commission, giving them an overview of the update process, outlining state housing law, and describing the required components of the Housing Element Background Report and Policy Document. During and after the presentation, City staff gave the public and stakeholders an opportunity to identify key housing issues and concerns in the city. The meeting had relatively low attendance.

Input received from the Planning Commission included an interest in mixed-use projects and smaller units to achieve housing goals. In response to public input, the Commission agreed that maintaining housing for the workforce when housing prices are high in the area needs to be addressed. A stakeholder from the real estate industry noted that housing sales prices have seen a 20 percent increase in the last year in the city. Several commenters encouraged the City to focus on improving the condition of the existing housing stock.

01/23/14 ***Community/Stakeholder Workshop #2*** - The City made a presentation to the general public, local stakeholders, and the Planning Commission, giving them an overview of the draft Housing Element update. The draft document had been available for public review since 01/7/2014 on the City's website. The discussion focused on the following four emerging issues:

- Should the City adopt minimum density standards?
- Should the City initiate a long term motel/hotel rental inspection program?
- Should the Housing Element contain a policy for the transfer of residential development rights out of the City?
- What additional incentives can the City provide to meet housing goals?

Input received included mixed opinions on minimum density standards, support for a long term rental motel inspection program, support for a policy regarding the transfer of residential rights out of the City, and the following additional ideas:

- Support establishment of a HOME consortium,
- Support Tahoe Conservancy Livable Communities Program and the use of development commodities for affordable housing,
- Use Transient Occupancy Tax generated by vacation rentals for affordable housing programs,
- Support a green community and "housing affordability."

02/13/2014 Planning Commission public discussion on Transfer of Residential Rights – City staff presented several policy options regarding the transfer of development rights out of the City. The first option allowed for City Council consideration of transfers based on economic, social and/or environmental benefit. The second option, proposed by a member of the public, allowed for the City Council consideration of transfers based on economic and housing demand impacts. The third option emphasized economic and housing impacts in the consideration of transfers but also allowed for consideration of social and environmental benefits that may outweigh impacts. The Commission has a discussion of the options and narrowed down the goals of the policy, then directed staff to continue working on developing the policy.

02/18/2014 City Council Presentation – City staff presented an overview of the Housing Element update process, analysis of the current Housing Element, RHNA numbers, and proposed policies and programs included in the draft Housing Element update.

Community/Stakeholder Input

Based on stakeholder input gathered during the public participation process, the consultants identified the following issues as being of the greatest importance to the community members that participated. These perceptions are not necessarily those of the consultants or the City of South Lake Tahoe. These issues are addressed in this Housing Element update:

- Affordability of housing for the workforce
- Unsafe and unsanitary conditions of long term motel unit rentals

- Transfer of residential development rights out of the City
- Funding of housing programs

Response to Input Received

In response to input received on the Public Review Draft Housing Element as revisions were made to the draft Housing Element as follows:

- Policy 1-9 has been added directing the City to support the California Tahoe Conservancy's Tahoe Livable Communities Program.
- Policy 2-10 has been added directing the City to support the formation of a bi-state HOME consortium to receive funding for housing if it is a feasible option in South Lake Tahoe.
- Policy 3-4 has been revised to apply to all displaced residents.
- Policy 3-7 has been added to add additional restrictions on transfer of residential development rights out of the City.
- In several places in the Background Report additional explanation has been added regarding the option for the City to adopt Area Plans to implement the 2012 Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) Regional Plan Update.
- Revisions were made on page 4-105 of the Background Report to clarify that there are more than two options allowed by TRPA for the conversion of tourist accommodation units (TAUs).

Additional minor edits were made to correct typos and other minor errors.

This page intentionally left blank.

4.2 NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The Needs Assessment begins with a description of housing and demographic characteristics of the current population. This section then discusses the existing housing needs of the residents of South Lake Tahoe based on housing and demographic characteristics. The final component of this section is a description of the city's future housing needs based on the Regional Fair Share Allocation.

Housing Stock and Demographic Profile

The purpose of this section is to establish "baseline" population, employment, and housing characteristics for the City of South Lake Tahoe. The main sources of the information in this section are the 2000 and 2010 US Census and the 2008–2010 and 2006–2010 US Census American Community Survey (ACS). Other sources of information include the following: the California Department of Finance (DOF); the California Employment Development Department (EDD); the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD); the US Department of Agriculture (USDA); and local economic data (e.g., home sales prices, rents, and wages).

Data for the city is presented wherever possible alongside comparable data for El Dorado County. This facilitates an understanding of the city's characteristics by illustrating how the city is similar to, or differs from, the county in various aspects related to demographic, employment, and housing characteristics and needs. Trends between 2000 and the most recent available data are also discussed for many data sets.

Demographic and Employment Characteristics and Trends

Local Housing Needs in the Context of the Lake Tahoe Basin

Although the City of South Lake Tahoe is assigned to the SACOG region, the city's ties to the Lake Tahoe Basin are more direct both geographically and economically. Placer and El Dorado Counties comprise the California portion of the Tahoe Basin, and Douglas and Washoe Counties make up the Nevada side. South Lake Tahoe is the only incorporated city in the Lake Tahoe Basin, and is an important center for housing and services. Carson City, located close to the Nevada portion of the Basin, is another significant population center in the area.

Two-thirds of the Basin lies in California and one-third in the state of Nevada. In Nevada, the hourly minimum wage is $8.25, and in California, it is $8.00 (although in September 2013, California passed a law to begin phasing in an increase in the minimum wage from $8.00 to $10.00, starting in 2014). Housing law requirements also differ between the two states, including requirements for closing mobile home parks.

Lake Tahoe Basin's housing markets operate across jurisdictional lines. In recognition of the inextricable links between Basin jurisdictions, the TRPA, Placer County, and HCD collaborated in 1997 to prepare a report entitled "Affordable Housing Needs Assessment: Final 'Fair Share' Report." The purpose of the report was to assist the local jurisdictions in assessing their affordable housing needs in the context of the Lake Tahoe Basin and attributing responsibility for that need.

The report indicates a premise that the political jurisdiction attracting the employment that is creating a need for affordable housing should be responsible for providing housing for those employees. People not residing within the same jurisdiction in which they are employed were presumed to be a potential burden for the jurisdiction providing the housing because of financial concerns, such as cost of social services, for lower-income households that impact the host jurisdiction. The report also recognizes that this goal may be unrealistic due to other housing constraints, such as land availability, environmental restrictions, and the real estate market.

The state line between South Lake Tahoe and neighboring communities in Douglas County, Nevada, is a political boundary across which many residents travel daily for jobs, shopping, and housing. Table 4-1 shows recent findings from the US Census OnTheMap application to update the type of information contained in the 1997 report. The database indicated that just 5 percent (over 900 people) of the approximate 18,000 employees in Douglas County were residents of South Lake Tahoe. Thirty-one percent (3,000 people) of the approximate 9,800 employees in South Lake Tahoe also lived in the city. Of Douglas County's 18,000 employees in 2010, 1,451 workers (8 percent) were living in unincorporated El Dorado County. Forty-nine percent of South Lake Tahoe's employees resided in the unincorporated portion of El Dorado County.

TABLE 4-1
PLACE OF RESIDENCE OF DOUGLAS COUNTY AND SOUTH LAKE TAHOE EMPLOYEES
2010

Place of Residence	Employees in Douglas County		Employees in South Lake Tahoe	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Living in South Lake Tahoe	925	5.0%	3,049	31.0%
Living in Unincorporated El Dorado County	1,451	8.0%	4,817	49.0%
Living outside Tahoe Basin	15,787	87.0%	1,935	20.0%
TOTAL	18,163	100%	9,801	100%

Source: US Census Bureau, Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics, OnTheMap application. July 2013. http://onthemap.ces.census.gov/

In 2010, the observed trend is that many South Lake Tahoe and Douglas County employees, especially the middle class, choose housing outside of the Basin. This choice appears based on either the desire to obtain the least expensive housing, a desire to live where there is less snow, or an opportunity to obtain larger and newer housing for their housing dollar as compared to living inside the Basin. For the people who make this choice, the half-hour commute is an acceptable trade-off. For many who live "off the hill," it is a lifestyle choice, especially if they have had the recent opportunity to profit from their equity of past home ownership due to the escalation in Tahoe Basin housing prices in recent decades. For others, it is a choice borne out of necessity because housing prices in the Tahoe Basin skyrocketed from 2000 to 2008. However, for the poorest people, or those without reliable transportation, a commuter lifestyle is not an option.

The data presented in Table 4-2 validates, to some extent, that South Lake Tahoe is bearing the brunt of housing other jurisdictions' low-income employees. However, the data also indicates that much of South Lake Tahoe's housing burden is being created by the lack of employment opportunities within the city. Specifically, of the employees living within the Lake Tahoe Basin earning low incomes, 4,160 worked in Douglas County (of a total of 18,163 employees) and 3,344 worked in South Lake Tahoe (of a total of 9,801 employees). The data shows that South Lake Tahoe has a higher percentage of low-paying jobs.

TABLE 4-2
PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT FOR LOW-INCOME WORKERS
Douglas County and South Lake Tahoe
2010

	Douglas County Employees	South Lake Tahoe Employees
Earning Lower Income Wages	4,160	3,344
Percentage of Workforce	22.9%	34.1%
TOTALWORKFORCE	18,163	9,801

Source: US Census Bureau, Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics, OnTheMap application. July 2013. http://onthemap.ces.census.gov/

This Tahoe Basin housing "shortage," in spite of a high number of vacant units in the communities, may be caused by the area's resort atmosphere and particularly its predominance of vacation-home ownership. The high cost of housing in many of California's urban areas may make housing costs in South Lake Tahoe seem relatively less expensive and more attractive to owners of second homes—and sometimes first homes for those who are out-priced in the area where they reside—as well as vacation rentals.

The Tahoe Basin's ample supply of housing stock—plenty to serve the regional population—is used inefficiently. Many workers, particularly seasonal workers, reside in older motel rooms that are less appealing to visitors and were never intended for permanent occupancy. While some people allege that vacation home rentals "cut into" the demand and market for motel rooms, others observe that many of the motels providing housing for some area residents would never appeal to the visitor market without substantial rehabilitation/investment.

Increasing the supply of housing (i.e., TRPA issuing more allocations) in this type of environment does not necessarily correlate with ensuring that housing will be available for local residents of all income levels to purchase or rent. Consequently, to provide housing for residents of all income levels, special requirements, such as affordable deed restrictions, may be necessary when the housing is developed.

An additional factor related to the regional context in which South Lake Tahoe is located is that land and housing prices are lower in South Lake Tahoe compared to everywhere else in the Tahoe Basin. While the Basin-wide median sales price for single-family homes was $395,700 in 2013, the median sales price in South Lake Tahoe was $260,200. Further, the California side of the south shore (South Lake Tahoe and unincorporated portions of El Dorado County) has greater amounts of vacant private land than all other jurisdictions in the Tahoe Basin. Consequently, developers in neighboring Douglas County often seek to construct higher-end housing or tourist accommodation projects there, sometimes on existing developed land. The least expensive developed land sometimes contains the most inexpensive, market-rate rental housing serving the community. Increasingly, such developers and large-scale Nevada-side employers are

working with realtors to secure properties in South Lake Tahoe for the construction of their TRPA-imposed housing mitigation or employee housing projects. South Lake Tahoe properties, at least in the short term, will be consistently less expensive than the Nevada portion of the Tahoe Basin.

Population/Demographic Trends and Employment Characteristics and Trends

Population

Table 4-3 shows population, households[1], average household size, and housing units for South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County for 1990, 2000, 2010, and 2012. The table also shows 1990–2000, 1990–2010, and 1990–2012 average annual growth rates (AAGR).

Since 1990, South Lake Tahoe's population has grown at a much slower rate than that of El Dorado County. As shown in Table 4-3, the AAGR for South Lake Tahoe's population between 2000 and 2010 was -1.0 percent compared to 1.5 percent for El Dorado County. Figure 4-1 shows the comparison of AAGR for South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County from 2000 to 2012.

TABLE 4-3
POPULATION, HOUSEHOLDS, HOUSING SIZE AND HOUSING UNITS
South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County
1990, 2000, 2010, AND 2012

	South Lake Tahoe				El Dorado County			
	1990	2000	2010	2012	1990	2000	2010	2012
Population								
Number	21,586	23,609	21,403	21,460	125,995	156,299	181,058	181,711
Growth from Previous Period	–	2,023	-2,206	57	–	30,304	24,759	653
% AAGR from Previous Period	–	0.9%	-1.0%	0.1%	–	2.2%	1.5%	0.2%
Households								
Number	8,625	9,410	8,918	8,929	46,845	58,939	70,223	70,335
Growth from Previous Period	–	785	-492	11	–	12,094	11,284	112
% AAGR from Previous Period	–	0.9%	-0.5%	0.1%	–	2.3%	1.8%	0.1%
Average Household Size	2.50	2.51	2.40	2.36	2.69	2.65	2.58	2.58
Housing Units								
Number	14,066	14,050	15,087	15,105	61,451	71,278	88,159	88,300
Growth from Previous Period	–	-16	1,037	18	–	9,827	16,881	141
% AAGR from Previous Period	–	-0.0%	0.7%	0.1%	–	1.5%	2.2%	0.1%

Source: 1990, 2000, and 2010 U.S Census, 2012 DOF estimate

[1] A household is defined as an occupied housing unit.

FIGURE 4-1
AVERAGE ANNUAL GROWTH RATE OF POPULATION AND HOUSING UNITS
South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County
2000-2012



	South Lake Tahoe	El Dorado County
Population	-9.1%	16.3%
Housing Units	7.5%	23.9%

Source: 2000 US Census, 2012 DOF estimate

South Lake Tahoe's housing stock showed little growth between 2000 and 2012, with an increase of 7.5 percent. Comparatively, El Dorado County's housing stock, as a whole, grew at a much faster rate of 23.9 percent from 2000 to 2012. The city's slow rate of housing unit production and population growth is due, in part, to strict TRPA growth regulations that limit housing construction. While the housing statistics do not show a large net increase in housing units, the city saw a steady amount of residential development through 2008. The rate of development slowed from 2009 to 2012 due to the economic downturn and has returned to pre-2009 levels in 2013. Some of this housing development has been built in place of existing units that were demolished or rehabilitated, which would not be reflected in net housing growth. Other new units may not have been captured in the DOF housing unit estimate.

Age/Sex

The South Lake Tahoe community is fairly equally divided between males and females. According to the 2010 Census, 53.2 percent of the city's population was male and 46.8 percent was female.

South Lake Tahoe has a relatively young population. Table 4-4 shows the age breakdown of the city's population in 2000 and 2010. In 2010, children under 19 comprised 23.4 percent of South Lake Tahoe's population, a decrease from 28 percent in 2000. This proportion was relatively the same as the proportion of children under 19 in El Dorado County in 2010 (25.2 percent). The majority of South Lake Tahoe's population (53.9 percent) was between ages 20 and 54 in 2010, a slight decrease for this group from 55.9 percent in 2000.

Seniors over age 65 made up only 9.8 percent of the city's population in 2010, compared to 14.6 percent of El Dorado County's population. The relatively small senior population is not surprising, as the winter climate and lack of single-story housing makes some people prefer warmer areas in their retirement years.

TABLE 4-4
POPULATION BREAKDOWN BY AGE
South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County

Age Distribution	2000				2010			
	South Lake Tahoe		El Dorado County		South Lake Tahoe		El Dorado County	
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total
Under 5	1,564	6.6%	8,946	5.7%	1,349	6.3%	9,513	5.3%
Age 5-9	1,757	7.4%	11,488	7.4%	1,096	5.1%	11,126	6.1%
Age 10-14	1,711	7.3%	12,930	8.3%	1,174	5.5%	12,506	6.9%
Age 15-19	1,585	6.7%	11,324	7.3%	1,400	6.5%	12,522	6.9%
Age 20-24	2,017	8.5%	6,763	4.3%	1,859	8.7%	8,958	5.0%
Age 25-34	3,719	15.8%	15,640	10.0%	3,659	17.1%	17,244	9.5%
Age 35-44	4,065	17.2%	27,809	17.8%	2,757	12.9%	22,203	12.3%
Age 45-54	3,398	14.4%	26,708	17.1%	3,254	15.2%	32,346	17.9%
Age 55-59	974	4.1%	8,668	5.6%	1,597	7.5%	15,146	8.4%
Age 60-64	796	3.4%	6,689	4.3%	1,162	5.4%	12,970	7.2%
Age 65-74	1,225	5.2%	10,952	7.0%	1,259	5.9%	15,437	8.5%
Age 75-84	635	2.7%	6,614	4.2%	620	2.9%	7,969	4.4%
85 and over	163	0.7%	1,768	1.1%	217	1.0%	3,118	1.7%
TOTAL	**23,609**	**100.0%**	**156,299**	**100.0%**	**21,403**	**100.0%**	**181,058**	**100.0%**
Median Age	**33.4**	–	**39.4**	–	**35.6**	–	**43.6**	–

Source: 2000 Census, SF1, 2010 US Census, SACOG 2012

Race/Ethnicity

Table 4-5 summarizes South Lake Tahoe's population by race and ethnicity. In 2010, nearly 60 percent of South Lake Tahoe's population was white. This percentage is lower than that of El Dorado County. About 31 percent of the city's population was of Hispanic origin, and 5.4 percent were Asian. Less than one percent of the city's population was American Indian or Alaska Native, and just over one half of one percent of residents were Black or African American.

TABLE 4-5 POPULATION BREAKDOWN BY RACE AND ETHNICITY South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County 2010				
Racial/Ethnic Category	South Lake Tahoe		El Dorado County	
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total
White	12,818	59.9%	144,689	79.9%
Black or African American	138	0.6%	1,296	0.7%
American Indian and Alaska Native	122	0.6%	1,553	0.9%
Asian	1,155	5.4%	6,143	3.4%
Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander	32	0.2%	261	0.1%
Other	34		318	
Two or More Races	439	2.1%	4,923	2.7%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	6,665	31.1%	21,875	12.1%
TOTAL	**21,403**	**100.0%**	**181,058**	**100.0%**

Source: 2010 US Census, SACOG 2012

Household Characteristics

The 2010 Census counted 8,918 households in the City of South Lake Tahoe. About 52.4 percent (4,677) of the households were family households, defined as a "householder and one or more persons living in the same household who are related to the households by birth, marriage, or adoption." Figure 4-2 provides additional information on the types of households in South Lake Tahoe. Married couples with children under 18 made up 18.9 percent (1,279) of households in the city. The percentage of "empty nester" households or married couples without children under 18 in South Lake Tahoe was 26.3 percent (1,821) of all households in 2010.

In 2010, there were 904 single-parent households in the city, making up 13.1 percent of total households, Non-family households made up 47.6 percent of all households in South Lake Tahoe in 2010. In 2010, 42.2 percent of all households in the city were composed of individuals living alone.

The information on household types in South Lake Tahoe suggests that a variety of housing types are needed to accommodated the variety of household types in the city.



Source: 2010 Census, SF1

Tenure

South Lake Tahoe has a high proportion of renter-occupied housing units. Of the 8,918 occupied housing units counted during the 2010 Census, 5,445 units (61.1 percent) were rental units, while only 3,473 units (38.9 percent) were owner-occupied units. As shown in Figure 4-3, homeownership in South Lake Tahoe is much lower than in El Dorado County, where 73.2 percent of occupied housing units were owner-occupied.

Since the Census is collected in April during the low season of the Tahoe Basin, it can be assumed that the occupied housing units represent the housing stock occupied by year-round residents. As shown in Table 4-6, in 2010, the Census counted 6,169 vacant units in South Lake Tahoe, a 34 percent increase from the 2000 number of 4,595. Nearly 80 percent (4,860) of the vacant units were considered for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use (seasonal). This means 54.5 percent of South Lake Tahoe's housing stock is seasonal housing. The number of vacant seasonal units increased 32 percent from 3,677 to 4,860 between 2000 and 2010, about the same percentage as the overall increase.

TABLE 4-6 VACANT UNITS BY TYPE OF VACANCY South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County 2010				
Vacancy Status	South Lake Tahoe		El Dorado County	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
For rent	936	15.2%	2,139	11.9%
For sale only	164	2.7%	1,278	7.1%
Rented or sold; not occupied	51	0.8%	336	1.9%
For seasonal; recreational; or occasional use	4,860	78.8%	12,677	70.7%
For migrant workers	0	0.00%	6	0.0%
Other vacant	158	2.6%	1,500	8.4%
TOTAL	**6,169**	**100.0%**	**17,936**	**100.0%**

Source: 2010 US Census, CA DOF 2010 Estimates, SACOG 2012



Source: 2010 US Census

Household Income

Table 4-7 shows median incomes and the distribution of household incomes for South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County based on data from the 2006–2010 Census ACS. The median household income in South Lake Tahoe between 2006 and 2010 was $44,217, which was lower than the median income for El Dorado County ($70,000). Just over 26 percent of all households in South Lake Tahoe earned under $25,000 between 2006 and 2010, compared to 11.4 percent in the county. At the other end of the income spectrum, only 13.3 percent of households in South Lake Tahoe earned over $100,000, compared to 37.1 percent in El Dorado County. Many of the city's year-round residents that live and work in the city find it difficult to afford housing due to the high cost and low incomes.

TABLE 4-7 HOUSEHOLD INCOME DISTRIBUTION South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County 2006–2010 Estimate				
	South Lake Tahoe		El Dorado County	
Income Category	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total
Less than $24,999	2,350	26.1%	6,324	11.4%
$25,000 to $49,999	2,712	30.1%	10,338	18.6%
$50,000 to $74,999	1,842	20.4%	10,301	18.5%
$75,000 to $99,999	907	10.1%	7,962	14.3%
$100,000 or more	1,197	13.3%	20,608	37.1%
TOTAL	**9,008**	**100.0%**	**55,533**	**100.0%**
Median Income	$44,217	–	$70,000	–

Source: 2006–2010 Census ACS; SACOG 2012

Existing and Projected Employment

South Lake Tahoe is primarily a tourism-based economy. The city's proximity to the large Bay Area, Sacramento, and Reno population centers makes Lake Tahoe an attractive place for day trippers or weekenders seeking to escape the summertime Central Valley heat or spend a day on the ski slopes. This situation creates a low-paid, seasonal workforce. Jobs paying minimum wage plus tips are not uncommon.

As is typical in destination resort areas, the economy tends to be seasonal in nature, climate-dependent, and tending toward instability. Between Labor Day and ski season and in the spring, hours of employment tend to be cut back, and in some cases, full season layoffs occur. Some people work "dual" seasonal employment, such as Forest Service firefighting in the summer and ski patrolling in the winter.

While South Lake Tahoe's year-round resident population is growing slowly, the city continues to be a popular resort destination, and tourist-based employment will continue to grow. Lower-wage service industry jobs create a need for affordable low-income housing. At the same time, the City recognizes the need to diversify its economy. To create opportunities for non-service sector employees, there is also a need to provide quality, moderate-income housing for year-round residents.

FIGURE 4 - 4
EMPLOYEES BY MAJOR INDUSTRY
El Dorado County
2010



Source: California Employment and Disability Department, Employment by Industry Data

The top employers in the city by number of employees are shown in Table 4-8. In both fiscal years (FY) 2006–2007 and 2011–2012, Barton Memorial Hospital was the city's largest employer with above 5 percent of total employees in each year. The total number of jobs in South Lake Tahoe decreased from 15,874 in FY 2006–2007 to 15,379 in FY 2011–2012, an indicator of the slow economy during the last five years.

TABLE 4-8 LARGE EMPLOYERS South Lake Tahoe 2006–2012				
	2006–2007		2011–2012	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Barton Memorial Hospital	909	5.7%	795	5.2%
Lake Tahoe Unified School District	458	2.9%	344	2.2%
El Dorado County	225	1.4%	253	1.7%
Heavenly Mountain Resort	157	1.0%	230	1.5%
United States Forest Service	245	1.5%	220	1.4%
Lake Tahoe Community College	260	1.6%	213	1.4%
Marriott Corporation	320	2.0%	195	1.3%
Raley's Supermarket	227	1.4%	167	1.1%
City of South Lake Tahoe	208	1.3%	164	1.1%
South Tahoe Public Utility District	113	0.7%	111	0.7%
All Other Employers	12,752	80.3%	12,687	82.5%
Total Workforce	**15,874**	**100.0%**	**15,379**	**100.0%**

Source: City of South Lake Tahoe, Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, 2012.

Housing Characteristics and Trends

Housing Inventory/Supply

South Lake Tahoe offers a variety of housing options. Table 4-9 and Figure 4-5 present comparative data on the housing stock in the City of South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County. The table summarizes the total housing stock according to the type of housing structure.

As shown in Table 4-9, single-family detached housing units account for the majority of housing in the city and county. The city has a significantly smaller proportion of single-family detached homes compared to El Dorado County. In 2010, 63.3 percent of the city's housing stock was single-family detached compared to 81.2 percent for the county. The majority of this difference between the city and county is made up by multi-family developments. The City of South Lake Tahoe had a total of 29.7 percent of its housing in multi-family developments in 2010, whereas the county had only 11.5 percent of its housing in this type.

FIGURE 4-5
HOUSING STOCK CHARACTERISTICS
South Lake Tahoe, and El Dorado County
2010



	Single-Family	Multi-Family	Mobile Homes
South Lake Tahoe	65.83%	29.71%	4.46%
El Dorado County	83.36%	11.47%	5.17%

Source: 2010 US Census

TABLE 4-9
HOUSING STOCK BY TYPE
South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County
2000 and 2010

Year		Total Units	Single-Family		Multi-Family		Mobile Homes
			Detached	Attached	2 to 4	5 plus	
City of South Lake Tahoe							
2000	#	14,005	8,754	366	1,973	2,244	668
	%	100.0%	62.5%	2.6%	14.1%	16.0%	4.8%
2010	#	14,450	9,151	361	2,054	2,239	645
	%	100.0%	63.3%	2.5%	14.2%	15.5%	4.5%
El Dorado County							
2000	#	71,278	57,094	1,598	3,410	4,803	4,373
	%	100.0%	80.1%	2.2%	4.8%	6.7%	6.1%
2010	#	84,449	68,562	1,833	3,705	5,980	4,369
	%	100.0%	81.2%	2.2%	4.4%	7.1%	5.8%

Source: 2000 and 2010 US Census, CA DOF2012 Estimates, SACOG 2012

Table 4-10 shows the housing types for all renter-occupied housing units in the City of South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County. The data presented comes from the 2008–2010 US Census ACS. Between 2008 and 2010, 38.0 percent of renters in South Lake Tahoe lived in single-family homes while 59.4 percent resided in multi-family homes. The remaining 2.7 percent of renters occupied mobile homes of other housing unit types. In El Dorado County, 53.1 percent of rented units were single-family homes, 43.2 percent were multi-family, and the remaining 3.7 percent was mobile homes or other types.

TABLE 4-10
HOUSING TYPE FOR RENTERS
South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County
2008–2010 Estimate

	South Lake Tahoe		El Dorado County	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Single-Family Homes	1,716	38.0%	8,620	53.1%
Multi-Family Homes	2,684	59.4%	7,022	43.2%
Mobile Homes and Others	121	2.7%	604	3.7%
Total	4,521	100.0%	16,246	100.0%

Source: SACOG 2012

Table 4-11 shows the number of housing units and employed residents in the city and county in 2000 and 2010. The ratio of these figures is known as the housing jobs ratio and can be used to evaluate the balance between job opportunities and housing availability in the city. In 2010, the housing jobs ratio was 0.8 in the city and 1.0 in the county.

TABLE 4-11
HOUSING JOBS RATIO
South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County
2000 and 2010

	South Lake Tahoe		El Dorado County	
	2000	2010	2000	2010
Housing Units	14,050	15,087	71,278	88,159
Employed Residents	11,953	12,223	73,821	84,829
Jobs Housing Ratio	0.9	0.8	1.0	1.0

Sources: SACOG 2012, 2000 and 2010 US Census

Vacancy Rates and Rental Housing

The vacancy rate is an important factor in the availability of housing. Where vacancy rates are high, housing prices and rents tend to be lower. A vacancy rate of 5 percent or lower indicates a "tight housing market," meaning that it is harder to find available units in any particular area or price range. The 2010 Census reported the South Lake Tahoe homeowner vacancy rate to be 4.5 percent, with a rental vacancy rate of 14.6 percent.

The local tourist economy creates an attractive market for buying houses as second homes and vacation rentals. Tourists come to the city and pump substantial amounts of disposable income into the local economy, which has positive aspects for South Lake Tahoe. The city benefits from the generation of transient occupancy taxes from the local motels, hotels, and vacation rental units.

There are several concerns associated with the high percentage of seasonal and tourist units. In 2010, 54.5 percent of housing units in South Lake Tahoe were considered "vacant" according to the Census. Of these vacant units, 78.8 percent were for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use as shown previously in Table 4-6. Vacant units which were available for rent in 2010 constituted 15.2 percent of vacancies.

The use of housing as vacation rentals may reduce the number of available rental units for the local workforce; however, the majority of vacation rentals are larger second homes located in prestigious areas of the city. These homes would not likely be available as full-time rentals if they were not used as vacation rentals, as they are used seasonally by their owners. The second home market in South Lake Tahoe increases competition for homebuyers and is a force that drives up prices. The presence of second homes/vacation rentals changes the character of local neighborhoods, as more houses are either unoccupied much of the time or have a "revolving door" with different neighbors every week. Because the construction of new housing is restricted (refer to Housing Constraints section), it is beneficial if as much of the existing housing stock as possible is available for South Lake Tahoe's workforce.

As mentioned previously, some individuals and families resort to renting motel rooms rather than renting residential units when they cannot save enough money for refundable security deposits (typically two months' rent for damages or unpaid rent), or if they have a poor rental history and are unable to compete for a rental. At weekly room rental rates ranging between $150 and $400 per week (or $600 to $1,600 monthly), the motel rate can cost more than an equivalent market-rate studio residential unit, making it difficult to save the money needed to break out of the motel-room cycle. Units are sometimes overcrowded, either with families or sometimes with seasonal workers stretching their housing dollars by "hot bedding" (the practice of sharing a unit with others who work opposite shifts such that there is always someone sleeping in the bed).

However, for many motel residents, motel living is a lifestyle choice. These residents may prefer to live in motels because of amenities such as maid service and the ease of paying a single bill each month. Others may be mentally or physically disabled, and prefer a less independent style of living. Also, some of the residents live and work at the motels as resident managers.

Age of Householders

Table 4-12 shows the age of householders by tenure for both the City of South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County. As shown, between 2008 and 2010, the majority of households in South Lake Tahoe were renter-occupied and of those rented householders, 14.2 percent had householders between 25 and 34 years old. The next largest renter-occupied age bracket was age 45 to 54 with 12.1 percent of all households. The most significant age bracket in owner-occupied households in the City was 45 to 54 years with 8.89 percent of all households. In El Dorado County, the majority of households were owner-occupied with 76.2 percent of all households falling into that category. Of owner-occupied households, the most significant age group was householders 45 to 54 years of age.

TABLE 4-12 HOUSEHOLDERS BY AGE AND TENURE South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County 2008–2010 Estimate				
	South Lake Tahoe		El Dorado County	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS	**8,413**	**100.0%**	**68,118**	**100.0%**
Total Owner-Occupied Households	**3,892**	46.3%	**51,872**	76.2%
Householder 15 to 24 years	65	0.8%	155	0.2%
Householder 25 to 34 years	330	3.9%	2,727	4.0%
Householder 35 to 44 years	672	8.0%	8,271	12.1%
Householder 45 to 54 years	745	8.9%	14,362	21.1%
Householder 55 to 59 years	547	6.5%	6,358	9.3%
Householder 60 to 64 years	442	5.3%	6,513	9.6%
Householder 65 to 74 years	677	8.1%	7,912	11.6%
Householder 75 to 84 years	307	3.7%	4,391	6.5%
Householder 85 years and over	107	1.3%	1,183	1.7%
Total Renter-Occupied Households	**4,521**	**53.7%**	**16,246**	**23.9%**
Householder 15 to 24 years	555	6.6%	1,309	1.9%
Householder 25 to 34 years	1,192	14.2%	4,710	6.9%
Householder 35 to 44 years	973	11.6%	3,406	5.0%
Householder 45 to 54 years	1,017	12.1%	3,275	4.8%
Householder 55 to 59 years	391	4.7%	1,175	1.7%
Householder 60 to 64 years	175	2.1%	791	1.2%
Householder 65 to 74 years	94	1.1%	718	1.1%
Householder 75 to 84 years	100	1.2%	539	0.8%
Householder 85 years and over	24	0.3%	323	0.5%

Source: 2008–2010 Census ACS

Overcrowded Housing

Overcrowding is a measure of the capacity of the housing stock to adequately accommodate residents. Too many individuals living in a housing unit with inadequate space and number of rooms can result in unhealthy living arrangements, as well as accelerated deterioration of the housing stock. The concept of overcrowding is partly determined by cultural preferences. In the United States, housing providers typically consider a household as overcrowded if there is more than one person per room or two persons per bedroom. When calculating the number of people per room, bathrooms and kitchens are excluded. "Extreme overcrowding" is defined as more than 1.5 persons per room. This definition of overcrowding does not consider the size of a dwelling unit or bedroom or the practice of extended family living that is common in some cultures.

Overcrowding can result when the cost of available housing with a sufficient number of bedrooms for larger families exceeds the family's ability to afford such housing, or when unrelated individuals share dwelling units due to high housing costs.

Table 4-13 shows the number of persons per room for renter- and owner-occupied housing units in South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County. Of the City's occupied housing units in 2010, approximately 7.5 percent were extremely overcrowded, compared to 2.4 percent elsewhere in El Dorado County. Extreme overcrowding occurred more often in rental housing than owner-occupied housing. Overall, there was a 7.1 percentage point decrease in extreme overcrowding from 2000, when 14.6 percent of the city's households were extremely overcrowded.

TABLE 4-13
OVERCROWDED HOUSING
South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County
2000 and 2008–2010 Estimate

Persons per Room	South Lake Tahoe				El Dorado County			
	Rental Units		Owner Units		Rental Units		Owner Units	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
2000								
1 or less	4,268	79.6%	3,854	94.4%	13,104	87.9%	42,763	97.1%
1.01 to 1.50	450	8.4%	119	2.9%	862	5.8%	858	1.9%
1.51 or more	643	12.0%	108	2.6%	940	6.3%	412	0.9%
TOTAL	**5,361**	**100.00%**	**4,081**	**100.00%**	**14,906**	**100.00%**	**44,033**	**100.00%**
2008–2010 Estimate								
1 or less	3,876	85.7%	3,698	95.0%	15,057	92.7%	50,913	98.2%
1.01 to 1.50	412	9.1%	104	2.7%	869	5.4%	779	1.5%
1.51 or more	233	5.2%	90	2.3%	320	2.0%	180	0.4%
TOTAL	**4,521**	**100.00%**	**3,892**	**100.00%**	**16,246**	**100.00%**	**51,872**	**100.00%**

Source: 2000 US Census and 2008–2010 Census ACS

Household Size

Table 4-14 summarizes average household size and number of persons per housing unit for South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County in 2000 and 2010. According to the 2010 Census, the proportion of households occupied by one person in South Lake Tahoe (32.7 percent) was larger than the proportions of one-person households in El Dorado County (22.07 percent). The city and county percentages of one-person households both increased slightly between 2000 and 2010. One- and two-person households made up more than 66 percent of all households in South Lake Tahoe in 2010. This proportion was slightly higher in the city than in El Dorado County (60.8 percent). These numbers also represented small increases over the 2000 numbers.

TABLE 4-14
HOUSEHOLD SIZE BY TENURE
South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County

	2000				2010			
	South Lake Tahoe		El Dorado County		South Lake Tahoe		El Dorado County	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Owner-								
1 Person	1,143	28.0%	7,524	17.1%	1,074	30.9%	9,635	18.8%
2 Person	1,524	37.3%	18,037	41.0%	1,440	41.5%	21,812	42.4%
3 Person	584	14.3%	7,078	16.1%	454	13.1%	8,050	15.7%
4 Person	503	12.3%	7,042	16.0%	300	8.6%	7,425	14.5%
5 Person	224	5.5%	2,946	6.7%	124	3.6%	2,901	5.6%
6 Person	67	1.6%	937	2.1%	46	1.3%	997	1.9%
7 + Persons	36	0.9%	469	1.1%	35	1.0%	571	1.1%
TOTAL	**4,081**	**100.0%**	**44,033**	**100.0%**	**3,473**	**100.0%**	**51,391**	**100.0%**
Renter-								
1 Person	1,623	30.3%	4,331	29.1%	1,844	33.9%	5,865	31.1%
2 Person	1,565	29.2%	4,369	29.3%	1,574	28.9%	5,366	28.5%
3 Person	847	15.8%	2,550	17.1%	819	15.0%	3,122	16.6%
4 Person	690	12.9%	2,099	14.1%	589	10.8%	2,371	12.6%
5 Person	348	6.5%	986	6.6%	370	6.8%	1,261	6.7%
6 Person	191	3.6%	380	2.5%	152	2.8%	540	2.9%
7 + Persons	97	1.8%	191	1.3%	97	1.8%	307	1.6%
TOTAL	**5,361**	**100.0%**	**14,906**	**100.0%**	**5,445**	**100.0%**	**18,832**	**100.0%**
Total								
1 Person	2,766	29.3%	11,855	20.1%	2,918	32.7%	15,500	22.1%
2 Person	3,089	32.7%	22,406	38.0%	3,014	33.8%	27,178	38.7%
3 Person	1,431	15.2%	9,628	16.3%	1,273	14.3%	11,172	15.9%
4 Person	1,193	12.6%	9,141	15.5%	889	10.0%	9,796	14.0%
5 Person	572	6.1%	3,932	6.7%	494	5.5%	4,162	5.9%
6 Person	258	2.7%	1,317	2.2%	198	2.2%	1,537	2.2%
7 + Persons	133	1.4%	660	1.1%	132	1.5%	878	1.3%
TOTAL	**9,442**	**100.0%**	**58,939**	**100.0%**	**8,918**	**100.0%**	**70,223**	**100.00%**

Source: US Census 2000, SF 1 Tables H12, SF3 Table H17, 2010 US Census

Housing Size

South Lake Tahoe also has a larger proportion of smaller housing units than El Dorado County. Table 4-15 summarizes the number of bedrooms in housing units by tenure. Studios, one-bedroom, and two-bedroom housing units made up more than half (51.1 percent) of all housing units in South Lake Tahoe between 2008 and 2010. Studios, one-, and two-bedroom units made up only 28.3 percent of El Dorado's housing stock.

TABLE 4-15
NUMBER OF BEDROOMS BY TENURE
South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County
2008–2010 Estimate

	South Lake Tahoe		El Dorado County	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Owner-Occupied				
No bedroom	26	0.7%	99	0.2%
1 bedroom	174	4.5%	905	1.7%
2 bedrooms	808	20.8%	8,672	16.7%
3 bedrooms	2,156	55.4%	25,125	48.4%
4 bedrooms	631	16.2%	13,494	26.0%
5 or more bedrooms	97	2.5%	3,577	6.9%
TOTAL	**3,892**	**100.0%**	**51,872**	**100.0%**
Renter-Occupied				
No bedroom	455	10.1%	632	3.9%
1 bedroom	1105	24.4%	3238	19.9%
2 bedrooms	1733	38.3%	5731	35.3%
3 bedrooms	1035	22.9%	5605	34.5%
4 bedrooms	126	2.8%	799	4.9%
5 or more bedrooms	67	1.5%	241	1.5%
TOTAL	**4,521**	**100.0%**	**16,246**	**100.00%**
Total Households				
No bedroom	481	5.7%	731	1.1%
1 bedroom	1279	15.2%	4143	6.1%
2 bedrooms	2541	30.2%	14403	21.1%
3 bedrooms	3191	37.9%	30730	45.1%
4 bedrooms	757	9.0%	14293	21.0%
5 or more bedrooms	164	2.0%	3818	5.6%
TOTAL	**8413**	**100.0%**	**68118**	**100.0%**

Source: 2008–2010 US Census ACS

Development Trends

As the next section describes, housing prices have increased significantly in the last few decades, and it is true that people are no longer building 860 square foot "Tahoe cabins." Developers find higher profitability in the upper-end ownership market than in first-time homebuyer market and rental market, causing builders to focus on that market in their speculative development.

However, the City's method of distributing 30 percent of the limited market-rate residential allocations it receives from TRPA to new multi-family units ensures that multi-family housing is also constructed. These units have tended to be used for smaller multi-family rental housing (typically four units or fewer with two bedrooms per unit) or small individual ownership condominiums that can benefit the first-time homebuyer. This new construction adds diversity to what would likely otherwise be aging multi-family rental housing stock.

Housing Conditions

The US Census provides limited data that can be used to make inferences about the condition of South Lake Tahoe's housing stock. For example, the Census reports on whether housing units have complete plumbing and kitchen facilities. Since less than 2 percent of all housing units in South Lake Tahoe were lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities between 2008 and 2010 (see Table 4-16), these indicators do not reveal much about overall housing conditions.

Housing stock age and condition are generally correlated, so one Census variable that provides an indication of housing conditions is the age of a community's housing stock. Table 4-16 shows the median year built and the decade built for owner-occupied and renter-occupied housing units in South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County between 2008 and 2010. As shown in the table, South Lake Tahoe's housing stock is older than El Dorado County housing stock. Over 75 percent of South Lake Tahoe's housing units were built before 1980, compared to 43 percent for El Dorado County. With Tahoe's winter climate, older houses require investment in order to keep them properly maintained.

TABLE 4-16
AGE OF HOUSING STOCK & HOUSING STOCK CONDITIONS BY TENURE
South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County
2008–2010 Estimate

	South Lake Tahoe		El Dorado County	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Owner-Occupied Housing Units				
Built 2005 or later	116	3.0%	3,099	6.0%
Built 2000 to 2004	109	2.8%	6,277	12.1%
Built 1990 to 1999	325	8.4%	10,616	20.5%
Built 1980 to 1989	398	10.2%	11,635	22.4%
Built 1970 to 1979	1,028	26.4%	11,141	21.5%
Built 1960 to 1969	940	24.2%	4,303	8.3%
Built 1950 to 1959	894	23.0%	2,787	5.4%
Built 1940 to 1949	71	1.8%	946	1.8%
Built 1939 or earlier	11	0.3%	1,068	2.1%
TOTAL	**3,892**	**100.0%**	**51,872**	**100.0%**
Median Year Built	1970	-	1985	-
Units Lacking Complete Plumbing Facilities	48	1.2%	71	0.1%
Units Lacking Complete Kitchen Facilities	48	1.2%	108	0.2%

TABLE 4-16 AGE OF HOUSING STOCK & HOUSING STOCK CONDITIONS BY TENURE South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County 2008–2010 Estimate				
	South Lake Tahoe		El Dorado County	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Renter-Occupied Housing Units				
Built 2005 or later	47	1.0%	772	4.8%
Built 2000 to 2004	32	0.7%	1,350	8.3%
Built 1990 to 1999	215	4.8%	1,954	12.0%
Built 1980 to 1989	541	12.0%	3,192	19.7%
Built 1970 to 1979	1,227	27.1%	3,875	23.9%
Built 1960 to 1969	1,345	29.8%	2,361	14.5%
Built 1950 to 1959	732	16.2%	1,609	9.9%
Built 1940 to 1949	175	3.9%	508	3.1%
Built 1939 or earlier	207	4.6%	625	3.9%
TOTAL	**4,521**	**100.0%**	**16,246**	**100.0%**
Median Year Built	1969	-	1978	-
Units Lacking Complete Plumbing Facilities	0	0.0%	20	0.0%
Units Lacking Complete Kitchen Facilities	0	0.0%	82	0.2%
Total Occupied Housing Units				
Built 2005 or later	163	1.9%	3,871	5.7%
Built 2000 to 2004	141	1.7%	7,627	11.2%
Built 1990 to 1999	540	6.4%	12,570	18.5%
Built 1980 to 1989	939	11.2%	14,827	21.8%
Built 1970 to 1979	2,255	26.8%	15,016	22.0%
Built 1960 to 1969	2,285	27.2%	6,664	9.8%
Built 1950 to 1959	1,626	19.3%	4,396	6.5%
Built 1940 to 1949	246	2.9%	1,454	2.1%
Built 1939 or earlier	218	2.6%	1,693	2.5%
TOTAL	**8,413**	**100.0%**	**68,118**	**100.0%**
Median Year Built	1969	-	1983	-
Units Lacking Complete Plumbing Facilities	48	0.6%	91	0.1%
Units Lacking Complete Kitchen Facilities	48	0.6%	190	0.3%

Source: 2008–2010 US Census ACS

2002 Housing Condition Survey

In July 2002, the City of South Lake Tahoe contracted with Parsons HBA to evaluate exterior housing conditions citywide. The housing conditions survey was conducted using the nominal point system and survey format recommended by HCD for use in the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)

program. The survey included 5,166 units, compared to 330 units surveyed in 1990. The survey findings present a snapshot of 15 sub-areas of the city surveyed; these samples are not necessarily representative of each sub-area or of the city as a whole.

Survey Methodology

The survey sample size was at least 25 percent of all structures of one to four units, and 100 percent of all five or more unit complexes in each sub-area. In addition, all 771 mobile homes were surveyed. Only 10 percent of the one-to-four-unit structures in Tahoe Keys and Tahoe Meadows were surveyed. Ten percent of Tahoe Keys was surveyed because it has a high percentage of housing units constructed since 1970. The likelihood of significant housing rehabilitation need is much lower than in neighborhoods with older housing. In any case, 100 percent of the multi-family housing stock was surveyed in this area. In addition, 10 percent of the structures of one to four units in Tahoe Meadows were surveyed because this is an older gated subdivision listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Information on housing conditions was collected through a "windshield survey," a drive-by assessment of exterior housing conditions. While a drive-by inspection can determine if a housing unit needs a new foundation, roof, or paint, it cannot identify substandard interior conditions, such as faulty plumbing or wiring. By assessing the condition of the exterior electrical box, however, a correlation between substandard interior conditions and a damaged or faulty electrical box can be made. Housing units that require exterior rehabilitation often require interior rehabilitation, as well.

The survey noted the following housing characteristics: status (occupied, for rent, for sale, etc.); housing type (single-family, duplex, etc.); estimated age; and exterior type (wood, masonry, etc.). Housing conditions were evaluated based upon a point rating system devised by HCD. Each unit was identified by street address and rated with a numbered assessment based on the condition of five exterior conditions (foundation, windows, roofing, electrical, and siding). The total point score for the five rated conditions comprises the total rating for each housing unit. Based on the total point score, each unit was categorized as sound; needing minor rehabilitation, moderate rehabilitation, or substantial rehabilitation; or dilapidated (infeasible to rehabilitate).

Survey Results

Table 4-17 summarizes the overall conditions for housing units in South Lake Tahoe as of the 2002 Conditions Survey.

TABLE 4-17
HOUSING UNITS IN NEED OF REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT
South Lake Tahoe
1990 and 2002

Condition	1990	2002
Repair—Percentage of Housing Units Needing Rehabilitation	39%	25%
Demolition—Percentage of Housing Units Needing Replacement	<1%	<1%

Source: 2002 Housing Conditions Survey, Parsons HBA

Table 4-18 summarizes the total results of the 2002 Housing Conditions Survey by area of the city.

TABLE 4-18
HOUSING CONDITIONS SURVEY RESULTS
South Lake Tahoe
2002

Sub-Areas	Excellent		Sound		Minor Rehab		Moderate Rehab		Substantial Rehab		Dilapidated		Units Surveyed
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Al Tahoe	211	40%	177	33%	53	10%	88	17%	3	1%	0	0%	532
Barton	21	23%	57	63%	5	5%	8	9%	0	0%	0	0%	91
Bijou Pines	72	40%	75	41%	5	3%	28	28%	2	1%	0	0%	182
Blackwood Herbert	184	38%	224	46%	51	11%	23	5%	0	0%	0	0%	482
Bonanza	141	41%	119	34%	56	16%	18	5%	14	4%	0	0%	348
Gardner Mountain	56	12%	324	69%	67	14%	21	4%	0	0%	0	0%	468
Heavenly Summary	181	79%	39	17%	5	2%	3	1%	0	0%	0	0%	228
Highland Woods	73	45%	60	37%	25	15%	4	2%	0	0%	0	0%	162
Lakeside Park	41	38%	37	25%	24	22%	2	2%	2	2%	1	1%	107
Pioneer Glenwood	111	45%	81	33%	36	14%	20	8%	0	0%	1	1%	249
Sierra Tract	186	41%	135	30%	87	19%	43	10%	0	0%	0	0%	451
Tahoe Keys	152	34%	280	63%	8	2%	1	<1%	0	0%	0	0%	441
Tahoe Meadows	7	47%	5	33%	0	0%	3	20%	0	0%	0	0%	15
Tahoe Valley/Tahoe Island	144	34%	170	40%	82	19%	24	6%	2	<1%	0	0%	422
Triangle	216	22%	291	29%	258	26%	181	18%	42	4%	0	0%	988
TOTAL	**1,796**	**35%**	**2,074**	**40%**	**762**	**15%**	**467**	**9%**	**65**	**1%**	**2**	**1%**	**5,166**

Source: 2002 Housing Conditions Survey, Parsons HBA

At the time of the 2000 Census, South Lake Tahoe had 14,050 housing units. Over 79 percent of the housing stock citywide consisted of structures containing one to four dwelling units. While conducting the survey, the consultants' staff found discrepancies between the number of housing units in a structure and the number reported in the 2000 Census counts. For example, the 2000 Census identifies 1,511 housing units in structures with 5 to 19 units and 738 housing units in structures with 20 or more units. In contrast, the consultants found 808 housing units in structures of 5 to 19 units and 1,718 housing units in structures of 20 or more units. The Census Bureau may have counted small motels being used for housing in the 5- to 19-unit category and counted several of the multi-family properties containing 20 or more units in the 5- to 19-unit category.

Properties with One to Four Units

Among properties with one to four dwelling units, 2,640 units were included in the survey. Seventy-five percent of these units were evaluated as having no rehabilitation needs. About one-quarter (631 units) need rehabilitation, and less than 1 percent (2 units) requires replacement. Most homes in need of rehabilitation require "minor" or "moderate" rehabilitation. Of the dwelling units found to not require rehabilitation ("sound"), 37 percent (969) exhibit signs of deferred maintenance which, if not properly addressed, could result in a need for rehabilitation in the future.

The need for rehabilitation or replacement of residential structures containing one to four units varies among the neighborhoods surveyed. Sierra Tract has the highest number of units in need of rehabilitation (130 units), Lakeside Park and Pioneer/ Glenwood has the highest replacement need (one unit each), and Tahoe Meadows has the lowest rehabilitation need (six units) and replacement need (no units).

Properties with Five or More Units

Among properties with five or more dwelling units, 2,526 units were included in the survey (or 100 percent). Of those with 5-19 units, 65 percent required no rehabilitation, 34 percent required rehabilitation, and 1 percent required replacement. Of those with 20 or more units, 77 percent required no rehabilitation and 23 percent required rehabilitation. Of the multi-family dwelling units found not to be requiring rehabilitation, 44 percent (1,105 units) exhibit signs of deferred maintenance, which, if not properly addressed within five to seven years, could result in a need for rehabilitation. About 26 percent (663 units) overall need rehabilitation, and less than 1 percent (four units) require replacement.

The Triangle area had the highest number of complexes of five or more units in need of rehabilitation (759 units), followed by the Gardner Mountain area, which has 50 units in need of rehabilitation. Heavenly and Tahoe Keys had no rehabilitation and replacement need.

Mobile Homes

A survey of all 20 mobile home/trailer parks in the City of South Lake Tahoe was conducted as a supplement to the City's housing conditions survey. The survey included assessing both the conditions of mobile home parks and individual mobile homes, travel trailers, recreation vehicles, and campers. As part of the survey, willing mobile home park owners and/or management agents were contacted to obtain information on the number of owned verses rented dwellings, recent selling/rental prices, the number of unoccupied spaces, general demographics, and any planned improvements for the future.

Similar to the housing conditions survey, information on the mobile home park dwelling and site conditions survey was collected through a "windshield survey," which is a drive-by assessment of exterior conditions. The survey noted the following exterior dwelling characteristics: approximate age (pre- or post-1976); structure type (manufactured home, mobile home, travel trailer, recreation vehicle, motor home, or camper); and status (occupied, for rent, for sale, or vacant).

Dwelling conditions were evaluated based upon a modified point rating system devised by HCD. (Modification to the conditions rating scale was necessary, as foundations were not assessed as part of the mobile home park survey.) Each dwelling was rated with a numbered assessment based on the following three exterior conditions: roofing, siding, and windows and doors.

Recreational vehicles (RV) and campers are not regulated by mobile home park guidelines and do not meet federal standards for permanent occupancy; consequently, regardless of condition, they are not suitable forms of permanent shelter. Based on housing type alone, RVs and campers were considered in need of replacement. RV parks registered with HCD are recreation facilities not intended to provide long-term housing. Due to their temporary nature, RV parks do not have to meet the minimum standards for permanent housing, unlike mobile home parks.

Table 4-19 summarizes the conditions of mobile homes and RVs. According to the Census, South Lake Tahoe had 668 mobile homes, recreation vehicles, campers, etc. in 2000. These dwellings represented 5 percent of the total number of housing units citywide. The City's 2002 mobile home park survey assessed 771 structures. Similar to the housing conditions survey, a discrepancy was found between the number of mobile homes, recreation vehicles, and campers reported in the 2000 Census count and the total number surveyed by the consultants.

Of the 771 dwellings surveyed, 731 (95 percent) were occupied, 25 were unoccupied, 12 were for rent, and three were for sale. Several mobile home and/or trailer parks had vacant sites with no structure present (36 mobile home sites and 12 RV sites).

Approximately 39 percent (300) of the mobile homes, RVs, travel trailers, and campers surveyed were built after the 1976 Mobile Home Construction Standards Act, while 61 percent (471) were built prior to the act. The Mobile Home Construction Standards Act created minimum standards for the construction of mobile homes. Of the 300 built after the act, 265 were mobile homes located at Tahoe Verde Mobile Home Park.

Travel trailers represented the largest percentage of dwellings surveyed, at just over half the total (55 percent). Travel trailers resemble mobile homes; however, they have a built-in visible front "hitch-up" feature that makes transporting the dwelling much easier. Of the remaining dwellings surveyed, 301 (39 percent) were mobile homes, 42 (5 percent) were RVs, and three (<1 percent) were campers.

Of the 771 individual dwellings, common problems found during the mobile home park survey included cracked and broken roofs, siding in need of patchwork and repainting, and windows and doors in need of repainting.

TABLE 4-19 OVERALL MOBILE HOME AND RV CONDITIONS South Lake Tahoe 2002					
Excellent	**Sound**	**Need Minor Rehabilitation**	**Need Substantial Rehabilitation**	**Need Moderate Rehabilitation**	**Dilapidated (unsuitable for rehabilitation)**
34 (5%)	265 (34%)	79 (10%)	216 (28%)	47 (6%)	130 (17%)
No rehab required: 39%		Rehab required: 44%			Demolish/Replace: 17%

Source: 2002 Housing Conditions Survey, Parsons HBA

Table 4-20 shows the conditions of individual mobile home parks based on the 2002 conditions survey.

TABLE 4-20 OVERALL MOBILE HOME PARK CONDITIONS South Lake Tahoe 2002				
Name/Address	**Sites Licensed**	**Vacant**	**Existing**	**Score/Overall**
Al's Mobile Home Park *1072 Marjorie Drive*	12 MH	--	12 TT	45 - Dilapidated
Bonanza Trailer Park* *1345 Bonanza Avenue*	18 MH	15	3 TT	45 - Dilapidated
Chris Haven/Annex *2030 E Street/1300 Melba Drive*	78 MH	--	78 TT	8 - Minor Rehabilitation
	30 RV	--	30 RV	0 - Excellent
Hansen's Tahoe Valley Village *2033 C Street*	7 MH	--	6 TT	28 - Moderate Rehabilitation
		--	1 MH	6 - Minor Rehabilitation
Heavenly Trailer Park *3593 Terry Lane*	13 MH	6	3 TT	20 - Moderate Rehabilitation
			4 RV	0 - Excellent
Heavenly Valley Mobile Estate *3740 Blackwood Road*	61 MH	--	61 TT	11 - Moderate Rehabilitation
Lakeside Mobile Home Park *3987 Cedar Avenue*	43 MH	--	43 TT	13 - Moderate Rehabilitation
Little Truckee MHP *2333 Eloise Avenue*	30 MH	--	30 TT	45 - Dilapidated
Morgan's Trailer Park *1010 Second Street*	5 MH	2	3 C	18 - Moderate Rehabilitation
Old Stage Mobile Home Park *861 Emerald Bay Road*	27 MH	--	27 MH	40 - Substantial Rehabilitation
	3 RV	3 RV	0 RV	40 - Substantial Rehabilitation
Pioneer Trailer Court* *1029 Shepherds Drive*	20 MH	--	20 TT	40 - Substantial Rehabilitation
Sierra Hills Mobile Park* *1333 Bonanza Avenue*	15 MH	11 MH	4 MH	45 - Dilapidated
	5 RV	5 RV	0 RV	--
Skylark Mobile Home Park	20 MH	--	20 TT	45 - Dilapidated

TABLE 4-20 OVERALL MOBILE HOME PARK CONDITIONS South Lake Tahoe 2002				
Name/Address	**Sites Licensed**	**Vacant**	**Existing**	**Score/Overall**
981 Lodi Avenue	4 RV	4 RV		
Spiva Mobile Park *1314 Melba Drive*	8 MH	--	4 MH	11 - Moderate Rehabilitation
		--	4 TT	11 - Moderate Rehabilitation
Tah-Wye Pines *885 James Avenue*	20 MH	2	18 TT	45 - Dilapidated
Tahoe Riviera Trailer Park *3284 Lake Tahoe Boulevard*	92 MH	--	92 TT	11 - Moderate Rehabilitation
Tahoe Verde Mobile Park *1080 Julie Lane*	265 MH	--	265 MH	3 - Sound
The Pine Cone *2181 Jean Avenue*	9 MH	--	9 TT	45 - Dilapidated
Trailer Towne MHP *2214 Barton Avenue*	17 MH	--	19 TT	45 - Dilapidated
	3 RV	--		
Tuck's Travel Trailer Park** *1234 Melba Drive*	15 RV	--	7 TT	45 - Dilapidated
			8 RV	45 - Dilapidated

Note: TT = travel trailer, MH = mobile home, C = camper, RV = recreational vehicle
*Indicates that trailer park has closed since the 2002 Housing Conditions Survey
**Tuck's Travel Trailer Park is now called Cedar Pine Resort. Dilapidated trailers have been replaced with new modular homes.
Source: 2002 Housing Conditions Survey, Parsons HBA

Changes Since the 2002 Housing Conditions Survey

In the early parts of the last decade, the South Tahoe Redevelopment Agency (STRA) played a very active role in the redevelopment of blighted properties throughout the city. During 2003 and 2004, the STRA continued to work on the Heavenly Village Project—a redevelopment project that began in 1999 and involved the removal of 21 deteriorated and dilapidated motels and commercial uses. Heavenly Village consists of a gondola base station that provides access to the Heavenly Ski Resort, the Marriott Grand Residence Club, the Timber Lodge time share, a multi-screen cinema, and new retail and commercial space.

STRA's Redevelopment Project Number 3, which had been in the planning stages since 1995, finally broke ground in June 2007. The project is located adjacent to the California-Nevada state line, bounded by Lake Tahoe Boulevard to the east, Cedar Avenue to the west, and Stateline Avenue to the north. The project is aimed at enhancing the city's tourist-based economy and includes, among other things, condominium hotels, a convention center, and retail space. After construction began the project was put on hold for several years due to economic conditions and difficulties with construction financing. In 2013 construction began again on a portion of the retail component of the project. This retail portion is expected to be completed in 2014. However, there is no definitive timeline for construction of the rest of the project.

While the 2002 Housing Conditions Survey did not survey motel rooms, it is well known that many of the city's older, more deteriorated motels are being used as temporary or permanent housing. STRA's redevelopment activity included the removal of many dilapidated motels along Lake Tahoe Boulevard

(Highway 50). As of the end of FY 2003-04, the STRA had removed a total of 232 units containing 297 bedrooms, most of which were substandard motel units. Through its Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the City, the STRA has contributed to the creation of 194 new units containing 355 bedrooms, leaving a replacement housing need of 38 more units. In 2006, 26 additional motel units and one substandard housing unit were removed. The redevelopment agency aided in the creation of 31 units of affordable housing in 2006 and 2007. As of early 2008, the redevelopment agency had removed a total 259 units and replaced 227 units, leaving a remaining housing obligation of 32 housing units**.**

The City has also aided in the redevelopment of substandard housing units through its Housing Rehabilitation Loan Program. Between 2003 and 2008, the City provided 11 loans (10 for single-family housing units and one loan for a multi-family project). The largest rehabilitation project that was partially funded through this program during that time period was the acquisition and complete rehabilitation of Sierra Garden Apartments—a 76-unit affordable housing project that was over 30 years old and in need of repair. The property changed ownership during the rehabilitation, and is now owned through a limited liability partnership between PAM Companies and the St. Joseph Community Land Trust. Since 2008, the City has provided 10 additional housing rehabilitation loans to single-family property owners for a total of 21 loans assisting 96 housing units since 2003.

Finally, three of the city's mobile home parks have closed and one has been redeveloped. Bonanza Trailer Park and Sierra Hills Mobile Park, located adjacent to one another on Bonanza Avenue, have closed. During the 2002 Housing Conditions survey, both parks were identified as dilapidated. Mobile homes in the Pioneer Trailer Court park, which was noted in 2002 as needing substantial rehabilitation, have been removed from the site and are currently being replaced by modular homes, however it remains a Mobile Home Park as defined by HCD. This park is now called Shepard's Trail. Tuck's Travel Trailer Park, which was identified as dilapidated in 2002, replaced the substandard mobile homes with new modular homes and is now called Cedar Pine Resort.

In April 2002, the City of South Lake Tahoe created a bilingual (English/Spanish) Housing Issues Hotline. It responds to tenant complaints about the condition of rental housing and coordinates inspection with appropriate agencies such as the City Building and Safety Division, the County Health Department, and other agencies to address substandard housing in our community. The hotline has proven valuable to tenants. Between 2009 and present, the City received approximately 2,000 calls. The City responded to all of the substandard housing complaints with inspections. Over 200 inspections have been conducted. Over 150 cases have been closed after the landlords responded with housing condition improvements. There have not been significant changes to the housing stock conditions since the last surveys were conducted. However, with economic conditions over the last five years it is expected that there is a higher level of deferred maintenance on housing units due to the inability for property owners to invest in them. In addition, there was a significant slowdown in new construction activity between 2008 and 2012 so the number of new housing units has not continued to grow, resulting in an older housing stock overall throughout the City. The City recognizes the need to update information regarding the condition of the City's housing stock and will undertake a housing condition survey prior to completion of the 6th cycle Housing Element (See Program 3-8).

Housing Affordability

Table 4-21 shows the median household income for various sized households in the city and county between 2006 and 2010. A four-person household in the city had a median annual income of $69,696 and

the same county household had $104,566 as a median income. Overall, the median household income in South Lake Tahoe was $44,217 and $70,000 in the county.

TABLE 4-21
MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY HOUSEHOLD SIZE
South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County
2006–2010 Estimate

	South Lake Tahoe	El Dorado County
	Median Income	Median Income
1 Person Household	$25,074	$31,707
2 Person Household	$53,048	$71,739
3 Person Household	$52,630	$83,078
4 Person Household	$69,696	$104,566
5 Person Household	$46,066	$99,172
6 Person Household	$45,542	$87,875
7+ Person Household	$60,781	$112,292
Total Median Household Income	$44,217	$70,000

Source: 2006-2010 Census ACS, SACOG 2012

Housing Cost Burdens

HCD calls for an analysis of the proportion of "lower-income" households "overpaying for housing." Lower-income households are defined as those that earn 80 percent or less of the area median income. This is a share of income approach to measure housing affordability in terms of the percentage of income that a household spends on its housing.

An assessment of housing cost burdens requires that information about household size be combined with information on household income for each household individually. HUD creates a special Census tabulation for use in Consolidated Plans.[2] The data in this section uses this Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data from HUD's State of the Cities Data Systems website.

A "moderate cost burden" is defined by HUD as gross housing costs between 31 and 50 percent of gross income. A "severe cost burden" is defined as gross housing costs exceeding 50 percent of gross income. For renters, gross housing costs include rent paid by the tenant plus utilities. For owners, housing costs include mortgage payment, taxes, insurance, and utilities.

Income groups are shown in the CHAS tabulation based on the HUD-adjusted area median family income. The area median family income is based on the Sacramento Metropolitan Statistical Area, encompassing El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, and Yolo counties. In 1974, Congress defined "low

[2]The Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy data file is a detailed tabulation of the decennial Census sponsored by HUD. It includes extensive data on a variety of physical and financial housing characteristics and needs categorized by HUD-defined income limits (30, 50, and 80 percent of area median income) and HUD-specified household types. As with the long form in the decennial Census, CHAS indicators are estimates based on a sample of households. These special tabulation data are used by local governments for housing planning as part of the Consolidated Planning process and by HUD for various allocation formulas to distribute funds to localities.

income" and "very low income" for HUD rental programs as incomes not exceeding 80 and 50 percent, respectively, of the area median family income, as adjusted by HUD.[3]

Table 4-22 below shows the CHAS special tabulation data from the 2006–2010 Census ACS regarding the percentage of households with a housing cost burden greater than 30 percent by income group and tenure for extremely low- and very low-income households in South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County.

As shown in Table 4-22, 2.0 percent of all households in South Lake Tahoe were extremely low-income and had a housing cost burden greater than 30 percent between 2006 and 2010. In this income category, 9.6 percent had a cost burden between 30 and 50 percent. Nearly 6 percent of all households in South Lake Tahoe were very low income and had a cost burden greater than 30 percent during this time. The percentage of renters (7.8 percent) with this cost burden was significantly higher than owners (2.9 percent) in this category. Nearly 5 percent of those with very low incomes had a cost burden between 30 and 50 percent.

In El Dorado County as a whole, 0.9 percent of all households were extremely low income and had a housing cost burden greater than 30 percent between 2006 and 2010. In this income category, 9.6 percent had a cost burden greater than 50 percent. In the county, 2.6 percent of all households were very low income and had a cost burden greater than 30 percent during this time. As was the case in the city, the percentage of renters (8.1 percent) with this cost burden was significantly higher than owners (1.2 percent) in this category. Nearly 5 percent of those with very low incomes had a cost burden between 30 and 50 percent, the same as in the City of South Lake Tahoe. As would be expected, housing cost burdens were more severe for households with lower incomes. The highest cost burdens in both the city and the county fell on very low-income renters. This may be due to the higher numbers of very low-income households overall and the fact that extremely low-income households with housing often receive some form of assistance or supportive services.

[3] Statutory adjustments now include upper and lower caps for areas with low or high ratios of housing costs to income and, for each non-metropolitan county, a lower cap equal to its state's non-metropolitan average. Estimates of the median family income and the official income cutoffs for each metropolitan area and non-metropolitan county are based on the most recent decennial Census results and updated each year by HUD. Each base income cutoff is assumed to apply to a household of four, and official cutoffs are further adjusted by household size: one person, 70 percent of base; two persons, 80 percent; three persons, 90 percent; five persons, 108 percent; six persons, 116 percent; etc.

TABLE 4-22 HOUSING COST BURDEN BY HOUSEHOLD INCOME CLASSIFICATION South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County 2006–2010 Estimate						
	South Lake Tahoe			El Dorado County		
	Owners	Renters	Total	Owners	Renters	Total
Household Income ≤ 30% MFI						
Total Households in jurisdiction	3,473	5,445	8,918	45,758	11,418	57,176
Number w/ cost burden > 30%	60	120	180	235	265	500
Percent w/ cost burden > 30%	1.7%	2.2%	2.0%	0.5%	2.3%	0.9%
Number w/ cost burden > 50%	230	630	860	1,530	1,655	3,185
Percent w/ cost burden > 50%	6.6%	11.6%	9.6%	3.3%	14.5%	5.6%
Household Income >30 to 50% MFI						
Total Households in jurisdiction	3,473	5,445	8,918	45,758	11,418	57,176
Number w/ cost burden > 30%	100	425	525	540	925	1,465
Percent w/ cost burden > 30%	2.9%	7.8%	5.9%	1.2%	8.1%	2.6%
Number w/ cost burden > 50%	145	285	430	1,405	1,320	2,725
Percent w/ cost burden > 50%	4.2%	5.2%	4.8%	3.1%	11.6%	4.8%

Source: 2006–2010 CHAS, SACOG 2012

Ability to Pay for Housing

The following section compares 2013 income levels and ability to pay for housing with actual housing costs. Housing is classified as "affordable" if households do not pay more than 30 percent of income for payment of rent (including a monthly allowance for water, gas, and electricity) or monthly homeownership costs (including mortgage payments, taxes, and insurance). Since above moderate-income households do not generally have problems locating affordable units, affordable housing is usually defined as units that are reasonably priced for low- and moderate-income households. The list below shows the definition of housing income limits as they are applied to housing units in South Lake Tahoe.

- **Extremely Low-Income Unit:** affordable to households whose combined income is between the floor set at the minimum Supplemental Security Income and 30 percent of the median income for South Lake Tahoe as established by HUD (using El Dorado County statistics).

- **Very Low-Income Unit**: affordable to households whose combined income is at or lower than 50 percent of the median income for South Lake Tahoe as established by HUD.

- **Low-Income Unit**: affordable to a household whose combined income is at or between 51 percent and 80 percent of the median income for South Lake Tahoe as established by HUD.

- **Median-Income Unit:** affordable to a household whose combined income is at or between 81 percent and 100 percent of the median income for South Lake Tahoe as established by HUD. Note that HCD defines the median income as 100 percent area median income.

- **Moderate-Income Unit**: affordable to a household whose combined income is at or between 81 percent and 120 percent of the median income for South Lake Tahoe as established by HUD.

- **Above Moderate-Income Unit**: affordable to a household whose combined income is above 120 percent of the median income for South Lake Tahoe as established by HUD.

According to HCD, the median family income for a four-person household in El Dorado County was $76,100 in 2013. Income limits for larger or smaller households were higher or lower, respectively, and are calculated using a HUD formula The income limits are shown in Table 4-23.

TABLE 4-23
HCD INCOME LIMITS BASED ON PERSONS PER HOUSEHOLD
El Dorado County*
2013

Income Categories	Persons per Household				
	1	2	3	4	5
Extremely Low Income	$16,000	$18,300	$20,600	$22,850	$24,700
Very Low Income	$26,650	$30,450	$34,250	$38,050	$41,100
Low Income	$42,650	$48,750	$54,850	$60,900	$65,800
Median Income	$53,250	$60,900	$68,500	$76,100	$82,200
Moderate Income	$63,900	$73,050	$82,150	$91,300	$98,600

Source: California Department of Housing and Community Development, http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hrc/rep/state/inc2k13.pdf

The HCD income limits for extremely low-, very low-, and low-income households are used to determine if households qualify for certain housing programs including the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher program. It is important to note that the median income in South Lake Tahoe is significantly lower than the income used to establish the income limits applied by HCD. At the time of the 2008–2010 Census ACS, South Lake Tahoe's median family income was $52,761 compared to $86,812 for El Dorado County.

Table 4-24 shows the 2013 HCD household income limits for El Dorado County by the number of persons in the household for the lower four income categories discussed above. The table also shows maximum affordable monthly rents and maximum affordable purchase prices for homes. For example, a three-person household was classified as low-income (80 percent of median) with an annual income of up to $54,850 in 2013. A household with this income could afford to pay a monthly gross rent (including utilities) of up to $1,371 or to purchase a house priced at or below $179,216.

TABLE 4-24 ABILITY TO PAY FOR HOUSING BASED ON HCD INCOME LIMITS El Dorado County* 2013						
Extremely Low-Income Households at 30% of 2013 Median Family Income						
	Studio	**1 BR**	**2 BR**	**3 BR**	**4 BR**	**5 BR**
Number of Persons	1	2	3	4	5	6
Income Level	$16,000	$18,300	$20,600	$22,850	$24,700	$26,550
Max. Monthly Gross Rent	$400	$458	$515	$571	$618	$664
Max. Purchase Price	$52,278	$59,793	$67,308	$74,660	$80,704	$86,749
Very Low-Income Households at 50% of 2013 Median Family Income						
	Studio	**1 BR**	**2 BR**	**3 BR**	**4 BR**	**5 BR**
Number of Persons	1	2	3	4	5	6
Income Level	$26,650	$30,450	$34,250	$38,050	$41,100	$44,150
Max. Monthly Gross Rent	$666	$761	$856	$951	$1,028	$1,104
Max. Purchase Price	$87,076	$99,492	$111,908	$124,324	$134,289	$144,255
Low-Income Households at 80% of 2013 Median Family Income						
	Studio	**1 BR**	**2 BR**	**3 BR**	**4 BR**	**5 BR**
Number of Persons	1	2	3	4	5	6
Income Level	$42,650	$48,750	$54,850	$60,900	$65,800	$70,650
Max. Monthly Gross Rent[1]	$1,066	$1,219	$1,371	$1,523	$1,645	$1,766
Max. Purchase Price[2]	$139,354	$159,285	$179,216	$198,984	$214,994	$230,841
Median-Income Households at 100% of 2013 Median Family Income						
	Studio	**1 BR**	**2 BR**	**3 BR**	**4 BR**	**5 BR**
Number of Persons	1	2	3	4	5	6
Income Level	$53,250	$60,900	$68,500	$76,100	$82,200	$88,300
Max. Monthly Gross Rent[1]	$1,331	$1,523	$1,713	$1,903	$2,055	$2,208
Max. Purchase Price[2]	$173,988	$198,984	$223,816	$248,648	$268,579	$288,510
Moderate-Income Households at 120% of 2013 Median Family Income						
	Studio	**1 BR**	**2 BR**	**3 BR**	**4 BR**	**5 BR**
Number of Persons	1	2	3	4	5	6
Income Level	$63,900	$73,050	$82,150	$91,300	$98,600	$105,900
Max. Monthly Gross Rent[1]	$1,598	$1,826	$2,054	$2,283	$2,465	$2,648
Max. Purchase Price[2]	$208,786	$238,682	$268,415	$298,312	$322,164	$346,016

Notes:
* Based on the El Dorado County median family income for 2013: $76,100; HCD FY 2013 income limits
[1] Assumes that 30% of income is available for either monthly rent, including utilities; or mortgage payment, taxes, mortgage insurance, and homeowners insurance.
[2] Assumes 95% loan @ 7% annual interest rate and 30-year term; assumes taxes, mortgage insurance, and homeowners' insurance account for 21% of total monthly payments.
Sources: HCD FY 2013 El Dorado County Income Limits

Table 4-25 shows HUD-defined fair market rent levels (FMR) for El Dorado County in 2013. In general, the FMR for an area is the amount that would be needed to pay the gross rent (shelter rent plus utilities) of privately owned, decent, safe, and sanitary rental housing of a modest (non-luxury) nature with suitable amenities.[4] HUD uses FMRs for a variety of purposes: FMRs determine the eligibility of rental housing units for the Section 8 Housing Assistance Payments program; Section 8 Rental Certificate program participants cannot rent units whose rents exceed the FMRs; and FMRs also serve as the payment standard used to calculate subsidies under the Rental Voucher program.

As stated above, a three-person household classified as low income (80 percent of median) with an annual income of up to $54,850 could afford to pay $1,371 monthly gross rent (including utilities). The 2013 FMR for a two-bedroom unit in El Dorado County was $1,073. Therefore, a low-income household at the top of the income range could afford to rent a unit at the FMR level, assuming that such a unit is available for rent.

However, a three-person household classified as very low income (50 percent of median) with an annual income of up to $34,250 could afford to pay only $856 for monthly gross rent. This household could not afford the FMR rent of $1,073 for a two-bedroom unit, and barely afford the FMR rent of $855 for a one-bedroom unit. Households with incomes below 50 percent of median would have even less income to spend on rent.

As previously stated, given the disparity between the median incomes of El Dorado County and South Lake Tahoe, the HUD-defined income limits and FMR for the county are not entirely accurate indicators of the rents that low-income residents in South Lake Tahoe can afford.

TABLE 4-25
HUD FAIR MARKET RENT
El Dorado County
2013

Bedrooms in Unit	Fair Market Rent (FMR)
Studio	$717
1 Bedroom	$855
2 Bedrooms	$1,073
3 Bedrooms	$1,581
4 Bedrooms	$1,900

Source: HUD User Data Sets: 2013 FY FMR

[4]According to HUD, "the level at which FMRs are set is expressed as a percentile point within the rent distribution of standard-quality rental housing units. The current definition used is the 40th percentile rent, the dollar amount below which 40 percent of the standard-quality rental housing units are rented. The 40th percentile rent is drawn from the distribution of rents of all units occupied by recent movers (renter households who moved to their present residence within the past 15 months). Public housing units and units less than 2 years old are excluded."

Housing Costs

Average Monthly Rents

Typical rents in South Lake Tahoe have been increasing. The seasonal nature of the Lake Tahoe workforce leads to considerable turnover of housing units in the city. With frequent turnover in units, landlords are able to raise rents easier and more often than if the residents stayed for longer periods. This pattern of "unit hopping" combined with the lack of new rental unit development has allowed the cost of rental housing to increase much faster than local workers' incomes.

Table 4-26 shows the median contract rents and median gross rents for households in South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County at the time of the 2008–2010 Census ACS. The split between gross rent (which includes all utilities payments) and contract rent (the amount paid to the property manager) can differ among areas not just because of different utility prices, but also because contract rents may or may not include utilities, while gross rents always do. For most housing analysis, comparing gross rents rather than contract rents is a better choice since gross rents are a more comprehensive measure of renters' costs and using it ensures that the same housing cost components are included for all renters.

The median gross rent between 2008–2010 for the City of South Lake Tahoe was $910. As shown in Table 4-26, the median contract rent in South Lake Tahoe between 2008 and 2010 ($825) was lower than El Dorado County ($969). The median gross rent in South Lake Tahoe between 2008 and 2010 ($910) was also lower than the county ($1,099). While rents were more generally affordable in South Lake Tahoe, median incomes in the city were significantly lower than incomes in El Dorado County.

TABLE 4-26
MEDIAN CONTRACT RENT AND MEDIAN GROSS RENT
South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County
2008–2010 Estimate

	South Lake Tahoe	El Dorado County
Median contract rent	$825	$969
Median gross rent	$910	$1,099

Source: US Census 2008–2010 ACS

It should be noted that South Lake Tahoe's median rent levels shown in Table 4-26 are not influenced by the large number of seasonal homes, some of which are vacation rentals. While some data sources such as the American Housing Survey estimate the contract rents of vacant units, rents on vacant units from the Census are unavailable and are therefore excluded.

Table 4-27 shows the average monthly rents for 2013 for apartments and homes in South Lake Tahoe. These current average rents were estimated based on rental listings in July 2013. The majority of rents do not include utility costs. Average monthly rents for all size units are lower than the HUD FMR figures shown earlier in Table 4-25. At these rent levels, an average one-bedroom rental ($722 monthly rent) would likely be affordable (depending on utility costs) to a two-person low-income household (can afford $1,219 monthly rent and utilities).

Unlike the cost of homeownership in South Lake Tahoe, rents are more affordable to households with median and low incomes; however, market rents are still out of reach to individual and families with very

low incomes. As shown in Table 4-24, an extremely low-income family of four can afford to spend a maximum of $571 for monthly rent and utilities. The average three-bedroom apartment or house ($1,670) is nearly triple the affordable price limit for an extremely low-income family.

TABLE 4-27
AVERAGE RENTS
South Lake Tahoe
July 2013

Number of Bedrooms	Average Rent	Range	Number of Listings
Studio	$588	$375 to $800	16
1 Bedroom	$722	$525 to $975	26
2 Bedrooms	$1,001	$695 to $1,800	36
3 Bedrooms	$1,670	$1,200 to $3,500	15
4 Bedrooms	$1,828	$1,400 to $2,090	13

Source: Craigslist.com, Listings for South Lake Tahoe, May 1 through July 1, 2013

Value of Homes Sold

Table 4-28 summarizes the median sales prices for single-family homes sold in South Lake Tahoe each year between 2000 and 2013. Home prices decreased by $201,558 between 2007 and 2013, a 43 percent decrease.

TABLE 4-28
MEDIAN SALES PRICE OF SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES
South Lake Tahoe
2000–2013

Year	Median Sales Price	% Change[1]
2000	$189,000	–
2001	$245,000	29.6%
2002	$274,750	12.1%
2003	$317,307	15.5%
2004	$347,004	9.4%
2005	$389,021	12.1%
2006	$453,000	16.4%
2007	$461,758	-6.2%
2008	$420,346	-9.0%
2009	$364,583	-13.3%
2010	$321,438	-11.8%
2011	$295,979	-7.9%
2012	$240,610	-18.7%
2013[2]	$260,200	8.1%

Notes: [1] Percent change is over a 12-month period.
[2] Data for 2007 through May 2013
Sources: South Tahoe Association of REALTORS® Multiple Listing Service

Table 4-29 shows the median sales prices by number of bedrooms for single-family homes sold between January 1, 2013, and June 30, 2013. The majority of single-family homes sold during this time period had between two and three bedrooms. The median sales price for two-bedroom single-family homes sold in 2013 was $325,000. The median sales price for three-bedroom homes was $380,000 in 2007.

While some of the two-bedroom homes sold in South Lake Tahoe in 2013 may be affordable to a moderate-income three-person household in South Lake Tahoe that can afford $268,415, these homes are older and likely in need of substantial rehabilitation. The majority of these homes were out of the price range of what moderate-income families in South Lake Tahoe can afford. Larger homes of four or more bedrooms were out of the price range of many larger families in South Lake Tahoe as well. For example, a low-income family of five could afford a maximum purchase price of $214,994, and a moderate-income family of five could afford a maximum purchase price of $322,164. The median sales price for four-bedroom homes was $440,000 in 2013.

TABLE 4-29
MEDIAN SALES PRICE BY NUMBER OF BEDROOMS
South Lake Tahoe
2013 YTD

Number of Bedrooms	2013 YTD Median Sales Price	Number of Listings
1 Bedroom	$325,000	8
2 Bedrooms	$325,000	52
3 Bedrooms	$380,000	405
4 Bedrooms	$440,000	244
5 Bedrooms or more	$568,000	56

Source: Realtor.com. Search of homes recently sold in South Lake Tahoe, July 10, 2013.

Table 4-30 shows the median sales price of single-family homes in the Lake Tahoe area from January to July 2013. As shown in Table 4-28, the median sale price in South Lake Tahoe in 2013 was $260,200. Prices in the northern Lake Tahoe area were over 100 percent greater than those in South Lake Tahoe, with a median sale price of $531,250. El Dorado County median home prices were similar to South Lake Tahoe with $230,000.

TABLE 4-30
MEDIAN SALES PRICE OF SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES
Lake Tahoe Area
2013

Area	Median Sales Price	% Difference from South Lake Tahoe
South Lake Tahoe	$260,200	-
Northern Lake Tahoe Area	$531,250	104.2%
El Dorado County	$230,000	-11.6%
California	$337,000	29.5%

Sources: South Tahoe Association of REALTORS® Multiple Listing Service; Zillow.com.; Trulia.com; DQNews.com

Existing Housing Needs

Under state housing element requirements, housing needs are defined in three categories: existing needs, needs of special groups within the community, and projected needs over the next eight-year housing element planning period. Projected housing needs are the total additional housing units required to adequately house a jurisdiction's projected population over the housing element planning period in units that are affordable, in standard condition, and not overcrowded. These needs, therefore, include those of the existing population, as well as the needs of the additional population projected to reside in the jurisdiction.

Special Housing Needs

Within the general population there are several groups of people who have special housing needs. These needs can make it difficult for members of these groups to locate suitable housing. The following subsections discuss these special housing needs of six groups identified in state housing element law (Government Code, Section 65583(a)(6): "elderly, persons with disabilities (including those with developmental disabilities), large families, farmworkers, families with female heads of household, and families and persons in need of emergency shelter." In addition to these six groups, the section also discusses the needs of students and seasonal employees. Where possible, estimates of the population or number of households in South Lake Tahoe falling into each group are shown. When such information is unavailable for South Lake Tahoe, estimates for El Dorado County are shown.

Homeless Persons

Those who are homeless or at risk of becoming homeless have varying housing needs. Some require emergency shelter, while others require other assistance to enable them to become productive members of society. Some are just passing through, while others are long-time residents. Often, there is crossover between one "special needs" population group and another. For example, the seasonal and transient nature of much of the workforce may contribute to the potential for homelessness. Female heads of household may become homeless due to domestic violence. In each instance, the point of contact for addressing their homelessness is the problem that made them homeless.

Homelessness is usually the end result of multiple factors that converge in a person's life. The combination of loss of employment and the inability to find a job because of the need for retraining leads to the loss of housing for some individuals and families. For others, the loss of housing is due to chronic health problems, physical disabilities, mental health disabilities, or drug and alcohol addictions, along with an inability to access the services and long-term support needed to address these conditions.

The housing needs of homeless persons are more difficult to measure and assess than those of any other population subgroup. Since these individuals have no permanent addresses, they are less likely to be counted in the Census. They are also unlikely to have stable employment, which makes housing opportunities limited. There are currently no homeless shelters in the City of South Lake Tahoe. Most of the current homeless population often uses motel rooms or camping for their permanent residence.

In January 2011, El Dorado County conducted a "head count" of homeless people seen sleeping in public places. This point-in-time count revealed 37 homeless individuals, all of whom were unsheltered. Due to the inclement January weather in South Lake Tahoe, it is conceivable that the city's summertime population of homeless residents is significantly higher, but the wintertime count is the only available data.

All governmental services for homeless individuals or families in South Lake Tahoe are provided by El Dorado County. In the past, the City has considered providing Section 8 rental assistance services; however, after consultation with El Dorado County staff, the City and County concluded that it was best for the County to continue administering the program. City-provided services would not lead to any increase in assistance available in the community and would create a duplication of administrative efforts to implement the program separately for the City.

There are no homeless shelters in South Lake Tahoe. The nearest homeless shelter in El Dorado County—Grace Place operated by United Outreach of El Dorado County during the winter months—is over 50 miles away in Camino, California. El Dorado County Community Services gives vouchers for limited stays at local motels (averaging two to three vouchers each week). Funding for the vouchers comes from the Salvation Army and local churches. Limited vouchers for showers (such as for someone who is camping) and food (such as a voucher for McDonald's) can also be given out. Community Services is sometimes able to make referrals to shelters or assistance programs such as Salvation Army in Carson City or Reno. These referrals serve people who are not California residents (with identification from another state).

The Tahoe Opportunity Project, administered by El Dorado County Mental Health, is a grant-funded program that provides supportive services to county residents with mental disorders who are homeless, at risk of becoming homeless, or at risk of incarceration. The program offers temporary assistance with housing in the form of motel vouchers for participating motels. The Tahoe Opportunity Project also tries to find permanent housing for program participants. Assistance with food, clothing, and transportation is also provided through vouchers for shopping centers, supermarkets, pharmacies, and Area Transit Management, which is located in South Lake Tahoe.

El Dorado County Social Services can also provide some assistance to homeless families, but not to individuals. Programs specific to women are addressed under the Single Female-Headed Households section of this document.

Several social service organizations provide services to the residents of South Lake Tahoe. Local churches, in particular, have led the effort to ensure that all residents in the South Lake Tahoe community can have enough to eat through their weekly food programs. Other agencies that provide services to the homeless in South Lake Tahoe are:

- **Tahoe Community Church.** Tahoe Community Church's Food Pantry is a nonprofit organization. Although located in South Lake Tahoe, it became an agency of the Nevada Food Bank in 1999, which allowed it to serve more people and increase the allotment of food given to individuals. Anyone who is needy can obtain food. Attending the church is not a condition for obtaining assistance. Weekly food distribution is available. The Food Pantry's normal hours of operation are Fridays from 3:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. Individuals who consistently return for food

month after month are referred to the Benevolence Program. This program assists individuals with seeking employment and/or getting the necessary forms and paperwork together for obtaining federal assistance.

- **Christmas Cheer.** Christmas Cheer provides food to those in need, including through the Senior Brown Bag program. It receives donations from local supermarkets and the community as well as from Food for Families from Raley's Supermarket, and buys from the Northern Nevada Food Bank. Because many of Christmas Cheer's clients are homeless or living in campgrounds or in motels, the types of foods distributed are limited to those that can be cooked without kitchen facilities.

- **Bread & Broth.** Bread & Broth is operated by the parish of St. Theresa's. The program does not receive public funds, and all funding is from the parishioners. Bread & Broth serves a hot meal every Monday from 4-6 p.m., and is sometimes able to give out canned food. It does not generally help with shelter; however, it can assist with clothing vouchers from The Attic (thrift shop for Barton Hospital) and gas vouchers or bus tokens.

- **Welfare to Work.** The Welfare to Work program is operated by the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program. It is an employment and training program, and it has a housing component; however, it is difficult to get into the program.

- **Other Programs.** Other organizations and programs that serve the homeless population of South Lake Tahoe include the El Dorado County Food Bank, and Tahoe Youth & Family Services. The El Dorado County Food Bank is a nonprofit organization formed in August 2000. It serves 1,500 South Lake Tahoe residents each month. Tahoe Youth & Family Services provides temporary shelter care for runaway/homeless youth.

While there are a number of services available to homeless residents of South Lake Tahoe, there is a lack of emergency housing. Motel vouchers may provide some relief for homeless residents seeking shelter from harsh winter weather; however, based on conversations with local volunteer service providers, there is a need for an emergency shelter in, or near, the city. During warmer summer months, many of the city's homeless residents camp in the Meadows area, increasing the threat of wildfires.

Farmworkers

Farmworkers tend to have lower incomes due to their lower-paying nature of work. Specific data on the number of farmworkers in a community is not systematically collected; as a result, it is difficult to assess the precise needs of this group. According to the 2007 USDA Census of Agriculture, 1,521 persons were employed in farming, forestry, and fishing occupations in El Dorado County. Because there is no commercial agricultural activity within the City of South Lake Tahoe or its surroundings, South Lake Tahoe's "farmworkers" are likely people who own or work fishing charters, have tree removal businesses or are employed by the Forest Service, California Division of Forestry, or California Conservation Corps.

As part of the USDA Census, farms were asked whether any hired or contract workers were migrant workers, defined as "a farm worker whose employment required travel that prevented the migrant worker from returning to his/her permanent place of residence the same day." This information is available at the

county level. There is no information available about the number of farmworkers and their families living specifically in South Lake Tahoe.

As shown in Table 4-31, the 2007 Census of Agriculture reported 34 migrant farm workers in El Dorado County. Although there is no real estimate of the number of farmworkers in South Lake Tahoe, due to the dominant local industries and weather and climate conditions, it is likely that there are not many living in the city, and therefore the city does not have a need for farmworker housing. However, housing for farmworkers is, in general, better provided in cities, where services are located nearby. This is particularly true of seasonal farmworkers whose families live with them. Since many of these types of workers receive housing on private farms, separately from governmental programs, it is difficult to assess supply and demand.

TABLE 4-31
FARMWORKERS
El Dorado County and California
2007

	El Dorado County	California
Farms (number)	1,268	81,033
Hired farm labor (farms)	299	29,661
Hired farm labor (workers)	1,521	448,183
Workers by days worked - 150 days or more	316	191,438
Workers by days worked - Less than 150 days	872	71,099
Migrant farm labor on farms with hired labor	34	5,866
Migrant farm labor on farms reporting only contract labor	15	1,598

Source: 2007 USDA Census of Agriculture, Table 1 and 7

Farmworkers have special housing problems due to seasonal income fluctuations, very low incomes, and substandard housing conditions. Housing that is targeted to very low-income households serves seasonal farmworkers. Seasonal workers are more likely to have their families with them, although some migrant workers come with their families if they feel they can locate suitable housing. Many workers are Latino immigrants. Due to increased border security with Mexico, it is believed that more immigrant farmworkers are remaining in the area year-round with their families, since it is more difficult to travel across the border in both directions.

Housing for migrant farmworkers should be affordable and flexible. Bunk-style housing with bathrooms and kitchens is adequate, particularly if it is built so that if a family needs to stay in group quarters, there is a way to provide privacy. For seasonal farmworkers, housing needs to be affordable at extremely low incomes and provide large units to accommodate larger families. Therefore, the type of housing needed for seasonal farmworkers does not differ from the type of housing needed by other very low-income households. Program 4-4 commits the City to amend the zoning code, if needed, to comply with the state Employee Housing Act addressing farmworker and other employee housing.

Persons with Disabilities

This special needs group includes individuals that have mobility impairments, self-care limitations, or other conditions that may require special housing accommodations or financial assistance. Such individuals can have a number of special needs that distinguish them from the population at large:

- Individuals with mobility difficulties (such as those who use wheelchairs) may require special accommodations or modifications to their homes to allow for continued independent living. Such modifications are often called "handicapped access."

- Individuals with disabilities that prevent them from operating a vehicle may require proximity to services and access to public transportation.

- Individuals with self-care limitations (which can include persons with mobility difficulties) may require residential environments that include in-home or on-site support services, ranging from congregate to convalescent care. Support services can include medical therapy, daily living assistance, congregate dining, and related services.

- Individuals with developmental disabilities and other physical and mental conditions that prevent them from functioning independently may require assisted care or group home environments.

- Individuals with disabilities may require financial assistance to meet their housing needs because typically a higher percentage are low income compared to the population at large, and their special housing needs are often more costly than conventional housing. Many live on Supplemental Security Income, which is currently (2013) $710/month for those living independently. Further, there is an even greater scarcity of low-income housing that is barrier-free. Newer Tahoe housing tends to construct larger homes within regional land coverage limitations, making stairs and multiple levels commonplace, rather than implementing universal design concepts.

Some people with mobility and/or self-care limitations are able to live with their families, who can assist in meeting housing and daily living needs. In South Lake Tahoe, the majority of clients of the Alta California Regional Center (for persons with developmental disabilities) fit into this category. A segment of the disabled population, particularly low-income and retired individuals, may not have the financial capacity to pay for needed accommodations or modifications to their homes. In addition, even those able to pay for special housing accommodations may find limited availability in the city.

Social Security Income (SSI) is a needs-based program that pays monthly benefits to persons who are 65 or older, blind, or have a disability. Seniors who have never worked, or have insufficient work credits to qualify for Social Security Old Age, Survivors, or Disability Insurance often receive SSI benefits. In fact, SSI is the only source of income for a number of low-income seniors. With the maximum monthly benefit of $710 as of 2013, SSI recipients are likely to have difficulty finding housing that fits within their budgets.

Data regarding Supplemental Security Income recipients is available only at the state and county level. Table 4-32 shows Supplemental Security Income recipients by category in El Dorado County and California in 2012. In 2012, a total of 3,180 persons in El Dorado County received Supplemental Security

Income because they were aged, blind, or disabled, representing 1.8 percent of the total county population. California as a whole had a higher percentage, 3.4 percent, of the total state population receiving Supplemental Security Income benefits in 2012. Out of all Supplemental Security Income recipients, a lower percentage of seniors received SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME in El Dorado County than in California as a whole (20.6 percent compared to 42.7 percent).

TABLE 4-32
SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME RECIPIENTS BY CATEGORY
El Dorado County and California
2012

	El Dorado County		California	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total Population	181,711	100.00%	37,668,804	100.00%
Total Supplemental Security Income Recipients	3,180	1.8%	1,294,393	3.4%
Category				
Aged	334	10.5%	357,818	27.6%
Blind and Disabled	2,846	89.5%	936,575	72.4%
Age				
Under 18	220	6.9%	117,775	9.1%
18-64	2,306	72.5%	624,218	48.2%
65 or older	654	20.6%	552,400	42.68%
Supplemental Security Income Recipients also receiving Social Security[1]	1,406	44.2%	490,887	37.9%

Notes: 1 Old Age, Survivors, or Disability Insurance
Sources: SSA, Supplemental Security Income Recipients by State and County, 2012; DOF, Table E-5 City/County Population and Housing Estimates, 2012

Table 4-33 shows information from the 2000 Census on the types of disabilities by age group in South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County. As shown in the table, there were 114 disabilities reported for South Lake Tahoe residents, and 43,352 for El Dorado County residents. For both South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County, the majority of these disabilities were classified as “go-outside-home” disabilities. In fact, 88.6 percent of disabilities reported for South Lake Tahoe were “go-outside-home” disabilities.

TABLE 4-33 PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES BY DISABILITY TYPE South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County 2000				
	South Lake Tahoe		El Dorado County	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total Disabilities	114	100.0%	43,352	100.0%
Total Disabilities for Ages 5-64	13	11.4%	1,547	3.6%
Sensory Disability	0	0.0%	202	0.5%
Physical disability	0	0.0%	202	0.5%
Mental disability	13	11.4%	1,039	2.4%
Self-care disability	0	0.0%	104	0.2%
Go-outside-home disability	101	88.6%	29,082	67.1%
Employment disability	13	11.4%	2,115	4.9%
Total Disabilities for Ages 65 and Over	23	20.2%	6,387	14.7%
Sensory Disability	17	14.9%	3,513	8.1%
Physical disability	0	0.0%	1,303	3.0%
Mental disability	32	28.1%	4,393	10.1%
Self-care disability	16	14.0%	11,371	26.2%
Go-outside-home disability	0	0.0%	12,723	29.3%

Source: 2000 Census

Table 4-34 shows the number of residents by age group in South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County who have a developmental disability. In total, 95 people had a developmental disability in South Lake Tahoe in 2012. This population makes up 0.4 percent of the total population. El Dorado County had a similar percentage of population with a developmental disability at 0.5 percent. The largest age group in South Lake Tahoe was 14 years or younger with 41.1 percent of the developmentally disabled population.

TABLE 4-34 POPULATION WITH A DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITY South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County 2012				
Age	South Lake Tahoe		El Dorado County	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
14 years or younger	39	41.1%	395	41.0%
15 to 22 years	13	13.7%	182	18.9%
23 to 54 years	36	37.9%	344	35.7%
55 to 64 years	4	4.2%	31	3.2%
65 or older	3	3.2%	11	1.1%
Total Developmental Disability Population	95	100.0%	963	100.0%
Percent of Total Population	-	0.4%	-	0.5%

Source: SACOG 2012

Senate Bill (SB) 812 requires the City to include the needs of individuals with a developmental disability within the community in the special housing needs analysis. According to Section 4512 of the Welfare and Institutions Code a "developmental disability" means a disability that originates before an individual attains age 18 years, continues, or can be expected to continue, indefinitely, and constitutes a substantial disability for that individual which includes mental retardation, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, and autism.

Many developmentally disabled persons can live and work independently within a conventional housing environment. More severely disabled individuals require a group living environment where supervision is provided. The most severely affected individuals may require an institutional environment where medical attention and physical therapy are provided. Because developmental disabilities exist before adulthood, the first issue in supportive housing for the developmentally disabled is the transition from the person's living situation as a child to an appropriate level of independence as an adult.

The California Department of Developmental Services (DDS) currently provides community-based services to approximately 243,000 persons with developmental disabilities and their families through a statewide system of 21 regional centers, four developmental centers, and two community-based facilities. The Alta California Regional Center in Sacramento is one of 21 regional centers in the state of California that provides point of entry to services for people with developmental disabilities, and is the center serving South Lake Tahoe. The center is a private, nonprofit community agency that contracts with local businesses to offer a wide range of services to individuals with developmental disabilities and their families. Program 4-5 commits the City working with housing providers to address the housing needs for special needs group including those with developmental disabilities.

Disabled persons often require special housing features to accommodate physical limitations. Some disabled persons may experience financial difficulty in locating suitable housing due to the cost of modifications to meet their daily living needs or may have difficulty in finding appropriate housing near places of employment. Although the California Administrative Code (Title 24) requires that all public buildings be accessible to the public through architectural standards such as ramps, large doors, and restroom modifications to enable handicap access, not all available housing units have these features. There are additional types of physical and design modifications that may be necessary to accommodate various types of disabilities.

Nationally, a growing number of architects and developers are integrating universal design principles into their buildings to increase the accessibility of the built environment. The intent of universal design is to simplify design and construction by making products, communications, and the built environment usable by as many people as possible without the need for adaptation or specialized design. Universal design is generally not being used in new residential construction in South Lake Tahoe except when required by Code for multi-family housing. Land coverage limitations encourage builders to build multiple story homes to reduce the building footprint. Applying the principles of universal design, in addition to the regulations specified in the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), to new construction in South Lake Tahoe will increase the opportunities in housing and employment for everyone. Program 4-2 calls for the City to adopt universal design standards for new construction and rehabilitation projects. Furthermore, studies have shown the access features integrated into the design of new facilities in the early conceptual stages increase costs less than 1/2 of 1 percent in most developments.

The following are the seven principles of universal design as outlined by the Center for Universal Design:

- **Equitable Use** - The design is useful and marketable to people with diverse abilities.
- **Flexibility in Use** - The design accommodates a wide range of individual preferences and abilities.
- **Simple and Intuitive** - Use of the design is easy to understand, regardless of the user's experience, knowledge, language skills, or current concentration level.
- **Perceptible Information** - The design communicates necessary information effectively to the user, regardless of ambient conditions or the user's sensory abilities.
- **Tolerance for Error** - The design minimizes hazards and the adverse consequences of accidental or unintended action.
- **Low Physical Effort** - The design can be used efficiently and comfortably with minimum fatigue.
- **Size and Space for Approach and Use** - Appropriate size and space is provided for approach, reach, manipulation, and use regardless of user's body size, posture, or mobility.

Sky Forest Acres, a 17-unit housing project targeted specifically for very low-income people with mobility impairment, was completed in 2008. The project, which incorporates many universal design elements, was a joint effort between Accessible Space, Inc. and the Tahoe Area Coordinating Council for the Disabled. The 17 one-bedroom and 2 two-bedroom units will be accessible in an independent-living environment with subsidized rent. This housing opportunity assisted in addressing an unmet need for the disabled population in South Lake Tahoe.

Senior Households

Seniors are defined as person 65 years and older, and senior households are those households headed by a person 65 years and older. In general, seniors face special housing challenges related to physical (i.e. declining mobility and self-care capabilities) and financial conditions. Some of these challenges are compounded by Tahoe's mountain environment, where snow shoveling or winter driving is dangerous for many seniors. Many older adults, even those owning their own homes, face financial challenges due to limited incomes from Social Security and other retirement benefits. These older adults may benefit from assistance related to:

- Repair and maintenance of owned dwellings units.
- Modifications to existing homes to better meet mobility and self-care limitations.
- Additional subsidized housing, as the waiting list for the Tahoe Senior Plaza has been up to five years and the waiting list for Kelly Ridge (Tahoe Senior Plaza II) is up to two years.
- Financial assistance to meet rising rental housing costs for those who do not own.

- Supportive services to meet daily needs such as those provided at assisted care residences.

Table 4-35 shows information on the number of seniors, the number of senior households, and senior households by housing tenure in South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County in 2000 and from 2006 to 2010. As discussed earlier (and shown previously in Table 4-4 (Population Breakdown by Age)), the proportion of South Lake Tahoe's senior population is relatively small compared to El Dorado County. During the 2006–2010 time period senior households represented 15.5 percent of all households in South Lake Tahoe compared to 23.7 percent in El Dorado County. Both the City and County's 2006–2010 numbers represent an increase of more than two percentage points from the number of senior households in 2000.

Tenure is also important when analyzing the needs of seniors. Older adults typically have the highest rates of homeownership of any age group, and senior households in South Lake Tahoe are no exception, where 67.1 percent of senior households owned their homes between 2006 and 2010, compared to 33.5 percent of all households.

TABLE 4-35
SENIOR POPULATIONS AND HOUSEHOLDS
South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County

	2000				2006–2010			
	South Lake Tahoe		El Dorado County		South Lake Tahoe		El Dorado County	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Population								
TOTAL POPULATION	**23,609**	**100.0%**	**156,299**	**100.0%**	**21,403**	**100.00%**	**181,058**	**100.00%**
Number of Persons 65 years and older	2,023	8.6%	19,334	12.4%	2,096	9.8%	26,524	14.7%
Male	871	43.1%	8,916	46.1%	991	4.6%	12,556	6.9%
Female	1,152	57.0%	10,418	53.9%	1,105	5.2%	13,968	7.7%
Households								
TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS	**9,410**	**100.0%**	**58,939**	**100.0%**	**8,918**	**100.00%**	**70,223**	**100.00%**
Senior Headed-Households	1,379	14.7%	12,067	20.5%	1,386	15.5%	16,640	23.7%
Owner	951	10.1%	10,344	85.7%	927	10.4%	14,208	20.2%
Renter	428	4.5%	1,723	14.3%	459	5.2%	2,432	3.5%

Source: 2006-2010 Census ACS, SACOG 2012

Large Families/Households

Large families, defined as family households with five or more persons, can have difficulty securing adequate housing due to the need for a larger number of bedrooms (three or more) to avoid overcrowding. Overcrowding is typically defined as more than one person per room or two persons per bedroom, excluding uninhabitable space such as bathrooms and hallways. Typical problems encountered by large families in El Dorado County include:

- Low-income large families typically need financial assistance to secure affordable housing that meets their space needs.
- It is difficult to find adequate rentals within budget because rentals typically have fewer bedrooms than ownership housing.
- Large families tend to have higher rates of overcrowding and overpaying for housing (housing costs that exceed 30 percent of a household's income).
- Many large families are composed of immigrants and/or minorities whose cultural norms include extended families living under one roof. They may face additional housing challenges due to discrimination or limited language proficiency.

In general, housing for families should provide safe outdoor play areas for children and should be located to provide convenient access to schools and child-care facilities. These types of needs can pose problems particularly for large families that cannot afford to buy or rent single-family houses, as apartment and condominium units are most often developed with childless, smaller households in mind. Therefore, for the large families that are unable to rent single-family houses, it is likely that these large renter households are overcrowded in smaller units. When planning for new multi-family housing developments, the provision of three- and four-bedroom units is an important consideration due to the likely demand for affordable, larger multi-family rental units.

As shown in Table 4-36, between 2008 and 2010, 13 percent of all households in South Lake Tahoe had five or more persons. Of the large households, 310 were owner-occupied households and 783 were renter-occupied households. The percentage of large households in South Lake Tahoe was slightly greater than the percentage of large households in El Dorado County (9.7 percent).

TABLE 4-36 LARGE HOUSEHOLDS South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County 2008–2010 Estimate				
	South Lake Tahoe		El Dorado County	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Owner-Occupied				
Less than 5 Persons	3,582	92.0%	47,255	91.1%
5+ Persons	310	8.0%	4,617	8.9%
TOTAL	**3,892**	**100.0%**	**51,872**	**100.0%**
Renter-Occupied				
Less than 5 Persons	3,738	82.7%	14,241	87.7%
5+ Persons	783	17.3%	2,005	12.3%
TOTAL	**4,521**	**100.0%**	**16,246**	**100.0%**
All Households				
Less than 5 Persons	7,320	87.0%	61,496	90.3%
5+ Persons	1,093	13.0%	6,622	9.7%
TOTAL	**8,413**	**100.0%**	**68,118**	**100.0%**

Source: 2000 US Census, SF3

Single Female-Headed Households

According to the US Census Bureau, a single-headed household contains a household head and at least one dependent, which could include a child, an elderly parent, or non-related child. Most female-headed households are either single women over the age of 65 or single women with children (mothers or other female relatives caring for children).

Due to generally lower incomes, single female-headed households often have more difficulties finding adequate affordable housing than do families with two adults or male-headed households. Also, female-headed households with small children may need to pay for child care, which further reduces disposable income. This special needs group will benefit generally from expanded affordable housing opportunities. More specifically, the need for dependent care also makes it important that housing for female-headed families be located near child care facilities, schools, youth services, medical facilities, and senior services.

Table 4-37 shows female-headed households in South Lake Tahoe. Of the 4,677 family households in the city between 2006 and 2010, 983 were female-headed households, or 21.0 percent of the family households in South Lake Tahoe compared with 12.4 percent in El Dorado County. Of the female-headed households in the City, 664 had children under 18 (14.2 percent of all family households); in the County, there were 3,803 female-headed households (7.7 percent of all family households) with children under 18.

TABLE 4-37 FEMALE-HEADED HOUSEHOLDS South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County 2006–2010				
	South Lake Tahoe		El Dorado County	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TOTAL FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS	**4,677**	**100.0%**	**49,718**	**100.0%**
Female-Headed Households with Children Under 18	664	14.2%	3,803	7.7%
Female-Headed Households with no Children Under 18	319	6.8%	2,384	4.8%
TOTAL FEMALE-HEADED HOUSEHOLDS	**983**	**21.0%**	**6,187**	**12.4%**

Source: 2006-2010 US Census ACS, SACOG 2012, 2010 US Census

South Lake Tahoe Live Violence Free Sheltering Program includes a nine-bed emergency shelter that provides a temporary safe haven for women and their children who are fleeing domestic violence. Victims of domestic violence may stay at the emergency shelter for up to 90 days. Clients who successfully complete the emergency shelter program may qualify for transitional housing. There are two dwelling units available for transitional housing. The goal of Live Violence Free is to transition participants to paying full rent within 18 months. Transitioning has become increasingly difficult, however, as jobs are not paying enough to afford market rents in South Lake Tahoe. It is becoming more common to relocate participants out of the area to communities with lower housing costs unless there are strong ties to the South Lake Tahoe community. In both of the Live Violence Free programs, clients receive intensive, individualized services including counseling, legal services, and life skills training with the end goal of achieving permanent housing and a violence-free lifestyle.

Other services are available to women in South Lake Tahoe. As part of the Women, Infants and Children (WIC) Supplemental Food Program, there are bilingual classes with 60-70 participants that include presentations on housing and housing rights. The Family Resources Center obtained Proposition 10 grants to provide security deposit funds for families with a child or children five years old or younger.

Extremely Low-Income Housing Needs

Extremely low-income households are defined as those households making under 30 percent of the area median income. Extremely low-income households typically consist of minimum wage workers, seniors on fixed incomes, the disabled, and farmworkers. This income group is likely to live in overcrowded and substandard housing conditions. Table 4-22 details cost burdens for extremely low-income households in South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County.

Seasonal Employees and Students

South Lake Tahoe's recreation and tourist-based industries rely on a seasonal workforce often comprising college-aged workers. In addition, the local Lake Tahoe Community College (LTCC) serves approximately 2,500 students. The college has 400 full-time students and 2,200 part-time students, primarily either local residents or residents from adjacent communities. The college does not provide housing for its students. While many of these students grew up in Lake Tahoe and still live with their families, new students to the area must compete for housing in the local housing market.

The younger, seasonal workforce may have a higher tolerance—or may sometimes even favor—more crowded households or single-room occupancy dwellings. The "party" atmosphere and easy opportunities for companionship, a ride to the ski hill, and information sharing may make their time at South Lake Tahoe more fun and rewarding. The overcrowding of these housing units takes a toll on the city's housing stock.

Because full-time community college students sometimes do not work, work at lower paying-jobs, or work less than full-time, their ability to compete for housing can be compromised by the lack of income and credit when they go through traditional credit checks at property management companies. Seasonal employees are similarly less competitive for housing units on the local market, as they are unable to commit to longer-term leases. Property owners and managers making a rational decision based upon the applicant pool might choose a more stable, long-term renter with a steady source of income. To further complicate matters, these renters are often part of larger non-family households in order to be able to afford rental housing. Sometimes the members of the household fluctuate. Landlords may prefer a more stable group of renters, such as a traditional family, and may be concerned about wear and tear on their property, or may be fearful of it becoming the neighborhood's "party house." Consequently, students and seasonal employees sometimes find that the most willing landlords own the most substandard housing, or they resort to motel room living.

Although the campus does not provide official student housing, the Alder Inn on Ski Run Boulevard has rooms reserved for LTCC students. The school's current master plan, prepared when rental housing was relatively abundant and inexpensive, does not anticipate constructing any on-campus or other housing. However, the City will continue to work with LTCC to explore student housing needs and options for meeting those needs.

Tourist-Based Employee Housing Needs

Unlike in many other communities, the primary backbone of South Lake Tahoe's economy is the tourist-based service industry. Casino workers, ski instructors, hotel employees, and restaurant workers play an essential role in the Tahoe Basin's resort economy. Many of these service industry employees earn low wages, and may require rental housing, both year-round and seasonal.

A limited number of employers offer housing for their seasonal employees. The units provided are few compared to the number of employees hired. Heavenly Ski Resort, for example, owns and/or operates 21 housing units that can house as many as 116 members of its workforce. Heavenly awards bed spaces to full-time workers via a lottery in mid-October. Workers that are not awarded a bed in the workforce housing units must find alternative lodging during their stay in Lake Tahoe.

Interestingly, many large employers (on both the California and Nevada sides) have taken to recruiting employees from outside the United States (e.g., Australia, Eastern Europe, Latin America) to make up their seasonal workforce. In general, these people must pay for their own visas and find and pay for their own housing. They often find a disparity between the costs of rent compared to the wages they receive.

In addition, Sierra-at-Tahoe and Kirkwood ski resorts are both located outside of the Tahoe Basin, in Alpine and unincorporated El Dorado counties respectively, within 45 minutes of South Lake Tahoe. Neither resort has a bed base that fully supports their employee requirements. Consequently, South Lake Tahoe also is providing housing for many of these seasonal employees.

In addition to working with the larger ski resort employers (e.g., Kirkwood, Heavenly Mountain Resort, and Sierra-at-Tahoe), the City could also work with larger casinos (e.g., Harvey's and Harrah's), and hotels located within the city and just across the Nevada border, to create affordable employee housing for full-time city residents and seasonal employees working in tourist-based industries.

Workforce Housing Needs

There is another backbone to the South Lake Tahoe community that is lacking housing opportunities in the city. As in any community, police officers, teachers, firefighters, and nurses—referred to as "hero workers"—are key members of the workforce. Nationwide, these workers are having difficulty finding safe, affordable homes in the communities that they serve. The housing needed for these workers is most likely for-purchase attached and detached single-family homes and condominiums. A police officer in South Lake Tahoe earning around $65,000 can afford to spend approximately $220,000 to purchase a home. With a 2013 median home sales price of $260,200, a police officer would have difficulty purchasing a home. In South Lake Tahoe, the homes that these workers can afford are often substandard and do not meet their expectations. Many of these middle-income workers commute more than an hour each way from communities outside of the Basin where they can find higher quality affordable homes. These commutes, especially during the harsh Tahoe winters, are not only long but dangerous as well. During emergency situations, firefighters, police officers, and other emergency response workers living down the mountain have difficulty responding to emergencies in the Tahoe communities that they serve. Teacher turnover is increasing as long commutes encourage teachers to find jobs closer to home.

"Workforce housing" is a relatively new term that is gaining popularity with planners, government officials, and housing advocates. Workforce housing can refer to almost any housing, but typically refers to affordable housing. The actual definition of "workforce housing" depends on the specific needs and the specific market characteristics of a community. In South Lake Tahoe, there is a recognized need for workforce housing, but there is also a need to define exactly what the term "workforce housing" means in the context of this Housing Element. In general, "workforce housing" refers to housing that is affordable to working households that do not qualify for publicly subsidized housing, and cannot afford market-rate housing in their own community. Generally, workforce housing programs are targeted to residents earning between 60 and 120 percent of the area median income; however, depending on local market conditions, the upper income cap may need to be adjusted. Area median income for El Dorado County in 2013 is $76,100.

One way to establish the upper income cap for workforce housing is to calculate the annual income that would be required to afford a median-priced home in the community. In South Lake Tahoe, the median home sales price in 2013 was $260,200. Assuming a 95 percent loan and a mortgage interest rate of 6 percent, the annual income required to purchase a $260,200 home is $68,860. This is approximately 90 percent of 2013 area median income. Ideally, workforce housing in South Lake Tahoe will satisfy the housing needs of family households earning between 60 and 180 percent of the median-household income.

Future Housing Needs

Regional Fair Share Allocation

In September 2012, SACOG adopted its final plan for allocation of regional housing needs for January 1, 2013, through October 31, 2021. Required by state law, the Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan (RHNP) is part of a statewide statutory mandate to address housing issues that are related to future growth. The RHNP allocates to cities and counties each jurisdiction's "fair share" of the region's projected housing needs by household income group over the upcoming housing element planning period. Although the regional housing needs allocation (RHNA) numbers for South Lake Tahoe were provided in the SACOG plan and the RHNA projection period is January 1, 2013 through October 31, 2021, the Housing Element planning period for the TRPA jurisdictions including South Lake Tahoe is June 15, 2014 through June 15, 2022.

The core of the RHNP is a series of tables that indicate for each jurisdiction the distribution of housing needs for each of the four household income groups. The tables also indicate the projected new housing unit targets by income group for the ending date of the plan. These measures of units define the basic new construction that needs to be addressed by individual city and county housing elements. The allocations are intended to be used by jurisdictions when updating their housing elements as the basis for ensuring that adequate sites and zoning are available to accommodate at least the number of units allocated.

SACOG applies a different methodology for determining the "overall allocations" of jurisdictions in the Tahoe Basin than that which is used for other jurisdictions. This is primarily because TRPA regulations limit the land use authority of the local governments to manage growth rates. SACOG worked with TRPA to determine the RHNP allocations for jurisdictions located within the Basin, and calculated the city's RHNP allocation based on historical and projected TRPA allocations. To be consistent with TRPA allocations, SACOG distributed 29 housing units per year to the City of South Lake Tahoe. The income distribution calculations for the city were determined using the same methodology as the rest of the region.

The RHNP allocation is not an accurate assessment of the actual needs of the city's residents by income group. To a large extent, SACOG's methodology for all jurisdictions was based on assumptions of the amount of housing unit growth that would be reasonable given residential development projects in the pipelines. SACOG's methodology of basing South Lake Tahoe's RHNP allocation on expected TRPA building allocations is not that different from the methodology applied to other jurisdictions.

Table 4-38 shows the SACOG RHNP allocation for South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado County as a whole, and the SACOG region. As shown in the table, the RHNP allocated 336 new housing units to South Lake Tahoe for the planning period. Of 336 housing units, 155 units are to be affordable to moderate-income households and below, including 27 extremely low-income units, 27 very low-income units, 38 low-income units, and 63 moderate-income units.

TABLE 4-38 REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATION BY INCOME South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado County, and SACOG Region 2013–2021						
	TOTAL	Extremely Low*	Very Low*	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate
South Lake Tahoe						
RHNP Allocation	336	27	27	38	63	181
Percent of Total	100.0%	8.0%	8.0%	11.3%	18.8%	53.9%
El Dorado County						
RHNP Allocation	5,136	609	609	855	955	2,108
Percent of Total	100.0%	11.9%	11.9%	16.7%	18.6%	41.0%
SACOG Region						
RHNP Allocation	104,970	12,280	12,280	17,220	19,520	43,670
Percent of Total	100.0%	11.7%	11.7%	16.4%	18.6%	41.6%

Note: It is assumed that 50% of very low income is extremely low.
Source: Sacramento Area Council of Governments, Regional Housing Needs Plan 2013–2021 (September 2012).

As previously stated, the median income for a family in South Lake Tahoe at the time of the 2008–2010 Census ACS was $52,761 and $86,812 for El Dorado County. South Lake Tahoe's median family income was lower than the County median income, suggesting that the city's actual housing need for very low-, low-, and moderate-income households greatly exceeds the projected housing need assigned by SACOG. The City recognizes that the RHNA allocation underestimates the actual needs of city residents. The City will strive to create opportunities above and beyond what is required by Housing Element law.

Comparison of Housing Production with Projected Housing Needs

Table 4-39 provides the units constructed or approved since the beginning of the 2013-2021 RHNA cycle. The 48 multi-family housing units that received building permits in 2013 were part of the Aspens Project that included 47 low and very low income units and one manager unit (which will be rented at moderate income levels).. The Aspens Project received funding through the HOME program. The units will be deed restricted for 55 years. The project is currently under construction and expected to open in February 2014.

TABLE 4-39
PROGRESS TOWARD MEETING HOUSING NEEDS
South Lake Tahoe
January 1, 2013 through present

		Extremely Low	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
2013 – 2021 RHNA		27	27	38	63	181	336
Project	**Status**						
The Aspens	Building permit issued: Expected occupancy: 2014		10[1]	37[1]	1		48
Tahoe Woods	Building permit issued:, Expected occupancy 2014					28	28
Single-family Dwellings	Building permits issued; Expected occupancy 2014				4	8	12
Remaining RHNA		45			58	145	248
Land Inventory		120-170[2]			660[3]	1,474[4]	2,249-2,304
Remaining RHNA After Consideration of Land Inventory		0			0	0	0

Source: SACOG 2012; City of South Lake Tahoe, 2013.
Notes:
1. These 47 units are part of the Aspens project, currently under construction, which will provide deed-restricted units affordable to low and very low-income residents.
2.The sites that could accommodate these units include the stand alone vacant sites that can accommodate 16 or more units at 20 units per acre and those sites with potential for lot consolidation that are detailed in Table 4-44.
3.The sites that could accommodate these units allow densities between 12 and 15 units per acre and are included in Appendix A.
4.The sites that could accommodate these units allow single-family development. This number is a combined total of this type of site in Appendix A and the sites that could produce less than 20 units/acre or 16 units/site in Tables 4-42 and 4-43.

This page intentionally left blank

4.3 RESOURCE INVENTORY

This section assesses the availability of land and services to meet the needs documented in the previous section. This section inventories South Lake Tahoe's available residentially designated land and reviews the adequacy of services to support future housing development.

Availability of Land and Services

Consistent with Government Code Section 65583(a)(3), the purpose of this section is to identify specific sites suitable for residential development in order to compare the city's new construction need by affordability category with the total capacity for residential development. A land inventory was conducted to enable the City to determine whether additional actions are needed to provide an adequate amount of suitable sites to support needed housing development.

Land suitable for residential development includes characteristics appropriate for housing construction. These include desirable physical features, as well as locations close to transit, job centers, and public services. Additional required analysis includes assessing the suitable sites for the realistic number of dwelling units that could be constructed and the areas that can accommodate the city's share of the regional housing need for all income levels.

South Lake Tahoe's Setting, Zoning, and Development Procedures

The City of South Lake Tahoe is geographically bounded by mountains, Lake Tahoe, and the Nevada border. The City has few options to significantly increase the acreage of vacant land for affordable housing, as much of the upland area of the city is protected as part of the National Forest system and the TRPA prohibits development outside of the urban boundaries in the Basin. The unincorporated portion of El Dorado County within the city's urban services boundary may provide a potential area for future annexation and is almost exclusively available for single-family residential development.

The Constraints Section of this Housing Element discusses in detail the specifics of local and regional development standards and how these requirements contribute to the economic feasibility of producing housing at South Lake Tahoe. It also briefly describes the nontraditional "zoning mechanism" used by the City. More details are provided in this section.

Concurrent with its 1999 General Plan update, the City adopted the TRPA's system of Plan Area Statements and Community Plans in lieu of its previous, traditional zoning. This change was made in order to eliminate inconsistencies between the City's zoning and the TRPA's system of permissible uses, provide clarity for project applicants, and to streamline the process. Previously, in some cases, the two systems were contradictory and the most restrictive prevailed. This potential inconsistency was often a source of confusion to project applicants. Since the 2012 TRPA Regional Plan update local jurisdictions within TRPA may develop area plans to replace existing community plans and plan area statements to implement the TRPA Regional Plan. The City has recently adopted the Tourist Core Area Plan (TCAP) and is currently preparing the Tahoe Valley Area Plan for this purpose.

Each parcel of land within the city is geographically assigned to a Plan Area Statement (PAS), Area Plan (AP), or Community Plan (CP) district (see Table 4-40). Each of these documents defines the "permissible uses" for any given area and describes how that area should be used to achieve regional and local environmental and land use objectives. They describe:

- The primary land use classification of the area (such as residential).
- The environmental management strategy.
- Special designations (such as a receiving area for transfer of development rights or multi-residential incentives program).
- A statement of the overall land use/environmental management policy for the area.
- A description of planning considerations related to the environment and existing permissible uses.
- Permissible uses within defined sub-areas.
- General development standards, such as for maximum density and noise.

Amendments to the AP, PAS or CP require approval by both the City Council and TRPA Governing Board. The PAS method of zoning tailors uses to what is appropriate for the areas; thus various residential (or other) uses are often permissible without requiring such amendments (rezoning).

There are six categories of potentially permissible residential uses:

- Employee Housing: Residential units owned and maintained by public or private entities for purposes of housing employees of said public or private entity. (Measured in persons per acre. For uses that denote density by "persons per acre," one residential unit is required for every 2.5 people accommodated.)
- Mobile Home Dwelling: A vehicular structure that is built on a chassis or frame, is designed to be used with or without a permanent foundation, is capable of being drawn by a motor vehicle, and is used as a residential dwelling when connected to utilities. (Measured in units per acre. Mobile homes are different from recreational vehicles.)
- Multi-Person Dwelling: A building designed primarily for permanent occupancy by individuals unrelated by blood, marriage, or adoption in other than single-family dwelling units or transient dwelling units. A multi-person dwelling includes but is not limited to facilities such as dormitories and boarding houses, but not such facilities as hotels, motels, and apartment houses. (Measured in persons per acre. For uses that denote density by "persons per acre," one residential unit is required for every 2.5 people accommodated.)

- Multiple-Family Dwelling: More than one residential unit located on a parcel. Multiple-family dwellings may be contained in separate buildings, such as two or more detached houses on a single parcel, or in a larger building on a parcel such as a duplex, a triplex, or an apartment building. One detached secondary residence is included under secondary residence. (Measured in units per acre.)

- Nursing and Personal Care: Residential establishments providing nursing and health-related care as a principal use with in-patient beds such as skilled nursing care facilities, extended care facilities, convalescent and rest homes, and board and care facilities. (Measured in persons per acre.)

- Residential Care: Establishments primarily engaged in the provision of residential social and personal care for children, the aged, and special categories of persons with some limits on ability for self-care, but where medical care is not a major element. Including, but not limited to, children's homes, halfway houses, orphanages, rehabilitation centers, and self-help group homes. Note: The City and TRPA treat group homes of six or fewer clients residing in a residence as a "family," not as a residential-care facility. They are authorized wherever single-family homes are authorized. (Measured in persons per acre. For uses that denote density by "persons per acre," one residential unit is required for every 2.5 people accommodated.)

- Single-Family Dwelling: One residential unit located on a parcel. A single-family dwelling unit may be contained in a detached building such as a single-family house, or in a subdivided building containing two or more parcels such as a townhouse condominium. A caretaker residence is included under secondary residence, which can be permissible for single-family parcels greater than one acre in size.

Affordable Housing is defined by Chapter 90 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances as:

> *"Residential housing, deed restricted to be used exclusively for lower-income households (income not in excess of 80 percent of the respective county's median income) and for very low-income households (not to exceed 50 percent of the respective county's median income). Such housing units shall be made available for rental or sale at a cost that does not exceed the recommended state and federal standards. Each county's median income will be determined according to the income limits published annually by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. For multi-person dwellings, the affordable housing determination shall be made using each resident's income and not the collective income of the dwelling."*

Some Plan Area Statements, Area Plans, or Community Plans, or portions thereof, are designated Preferred Affordable Housing Areas. Plan areas with the preferred affordable housing area designation are preferred locations for affordable housing and are eligible for special incentives found in the TRPA Code pursuant to Chapter 50 (e.g., allocation exemption) and 52 (e.g., bonus-unit assignment). Figure 4-6 shows the Preferred Affordable Housing Areas in South Lake Tahoe. Some plan areas are designated as eligible for the Multi-Residential Incentive Programs. Plan areas with this designation are eligible for the multi-residential incentive program pursuant to Chapter 52 of the TRPA Code, which essentially allows

"bonus units" to be substituted for needed development rights for multi-family housing. Figure 4-7 shows the areas of South Lake Tahoe that are designated as eligible for the Multi-Residential Incentive Program.

Housing that is deed-restricted as affordable in perpetuity may obtain multi-residential "bonus units" to substitute for their needed development rights and are exempt from the need for an allocation when located within an area designated as both a Preferred Affordable Housing Area and eligible for the Multi-Residential Incentive Program. Most Preferred Affordable Housing Areas are also Multi-Residential Incentive Areas; however, there are a few Plan Area Statements that have only one of the two designations. From the 1987 TRPA Regional Plan, 574 multi-residential bonus units remain available from a region-wide pool; 600 additional multi-residential bonus units were added in the Regional Plan update to be allocated in centers. Bonus units are currently available on a first project approved, first served basis and are not subject to either reservation or a waiting list. In addition, Chapter 50 of the TRPA Code provides an exemption from the need for an allocation for residential development for all affordable housing units approved after January 1, 1986.

Table 4-40 is a summary table of the PAS/CP districts in the city. Each parcel in South Lake Tahoe is located in a PAS, CP district, or AP district. The table describes whether the residential use categories are permissible and if any special designations apply. It indicates the total number of acres in each area and the maximum density for each permissible use. Uses marked with an "A" are allowable by right if they meet local and regional standards; uses marked with an "S" require a use permit from the City of South Lake Tahoe and TRPA.

TABLE 4-40
PLAN AREA STATEMENTS AND COMMUNITY PLAN DISTRICTS RESIDENTIAL IMPLICATIONS
South Lake Tahoe
2013

PAS/CP			DESIGNATIONS				TDR RECEIVING AREA		PERMISSIBLE USE (*BY RESIDENTIAL USE CATEGORY*)												
Name PAS/CP	Sub-Unit or District (if any)	Acres	Land Use	Pref. AH Area?	Multi-Res. Incentive Program?	Bonus Units for AH?	Existing Develop-ment?	Multi-Res.?	SF	MF (units/ acre)	Multi-Pers. (pers/acre)	Employee Hous. (units/ acre)	Mobile Homes (units/ acre)	Res. Care ≤ 6 persons (pers/ acre)	Res. Care > 6 persons (pers/ acre)	Nurs./ Pers. Care (pers/ acre)	Second Unit	Emergency Shelter (Social Service Organ-ization)	Single-room Occupancy Unit	Transitional Hous.	Sup-portive Hous.
Lakeview Heights #085	Total	558.27																			
	Outside SA	517.21	Residential	No	No	No	No	No	A	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	A(3)	No	No	No	No
	SA #1	41.06		No	No	No	No	Yes	A	A, 15	No	No	No	S, 25	No	No	A(3)	No	No	No	No
Heavenly Valley CA #087		2367.04	Recreation	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Lakeside Park #089		41.18	Residential	No	No	No	No	Yes	A	S, 15	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	A	No	No	No
Tahoe Meadows #090		104.68	Residential	No	No	No	No	No	A	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	A(3)	No	No	No	No
Pioneer/ Ski Run #092		179.95	Residential	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A	A, 15	S,25	S, 15	No	No	No	No	A(3)	No	No	No	No
Bijou #093	Total	167.38																			
	Outside SA	112.67	Residential	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A	A, 15	S, 25	S, 15	No	No	No	No	A(3)	No	No	No	No
	SA #1	54.71		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	A(3)	No	No	No	No
Glenwood #094	Total	301.39																			
	Outside SA	291.56	Residential	No	No	No	No	No	A	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	A(3)	No	No	No	No
	SA #1	6.62		No	No	No	No	No	A	No	No	No	A, 8	No	No	No	A(3)	No	No	No	No
	SA #2	3.21		Yes*	Yes*	Yes*	No	No	A	S*, 15	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Trout/Cold Creek #95		198.88	Conserva-tion	No	No	No	No	No	S	No	No	S, 15	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Pioneer Village #096		29.17	Residential	No	No	No	No	No	A	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	A(3)	No	No	No	No
Bijou Pines #097	Total	91.17																			
	Outside SA	84.46	Residential	No	No	No	No	Yes	A	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	A(3)	No	No	No	No
	SA #1	6.71		No	No	No	No	Yes	A	A, 15	No	No	No	No	No	No	A(3)	No	No	No	No
Al Tahoe #099	Total	307.09																			
	Outside SA	158.71	Residential	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	A	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	A(3)	No	No	No	No
	SA #1	148.38		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A	A, 15	A, 25	No	No	No	No	No	A(3)	No	No	No	No
Truckee Marsh #100		657.31	Conserva-tion	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Bijou Meadow #101	Total	479.68																			
	Outside SA	445.23	Recreation	No	No	No	No	No	S	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	SA #1	34.45		No	No	No	No	No	S	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No

TABLE 4-40
PLAN AREA STATEMENTS AND COMMUNITY PLAN DISTRICTS RESIDENTIAL IMPLICATIONS
SOUTH LAKE TAHOE
2013

PAS/CP			DESIGNATIONS				TDR RECEIVING AREA		PERMISSIBLE USE? (*BY RESIDENTIAL USE CATEGORY*)												
Name PAS/CP	Sub-Unit or District (if any)	Acres	Land Use	Pref. AH Area?	Multi-Res. Incentive Program?	Bonus Units for AH?	Existing Develop-ment?	Multi-Res.?	SF	MF (units/ acre)	Multi-Pers. (pers/acre)	Employee Hous. (units/ acre)	Mobile Homes (units/ acre)	Res. Care ≤ 6 persons (pers/ acre)	Res. Care > 6 persons (pers/ acre)	Nurs./ Pers. Care (pers/ acre)	Second Unit	Emergency Shelter	Single-room Occupancy Unit	Transitional Hous.	Sup-portive Hous.
Tahoe Keys #102	Total	494.89																			
	Outside SA	401.18	Residential	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	A	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	A(3)	S	No	No	No
	SA #1	43.60		No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	S	No	No	No
	SA #2	50.11		No	No	No	Yes	Yes	A	A, 15	No	No	No	No	No	No	A(3)	S	No	No	No
Sierra Tract Commercial #103		67.15	Commercial/ Public Service	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	S	S, 15	No	S, 15	S, 8	S, 25	No	S, 25	No	A	No	No	No
Highland Woods #104	Total	107.48																			
	Outside SA	69.73	Residential	No	No	No	No	No	A	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	SA #1	37.75		No	No	No	No	Yes	A	A, 12	No	No	No	No	No	No	A(3)	No	No	No	No
Sierra Tract #105	Total	253.04																			
	Outside SA	184.86	Residential	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	SA #1	68.18		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A	A, 12	No	No	No	No	No	No	A(3)	No	No	No	No
Winnemucca #108		24.98	Residential	No	No	No	No	No	A	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
So. "Y" #110	Total	336.00																			
	Outside SA	198.12	Commercial/ Public Service	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	S, 15	No	S, 15	No	No	No	No	No	A	No	No	No
	SA #1	68.15		Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	S, 15	No	No	S, 8	No	No	No	No	A	No	No	No
	SA #2	69.73		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	S	A, 15	A, 25	A, 15	S, 8	A, 25	No	A, 25	A(3)	A	No	No	No
Tahoe Island #111	Total	524.66																			
	Outside SAs	431.57	Residential	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	A	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	SA #1	14.63		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	A	A, 8	No	No	No	No	No	No	A(3)	No	No	No	No
	SA #2	78.46		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A	A, 8	No	No	No	S, 25	No	S, 25	A(3)	No	No	No	No
Gardner Mountain #112	Total	328.48																			
	Outside SAs	313.77	Residential	No	No	No	No	No	A	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	SA #1	10.76		No	No	No	No	No	A	A, 8	No	No	No	S, 25	No	S, 25	A(3)	No	No	No	No
	SA #2	3.95		Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	A	S, 8	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Bonanza #114	Total	255.89																			
	Outside SA	125.69		Yes	No	No	No	Yes	A	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	SA #1	68.77	Residential	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	A	A, 15	No	No	S, 8	A, 25	No	A, 25	A(3)	S	No	No	No
	SA #2	52.25		Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	A	S, 15	No	No	A, 8	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	SA #3	9.18		Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	A	A, 8	No	No	No	No	No	No	A(3)	No	No	No	No
Airport #116		275.67	Commercial/ Public Service	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	S, 15	No	S, 15	No	No	No	No	No	S	No	No	No
Industrial CP		67.04	Commercial/ Public Service	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No

TABLE 4-40
PLAN AREA STATEMENTS AND COMMUNITY PLAN DISTRICTS RESIDENTIAL IMPLICATIONS
SOUTH LAKE TAHOE
2013

PAS/CP			DESIGNATIONS				TDR RECEIVING AREA		PERMISSIBLE USE? (*BY RESIDENTIAL USE CATEGORY*)												
Name PAS/CP	Sub-Unit or District (if any)	Acres	Land Use	Pref. AH Area?	Multi-Res. Incentive Program?	Bonus Units for AH?	Existing Develop-ment?	Multi-Res.?	SF	MF (units/ acre)	Multi-Pers. (pers/acre)	Employee Hous. (units/ acre)	Mobile Homes (units/ acre)	Res. Care ≤ 6 persons (pers/ acre)	Res. Care > 6 persons (pers/ acre)	Nurs./ Pers. Care (pers/ acre)	Second Unit	Emergency Shelter	Single-room Occupancy Unit	Transitional Hous.	Sup-portive Hous.
Bijou/Al Tahoe CP	Total	383.95	Commercial/ Public Service																		
	1	56.77		No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	S	S, 15	S, 25	S(1), 15	No	No	No	No	No	S	No	No	No
	2	9.64		No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	S	S, 15	No	S(1), 15	No	No	No	No	No	S	No	No	No
	3	19.09		No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	S	No	No	No
	4	298.45		No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	A(1/5), 15	No	S(1), 15	No	A (1/5)	No	No	A(3)	A	No	No	No
Tourist Core Area Plan	Total	279.98	Tourist																		
	TSC-C	63.89		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A(2)	A,25	S	S	No	No	No	No	A(3)	No	No	No	No
	TSC-MU	108.46		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A	A,25	S	S	No	No	No	No	A(3)	No	No	No	No
	TSC-MUC	40.44		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A	A,25	S	A	No	No	No	No	A(3)	A	No	No	No
	TSC-NMX	4.50		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A	A,25	S	S	No	No	No	No	A(3)	No	No	No	No
	TSC-G	46.33		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A	A.25	S	S	No	No	No	No	A(3)	A	No	No	No
	REC	5.83		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	S(2)	No	No	A	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	OS	10.53		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No

Note: CP = Community Plan
AH = Affordable Housing
A = Allowed Use
S = Special Use
SA = Special Area
A(1) = Allowed with CSLT and TRPA Design Review (Bijou/Al Tahoe CP)
A(1/5) = Allowed with CSLT Design Review on Specific Parcels Only
A(2) = for condominiums only
A(3) = Second units can be developed on lots larger than one acre in size located in PAS and CP districts where multi-family is a permissible use or PAS or CP districts where single-family is a permissible use (and multi-family is prohibited)
S(1) = Special Use with CSLT and TRPA Design Review
S(2) = caretaker residence only
**Senior Citizen Housing Only*
Source: TRPA Plan Area Statements, Tourist Core Area Plan, Bijou/Al Tahoe Community Plan, City of South Lake Tahoe 2013.

Program 2-10 proposes to include definitions of single-room occupancy units, emergency shelters, and transitional and supportive housing and to allow each of these residential uses as required by state law if not already allowed in the City.

This page intentionally left blank.

Figure 4-6: Preferred Affordable Housing Area



Figure 4-7 Multi-Residential Incentive Areas



Survey of Available Land

Description of Criteria for Identifying Housing Sites

Housing Element law requires an inventory of land suitable for residential development (Government Code, Section 65583(a)(3)). An important purpose of this inventory is to determine whether a jurisdiction has allocated sufficient land for the development of housing to meet the jurisdiction's share of the regional housing need, including housing to accommodate the needs of all household income levels.

In assessing the potential for achieving the development of housing consistent with regional and local needs, some assumptions were made:

- **Extremely Low-, Very Low- and Low-Income SACOG Target:**
  Based on construction and land development costs in South Lake Tahoe, it is assumed that new construction housing affordable to very low- and low-income households will primarily be deed-restricted multi-family attached housing constructed using bonus units.

- **Moderate-Income SACOG Target:**
  With rising housing costs, it is assumed that moderate-income ownership (likely condominiums) and rental housing (e.g., small multi-family, such as duplexes and triplexes) will be provided through development of vacant lots using multi-family residential allocations (and a few of the single-family allocations) obtained through the allocation list and rehabilitation of the limited existing, moderately priced housing stock.

- **Above Moderate-Income SACOG Target:**
  It is assumed that new above-moderate housing will be constructed on vacant parcels using residential single-family allocations and possibly some of the multi-family allocations obtained through the allocation list, as well as allocations transferred from retired environmentally sensitive parcels.

In conducting an evaluation of specific potential sites, two categories of sites with affordable housing development potential were identified. Given the diminishing availability of developable land, the City identified specific housing opportunity sites, incentives, and other advantages that could facilitate affordable housing development:

- Vacant parcels.

- Sites with redevelopment, re-use, or parcel consolidation potential, whether underutilized, best suited for demolition and reconstruction, or suitable for rehabilitation with affordability restrictions.

The following considerations were used as "screening criteria" in evaluating potential sites:

- Suitability of parcel for the construction of affordable housing due to location and site accessibility with respect to transportation and services.

- Availability or potential availability of infrastructure and public services.
- Environmental conditions affecting development capability of the land.
- Current ownership.
- For sites not presently vacant, condition and type of existing uses and potential for multi-family residential densities.

Inventory of Vacant Sites

Potential for Lower-Density Dwellings

TRPA has inventoried each vacant single-family residential development-eligible parcel under its Individual Parcel Evaluation System (IPES). This system evaluates the "buildability" of each lot based on slope, soil type, water influence, etc. The IPES scoring system sets a minimum point value, also called an "IPES line." Development is permitted only on parcels that are above the IPES line. Prior to 2003, the IPES line was set at 726; however, TRPA lowered the IPES line within certain jurisdictions that implemented water quality improvement projects. Due to the implementation of these improvement projects, TRPA has set the IPES line to "1" in most jurisdictions in the Basin, including the City of South Lake Tahoe. Therefore, all vacant parcels in the city that have an IPES score above "1" can apply for a building allocation.

The following assumptions were made in determining which vacant lots have development potential:

- If it has an IPES score greater than 1, the vacant lot is developable.
- If it has an IPES score of zero, it is not developable.

Table 4-41 summarizes the potential for development of vacant lots in South Lake Tahoe based on data provided by TRPA and the City of South Lake Tahoe. A full list of vacant parcels is included in Appendix B. All of the parcels in the land inventory can accommodate at least 1 unit per parcel. As shown in the table, 912 undeveloped lots are eligible for residential development in South Lake Tahoe, provided that they obtain a residential allocation. Of these 912 lots, single-family dwellings are allowed on 652 parcels (or 138.4 acres), and multi-family residential development is allowed on 254 parcels (or 73.4 acres).[5] Of the total vacant lots identified in Table 4-41, 783 parcels (or 191.5 acres) are considered highly developable, with IPES scores greater than 726. These "highly developable" lots would be able to build with a base land coverage of at least 20 percent. The other vacant lots shown in Table 4-41 would need to transfer in coverage to allow greater land coverage. Of the total 912 vacant lots, only 25 are greater than one-acre in size, making them eligible for an accessory "secondary residence" pursuant to TRPA regulations. The vacant parcels are shown in Figure 4-8.

[5] There are 252 parcels that allow both single-family and multi-family residential development.

Figure 4-8 Vacant/Underutilized Housing Inventory



Figure 4-8

City of South Lake Tahoe
Vacant/Underutilized Housing Inventory

PMC

TABLE 4-41 VACANT LOTS IN PAS/CP ALLOWING SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT South Lake Tahoe 2013					
Category	**Total Number of Parcels**	**Total Acres**	**Highly Developable [1] Parcels**	**Highly Developable Acres**	**Other Information**
Vacant parcels eligible for residential development	912	215.0	783	191.5	IPES score > 0
Vacant parcels eligible for single-family (SF) dwellings only	658	141.7	582	122.5	In PASs or CPs that allow SF, but do not allow MF development
Vacant parcels eligible for multi-family (MF) dwellings only	2	0.8	2	0.8	In PASs or CPs that allow MF, but do not allow SF development
Vacant parcels eligible for both SF and MF dwellings	252	72.6	218	68.3	In PASs or CPs that allow both SF and MF development
Vacant lots eligible for construction of a secondary residence	25	31.6	25	31.6	Greater than one acre in size

Notes: [1] Parcels with an IPES score greater than 726 are considered "highly developable"
Source: TRPA, City of South Lake Tahoe, and PMC, 2013.

Analysis of Above Moderate-Income Housing Opportunities

There are an adequate number of vacant single-family and small multiple-family parcels to meet the City's remaining "fair share" of regional housing needs for above-moderate income housing (145 units).

TRPA restricts the number of housing unit permits for local jurisdictions within the Basin. In the past, jurisdictions received a fixed number of allocations each year. In 2003 TRPA changed the allocation system by tying it directly to a jurisdiction's accomplishments of environmental improvements. The number of allocations that TRPA will make available to South Lake Tahoe will likely fluctuate in the future. In 2013, the City received 19 residential allocations (12 (eight single-family and four multi-family) first time around, five additional in August (four single-family and one multi-family), and one 2011 and one 2013 below IPES line allocation).

TRPA is currently in the process of modifying the Performance Review System (PRS) used to determine the number of allocations each jurisdiction receives each year. The new system will likely have different criteria for evaluating the accomplishment of environmental improvements. While the City cannot be sure of the number of allocations that it will receive from TRPA through the end of the Housing Element planning period, based on annual allocations received since 2003, it is likely that the City will receive approximately 20 allocations per year. The realistic development within this eight-year planning period, based upon allocations, is 150 new single-family homes and 50 new multi-family units (some of which may be subdivided into condominiums).

Different jurisdictions have different methods of distributing allocations to property owners. The City of South Lake Tahoe sets aside 30 percent of its allocations for multi-family housing developments (including condominiums). Because the market value of transferable allocations is about $35,000, it would be reasonable to expect that only people constructing above-moderate income homes would elect to obtain their allocations by purchasing them on the private market instead of waiting on the City's waiting list. Consequently, with the purchase of approximately 25 transferable allocations, a total of 185 new housing units, both single- and multi-family units, are estimated to be constructed within the eight-year planning period. Based upon staff assumptions and the affordability analysis described earlier in this section, it is reasonable to expect that the majority of these units will be affordable only to people with above-moderate incomes. This number of projected above-moderate units satisfies the city's remaining above-moderate income RHNA of 145 units.

Analysis of Extremely Low, Very Low-, Low-, and Moderate-Income Housing Opportunities on Vacant and Underutilized Land

There are multi-family parcels listed in Table 4-40 that could be used to create affordable ownership opportunities for moderate-income families who have made South Lake Tahoe their home. The analysis of vacant land available for this type of use is reflected in the land base available for moderate- and above moderate-income housing. Of these parcels, 220 (or 55.4 acres) allow densities between 12 and 15 units per acre, appropriate for moderate-income development. The City has a RHNA allocation of 63 moderate-income units. These parcels can produce 660 units. The 220 available parcels are sufficient to accommodate the moderate-income RHNA. Moderate-income units approved or constructed during the planning period will also be subject to allocation timing restrictions described above.

Thirteen of the vacant parcels available for lower-density single-family and multi-family development summarized in Table 4-41 are in the Tourist Core Area Plan (TCAP) area and also allow multi-family development up to a maximum of 25 units per acre. Based on City staff, consultant, and TRPA analysis, these parcels have the highest potential suitability for multi-family development. Table 4-42 presents these parcels and their development potential as analyzed by TRPA and City staff. The 13 parcels total 10.7 acres and when land coverage and environmental restrictions are considered can accommodate 207 units. The realistic unit capacity of 12 of these parcels would be at densities of 20 units per acre. Four of these parcels have capacity for 16 or more units (See Table 4-42). These four parcels (Figure 4-9 Map ID numbers 6, 9, 12 and 13) could provide a total of 120 units.

In addition to the 13 vacant parcels in the TCAP area with development potential, there are 10 commercial properties with some existing development and some developable land area (3.5 acres remaining developable acreage) in the TCAP area. Table 4-43 presents these parcels and their development potential as analyzed by TRPA. The analysis concludes that 70 units could realistically be accommodated on these sites. Figure 4-9 presents all of the vacant and underutilized parcels in the TCAP with potential for lower-income development.

TABLE 4-42
VACANT PARCEL ANALYSIS

Map ID	APN	Acres	Zoning	SFR Allowed Density	MFD Allowed Density	Developable Acres	Maximum Units	Realistic Units	Comments
1	027-072-32	0.52	TSC-MU	1	25	0.36	12.92	10.34	
2	027-313-09	0.34	TSC-MUC	1	25	0.24	8.62	6.90	
3	027-321-15	0.55	TSC-MUC	1	25	0.38	13.75	11.00	Parcel banked but no deed restrictions
4	027-690-08	0.73	TSC-MU	1	25	0.51	18.25	14.60	SW corner parcel at Ski Run and US 50 (former red parcels)
5	027-690-09	0.78	TSC-MU	1	25	0.55	19.50	15.60	SW corner parcel at Ski Run and US 50 (former red parcels)
6	028-081-07	0.83	TSC-MUC	1	25	0.38	20.80	16.64	
7	028-141-35	0.23	TSC-MUC	1	25	0.16	5.64	4.51	
8	028-141-37	0.04	TSC-MUC	1	25	0.03	1.07	1.00	Small parcel size
9	028-141-39	1.58	TSC-MUC	1	25	0.91	39.43	31.55	
10	029-010-20	0.98	TSC-MU	1	15/25	0.69	17.20	13.76	
11	029-164-02	0.45	TSC-MU	1	25	0.31	11.21	8.97	
12	029-441-15	2.00	TSC-MU	1	25	1.25	50.06	40.05	
13	029-441-21	1.64	TSC-MU	1	25	0.67	40.91	32.72	
		10.67				6.45	259.35	207.63	

TABLE 4-43
UNDERUTILIZED COMMERCIAL SITES

Map ID	APN	Acres	Zoning	SFR Allowed Density	MFD Allowed Density	Developable Acres1	Maximum Units	Realistic Units	Comments
14	027-072-33	0.86	TSC-MU	1	25	0.49	12.23	9.79	
15	027-101-02	0.43	TSC-G	1	25	0.30	7.56	6.05	
16	027-111-11	0.67	TSC-G	1	25	0.59	14.67	11.74	
17	027-163-30	0.36	TSC-MUC	1	25	0.25	6.24	4.99	
18	027-350-15	0.34	TSC-G	1	25	0.24	6.03	4.83	
19	029-095-08	0.65	TSC-MU	1	25	0.45	11.16	8.92	
20	029-161-24	0.34	TSC-MU	1	25	0.31	7.75	6.20	
21	029-170-03	0.42	TSC-MU	1	25	0.33	8.17	6.53	
22	029-170-04	0.53	TSC-MU	1	25	0.47	11.87	9.50	
23	029-170-05	0.10	TSC-MU	1	25	0.09	2.28	1.83	
		4.71				3.52	87.98	70.38	

1. Assumes all excess coverage is legally non-conforming and a 10% reduction in excess coverage.

Figure 4-9: Vacant/Underutilized Housing Inventory Inside the Tourist Core Area



500 0 500
FEET
N

Figure 4-9
Vacant/Underutilized Housing Inventory
Inside the Tourist Core Area Plan

PMC

All of the developable acreage on the vacant and underutilized sites in the TCAP area is less than 1 acre per site. In addition to the four stand alone vacant parcels with the potential to produce financially feasible projects of 16 units or greater at 20 units per acre, lot consolidation could increase the financially feasibility opportunities for affordable multi-family housing developments. Consolidation of existing development to create affordable housing for people of lower incomes can be expensive. It is not easy to consolidate properties to make a re-use project financially feasible and to create reasonably secure investments for a developer. Reconstruction or demolition of older structures typically requires the removal of existing occupants, loan/grant application processes, and unforeseen construction complications due to the dilapidated conditions of older buildings.

However, development that reuses infrastructure associated with existing substandard or underutilized sites, including those that require parcel consolidation, can provide the developer with needed commodities in the Lake Tahoe building environment. A developer's larger initial investment can be offset by the opportunity to retain the "grandfathered" excess land coverage that is unavailable on vacant sites. Further, existing sewer units and mitigation fee reductions based upon the previous use can reduce overall development costs. Existing units of use can be banked and sold if the development is located in an area with the special designations in place for "bonus units" to be used for the subsequent affordable residential project. Program 1-10 commits the city to allow and encourage lot consolidation and to work with the development community to promote awareness of lot consolidation opportunities.

Table 4-44 presents five "sites" made up of multiple parcels that could be consolidated and developed into one site for multi-family housing. Three of the four vacant parcels that could accommodate 16 or more units without lot consolidation are included in the sites in Table 4-44. The location of the parcels in the five sites is shown on Figure 4-9.

TABLE 4-44
LOT CONSOLIDATION SITES TO MEET THE LOWER-INCOME RHNA

Site	Parcel Numbers	Current Use	Zoning	Density Allowed	Actual Density	Acreage	Realistic Unit Capacity	Other Information
1	027-313-09	Vacant	TSC-MUC	25 units/acre	20 units/acre	0.89	17	
	027-321-15	Vacant	TSC-MUC					Parcel banked but has no deed restrictions
2	027-690-08	Vacant	TSC-MU	25 units/acre	20 units/acre	1.51	29	Parcels are owned by the South Tahoe Redevelop-ment Successor Agency. Southwest corner parcel at Ski Run and US 50 (former red parcels).
	027-690-09	Vacant	TSC-MU					
3	028-141-35	Vacant	TSC-MUC	25 units/acre	20 units/acre	1.85	36	
	028-141-37	Vacant	TSC-MUC					
	028-141-39	Vacant	TSC-MUC					
4	029-441-15	Vacant	TSC-MU	25 units/acre	20 units/acre	3.64	72	
	029-441-21	Vacant	TSC-MU					
5	029-170-03	Non-Vacant	TSC-MU	25 units/acre	15 units/acre	1.05	16	
	029-170-04	Non-Vacant	TSC-MU					
	029-170-05	Non-Vacant	TSC-MU					
Total Potential Units as a Result of Lot Consolidation							**170**	

Source: TRPA and City of South Lake Tahoe, 2013.

In addition to the four vacant parcels with potential for lower-income units and the additional sites in Table 4-44 above, there is estimated development potential for 85 units on the other sites identified in Tables 4-42 and 4-43. These unit numbers are included in the above-moderate land inventory totals in Table 4-40. The sites that could produce these units are small and don't provide opportunities for large housing projects. However, they could offer opportunities for infill of small affordable projects including self-help projects like those constructed by Habitat for Humanity. The combination of vacant sites that

can accommodate 16 or more units at 20 units per acre, sites with lot consolidation potential and sites with potential for infill development with small affordable units would produce up to 170 units, more than enough to meet the remaining lower-income (extremely low, very low, and low income) RHNA of 45 units.

Conclusions

Due to the maximum densities allowed by the TRPA Regional Plan, the City of South Lake Tahoe has limited sites where development at densities conducive to feasible affordable housing projects can occur. These limited sites are small in size and often constrained. Currently, only the TCAP area allows densities above 15 units per acre. The City is currently preparing the Tahoe Valley Area Plan for an area that the TRPA has also identified as allowing up to 25 units per acre if implemented through City zoning. The City plans to consider allowing this density on some or all of the parcels in the Tahoe Valley Area Plan area and will consider minimum densities during the plan preparation process. Program 1-11 commits the City to these actions during the preparation of the plan. Adoption of the Tahoe Valley Area Plan is anticipated in late 2014. Adoption of a plan that allows for increased densities on most or all of the plan area would substantially increase the land available for lower-income development during the planning period. Currently, the City has sufficient vacant and underutilized land appropriately zoned to meet the lower-income RHNA. There is more than enough vacant land to meet the moderate- and above moderate-income RHNA. The City will continue to strive to meet its housing production goals within the constraints of the TRPA's allocation process and constraints to development potential related to Basin-wide restrictions.

Adequacy of Public Facilities, Services, and Infrastructure

This section addresses the adequacy of public facilities, services, and infrastructure to accommodate planned residential growth through the end of the Housing Element planning period (June 15, 2022).

Water

The South Tahoe Public Utility District (STPUD, District) provides water service to the majority of the City of South Lake Tahoe. The water supply originates from 16 active wells and is stored in 22 holding tanks. Since 1997, MTBE (methyl tert-butyl ether) contamination has been responsible for the closure of 13 STPUD drinking wells. However, the District was the first in California to employ progressive advanced oxidation MTBE treatment technology approved by the California Department of Health Services. This treatment has significantly reduced the MTBE contamination in the water supply. The District is working to update and expand its storage capacity. In 2007, the District installed the Bayview Well, which produces 3,600 gallons of water per minute, making it the District's highest-producing well.

South Lake Tahoe is located in a water-rich region of the state that is only minimally affected by drought. The District currently (2013) owns a total maximum water allocation of 9,528 acre feet per year, which is anticipated to be available though at least 2030. Based on projected demands, groundwater extractions will be approximately 8,000 acre feet per year in 2015. At this time, the District has adequate capacity to service its current users as well as provide for future development.

Three smaller water providers (and several individual private wells) also serve South Lake Tahoe. Tahoe Keys meets all standards. Lakeside Park has the ability to filter lake water and to bypass the filter if

necessary to meet fire flows. The Lukins Brothers Water Company, a privately owned water-supply system, does not meet City Fire Code requirements for minimum fire flows for the primarily residential (and several commercial) properties that it serves (Tamarack, part of Tahoe Island, a small portion of Gardner Mountain, and Lukins Tract subdivisions). Multi-family developments in these areas have been required to install fire sprinkler systems. In addition, property owners must pay about 45 percent more in insurance due to the risk of fire. The Lukins Brothers Water Company recognizes the need to upgrade its system. The necessary upgrades would cost an estimated $18 million, and as of 2013 the private water company did not have the financial capacity to upgrade its service and was working with the City of South Lake Tahoe to secure funding.

Sewer

The South Tahoe Public Utility District also provides wastewater collection, treatment, and export for Tahoe's South Shore within El Dorado County. After advanced secondary treatment, the District pumps the effluent to outside of the Lake Tahoe Basin to a reservoir in Alpine County. The facilities have a permitted capacity of 7.7 million gallons per day (although actual treatment capacity is anticipated to be 8.5 million gallons per day) and received an average daily flow of 3.6 million gallons per day during the 2012–2013 fiscal year. During peak summer months, the average flow is closer to 5 million gallons per day. Thus, the permitted capacity at the District’s sewage treatment plant is millions of gallons per day beyond average use.

The District uses actual sewage inflow figures to determine the plant's ability to accommodate additional sewer connections. (“Sewer units” are used as the basis for fee calculation.) The District’s Future Connections Facilities Plan (1995) provides for the following additional development within the District’s service area: 116 residential units per year; 133,333 square feet of commercial space, 32 new hotel rooms, and 933 new campsites. The District is currently (2013) in the process of updating its Future Connections Facilities Plan as part of the TRPA Regional Plan update. While the additional residential development capacity figures may change, other sources of information support the finding that the District has sewer capacity to serve anticipated development.

Infrastructure Financing

Due to the already high cost of TRPA fees associated with development in South Lake Tahoe, the City does not currently (2012) collect impact fees from developers to finance infrastructure improvements. Instead, infrastructure is financed on a case-by-case basis during individual project review. On large projects, specific mitigation required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) may include off-site infrastructure improvement.

Summary

The City of South Lake Tahoe has adequate public facilities, services, and infrastructure to accommodate planned residential growth within the existing city limits during the time frame of this Housing Element. The South Tahoe Public Utility District has water and sewer capacity to accommodate projected residential demand.

Improvements are needed in the Lukins Brothers Water Company to meet the City's Fire Code requirements. The building division and fire department carefully review development that occurs within the area of the city connected to the Lukins Brothers Water Company, and propose appropriate mitigation measures. However, in general, the facilities in South Lake Tahoe are adequate to meet population growth associated with the development of South Lake Tahoe's share of the regional housing sites identified in this Housing Element.

Inventory of Local, State, and Federal Housing and Financing Programs

Current City Programs

The City has very limited financial resources of its own to allocate for housing. Instead, funds for affordable housing and rehabilitation come primarily from the state and federal governments. All of the programs discussed in this section are implemented by the City of South Lake Tahoe.

Rental Housing New Construction Program

Of all of the City housing programs, the Rental Housing New Construction Program has been the most effective program for creating deed-restricted affordable housing for very low- and low-income households in South Lake Tahoe. The City works with developers to create quality affordable housing and allocates funds to support such projects. The three most recent development projects in the City are the Evergreen Apartments, Sky Forest Acres, and Kelly Ridge (Tahoe Senior Plaza II). The Evergreen Apartments—a 26-unit apartment complex for very low- and low-income households—was completed in 2006. Sky Forest Acres is a 17-unit affordable housing project for very low-income persons with disabilities. It was completed in May 2008. Kelly Ridge (Tahoe Senior Plaza II) was completed in 2009. The project created 33 affordable units for very low- and low-income seniors. All of the units in these projects are deed-restricted for a minimum of 55 years. Additionally, since all of the units will be built using TRPA bonus units, a perpetual deed restriction will require the units to remain permanently affordable. The City has a current Loan Agreement with SLT Pacific Associates for the construction of The Aspens project. The loan is for $3,000,000 of HOME Program funds (Standards Agreement 10-HOME-6347). The Aspens project includes 48 rental units, 47 of which will be assisted units occupied by low- and very low-income households. The other unit will be a moderate-income manager unit. The project is located at 3521 and 3541 Pioneer Trail. The project is currently under construction and expected to open in February 2014.

Illegal Unit Conversion Program

Since adoption of TRPA regulations, a number of illegal second units have been built in South Lake Tahoe. In April 1993, the City adopted an ordinance authorizing certain illegally constructed second units to become legalized if they meet specific criteria. The program was created specifically to help meet the city's affordable housing needs. The criteria for legalization include:

- Cannot have been illegally constructed since the ordinance was adopted in April 1993.

- May contain one unit beyond permissible density (detached, attached, or within the legal dwelling).
- Must conform to height, setbacks, and design standards.
- Must meet health and safety standards.
- Parcel must contain 1.5 parking spaces per unit.
- Must pay South Tahoe Public Utility District all costs for the illegal sewer hook-ups.
- Must be deed restricted as lower-income housing.

Through the Illegal Unit Conversion Program, the City has authorized the conversion of 25 illegally constructed units (as of September 2007) to be brought into compliance with health and safety standards and other applicable codes. The cost of bringing the illegal unit up to code is paid by the property owner. As of June 2013, the program is still codified but not advertised due to a lack of staff needed for administration.

Current El Dorado County Programs

El Dorado County implements the following programs:

The Housing Choice Voucher Program

The Housing Choice Voucher Program (formerly Section 8) provides assistance to help low-income residents of El Dorado County afford safe, decent, and sanitary housing. The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) provides funds to the El Dorado County Public Housing Authority to administer the program. Currently, the El Dorado County Public Housing Authority has 77 families under lease in South Lake Tahoe. There are 279 families on the wait list, 27 of which are from South Lake Tahoe. Of the families on the waitlist, 77 are at approximately 50 percent of the area median income, and 212 families are at approximately 30 percent of the area median income. The waitlist is currently closed.

Mortgage Credit Certificate Program

El Dorado County's Mortgage Credit Certificate Program is available to provide home purchase assistance to low-income residents (earning 80 percent or less of the area median income) in South Lake Tahoe and the unincorporated areas of El Dorado County. The Mortgage Credit Certificate Program reduces the amount of federal income taxes a homebuyer pays, allowing the homebuyer to qualify for a larger mortgage loan by increasing the household income. The mortgage credit certificate is a 15 percent tax credit that is in effect for the life of the loan as long as the property remains owner-occupied. Currently (2013), the maximum qualifying purchase price for a home is $535,385.

CDBG First-Time Homebuyer Loan Program

The First-Time Homebuyer Loan Program provides low-interest rate loans to eligible low-income homebuyers to assist in the purchase of a home in the unincorporated areas of the county. Funding for the program is provided through the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program and the

County's revolving loan fund. The County's program requires that applicants be eligible for a first mortgage through a traditional lender. The County provides 30-year deferred second mortgage of up to $100,000 with an interest rate as low as 3 percent. This program is only available to residents of unincorporated areas of the county, and therefore is not available to residents of South Lake Tahoe.

Assisted-Housing Projects in South Lake Tahoe

There are six multi-family rental housing complexes in South Lake Tahoe that receive government assistance from specific programs. These housing complexes are described under the "Preserving At-Risk Units" section.

Private, State, and Federal Funding Programs

In addition to the funding programs available through the City and County, there are several state and federal funding programs that assist first-time homebuyers, build affordable housing, and help special needs groups, such as seniors and large households. In most cases other entities, including for-profit and nonprofit developers, apply for funds or other program benefits. For example, developers apply directly for Section 202 grants. In general, the City relies upon the private sector to develop new affordable units.

TABLE 4-45
FINANCIAL RESOURCES FOR HOUSING ACTIVITIES

Program Name	Description	Eligible Activities
1. Federal Programs		
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	Grants available to the City on a competitive basis for a variety of housing and community development activities. City competes for funds through the state's allocation process.	- Acquisition - Rehabilitation - Homebuyer Assistance - Economic Development - Homeless Assistance - Public Services
Housing Choice Voucher Program (Section 8)	Assistance program that provides direct funding for rental subsidies for very low-income families.	- Rental Assistance
Section 202	Grants to private nonprofit developers of supportive housing for very low-income seniors.	- New Construction
Housing Rehabilitation Program	Provides financial assistance to low-income homeowners for health and safety improvements.	- Rehabilitation
Continuum of Care/Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing (HEARTH)	Funding through the HEARTH Act of 2009 to provide necessary resources for development of programs to assist homeless individuals and families.	- Homeless Assistance - New Construction

TABLE 4-45 FINANCIAL RESOURCES FOR HOUSING ACTIVITIES		
Program Name	**Description**	**Eligible Activities**
2. State Programs		
Affordable Housing Partnership Program (AHPP)	Provides lower-interest rate CHFA loans to homebuyers who receive local secondary financing.	- Homebuyer Assistance
Home Investment Partnership Program (HOME)	Provides grants to local governments and nonprofit agencies, through the State of California, for many homeowner and renter needs.	- Homebuyer Assistance - Rehabilitation - New Construction - Rental Assistance
Building Equity and Growth in Neighborhoods (BEGIN)	A state-funded program administered by HCD which provides low- and moderate-income households up to $30,000 for a down payment.	- Homebuyer Assistance
Cal Home	Grants awarded to jurisdictions for owner-occupied housing rehabilitation and first-time homebuyer assistance.	- Homebuyer Assistance - Rehabilitation
Single Family Housing Bond Program (Mortgage Revenue Bonds)	Bonds issued to local lenders and developers so that below market-interest rate loans can be issued to first-time homebuyers.	- Homebuyer Assistance
Low Income Housing Tax Credits	A 4% annual tax credit that helps owners of rental units develop affordable housing.	- New Construction
Federal Emergency Shelter Grants	Competitive grants to help local governments and nonprofits to finance emergency shelters, transitional housing, and other supportive services.	- New Construction - Rehabilitation - Homeless Assistance - Public Services
3. Private Resources/Financing Programs		
California Community Reinvestment Corporation (CCRC)	Nonprofit mortgage banking consortium designed to provide long-term debt financing for affordable multi-family rental housing. Nonprofit and for-profit developers contact member banks.	- New Construction - Rehabilitation - Acquisition
Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae)	- Fixed-rate mortgages issued by private mortgage insurers.	- Homebuyer Assistance
	- Mortgages which fund the purchase and rehabilitation of a home.	- Homebuyer Assistance - Rehabilitation
	- Low down payment mortgages for single-family homes in underserved low-income and minority cities.	- Homebuyer Assistance

TABLE 4-45 FINANCIAL RESOURCES FOR HOUSING ACTIVITIES		
Program Name	**Description**	**Eligible Activities**
Freddie Mac Home Works	Provides first and second mortgages that include rehabilitation loan. City provides gap financing for rehabilitation component. Households earning up to 80% MFI qualify.	- Homebuyer Assistance

Source: PMC 2013

Preserving At-Risk Units

State law requires that housing elements include an inventory of all publicly assisted multi-family rental housing projects within the local jurisdiction that are at risk of conversion to uses other than low-income residential within 10 years of the beginning of the current planning period (prior to June 15, 2014).

There are six multi-family rental housing complexes in South Lake Tahoe that receive government assistance from specific programs. Units are considered "at risk" if they will be eligible, within the next 10 years, to change to market-rate housing due to termination (opt-out) of a rent subsidy contract (e.g., Section 8), mortgage prepayment, or expiring use restrictions.

As demonstrated in Table 4-46, three housing projects are at risk of conversion within 10 years from the start of the housing element planning period. The earliest subsidy expiration date was May 31, 2013 for Sky Forest Acres. In all, 185 housing units are at risk, with 162 of those utilizing Section 8 housing vouchers. Program 3-4 commits the City to working with St. Joseph's Community Land Trust or other organizations to preserve assisted at-risk units if needed during the planning period.

TABLE 4-46 AT-RISK AFFORDABLE HOUSING STOCK South Lake Tahoe 2013						
Facility Name	**Address**	**Section 8 Units**	**Total Units**	**Program Type**	**Expiration Date**	**Owner**
Bijou Woods	3421 Spruce Ave Apt# 3	69	92	Preservation	5/31/2017	Profit Motivated
Sierra Garden Apartments	1801 Lake Tahoe Blvd	76	76	Preservation	2/28/2015	Profit Motivated
Sky Forest Acres	750 Emerald Bay Road	17	17	PRAC/811	5/31/2013	Nonprofit
Totals		162	185			

Source: CHPC, 2013

Deed restrictions and affordability covenants are commonly used to preserve affordable units in publically assisted housing. These methods ensure that the units are available to lower-income households long-term. Over time, the City may face the risk of losing some of its affordable units due to the expiration of covenants and deed restrictions. If market rents continue to increase, property owners may

become inclined to discontinue public subsidies and convert the assisted units to market-rate housing to increase profits.

Conversion risk was assessed for the units in Table 4-46 based on information from HUD and the California Housing Partnership Corporation (CHPC). As stated previously, 185 units within the City of South Lake Tahoe are at risk of converting into non-affordable housing projects and the following is an analysis of the preservation and replacement options of these housing projects.

Preservation and Replacement Options

Overview

The City has two main options to maintain the existence of affordable housing stock: 1) preserve the existing assisted units or 2) facilitate the construction of new units to take the place of any converted projects. Depending on the circumstances of at-risk projects preservation options can include transfer of project to nonprofit ownership, provision of rental assistance to tenants using non-federal funding sources, or the purchase of affordability covenants. For replacement, the most direct option is the development of new affordable multi-family units. These options are described in more detail below.

Transfer of Ownership

Transferring ownership of an at-risk project to a nonprofit housing provider is generally the least expensive methods of extending the affordability of a housing project long-term. By transferring property ownership to a nonprofit organization, low-income restrictions can be secured indefinitely and the project would become potentially eligible for a greater range of governmental assistance. Although nonprofit corporations already own Sky Forest Acres, they could potentially be acquired by other nonprofit agencies to maintain the affordability of units.

The current market value of the project was estimated using information from multi-family sales listings in August 2013 in South Lake Tahoe. The average cost to purchase a multi-family development was $140 per square foot. The average size of a unit was about 800 square feet and the average cost to buy a unit was $103,000. There are 185 units at risk of converting to market rate within 10 years in South Lake Tahoe with an associated purchase cost of about $19 million.

Rental Assistance

The 185 affordable units can also be maintained using rental subsidies from non-federal (state, local, or other) funding sources. The rent subsidies can be structured much like the federal Section 8 program which pays the difference between what tenants can pay (defined as 30 percent of household income) and what HUD estimates as the fair market rent on the unit. In El Dorado County, the 2013 fair market rent is determined to be $855 for a one-bedroom unit.

The feasibility of this providing rental assistance is highly dependent upon the availability of other funding sources necessary to make rent subsidies available and the willingness of property owners to accept the City rental vouchers As indicated in Table 4-47, the total cost of subsidizing the rents for all 185 at-risk units is estimated at $52,725 per month or $632,700 annually.

TABLE 4-47
RENTAL SUBSIDIES
South Lake Tahoe
2013

	Number
Total Units	185
Fair Market Rent[1]	$855
Very Low Income (50% AMI)[2]	$26,650
Affordable Cost – Utilities[3]	$570
Monthly Per Unit Subsidy	$285
Total Monthly Subsidy	$52,725
Total Annual Subsidy	$632,700

Source: PMC 2013.
1. Fair market rent is determined by HUD for different jurisdictions/areas across the United States on an annual basis.
2. 2013 Area median household income (AMI) limits based on 2013 Income Limits from the California Department of Housing and Community Development.
3. Affordable cost = 30% of household monthly income minus estimated utility allowance of $100 for a one-bedroom unit.

Purchase of Affordability Covenants

Another option to preserve the affordability of at-risk projects is for the City to provide an incentive package to the owners of the 185 units to maintain the projects as affordable housing. Incentives could include writing down the interest rate on the remaining loan balance and/or supplementing the Section 8 subsidy received to market levels. The feasibility of this option depends on whether the complex is too highly leveraged. By providing lump sum financial incentives or ongoing subsidies in the form of rents or reduced mortgage interest rates to the owner, the City can ensure that some or all of the units remain affordable.

Construction of Replacement Units

The construction of new affordable housing units is a more permanent solution to replace at-risk units before conversion to market-rate units. The cost of developing new multi-family housing depends on the number of bedrooms, location, land costs, and type of construction. Assuming an average construction cost of $200 per unit, and an average size of 800 square feet per unit, the approximate cost per unit would be $160,000. In total, it would cost approximately $29 million (excluding land costs) to construct 185 new affordable units. Even excluding land costs, the total costs to develop replacement units far exceeds the cost of the other two alternatives.

Cost Comparisons

The above analysis estimated the cost of preserving the at-risk units under three distinct options. The lowest cost method is rental subsidies with an estimated annual cost of about $633,000. Transfer of ownership to a nonprofit organization is the next most viable option with an estimated annual cost of $19 million. The highest cost option is the construction of new units, with an estimated cost of $29 million. The best option to preserve the at-risk units appears to be to provide rental subsidies.

TABLE 4-48
PROJECTS RECEIVING GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE
South Lake Tahoe
2012

Name and Address of Development	Sponsor(s)	Funding Sources	Year Built/ Rehabilitated	Expiration Date	# of Affordable Units	Target Income Groups
Tahoe Senior Plaza 1101 Third Street[1]	American Baptist Homes of the West	HUD 202 with rental subsidies, HOME funds	1999	1/31/2014	44 (all elderly units)	50% of AMI and below. Tenants pay 30% of income
Kelly Ridge (Tahoe Senior Plaza II)[1] 1447 Herbert Avenue	American Baptist Homes of the West	HUD 202 with rental subsidies, HOME funds	2009	12/31/2080	33 (all elderly units)	50% and 80% AMI
Tahoe Pines Apartments 3431 Spruce Avenue[1]	Professional Apartment Managers (PAM)	Tax Credits and HOME funds	1994	2024	27	50% and 60% AMI
Tahoe Valley Townhomes 1055 Tata Lane	Mercy Housing	Tax Credits, CHFA, HOME and CDBG funds	1999	2053	70	50% and 60% AMI
Bijou Woods 3421 Spruce Avenue	FPI Management; Chateau Bijou Company, LP	Tax Credits and Project-Based Section 8	2001	5/31/2017	69	50% and 60% AMI. Some units with Section 8 subsidy (tenants pay 30% of income)
Sky Forest Acres 750 Emerald Bay Road	Accessible Space, Inc.	PRAC/811	2008	5/31/2013	17	50% and 60% AMI
Sierra Garden Apartments 1801 Lake Tahoe Blvd.	PAM; Sierra Garden II Apartments, LP	HOME and CDBG funds	2007 (rehab)	2/28/2015	76	Tenants pay 30% of income

Notes: [1] Because TRPA assigned bonus units for these projects during the permitting process, Tahoe Senior Plaza, Kelly Ridge (Tahoe Senior Plaza II) and Tahoe Pines must remain permanently affordable to low- and very low-income people regardless of expiration of the funding source.
Source: City of South Lake Tahoe 2013.

Federal Programs to Preserve At-Risk Units

For below-market properties, Section 8 preservation tools include the Mark-Up-to-Market program, which provides incentives for for-profit property owners to remain in the Section 8 program after their contracts expire. The Mark-Up-to-Market program authorizes eligible Section 8 properties to increase rents, the difference of which is paid to the property owner by HUD, in exchange for a guaranteed five-year affordability term. The Mark-Up-to-Budget program allows nonprofit owners to increase below-market rents to acquire new property or make capital repairs while preserving existing Section 8 units. For above-market properties, Mark-to-Market provides owners with debt restructuring in exchange for renewal of Section 8 contracts for 30 years.

For Section 236 properties, Interest Reduction Payment (IRP) Retention/ Decoupling enables properties to retain IRP subsidy when new or additional financing is secured.

Section 515 enables the USDA to provide deeply subsidized loans directly to developers of rural rental housing. Loans have 30-year terms and are amortized over 50 years. The program gives first priority to individuals living in substandard housing.

A range of resources are available for preservation of Section 515 resources. Nonprofits can acquire Section 515 properties and assume the current mortgage or receive a new mortgage to finance acquisition and rehabilitation of the structures. Section 538 Rental Housing Loan Guarantees are available for the Section 514 and 516 loans and grants are also available for purchase and rehabilitation of Section 515 properties that are occupied by farmworkers. Section 533 provides a Housing Preservation Grant Program, which funds rehabilitation, but not acquisition.

Due to the termination of two major federal preservation programs (LIHPRHA and ELIHPA), and the limitations of existing federal tools such as Mark-to-Market, state and local actors must assume a greater role in preserving HUD-assisted properties.

State Programs to Preserve At-Risk Units

At the state level, the California Housing Finance Agency (CHFA) offers low interest loans to preserve long-term affordability for multi-family rental properties through its Preservation Acquisition Finance Program.

The Division of Financial Assistance within HCD offers the Preservation Interim Repositioning Program to provide short-term acquisition loans for assisted rental units at risk of conversion to market-rate. As of September 2013, HCD had committed all available funds and was not accepting new applications.

The Division of Financial Assistance also offers Multi-family Housing Program, which provides deferred payment loans for preservation of permanent and transitional rental housing, as well as new construction and rehabilitation.

The HOME Investment Partnerships Program provides grants to cities and counties and low-interest loans to state-certified community housing development organizations to create and preserve affordable housing for single- and multi-family projects benefitting lower-income renters or owners.

Local Programs to Preserve At-Risk Units

To help preserve housing for very low-, low-, and moderate-income household, the City can pursue direct negotiations with at-risk project owners to extend affordability restriction terms. In addition, the City applies for and receives HOME and CDBG funds that it can direct through grants and loans to extend affordability covenants on expiring properties.

Community Housing Development Organizations can apply directly to the state for HOME funds for preservation. The only local group in this category is the Saint Joseph Community Land Trust, but it has not pursued HOME funds for preservation purposes.

Qualified entities are nonprofit or for-profit organizations with the legal and managerial capacity to acquire and manage at-risk properties that agree to maintain the long-term affordability of projects. Following is a list of qualified entities for El Dorado County:

- Christian Church Homes of Northern California, Inc. (Oakland)
- El Dorado County Housing Authority (Placerville)
- Eskaton Properties, Inc. (Carmichael)
- Project Go, Inc. (Rocklin)
- Rural California Housing Corporation (West Sacramento)

Energy Conservation Opportunities

State housing element law requires an analysis of the opportunities for energy conservation in residential development. Energy efficiency has direct application to affordable housing because the more money spent on energy, the less available for rent or mortgage payments. High energy costs have particularly detrimental effects on low-income households that do not have enough income or cash reserves to absorb cost increases and must choose between basic needs such as shelter, food, and energy. In addition, energy price increases since 2001 combined with rolling electricity blackouts have led to a renewed interest in energy conservation.

All new buildings in California must meet the standards contained in Title 24, Part 6, of the California Code of Regulations (Building Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings). These regulations respond to California's energy crisis and need to reduce energy bills, increase energy delivery system reliability, and contribute to an improved economic condition for the state. They were established in 1978 and most recently updated in 2013 (effective date of January 1, 2014) and included a Green Building Code which the City has already adopted as a voluntary option. Through the building permit process, local governments enforce energy efficiency requirements. All new construction must comply with the standards in effect on the date a building permit application is made.

The standards found in Title 24 create energy savings of approximately 25 percent[6] over residential construction practices used prior to the standards. South Lake Tahoe is enforcing the provisions of Title 24.

El Dorado County oversees the Home Weatherization Program. The federally funded program is available to low-income owners and renters in El Dorado County. The program offers free services including home repairs and installation of energy saving measures or devices.

The Southwest Gas Corporation offers the California Energy Savings Assistance Program (formerly known as the California Low-Income Energy Efficiency Weatherization Program). For 2013, the qualifying annual household income limits used to determine eligibility for the program were as follows:

- 1-person household: $22,980
- 2-person household: $31,020
- 3-person household: $39,060
- 4-person household: $47,100
- 5-person household: $55,140
- 6-person household: $63,180
- 7-person household: $71,220
- 8-person household: $79,260
- Each additional person in household: Add $8,040

The California Energy Savings Assistance Program provides qualified customers with no-cost, energy-saving improvements such as caulking, door weather-stripping, low-flow showerheads, and water heater blankets.

"Attachment R," TRPA's standard conditions of approval for residential projects, includes requirements for water conservation devices on all fixtures and sets strict emissions requirements for gas water and space heaters, as well as wood stoves and inserts, which ensure that equipment installed is some of the most energy-efficient on the market.

However, because the majority of housing stock in South Lake Tahoe is older, additional consideration has to be given to the rehabilitation of the older dwelling units. Many of these homes were originally built for summer-only occupancy and are now being resided in year-round. Consequently, energy conservation

[6] http://www.energy.ca.gov/title24/2013standards/rulemaking/documents/2012-05-31_2013_standards_adoption_hearing_presentation.pdf

retrofits are an important component of City rehabilitation loan programs. Such retrofits also benefit residents through reduced monthly utility costs.

There are also various programs available in South Lake Tahoe to assist low-income households with utility costs. El Dorado County administers the Home Energy Assistance Program, which is a federally funded program that assists income-eligible households in offsetting the cost of heating and/or cooling their homes. Program recipients may either have specific payment amounts credited to their utility accounts, or receive assistance in obtaining firewood or heating fuel. Priority is given to the elderly and disabled applicants. The Southwest Gas Corporation offers the California Alternate Rates for Energy Program, which provides a 20 percent discount on energy bills to households with qualifying incomes. The STPUD—the main supplier of water and sewage treatment in South Lake Tahoe—started the Helping Hands Program to assist customers who need help paying utility bills, but are ineligible for, or have exhausted, all other financial assistance. Programs 6-1 and 6-2 address energy conservation needs in the City.

This page intentionally blank

4.4 POTENTIAL HOUSING CONSTRAINTS

This section analyzes the potential constraints to the production of housing in South Lake Tahoe. California Government Code defines two categories of constraints: governmental constraints and non-governmental constraints. In South Lake Tahoe, governmental constraints include ordinances, policies, and procedures of both TRPA and the City. Non-governmental constraints include factors outside of governmental control such as land and construction costs, availability of financing, and local public opinions regarding development. When constraints within the City's realm of control are identified, the City is required to take action to remove or mitigate the constraints.

Potential Governmental Constraints

In South Lake Tahoe, development is subject to two levels of regulations: TRPA regulations and City of South Lake Tahoe regulations. For that reason, the constraints section of this housing element addresses both potential TRPA constraints on housing and the potential constraints related directly to the City.

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Potential and Actual Governmental Constraints

Background and Regional Authority − The Bi-State Compact

The Tahoe Regional Planning Compact (California Government Code Section 66801 or Public Law 96-551, 93 Stat. 3233, revised December 19, 1980), or "Bi-State Compact," authorized the TRPA to have both planning functions (Article V) and enforcement functions (Article VI). Of these functions, the planning powers are broader than the enforcement powers. Regulations that do not further the realization of the Regional Plan can neither be adopted nor enforced by the agency. However, regulations furthering the realization of the Regional Plan can preempt state law.

Both the states of California and Nevada delegated police powers to the TRPA to enforce their ordinances and regulations in order to effectuate the Regional Plan. In coordination with the US Forest Service, the Lahontan Regional Quality Control Board, and the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection, the TRPA adopted an updated Regional Plan in 2012. The police power given to the TRPA by the states of California and Nevada allows the TRPA to regulate or prohibit the use of property where necessary for the public welfare.

The findings and declarations of the Bi-State Compact are weighted with a concern for the protection of the natural resources of the Lake Tahoe Basin. TRPA's Regional Plan is "the long-term general plan for the development of the (Lake Tahoe) region." The Bi-State Compact dictates the required elements of the Regional Plan: a land use plan, a transportation plan, a conservation plan, a recreation plan, and a public services and facilities plan. The land use plan, in particular, was intended by Congress for "the integrated arrangement and general location and extent of, and the criteria and standards for, the uses of land, water, air, space and other natural resources within the region, including but not limited to, an indication or allocation of maximum population densities." The TRPA was given the power to enforce its land use plan. In fact, only the federal government is legally exempt from TRPA's "zoning regulations." The Bi-State Compact also required the TRPA to adopt all necessary rules, regulations, ordinances, and policies

to effectuate the Regional Plan. These include regional standards for subdivision, zoning, tree removal, grading, and the like, without limitation on the subject matter.

The Bi-State Compact directs the TRPA to "take account of" and "seek to harmonize" regional needs, and the plans and planning activities of local jurisdictions within the Basin, such as the City of South Lake Tahoe. The TRPA is to "seek the cooperation and consider the recommendations of…cities" and other governmental entities and other individuals and organizations (Article V[6]). The TRPA is specifically granted the power to "initiate, negotiate, and participate in contracts and agreements among the local governmental authorities of the region."

In matters where it has jurisdiction, the TRPA establishes the minimum standards for the Basin; political subdivisions like the City of South Lake Tahoe can enact equal or higher standards. The Bi-State Compact gives the TRPA the explicit authority to sue local jurisdictions—not the states nor federal government—to ensure compliance with the Regional Plan and ordinances (Article VI[e]).

Under the requirements of the Bi-State Compact, the TRPA is to address general, regional matters; local governments retain their power over purely local matters (Article V[b]). Almost immediately after the TRPA became operational, both the Nevada and California Supreme Courts had occasion to clarify the local/regional relationship when they acted on constitutional attacks regarding the TRPA. This case law stresses the necessity for a regional approach. Both courts recognized that a regional plan or regulation may have had a local impact and still are within TRPA's power if it is not local in nature and purpose. [People of the State of CA, ex rel. Younger v. County of El Dorado, 5 Cal. 3d 480, 487 P. 2d 193 (1971); and NV, ex rel. List v. County of Douglas, et al, 524 P. 2d 1271 (1974).] The former case recognizes the TRPA's purpose and responsibility to protect the delicate environment of the Lake Tahoe Basin and to provide for orderly development and provides this purpose as the basis for the TRPA's exercise of police power.

Housing Goals and Policies of the Existing Regional Plan

The TRPA updated its 20-year Regional Plan and adopted it on December 12, 2012. The Land Use Element of the Regional Plan includes a Housing Sub-element with a purpose of assessing the housing needs of the Basin and to make provisions for adequate housing. The goals and policies recognize that the Bi-State Compact does not specifically mandate this sub-element and that it is not addressed by the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities. However, because both California and Nevada require housing to be addressed as part of a general plan, it was included to address housing issues on a regional basis, with local plans handling the specifics of implementation.

The three housing goals of the Regional Plan are:

1. Promote housing opportunities for full-time and seasonal residents as well as workers employed within the region.

2. To the extent feasible, without compromising the growth management provisions of the regional plan, the attainment of threshold goals, and affordable housing incentive programs, moderate-income housing will be encouraged in suitable locations for the residents of the region.

3. Regularly evaluate housing needs in the region and update policies and ordinances if necessary to achieve state, local, and regional housing goals.

Constraints Analysis

Zoning

Overview

The "zoning" mechanism of the TRPA and City of South Lake Tahoe is through Plan Area Statements, Community Plans, and Area Plans. Each parcel of land within the City is geographically assigned to a Plan Area Statement (PAS), Community Plan (CP), or Area Plan (AP) district. Each of these documents defines the "permissible uses" for any given area. With its 1999 General Plan (and continued in the 2011 General Plan update), the City of South Lake Tahoe adopted this zoning scheme in lieu of its previous, traditional zoning in order to eliminate inconsistencies and provide clarity for project applicants. Amendment to the PAS or CPs requires approval by both the City Council and TRPA Governing Board.

In a particular PAS, CP or AP, a use is considered either an "allowed use" or a "special use." A proposed project that is an allowed use may still require several approvals. If it is new construction or an addition to an existing building it requires a City Design Review and TRPA approval. For the City Design Review the application may be considered minor or major depending on the extent of the project and whether new coverage is proposed. If it is a smaller project (residential four units or less, commercial 2,500 square feet or less, or other project listed in the Memorandums of Understanding [MOU] with TRPA) and not located on a scenic corridor, the City can review the project on behalf of the TRPA. This means that City staff applies the requirements of the TRPA Code of Ordinances in the project review as well as the City Code. If the project does not fall under the MOU then the applicant must submit separate applications to the City and the TRPA. City Planning Division staff conducts the Design Review and, if necessary, the TRPA review. If a variance or Code Amendment is necessary for the project that must be completed prior to applying for a building permit. Variances to City Code requirements must be approved by the City, and Code Amendments must be approved by the City and TRPA. Once these are complete the project may be submitted to the City Building Division for a Building Permit application.

If the project is just an interior remodel it does not require Design Review and can be submitted directly to the Building Division for a building permit. The project is routed to other City departments (Planning, Engineering, Fire, etc.) for review during the plan check process. The application is also sent to a consultant that completes the TRPA plan check.

Projects may also require transfers of coverage, commercial floor area, tourist accommodation units, residential units of use, residential development rights, etc. This process involves the City Planning and Building Divisions and TRPA. It is typically done during the building permit plan check process.

Where a use is a "special use" a permit is required, and standard review procedures are followed. If the building already exists, the procedures relate primarily to the transportation-related impacts of a change of use. For example, is there adequate parking for the use? (The parking standard for a multi-person dwelling is one space for every two beds and one guest parking space for every 10 beds. The applicant can submit a technically adequate parking analysis if they elect to request a parking ratio reduction.) In addition, there is a neighbor-notification requirement for a 300-foot radius and use permit findings must

be made. The City's use permit findings are found in Chapter 32 (Section 32-60) of the City Code. All of these findings must be made in order to approve a special use:

- The use is necessary or desirable on a specific parcel.
- The use is not injurious to the neighborhood.
- The use is consistent with the intent of Chapter 32 of the City Code.
- The use is consistent with the permitted uses in the plan area.

If a new building is proposed, design review requirements also apply. In either case, CEQA-related environmental analysis is required. The level of analysis varies depending upon the circumstances related to the application.

The applicant can elect whether to have the use permit reviewed by the Zoning Administrator or the City Planning Commission. In either case, the staff person preparing the review documents will offer the decision-maker his or her recommendation related to the proposal. The applicant, or others, can appeal the decision or specific conditions of approval to the City Council pursuant to Section 32-57 of the City Code within five business days from the date of this decision.

The PAS, CP and AP methods of zoning tailors uses to what is appropriate for the area; various residential uses are often permissible without requiring rezoning. In some cases, large parcels eligible for multi-family development are also eligible for one single-family home or a single-family home with a secondary residence. There is a risk that such parcels could be underutilized through development as single-family "estate" housing. This risk is lessened, however, by the limited land availability of multi-family parcels and the high prices that these parcels currently command. This issue relates more to potential risk and is not reflective of any development trend evident in South Lake Tahoe.

Specific residential uses allowed in the Plan Area Statements, Area Plans and Community Plans in the City are detailed in Table 4-40.

The TRPA regulates the type, location, density, and scale of residential development. Table 4-49 summarizes TRPA's general development standards aside from land coverage which varies from parcel to parcel. Land coverage limitations and height standards are described in detail later in this section.

TABLE 4-49
TRPA DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS
South Lake Tahoe

	TRPA Guideline
Height	24–95 ft.*
Lot depth	20 ft.
Yard setbacks	20 ft.

Note:
** Depending on lot slope and roof pitch. See Table 37.4.1-1 in the TRPA Code of Ordinances*
Source: TRPA Code of Ordinances 2012.

Conclusions

There is no actual constraint related to housing associated with the zoning mechanism of the TRPA and the City. The flexible zoning mechanism provides for a wide range of permissible uses. Amending the Regional Plan to encourage affordable and other housing has proven achievable based upon the several amendments undertaken in the past to promote such development.

Enhancements to the Plan Area Statements are feasible. Adopting minimum density policies for multi-family-eligible parcels of a certain size would be one way to eliminate the risk of such parcels being utilized for single-family housing. Program 1-11 proposes the consideration of minimum densities as part of the Tahoe Valley Area Plan process. While not all of the areas where multi-family housing is permissible allow the use "by right," historically the use permit process has been handled efficiently when public hearings have been required due to the special use permit requirements.

Growth Controls

Overview

The TRPA Code defines "additional residential units" as dwelling units created after January 1, 1986, with living, cooking, sleeping and eating facilities in one or more rooms designed to be permanently occupied by a family or household. New residential units either require an allocation (to be matched with a development right for each unit) or a specific TRPA Code exemption from the need for an allocation pursuant to Chapter 50 of the TRPA Code. Each market-rate residential unit requires an allocation; therefore, development of a 25-unit multi-family housing project would require 25 allocations and 25 additional development rights.

Allocation of residential units within the Tahoe Basin is the responsibility of TRPA (Chapter 50 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances). The number of market-rate allocations that the TRPA makes available to the local jurisdictions is restricted, and the different jurisdictions have different methods for their distribution to property owners desiring to build. The TRPA does not require allocations for the construction of deed-restricted housing units that meet the criteria of affordable housing (low- and very low-income categories and a limited number of moderate-income units).

In 2013, the City received 19 residential allocations (12 (eight single-family and four multi-family) initially, five additional in August (four single-family and one multi-family), and one 2011 and one 2013 below IPES line allocation). Previously, the City had received anywhere between 28 and 38 allocations annually. The number of allocations distributed each year fluctuates, as they are allocated pursuant to a performance-based system directly tied to accomplishments of environmental improvements. The Regional Plan update assessed the allocations used in different allocation categories (e.g. residential, tourist bonus, and commercial square feet) during the period of the first Regional Plan from 1987 through 2012. Table 50.4.1-1 of the Regional Plan provides details of units allocated from 1987–2012, remaining units, and new allocations made in 2013. The Regional Plan also calls for additional releases of allocations during the current Regional Plan planning period in four-year increments up to a maximum of 20 percent of the 2013 additional allocations. Requirements for traffic monitoring accompany the additional allocation releases.

The City distributes the allocations it receives to separate waiting lists for single-family and multi-family developments. This split was created to ensure that multi-family units would be consistently added to the supply of housing. Since 1990, 30 percent of all allocations received are assigned only to the creation of multi-family housing. These allocations can only "roll over" to other multi-family housing projects (not single-family). South Lake Tahoe is the only local jurisdiction in the Lake Tahoe Basin that sets aside allocations solely for multi-family housing development. The waiting lists for both types of allocations are approximately six to eight years, presuming the City receives a relatively stable number of allocations annually. It should be noted that approved new condominium projects receive their allocations from the multi-family list.

There are four other mechanisms of obtaining allocations for market-rate residential development:

- **Environmentally Sensitive Parcel Retirement.** Environmentally sensitive parcels may be permanently retired in exchange for a transferable residential allocation. This option has seen a lot of interest in the City due to the length of the allocation waiting list in South Lake Tahoe. The price of both transferable allocations is approximately $17,000 to $35,000 based on recent transactions (California Tahoe Conservancy, 2013). In 2003, retirement of lots due to this program and state and federal sensitive lot acquisition programs led to the first movement of the El Dorado County "IPES line," described in the Resource Inventory section. Consequently, the "shortage" of allocations due to pent-up demand and longer waiting lists for allocations have increased the use of this alternative program for obtaining allocations.

- **Replace Existing Housing Unit.** Each residential unit has an associated "residential unit of use" (RUU), which is essentially both a development right and an allocation. When a residential unit is torn down and removed, the original RUU can be used to rebuild on-site or can be transferred off-site. Transferring RUUs allows the buyer of the RUU to bypass the allocation process and proceed directly to the permitting process. To make this option of obtaining an allocation financially feasible for local developers, typically the least expensive housing, which is often the smallest, most substandard units are torn down. While residential units are ultimately rebuilt in South Lake Tahoe with the "banked" RUU (e.g., there is no net loss of housing unit numbers), there are no local or regional restrictions, beyond the basic land coverage, height, and design standards, as to size or type of housing that can be reconstructed. In addition, the TRPA and the City do not have a quantified mitigation requirement related to the replacement of units that are torn down. In 2013, RUUs were selling for as much as $35,000 (California Tahoe Conservancy, 2013). The cost of an RUU is still too expensive for developers of multi-family housing. RUUs can be purchased and transferred from outside the City, such as from Douglas County. There is an additional fee associated with a transfer from another jurisdiction. In the majority of cases, RUUs are used to build single-family luxury homes; however, if the price continues to decrease, multi-family housing developers may become more interested in buying the RUUs. Note that mobile home existing units of use are subject to a special requirement that narrows their ability to be banked and transferred off-site to multi-family housing projects of five units or more and prohibits them from being condominiumized.

- **Multi-Residential Bonus Units.** As described in Chapter 52 of the TRPA's Code of Ordinances, the TRPA allows "bonus units" to be substituted for the market-rate residential units of use associated with existing multi-family housing if the property meets, or is upgraded to meet, local government habitability and design requirements. This option is only available for properties that are located in Plan Areas or Community Plan districts that have the appropriate designations needed to obtain bonus units. For example, an existing market-rate apartment of 40 units, which is substandard and consequently collecting rents at or below affordable rates, could upgrade to meet local requirements, deed-restrict the units as affordable housing, substitute in bonus units, and ultimately have 40 market-rate units of use available for an off-site development. The off-site development would not require an allocation to build. The subsequent development project(s) are restricted to the construction of market-rate, multi-family housing of two units or more, which can never be subdivided into condominiums. TRPA can approve a maximum of 1,400 multi-residential bonus units Basin-wide. Starting in 2005, TRPA reserved 200 of the bonus units.

- **Conversion of Motel and Tourist Accommodation Units.** The TRPA allows the "conversion" of units of use from or to a residential use in very specific circumstances. In the case of obtaining allocations for market-rate residential development, there are the following options:

    - Existing motel units can go through a permitting process that results in their conversion to deed-restricted, affordable housing. The Tourist Accommodation Unit (TAU) of use associated with each motel room converts to a residential unit of use. The local government must certify that the converted units meet public health and safety standards for residences. In addition, the converted units must be located in an area that meets TRPA standards applicable for modifications to a developed project area. The City has limited this option to certain areas that do not adjoin Lake Tahoe Boulevard or Emerald Bay Road. In locations identified as preferred affordable housing areas eligible for the multi-residential incentive program, certain motels converted to affordable housing can qualify to "substitute bonus units" for their units of use. This would enable them to transfer market-rate residential units of use that could be used to construct only market-rate, multi-family or multi-person housing of two units or more that are never subdivided. (Note: TAUs can also be converted to commercial floor area (CFA).)

    - Additional options available to tourist accommodation properties that meet the TRPA's conversion ordinance are removing a motel from a stream environment zone, removing a nonconforming use, retrofitting/reconstructing a use on the site that meets development standards for new projects developed on a vacant parcel, or as part of a project linked to an Environmental Improvement Project. In these cases, the existing motel is typically torn down and the units of use are converted and banked or transferred to another project site.

Conclusions

There is an "actual constraint" related to housing associated with the growth-control mechanism of the TRPA. However, these growth-control mechanisms are the foundation of the Regional Plan. In the meantime, the City's performance related to implementation of environmental improvements can earn the City more allocations than it has received in the past. In addition, the longer waiting list for allocations is resulting in additional people inquiring about opportunities to avoid the list through the above-described alternative means of obtaining allocations. These alternatives have the benefit of additional retired sensitive parcels, removal of substandard development, and the creation of additional deed-restricted affordable housing. In 2004, the City codified its local motel conversion and bonus-unit substitution policies (See City of South Lake Tahoe Constraints: Motel Conversion Regulations).

Land Coverage Limitations

Overview

Two systems regulate land coverage in the Lake Tahoe Basin. The Bailey Land Capability Classification System, in place since 1971, regulates land coverage for all uses except single-family housing development. Single-family housing falls under the Individual Parcel Evaluation System (IPES), which was adopted by the TRPA under the 1987 Regional Plan.

Both systems generally limit the amount of land coverage for the most developable parcels to a maximum of 30 percent impervious land coverage. These limits were deemed necessary to protect the clarity and water quality of Lake Tahoe, and are based upon site factors such as soils, slope, proximity to surface water, and other environmental factors.

The Bailey classification system scores land between 1 and 7. Low-capability scores (i.e., less suitable for development) range between 1-3, and high-capability scores (i.e., more suitable for development) range from 4-7. The IPES system, used only for vacant residential parcels, scores land between 0 and 1,200, with scores under 726 considered low-capability and above 726 considered high-capability. Landowners are permitted to cover between 1 percent and 30 percent of a parcel's surface with "base coverage" depending on the Bailey classification or IPES score.

Chapter 30 of the TRPA's Code of Ordinances describes the land coverage requirements for the Basin. There are two elements of that chapter related to housing that are important to clarify. First, there is recognition that a certain minimum amount of land coverage is required in order to build a home. As a result, if a lot has a buildable IPES score, but only has a small permissible amount of "base land coverage," property owners can transfer in additional land coverage up to a specific maximum based upon the parcel size. This transferred land coverage is not free, but it can be purchased either privately or from the land bank in accordance with hydrologic transfer area restrictions. These rules enable coverage to be moved around within a sub-watershed, but remain within the cap that was created to protect Lake Tahoe.

There are different types of coverage that can be transferred. "Potential" coverage refers to the unused allowable base coverage on residential land that can be transferred to other residential property. Any land that is undeveloped or developed to a lesser extent than allowed by the Bailey or IPES system has potential coverage that it can use or sell. "Existing" coverage refers to the impacted surface of a parcel that can be restored to its near-natural state and then transferred to another parcel. There are two types of

existing coverage—"hard" and "soft." Hard coverage refers to existing impervious surface, and can be transferred in all cases. Soft coverage refers to soil that is compacted but not covered with impervious surface. Soft coverage can be transferred in all cases, except for transfers relating to commercial or tourist accommodation use; however, exceptions can be made in some areas of the South Y Industrial Tract Community Plan area.

For multi-family parcels located within adopted Community Plan areas, there is an additional land-coverage transfer opportunity. For multi-family housing projects of five units or more properties can transfer in up to 70 percent of land coverage based upon the parcel size, to high land capability districts only. This incentive is available for both market-rate and affordable multi-family housing of at least five units. Area Plans may also include the ability to transfer up to 70 percent coverage on to high capability lands. Again, the transferred land coverage is not free and it must be purchased either privately or from the land bank in accordance with hydrologic transfer area restrictions. In addition, there are limited numbers of undeveloped, large parcels in the Area Plans and Community Plan areas.

There is an advantage of developing on existing property where there is excess coverage. Some parcels, which were developed prior to TRPA land coverage regulations, have excess coverage beyond that which would currently be allowed by the TRPA. This excess coverage is "grandfathered." If a developer chooses to demolish and rebuild on a previously developed parcel with grandfathered excess coverage, the developer has the option to build to the previously existing coverage, as long as the developer implements certain mitigation measures, such as payment of a mitigation fee. In many cases, the option to use grandfathered excess land coverage with certain mitigation measures can be beneficial to developers.

Land coverage limitations often pose a constraint to the achievement of maximum residential density for multi-family uses. When land coverage limitations are combined with setbacks, parking requirements and height limitations, the ability to build to maximum density is more limited, especially for projects proposing larger units. In 2007, one of the most recent affordable housing projects was built at a density of 10 units per acre in a PAS with a maximum permissible density of 15 units per acre. If built to maximum density, the project could have provided roughly 39 units, rather than the 26 units that were actually built. Plans for the project indicated that there was only 257 square feet of potential coverage remaining on the parcel, signifying that coverage limitations limited the project to a density much lower than what is otherwise allowed.

The City's recently adopted Tourist Core Area Plan (TCAP) implements updates to allowed development standards from the TRPA Regional Plan update. The TCAP replaces the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan. The standards implemented in the TCAP include allowing mixed-use development and allowing 70 percent land coverage on high capability lands further than 300 feet from Lake Tahoe, allowing additional height in some districts, and allowing transfer bonuses for residential unit transfers into the TCAP area.

For single-family housing, land coverage limitations tend to result in multi-story structures to minimize the footprint of the building and maximize building square footage in relation to the amount of impervious land coverage. As a consequence, most homes do not implement universal design concepts.

The key advantage to the land coverage limitations is that they ensure that there is considerable open space available in the project area. This tends to make new development projects more attractive and

gives children residing in family housing projects open space on-site where they can play. (Note that true play structures may create land coverage.) New deed-restricted affordable housing projects in South Lake Tahoe tend to be models for attractive development, and break down the myth of affordable housing as substandard development that destroys neighborhoods and reduces property values.

Note that Chapter 12 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances specifically provides for the amendment of Community Plan boundaries to facilitate deed restricted affordable housing projects.

Conclusions

There is an "actual constraint" related to housing associated with TRPA's land coverage limitations. Past reports have called land coverage restrictions the "biggest single impediment" to the development of affordable housing. However, land coverage is a concept intrinsic to the Regional Plan. TRPA believes that limiting the amount of impervious surfaces is essential to improving water quality and maintaining the clarity of Lake Tahoe. A global amendment to the Regional Plan to eliminate land coverage regulations entirely is unlikely at this time. The City works with applicants to direct them to Area Plan and Community Plan areas where incentives are already in place to allow for the additional coverage that could help them achieve the densities necessary to make a project pencil out.

Water Quality Requirements

Overview

In addition to the land coverage requirement, the implementation of best management practices (BMPs) is also a requirement intended to protect water quality in the Basin. The TRPA requires property owners to install infiltration facilities designed to protect water quality by ensuring that runoff from up to the 20-year, one-hour storm is contained on-site for all development in the Lake Tahoe Basin. BMPs have long been required for new construction projects. Existing development in South Lake Tahoe, entirely located within Priority 2 watersheds, was required to be BMP compliant by October 15, 2006. Development in Priority 3 watershed areas was required to be BMP compliant by October 15, 2008.

The City is also subject to the requirements of its municipal National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit and a recently adopted Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) program that includes requirements to reduce stormwater pollution to meet milestone targets every five years. This includes stormwater runoff from all land within the City boundaries, public and private.

The City of South Lake Tahoe adopted a Drainage Master Plan in February 2008 that identifies the public storm drain improvements necessary to serve a major portion of the city at build-out.

Conclusions

There is an "actual constraint" related to housing associated with the TRPA's BMP requirements. BMPs for some existing properties are costly to implement and maintain, especially for developments such as mobile home parks. However, the treatment of runoff is essential for the implementation of the Regional Plan. The installation of area-wide BMPs would remove much of the financial burden from individual homeowners. The City has implemented several area-wide treatment systems such as the Park Avenue and Pine Boulevard system and the system developed through the Bijou Erosion Control Project. These are examples of area-wide systems that treat stormwater from multiple parcels as well as public land.

Density

Overview

Table 4-50 summarizes the maximum allowable densities in the Tahoe Basin.

TABLE 4-50
TRPA DENSITY LIMITATIONS FOR RESIDENTIAL USES
Tahoe Basin
2013

Residential Use	Maximum Density
Single-family Dwelling (parcels smaller than 1 acre)	1 unit per parcel
Single-family Dwelling (parcels larger than 1 acre)	2 units per parcel (provided one unit is an authorized secondary residence)
Summer Home	1 unit per parcel or lease site
Multiple-family Dwelling	15 units per acre
Multiple-family Dwelling in Special Height Districts	25 units per acre
Multiple-family Dwelling in Area Plans	25 units per acre
Mobile Home Dwelling	8 units per acre
Multi-person Dwelling, nursing and personal care, and residential care	25 persons per acre

Source: TRPA Code of Ordinances, Chapter 31, 2012.

Basin-wide, the maximum permissible density for multi-family housing is 15 units per acres. However, as described in Chapters 31, 37 and 13 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances densities may be increased in Special Height Districts and Area Plans. The TCAP was the first Area Plan adopted in the City (November 2013) and allows densities up to 25 units per acre. In some specific Plan Area Statements, that density is as low as eight (and sometimes 12) units per acre in order to maintain consistency with neighborhood character. Where mobile home parks are permissible, maximum density is eight units per acre. (Most, if not all, of the City's 20 mobile home and RV parks are nonconforming and overly dense.) Multi-person density, and density for other residential uses measured by persons per acre, is 25 persons per acre, which equates to roughly 10 dwelling units per acre based on typical household size. Affordable housing is allowed a 25 percent density bonus (i.e., 18 units per acre) when the following two specific findings can be made: 1) the project, at the increased density, satisfies a demonstrated need for additional affordable housing; and 2) the additional density is consistent with the surrounding area.

However, as described in the Land Coverage subsection, codified densities and density bonuses are typically not achievable due to other site conditions which limit land coverage availability. Developers new to the Tahoe Basin sometimes assert that permissible densities are too low to support new affordable housing projects. They suggest that 20 to 30 units per acre are required for financially viable projects. The City's success with affordable multi-family developments has been rooted in deep subsidies that have made projects financially feasible. These past success stories have made project developers interested in participating in additional projects in South Lake Tahoe.

When multi-family housing is developed as part of a mixed-use project, the number of units that can be developed is reduced according to the ratio of project area devoted to the multi-family use in relation to the entire project area. This reduces multi-family development potential on mixed-use sites. Additional information on densities in mixed-use projects can be found in Chapter 31 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

Conclusions

There is an "actual constraint" related to housing associated with density limitations. The requirement to reduce residential density for a mixed-use project is being reconsidered. The City would like for affordable multi-family housing to be developed at the maximum allowable density as if it were a stand-alone project when the mixed-use project is otherwise consistent with height, coverage, and other development standards**..** Program 1-1 addresses constraints to mixed-use development in the city.

There are other density issues that do not pose an actual constraint. In recently constructed affordable housing projects approved for South Lake Tahoe, no one has proposed a project to maximum density, let alone proposed the use of permissible density bonuses. The ability to build high-density developments tends to be constrained more by regional land coverage limitations than by density limitations. Permissible density and potential for density bonuses can actually mislead developers into thinking that they will be able to construct more units than is physically possible. The possibility of building to density is increased for projects proposed to reuse existing "over-covered" project areas or in Community Plan areas where there are land coverage transfer incentives. Rather than being available only for very low- and low-income affordable housing projects, the density bonus program is being evaluated for mixed use projects that provide a percentage of its units to lower- and moderate-income residents, or seniors.

Height Standards

Overview

Chapter 37 of TRPA's Code of Ordinances assigns maximum building heights based upon the slope of the parcels in combination with the pitch of the roof. For example, a building with a 5:12 roof pitch located on a parcel consisting of a 10 percent slope is assigned a maximum building height of 32'-6". Additional height findings must be made for residential buildings more than 26 feet tall.

Buildings containing a residential use, including mixed-use developments, are limited to two stories. This height limitation, combined with land coverage and setback restrictions, limits the feasibility of affordable housing and mixed-use projects.

The TRPA Regional Plan update allowed increased heights in the town and regional center areas of the city. In order to implement these allowed increases the City has adopted the Tourist Core Area Plan and is currently preparing the Tahoe Valley Area Plan. Heights up to 56 feet are allowed in town centers and up to 95 feet in the regional center. To minimize impacts related to height, projects of three stories or greater in town centers and the regional center are required to comply with Findings 1, 3, 5 and 9 from Section 37.7 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

Conclusions

There is an "actual constraint" related to housing associated with regional height standards in areas of the city outside the Tourist Core Area Plan. Mixed-use projects that contain residential and commercial uses are limited to two stories. These strict height restrictions limit the feasibility of mixed-use projects, which are a potential source of affordable housing.

Design Standards

Overview

Excellent project design enhances the appearance and reputation of local affordable housing development projects, as well as the neighborhoods in which they are located. Chapter 36 of TRPA's Code of Ordinances provides design standards to ensure consistency with the Land Use Element of its Regional Plan. City Standards and Guidelines for Design, Signage, Parking Driveway and Loading substitute for TRPA's design standards in South Lake Tahoe except for projects in the shoreland.

Flexible local design standards enable the use of a variety of materials, although recent affordable housing projects have elected high-quality details such as cedar siding and real rock accents. Most design standards, such as retention of natural vegetation outside of the project's construction area, do not add to developer costs. Design standards are quantified and are available at the City's Planning Department counter so that developers can elect to avoid purchasing the sites in scenic roadway corridors or shoreline units where standards are higher in order to protect or improve the scenic qualities of these areas important to tourism and community well-being. Standards for affordable and market-rate housing are the same.

The design standards specifically allow for single-family manufactured housing to be constructed on a permanent foundation, outside of mobile home parks, when design and building standards are met. There are separate plan review requirements in order to ensure that they can survive Tahoe's special climactic challenges. As their quality and durability have increased, there has been an increased prevalence of manufactured homes in South Lake Tahoe.

TRPA has designated Highway 50, Highway 89, and Pioneer Trail scenic highway corridors. The main purpose for this designation is to improve and maintain the scenic quality of the view from these roads. All projects located along the scenic corridors must meet certain design standards above and beyond the standards imposed by the City's general design standards. These standards include placing all electrical and communication lines underground, additional massing requirements and architectural design review, and additional landscaping requirements. According to an affordable housing developer with experience building in the city's scenic corridor, the massing requirements and architectural review process were the two most significant cost impediments to affordable housing associated with the scenic corridor design requirements. Landscaping requirements were less of a concern since landscaping materials are relatively inexpensive.

Interestingly, the developer identified that the most significant increase in costs for the project were associated with the escalating construction costs across the nation during a period of delay caused by HUD's rejection of the project. HUD rejected the project's initial design and associated project costs, which were developed to meet TRPA's minimum design standards for scenic corridors. The HUD Section 811 program dictates design standards for federally funded housing projects. These design standards directly conflict with many of TRPA's design requirements, especially in scenic corridors.

Conclusions

There is an "actual constraint" related to affordable housing associated with local design standards. Design standards in South Lake Tahoe require architectural design review and often require more expensive materials, which increase project costs. Furthermore, many of the TRPA's design standards directly conflict with HUD's standards for federally funded affordable housing projects. However, the high-quality designs of the most recent affordable housing projects in South Lake Tahoe have helped to decrease the stigma previously associated with affordable housing and gain community support.

Building Season Limitations/Grading Requirements

Overview

The building season in South Lake Tahoe is affected by winter conditions that reduce the number of days construction can occur. The building season is further limited by the regulatory context in which land development can proceed. To protect water quality, the building season in Lake Tahoe is May 1 to October 15. It should be noted that the TRPA has the authority to grant limited exceptions to the grading season. Construction sites must be "winterized," or have BMPs in place that prevent soil and runoff from leaving the project area during storm events. Outside of the building season, no grading that disturbs cumulatively more than three cubic yards of soil may occur without TRPA and Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board-issued grading ordinance exceptions. Many construction projects get their grading and framing done during the building season and work inside all winter. However, there is an additional burden for developers to carefully plan their construction schedule, as unforeseen events or poor planning can delay a development project an entire season.

Conclusions

There is no "actual constraint" related to housing associated with the building season limitations and grading requirements. Grading limitations are inherent to the water quality protections required by the Regional Plan.

Impediments to Housing for Persons with Disabilities

Overview

Most of the housing in South Lake Tahoe is not accessible to persons with disabilities. For example, areas with the mountainous terrain make for changes in grade that require steps or stairs, and land coverage restrictions encourage builders to reduce the building footprint by constructing multiple story-homes. Universal design is generally not being used in new residential construction except when required by the Building Code for multi-family housing.

Chapter 30, Land Coverage, of TRPA's Updated Code of Ordinances includes an opportunity for reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities. Specifically, development which is required to be compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is exempt from the calculation of land coverage. This exemption does not apply however to the land coverages associated with parking and other vehicular uses. This accommodation allows for greater ADA accessibility in public/commercial facilities and private residences.

Sky Forest Acres, a 17-unit affordable housing project, is available exclusively to persons with disabilities. Since the project contains more than five units, the developers were required to get permits from both the City and TRPA. For this project, the TRPA signed a contract review agreement with the City to enable the City's planners to conduct the review on behalf of the TRPA. Consequently, the TRPA has been open to innovative opportunities to expedite project review and reduce duplication of efforts.

Group homes for persons with disabilities, and all other group homes, fall under the use category of "residential-care facilities." These are defined as establishments primarily engaged in the provision of residential, social and personal care for children, the elderly, and special categories of persons with limited ability for self care, but where medical care is not a major element. (The latter would be "nursing and personal care facilities.") While the definition does not clarify the required number of occupants necessary to qualify a residence as a residential-care facility, the City and TRPA have a track record of treating group homes of six or fewer clients as a "family," not as a residential-care facility. In these cases, the residential-care facilities with six or fewer clients are authorized wherever single-family homes are authorized. There are no regional or local restrictions regulating a minimum distance required between group homes. Program 1-9 is proposed to amend the zoning code to comply with state allowing residential care facilities for six or fewer by right in all residential districts.

Conclusions

There is an "actual constraint" related to housing for persons with disabilities. The TRPA Regional Plan update put land coverage exemptions in place for ADA compliance in new and existing homes giving equal housing opportunity to persons with disabilities. The TRPA has no other specific process in place for requesting a reasonable accommodation.

Subdivision and Condominium Requirements

Overview

Chapter 39 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances contains TRPA's subdivision ordinances. Subdivisions that would create new development potential are prohibited in the Tahoe Region. Under TRPA code, both pre- and post-1987 multi-family structures may be condominiumized, under specific circumstances, if they do not exceed the density standards by more than 10 percent. While there is a general prohibition or mitigation requirement for subdivision of existing low-income residential units, housing units in the City of South Lake Tahoe are exempt from these requirements since the City has a housing program that addresses low-income housing needs. The City allows the conversion of multi-family rental units to condominiums with a stipulation that a portion of the units be deed-restricted for low- and moderate-income households. The remaining units must be deed-restricted for owner-occupancy and price-capped at the maximum price of the First-Time Homebuyer Program with the intent of serving middle-income residents.

Condominium density must be consistent with the multi-family housing density described in the applicable Plan Area Statement, Area Plans or Community Plan areas. Where multi-family housing is prohibited, new condominiums are also prohibited. New condominiums in areas designated preferred affordable housing areas are prohibited unless the local jurisdiction is meeting its portion of the regional fair share of low- and very low-income housing.

Conclusions

The City Council adopted condominium ordinances and policies stricter than the TRPA's to preserve rental housing. (These are described in the section related to City of South Lake Tahoe constraints.) Consequently, TRPA ordinances are less restrictive than the City's and are not an "actual constraint." The City's condominium ordinance is also not a constraint for affordable housing. The City's ordinance allows more opportunities for homeownership for residents of all income levels by promoting deed-restricted affordable housing.

Fees and Other Exactions

Overview

The TRPA's filing fee schedule categorizes residential projects into two groups: single-family and multi-family new construction. Table 4-51 shows the base fees for the two groups of residential developments.

TABLE 4-51
TRPA BASE FEES FOR NEW RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION
Tahoe Basin
Effective June 8, 2009

Residential Use Category	Base Fee
Single-family Dwelling, Summer Home, Secondary Residence, one Mobile Home Dwelling, and one Employee Housing unit	$1 per sq. ft. of floor area covered by roof $5,000 cap. $500 min.
Multiple-family Dwelling, Multiple-person Dwelling, Nursing and Personal Care, Residential-care, more than one Employee Housing unit, more than one Mobile Home Dwelling	$2,200 + $40/unit (extra unit cost does not apply to affordable housing) $5,000 cap.

Source: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Application Filing Fee Schedule (Effective June 8, 2009)

Depending on the required level of review (i.e., staff, hearing officer, or governing board review) and the location of the project, the total fee may be greater than the base fee. The majority of projects are reviewed at the staff level. The TRPA Hearings Officer or Governing Board generally only review residential projects identified as a "Special Use" in the applicable Plan Area Statement. Fees for revisions to the original plan are also determined by applying a multiplier to the original project fee. Table 4-52 summarizes TRPA's fee multipliers.

TABLE 4-52 TRPA FEE MULTIPLIERS Tahoe Basin Effective June 8, 2009	
Level of Review	**Multipliers**
Staff Level Review	1.00
Hearing Officer Review	1.40
Governing Board Review	1.80
Plan Revisions	
Minor—A non-substantive change to a permitted project. A project that will not cause changes to any TRPA permit conditions, does not require new field review by TRPA staff, does not require a public hearing, and does not involve any modifications to building size, shape, land coverage, location, or scenic rating score.	0.40
Major— A substantial change that does not significantly exceed the original scope of the project. Revisions that significantly exceed the original scope of a project, or which require a public hearing, shall be treated as new or modified projects, as the case may be.	0.70
Special Planning Area	
For projects located in an adopted community plan area, or subject to an adopted redevelopment, specific, or master plan.	1.25

Source: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Application Filing Fee Schedule (Effective June 8, 2009)

Projects are subject to other TRPA filing fees such as the $75 Information Technology Surcharge applied to each application for maintenance of the TRPA database, and the $400 Shoreland Scenic Review Fee applied to projects located in the Shoreland area of Lake Tahoe. Table 4-53 lists these and other fees charged by the TRPA in the land development process.

TABLE 4-53 OTHER TRPA FEES Tahoe Basin Effective June 8, 2009	
Category	**Fee**
Shoreland Scenic Review Fee—For new construction projects, and additions and other construction modifications to existing structures located in the shoreland area of Lake Tahoe.	$400
Information Technology Surcharge—applied to all applications	$75
Bonus Unit Allocation Transfer	$530 minimum fee, deposit account
Land Coverage Transfer	$540 minimum fee, deposit account
Lot Line Adjustment	$960 (2 lots) + $100 per add. lot

Source: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Application Filing Fee Schedule (Effective June 8, 2009)

In addition to the project application fees, mitigation fees are required by the TRPA for all projects in the Lake Tahoe Basin. No exemptions for affordable housing are provided. These fees are the same for single-family or multiple family housing:

- **Water quality mitigation fee:** $1.86 per square foot of land coverage.
- **Off-site land coverage mitigation fee:** $8.50 per square foot of coverage created in the public right of way.
- **Excess land coverage mitigation fee:** $200 minimum (dependent upon square footage of excess land coverage and project location).
- **Air quality mitigation fee:** $325.84 per daily vehicle trip.
- **Construction inspection fee:** approximately $1,500.

Together, TRPA mitigation fees for a 2,000-square-foot single-family home would cost an estimated $9,900.

Conclusions

There is an "actual constraint" related to the development of affordable housing associated with the TRPA's fees and mitigation costs. Past reports have suggested reduction or elimination of such fees for affordable housing projects. Such suggestions were not implemented by the TRPA. The City works with project proponents to redevelop existing developed sites, such as RV parks, for affordable housing, as existing developed sites have grandfathered land coverage and a certain number of recognized daily vehicle trip ends that reduce mitigation fees. In recognition of the TRPA's high development fees, the City of South Lake Tahoe maintains fees lower than those of most jurisdictions. The lower City fee schedule reduces the amount of money available in the City's budget, and limits the ability of the City to provide essential services.

Project Processing and Permit Procedures

Overview

Permissible uses that are allowable in the Plan Area Statement or Community Plan district are approved at staff level. Special uses require neighbor notification, public hearings, and issuance of a use permit. Design review is conducted in either case for multi-family projects.

To expedite project review and remove duplication, the City and TRPA have executed several Memorandums of Understanding (MOU). The City reviews and approves all single-family and multi-family residential projects four units or less (MOU signed in 1995). It also reviews all other multi-family dwellings (new, additions, or modifications that are categorically exempt under the requirements of CEQA), but the project is still approved by either the TRPA's Hearings Officer or Governing Board (MOU signed in 1999). Review of typical CEQA-exempt projects reviewed under the MOU takes approximately 3 months. Review of projects requiring CEQA review not reviewed under the MOU takes approximately 6 months.

Conclusions

There is an "actual constraint" related to the permitting process. Multi-family housing projects that are not categorically exempt from the requirements of CEQA do not fall under either the 1995 or 1999 MOU.

TRPA Preemption of State Housing Law

TRPA regulations that further the realization of the Regional Plan can preempt state law. In the past, the TRPA has made efforts to eliminate conflicts with state law where a modification that enabled compliance would not compromise the Regional Plan. For example, TRPA staff has interpreted its code consistent with California law that licensed group homes with six or fewer residents are treated no differently than other family housing and can move into any single- or multiple-family dwelling unit. The following state laws conflict with Regional Plan ordinances:

Second Units

Overview

AB 1866 revised California's second unit statutes (Government Code 65852.2). It mandates that after July 1, 2003, any second unit application filed on the basis of a local ordinance is to be considered through a ministerial process, without discretionary review or hearing (Government Code 65915). AB 1866 intended to simplify the process for obtaining second units in order to increase California's supply of affordable housing. Cities must either establish specific development and design standards for second units or apply the state's enumerated standards. In either case, the standards must be applied ministerially and no public hearing can be held. This may or may not be the case under TRPA's regulations, depending upon whether the use is allowed or special within the PAS or CP District (see Table 4-40).

Conclusions

Second units either require an allocation or must qualify for an allocation exemption pursuant to Chapter 21 of the TRPA Code unless they are deed-restricted as affordable housing. Second units can be developed in PAS and CP districts where multi-family is a permissible use where it meets density requirements, or on lots larger than one acre in size located in PAS or CP districts where single-family is a permissible use (and multi-family is prohibited) (Chapter 21). Program 2-10 proposes to further facilitate the development of second units through changes to regulations. These regulations are consistent with Government Code Section 65852.2, which allows the designation of locations where second units may be permitted. There are no special second unit standards related to parking, height, setbacks, coverage, or architectural review; they must be consistent with other residential design review standards. In many cases, the TRPA Code restricts second units and "granny flats" to a greater extent than what state law allows. This poses an "actual constraint" for the City of South Lake Tahoe in its ability to meet the requirements of state law without creating confusion for the public (e.g., if the City amended its code to meet the requirements of state law, but the TRPA code remains more restrictive).

Density Bonus

Overview

Following adoption of SB 1818 in 2004, SB 435 was passed in 2005 as a "clean up" of the previous density bonus bill. Effective January 1, 2005, SB 1818 revised California's density bonus statutes by reducing the number of affordable units that a developer must provide in order to receive a density bonus and increasing the maximum density bonus to 35 percent. The new minimum affordability requirements are as follows:

- The project is eligible for a 20 percent density bonus if at least 5 percent of the units are affordable to very low-income households, or 10 percent of the units are affordable to low-income households.

- The project is eligible to receive a 5 percent density bonus, if 10 percent of for-purchase units are affordable to moderate-income households.

The law also establishes a sliding scale, which determines the additional density that a project can receive:

- An additional 2.5 percent density bonus for each additional increase of 1 percent very low-income units above the initial 5 percent threshold.

- A density increase of 1.5 percent for each additional 1 percent increase in low-income units above the initial 10 percent threshold.

- A 1 percent density increase for each 1 percent increase in moderate-income units above the initial 10 percent threshold.

A developer can receive the maximum density bonus of 35 percent when the project provides either 11 percent very low-income units, 20 percent low-income units, or 40 percent moderate-income units. SB 435 clarifies that a project can only receive one density bonus.

Prior to SB 1818 and SB 435, jurisdictions were required to grant one incentive, such as financial assistance or development standard reductions, to developers of affordable housing. The new laws require that cities and counties grant more incentives depending on the percentage of affordable units developed. Incentives include reductions in zoning standards, reductions in development standards, reductions in design requirements, and other reductions in costs for developers. Projects that satisfy the minimum affordable criteria for a density bonus are entitled to one incentive from the local government. Depending on the amount of affordable housing provided, the number of incentives can increase to a maximum of three incentives from the local government. If a project utilizes less than 50 percent of the permitted density bonus, the local government must provide an additional incentive.

Additionally, the new laws provide density bonuses to projects that donate land for residential use. The donated land must satisfy all of the following requirements:

- The land must have general plan and zoning designations which allow the construction of very low-income affordable units as a minimum of 10 percent of the units in the residential development.

- The land must be a minimum of 1 acre in size or large enough to allow development of at least 40 units.

- The land must be served by public facilities and infrastructure.

SB 1818 also imposes statewide parking standards that a jurisdiction must grant upon request from a developer of an affordable housing project that qualifies for a density bonus. The developer may request these parking standards even if they do not request the density bonus. The new parking standards are summarized in Table 4-54. These numbers are the total number of parking spaces including guest parking and handicapped parking.

TABLE 4-54
STATEWIDE PARKING STANDARDS FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING
California
2013

Number of Bedrooms	Number of On-Site Parking Spaces
0 to 1 bedroom	1
2 to 3 bedrooms	2
4 or more bedrooms	2 ½

Source: Goldfarb & Lipman, LLC., SB 1818 Q & A

More recently, in 2008, AB 2280 (Saldana) was passed that further modified Sec. 65915 of the Government Code. The bill instituted several changes to the density bonus law. Most notably, the bill amended the timing for density bonus requests, clarified density bonus requirements for senior housing, and instituted a 10 percent across the board increase in the percentage of affordable units that must be included in a project to qualify for incentives.

Conclusions

The TRPA allows a 25 percent density bonus to affordable housing developments provided that the project satisfies specific TRPA requirements. First, the project, at the higher density, must satisfy a demonstrated need for additional affordable housing. Second, the additional density must be consistent with the surrounding area. These requirements are subjective, and open to interpretation by TRPA. While the TRPA does, in some cases, allow affordable housing developers to take advantage of a density bonus, TRPA's treatment of the density bonus is not consistent with state law. This poses an "actual constraint" for the City of South Lake Tahoe in its ability to meet the requirements of state law without creating confusion for the public (e.g., if the City amended its Code to meet the requirements of state law, but the TRPA code remains more restrictive). Although current regulations pose challenges to taking advantage of what is allowed under state density bonus law in the City of South Lake Tahoe, Program 1-7 commits the City to continuing to work with TRPA and other Tahoe Basin agencies to advocate for the option to allow density bonuses in the City compliant with state government code.

General Plan

Overview

In 2002, AB 2292 amended the law to prohibit local governments from reducing the residential density of any parcel to a density that is below the density used by HCD to determine that the jurisdiction's housing element is compliant. Residential densities can be reduced in one area if the jurisdiction identifies additional available sites that would avoid a net loss of residential unit capacity (Government Code 65853).

Conclusions
This is not an "actual constraint," as any amendment proposal could be required to be submitted in hand with another amendment request to re-zone another area.

City of South Lake Tahoe Potential and Actual Governmental Constraints

The City of South Lake Tahoe's 2011 General Plan, Area Plans and Community Plans, along with the Plan Area Statements, establish the amount and distribution of land allocated for the different types of residential uses. These documents also provide the City's framework for creating and fostering a viable local economy. While housing production is primarily constrained by the TRPA Regional Plan, the City's own land use controls, development processing procedures, fees, off-site improvement requirements, and building codes also affect development.

Land Use Controls

The discussion found in the TRPA section related to zoning, densities and design also applies to the City of South Lake Tahoe, as the City has adopted the TRPA Plan Area Statements and Community Plans as its zoning. This was done to ensure consistency and reduce confusion for applicants. Regional growth controls, grading standards and land coverage standards have not been codified by the City but nevertheless apply region-wide due to the TRPA's special regional government status.

Citywide, community plan and area plan design standards have been mutually adopted by both the City and TRPA, superseding the requirement of Chapter 36 of the TRPA Code. These design standards incorporate by reference the TRPA Code Chapter 37 height requirements. Conversely, TRPA's Code incorporates the City's parking standards, described in the "Parking Standards" section. This discussion, and the discussions related to "Impediments to Persons with Disabilities" and "Local Processing and Permit Procedures," also apply to the City and will not be duplicated here. Land use controls either not imposed within the City due to the regional regulations or different from the regional regulations are discussed below.

Airport Safety Areas

Overview
The South Lake Tahoe Airport has three airport safety zones that affect land uses within the city. These regulations were required by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to ensure no net increase of such uses exposed to safety risks associated with the aircraft take-off and landing.

No residential areas are located in airport safety zone #1, which is incompatible with all types of residential development. Safety zone #2 indicates that residential development is generally inconsistent unless the building density is two or less dwelling units per acre. Safety zone #3 is compatible with residential development, with a limitation that custodial care facilities are restricted to no more than six persons. In both zones 2 and 3, infill of vacant parcels, changes of use, and reconstruction within areas of existing development not ordinarily permitted by the airport land use plan can be permitted if the following specific findings are made:

- The use is consistent with the Plan Area Statement, Community Plan, and related City land use provisions; and there are similar uses within the area of existing development.

- The project would not extend the perimeter of the area of existing development with incompatible uses, and there is no increase in the "concentration of people."

New construction or expansion of incompatible uses is limited to uses that relocate development rights associated with other incompatible uses from within the safety zone and where the sending parcel is restricted to open space. (Note: Incompatible uses and their rights can be relocated from zone 2 to zone 3, but not from zone 3 to zone 2.)

The City of South Lake Tahoe can overrule the guidelines where there is a finding made that the hardships outweigh the public health, safety and welfare objectives of the airport plan.

Safety zone #2 within the city includes over 100 single- and multi-family parcels with IPES scores or land capability classifications that would otherwise make them eligible for development. Note that residential parcels, particularly in the Sierra Tract portions of the zone, are typically smaller than one-half acre. Since the airport safety zones were established, City planning has permitted residential development of duplexes and single-family units as "infill" consistent with the Plan Area Statements (103, 104, and 105) and adjacent development within over flight zone #2. Duplexes (two dwellings per parcel) and single-family dwellings at one unit per residential parcel have been approved. These projects have not extended the area of existing development with incompatible uses. The residential construction that has occurred has been constructed using "new" residential allocations, not relocating existing units of use, and therefore has moderately increased the intensity of uses in the area.

Planning staff responded to FAA safety concerns by limiting infill to two units or less. The FAA was concerned with safety factors related to concentrating large numbers of people in one building. The two-unit infill limitation was a compromise that addressed the FAA's safety concerns while still providing some land use options for the city.

Conclusions

There is no "actual constraint" associated with the airport safety zone requirements, as interpreted as infill development. If they were interpreted as new construction, undeveloped lots in the affected portions of Sierra Tract and Highland Woods would not be eligible for development from allocations received from the allocation list because they do not relocate incompatible uses from within the zone; however, this is not the case. Lots in Sierra Tract and Highland Woods are allowed to use allocations for either a single-family dwelling or a duplex, if permitted in the PAS.

Annexation Restrictions

Overview

Possibilities for annexation are limited by the geographic and physical boundaries surrounding South Lake Tahoe to the north and to the east. However, there are no annexation restrictions limiting annexation of unincorporated El Dorado County.

Conclusions
There is no "actual constraint" associated with annexation restrictions.

Mobile Homes/Mobile Home Parks

Overview
Chapter 32 of the City Code includes standards for new or enlarged mobile home parks. In reality, all parks are very dense and have no room for expansion. All existing mobile home parks in the city have some nonconforming elements, whether they are a nonconforming use, or have nonconforming land coverage, density, setbacks, etc. Only the Tahoe Verde Mobile Home Park was constructed since City incorporation in 1965. No one has inquired about construction of a new park, but if a new park were constructed the Plan Area Statements/Areas Plans/Community Plans permissible uses matrices would apply. Three Plan Area Statements include areas that allow construction of new mobile home parks. Where permissible, the TRPA limits new mobile home park densities to eight units per acre.

While manufactured homes that comply with local design standards can be placed on a permanent foundation outside of mobile home parks to serve as permanent residences, mobile homes and travel trailers cannot, as prohibited by City Code. Mobile homes and travel trailers are limited to designated mobile home or RV parks. Minimum lot size for new mobile home parks is 10 acres and 5 acres for RV parks.

Any discussion related to housing conditions in South Lake Tahoe typically finds its way to the condition of many of the area's mobile home parks. HCD's Division of Codes and Standards is the enforcement agency for the mobile home parks located within the City of South Lake Tahoe. The City has the option, but has not assumed enforcement responsibilities, for parks within its jurisdiction. Most South Lake Tahoe mobile home parks are overly dense and predate city incorporation; therefore, they tend not to meet city standards in at least some aspects. All parks are required to comply with the Mobile Home Parks Act and the regulations contained in the California Code of Regulations, Title 25, Division I, Chapter 2, commencing with section 1000. This agency is required to assure compliance with the act.

Even so, under state law, the City becomes involved prior to the conversion of a mobile home park to another use or prior to either the closure of a mobile home park or cessation of use of the property as a mobile home park. Some California local jurisdictions have codified the local requirements created to implement the conversion of a mobile home park to another use. Since the City has not done so, the requirements of the state Government Code apply. This law applies only to mobile home parks. The City's two RV parks, considered under the TRPA's use definitions to be a recreation use similar to camping and not residential units of use, have conversion standards pursuant to state RV park law, but they do not include a relocation requirement.

Specifically, Section 65863.7 of the California Government Code requires the person or entity proposing to close a mobile home park or otherwise change the use to file a report with the City, prior to initiating the change. The report must document the impact of the change on the residents of the park. (The term "residents" includes both owners and tenants of park coaches.) The report must specifically address the availability of adequate replacement housing and the costs of relocation in order to mitigate the adverse effects of the conversion/closure/cessation of use. This report must be provided to each park resident. In writing this report, the feasibility of moving the coaches should be assessed. Many older coaches are not

moveable (either because of condition or due to lack of replacement mobile home parks that will accept older coaches) and as a result may need to be appraised and acquired by the person or entity proposing the change.

The City Council would review the report before any change of use is approved. Payment of relocation assistance/moving expenses to park residents may be required. The costs of relocating residents—whether owners or occupants—would be borne by the person or entity proposing the change. In addition, an administrative fee for processing the change/closure/cessation of use can be charged. However, the City has not yet established such a fee.

After the change of use is approved, park management must give homeowners six months or more written notice of the termination of tenancy. If no local government permit is required to change the use, then notice must be given 12 months or more before the change of use occurs. This notice triggers response requirements on the part of the mobile home owners pursuant to the Section 798.56a of the Civil Code.

The ability to do acquisition/rehab or conversion/rebuild projects is impeded by the high cost of relocation of residents. Often the existing developed sites are overly dense and cannot—and should not—be reconstructed to that density. Pursuant to the City's nonconforming use requirements (and those of the TRPA), if a subsequent multi-family housing project or other use is proposed on a converted mobile home park site, nonconforming densities and setbacks will not be grandfathered as part of the new project. Legally existing excess land coverage may remain, but it must be mitigated pursuant to the requirements of Chapter 30 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

Many members of the community concerned about substandard mobile home park conditions in South Lake Tahoe suggest that these should be priority sites for park conversion and replacement with quality affordable housing projects. As stated previously, subsequent projects built to appropriate densities typically reduce the amount of housing, creating a replacement housing need.

Conclusions

There is an "actual constraint" associated with the 10-acre minimum mobile home park lot size. This minimum lot size is a disincentive to the creation of new parks and makes other mobile home regulations for new or enlarged parks have only limited applicability. The 10-acre lot size should be reevaluated. That reevaluation could assess other mobile home issues, including the following:

- City regulations do not address the conversion of mobile home parks. A planning handout has been drafted regarding the state requirements; however, the City Council could consider codifying the specifics regarding what constitutes a change of use (quantifying the definition of "cessation," such as all or part of a park, immediately or gradually, etc.), when relocation payment is required, etc. The City could also evaluate the appropriateness of the TRPA's restriction for the reuse of any units of use that originate from a mobile home park. These may be appropriate for single-family workforce housing.

- City regulations for new and enlarged parks should include an appropriate minimum size, design and required amenities, any fencing requirements, and an assessment of affordability. Further, it could consider identifying those mobile home parks that are most desirable or feasible to preserve

as long-term, permanent housing. These mobile home parks could be targeted for park-wide improvement with the necessary infrastructure and residents could be part of a special program for rehabilitation or replacement of older coaches.

Motel Conversion Regulations

Overview

The motel conversion and bonus unit substitution program is an option to assist the City of South Lake Tahoe in meeting its affordable housing obligations and ensuring a long-term supply of affordable housing for city residents. The City Code of Ordinances Section 32-33 establishes the criteria for the conversion of motels to affordable multi-family rental housing and the substitution of bonus units allowed by Chapter 52 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances (see TRPA Constraints, Growth Controls). When a motel is converted to a residential use, the units of use associated with the motel rooms (TAU) morph into residential units of use that are deed-restricted as affordable housing. The TAUs that become residential units of use are not excess-rights eligible for sale or transfer; however, if the number of on-site units is reduced, there may be additional TAUs available for transfer. As of 2012, the fee for transferring units of use within city limits is $160 per unit. To transfer the units to unincorporated El Dorado County, the fee is $12,396 per unit.

Opportunities for motel conversions are limited by the building and locational criteria provided in the City Code. The motel buildings must meet certain building criteria such as ceiling height, roof covering standards, electric system standards, and heating and cooling system standards. Motel properties abutting Lake Tahoe Boulevard or Emerald Bay Road located within certain PAS or CPs, all of which have either a commercial or tourist land use designation, are not eligible for conversion. Approximately one-third of the city's motels are ineligible due to their location. The excluded PAS/CP areas are as follows:

- PAS 103 (Sierra Tract commercial)
- PAS 110 (South Y, the preliminary Tahoe Valley Area Plan area)
- PAS 116 (airport)
- The Bijou/Al Tahoe Community Plan
- The Tourist Core Area Plan

Properties that are located in the excluded PAS/CP areas but do not directly abut Lake Tahoe Boulevard or Emerald Bay Road are still eligible to apply for conversions to affordable housing. Also, motel conversions may occur in the excluded areas when the conversion project is a mixed-use project that combines affordable housing with a commercial or public service component.

Conclusions

There is no "actual constraint," but rather the motel conversion ordinance serves as an affordable housing incentive. However, the conversion of motels to affordable housing has proven to be difficult to accomplish. TRPA regulations combined with health and safety standards limit the feasibility of many motel conversion projects.

Vacation Rental Regulations

Overview

In 2003 the City Council adopted an ordinance (City Code Chapter 28A) to regulate vacation rentals in South Lake Tahoe. Some area homeowners reside out of town and use their Tahoe residences as their vacation property, renting it to other vacationers when not used by them. As property values have risen, this use has generally provided owners with an income stream that helps them pay for and maintain their properties. Large homes in prime areas can "vacation" rent for more than the price that owners could receive from a permanent rental while preserving for the owners their ability to also use the property. Only approximately 9 percent of the City's housing stock is used in this manner (according to the South Lake Tahoe Finance Department); therefore, vacation rentals may not have as large an impact on housing supply issues as is perceived by many in the community. Conversely, older motel rooms, many with limited living space and without kitchens, are being used as transitional and permanent housing for the local workforce.

The City's ordinance was created in recognition that vacation rentals expand the number and type of lodging facilities available and generate revenue, but that they also make enforcement of violations more difficult due to the transience of the occupants. The ordinance requires a vacation home rental permit and payment of transient occupancy tax by all vacation rentals. Owners must sign their properties and identify a local contact person who can take remedial measures in case of a violation. It articulates specific penalties for violations, up to permit revocation, enabling the City to better control "nuisance" situations.

Adoption of this ordinance was controversial. Residents expressed concern that the ordinance blurred the definition of residential uses and tourist accommodation uses. Some were concerned about changing the residential character of their neighborhoods; others felt that it undercut the ability to profitably operate motels. They blamed out-of-area owners for the drop in school enrollments. Conversely, vacation property owners and managers expressed that vacation rentals are a property right, and an important lodging tradition in resort areas. They believe that their rentals are sometimes the best-kept properties in the neighborhood and that neighbor concerns can be mitigated through excellent property management.

Conclusions

Vacation rentals are not an "actual constraint" to providing housing for all income levels in South Lake Tahoe at the current level of use. While the use of housing for short-term rentals reduces the number of housing units that, in some cases, would be available as long-term rental units, the current level of use is not considered by the City Council to be a constraint to providing, maintaining, and improving housing for people of all income levels in South Lake Tahoe.

The monitoring and tracking systems now in place as part of the adopted ordinance better enable the City to keep its fingers on the pulse of the trends related to vacation rentals in South Lake Tahoe. Should circumstances change, such as numbers of units available for rent dramatically increase, the City would be aware of such changes and could assess the situation as appropriate.

"Illegal Unit" Program

Overview

Chapter 14 of the City Code provides an opportunity for certain unauthorized second units to become legalized if they meet specific criteria. This complaint-based program, created specifically to help meet

the City's affordable housing needs with decent, safe, and sanitary housing units, only applies if units are deed-restricted as affordable housing and are rented only to a lower-income person(s).

The criteria for legalization include:

- Cannot have been illegally constructed since the ordinance was adopted in April 1993.
- May contain one unit beyond permissible density (detached, attached, or within the legal dwelling).
- Must conform to height, setbacks, and design.
- Must meet health and safety standards.
- Parcel must contain 1.5 parking spaces per unit.
- Must pay South Tahoe Public Utility District all costs for the illegal sewer hook-ups.
- Must be deed-restricted as lower-income housing.

Since its adoption in April 1993, 137 potential illegal units were evaluated, 23 were "legalized" and deed-restricted as lower-income housing, 28 substandard units were removed, and the balance were determined not to contain an illegal unit after investigating the property's history. As of June 2013, the program is still codified but not active due to the lack of staff time needed for its administration.

Conclusions
Since the program to legalize nonconforming units is inactive, it doesn't currently have an impact on the development of housing in the city.

Building Height, Setback and Minimum Lot Size Requirements

Overview
Residential and other setbacks have been codified in Chapter 32 of the City Code, as have minimum lot sizes and building heights. Standard setback requirements, building height, and minimum lot sizes are listed in Table 4-55.

Chapter 37 of TRPA's Code assigns maximum building heights based upon the slope of the parcels in combination with the pitch of the roof. Generally, buildings containing a residential use, including mixed-use developments, are limited to two stories. This height limitation, combined with land coverage and setback restrictions, limits the feasibility of affordable housing and mixed-use projects. The TRPA Regional Plan update allowed increased heights in the town and regional center areas of the city. In order to implement these allowed increases the City has adopted the Tourist Core Area Plan and is currently preparing the Tahoe Valley Area Plan. Heights up to 56 feet are allowed in town centers and up to 95 feet in the regional center. To minimize impacts related to height, projects of three stories or greater in town centers and the regional center are required to comply with Findings 1, 3, 5 and 9 from Section 37.7 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

TABLE 4-55 CITY DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS South Lake Tahoe	
	City Guidelines
Building Height	24-95 ft.*
Setbacks	
Front	20 ft.
Side (lot ≥10,000 sq.ft.)	20 ft.
Side (lot <10,000 sq.ft.)	10 ft.
Side, Street	5 ft.
Rear	15 ft.
Minimum Lot Size	
Residential Development	6,000 sq.ft.
Minimum Width	60 ft.
Minimum Depth	100 ft.
Mobile Home Sites	10 acres
Travel Trailer Sites	5 acres

Note:
** Depending on lot slope and roof pitch. See Table 37.4.1-1 of TRPA Code of Ordinances*
South Lake Tahoe Municipal Code. http://www.codepublishing.com/ca/southlaketahoe/; Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, Code of Ordinances. 2012.

The minimum residential lot size in South Lake Tahoe is 6,000 (60 x 100) square feet. However, the City recognizes all legal residential lots. In older subdivisions such as Sierra Tract, the typical lot size is 5,000 square feet. Consequently, the primary purpose of the minimum lot size relates to lot line adjustments. An adjustment that reduces an existing lot to below the minimum lot size would not be permissible.

Table 4-56 shows several exceptions to the setback requirements listed above in Table 4-55. For example, if a lot was established prior to April 30, 1962, and is 5,000 square feet or less in size, then the rear yard setback is reduced from 15 feet to 10 feet. Another example is for the use of residential pools and spas. When these are developed, the rear yard setback is reduced from 15 feet to 5 feet.

TABLE 4-56 SETBACK EXCEPTIONS South Lake Tahoe	
Condition	**Exception**
Lot established prior to April 30, 1962, and 5,000 sq.ft. or less	Reduce rear yard setback 10 ft.
Garage or carport site with slope greater than 1:4	Setback can be either 20 ft. or 0 ft.
Swimming pool and spas	Reduce rear setback to 10 ft.
Cornices, eaves, fireplaces or similar architectural features	May extend into any required yard by not more than 50 percent of the required width or depth.
First floor decks (not including freestanding decks), patios, and canopies	Reduce rear setback to 5 ft.
First floor stairs, landings, or decks	May encroach into front yard setback provided they do not exceed a height of 30 in. and encroach no more than 5 ft.
Play equipment allowed in yard	Must be temporary, less than 7 ft. tall, less than 115 sq.ft., and 3 ft. from property line

South Lake Tahoe Municipal Code. http://www.codepublishing.com/ca/southlaketahoe, 2013

Conclusions

City setbacks, building heights, and minimum lots size are not an "actual constraint." They are comparable to other jurisdictions and, since they have been in place since City incorporation, they preserve community character.

Condominium Regulations

Overview

Existing Development: Chapter 32 of the City Code describes lot and setback requirements for condominiums. In addition, the City created regulations for condominiums that are more restrictive than TRPA's regional regulations. While the TRPA's Code of Ordinances allows conversion of existing multi-family residential development to condominiums, the City Code in Chapter 32 establishes stricter criteria for such conversions. Previously, City code prohibited the condominiumization of multi-family rental properties; however, in 2004, the City amended the code to allow the conversion of multi-family rental units to condominiums with a stipulation that a portion of the units be deed-restricted for low- and moderate-income households. The remaining units must be deed-restricted for owner-occupancy and price-capped at the maximum price of the City's First-Time Homebuyer Program with the intent of serving middle-income residents. This change was made with the intent of increasing local home ownership for local area residents, specifically the local workforce, who are being priced out of the local market. However, to protect the city's supply of rental housing, eligible properties were limited to multi-family rental properties with 10 or fewer units.

In 2008, the City further amended the code after discovering financing issues which arose in the tightened housing market. Previously, the code restricted the converted units to owner-occupied condominiums. This restriction made obtaining financing difficult since lenders who may have to foreclose upon a unit want the ability to rent the condominium pending a resale after foreclosure. The City amended the code to confirm that a foreclosing lender has the ability to rent a condominium pending their resale to income-qualified buyers.

In spring 2007, Fernwood Village was successfully converted from an eight-unit multi-family rental property to eight single-family condominiums. Of the eight condominium units, six units are limited to middle-income households, and two units are limited to moderate-income households.

New Development: In 1998, the City Council modified the way allocations were distributed to condominium projects. Previously, people had to obtain such allocations from the single-family list. Since no one can receive more than one single-family allocation each year, it would have taken two or more years to obtain enough allocations from the list to construct a project. Consequently, the City Council amended the allocation policy to enable such allocations to come from the multi-family list. The developer must identify his or her intent to construct condominiums at the outset.

At the same time, the Council adopted a policy that such condominiums must be constructed in, at minimum, clusters of two attached units. This policy was adopted to prevent the appearance of single-family homes, such as the gated, luxury home developments that occur elsewhere in the Basin. If the new condominiums are deed-restricted as affordable housing, no residential allocation is needed.

Conclusion

Existing Development: City restrictions on condominiumization of existing development to preserve rental housing do not pose an "actual constraint" to providing housing in South Lake Tahoe. The City code allows more opportunities for homeownership for residents of all income levels by promoting deed-restricted affordable housing; however, regardless of the incentives, many developers in South Lake Tahoe are still reluctant to build affordable housing so preserving existing affordable housing is critical.

New Development: City regulations of new condominiums are sometimes an "actual constraint" in that the policy is not codified. A developer would not find the requirement to attach the dwelling units in the City's code. The City Council might also consider code changes to allow condominiums that aren't attached to be developed in cases where a proposal can meet the intent of providing low- or moderate-income ownership housing opportunities. Deed-restricted ownership opportunities could require owner occupancy and mandate that any ownership transfer has to be to—and affordable to—moderate income or less homeowners. This could provide ownership opportunities to help to meet community housing needs.

Timeshare Conversion Regulations

Overview

Chapter 33 of the City code prohibits conversion of existing residential dwellings to timeshares. There is also a moratorium on converting existing visitor lodging uses to timeshares. This section of the code has been interpreted as prohibiting the tear-down and reconstruction of either existing residential (through conversion) or motels as timeshares.

Conclusion

City prohibitions on conversion of residential units to timeshares are not an "actual constraint" to providing housing for all income levels in South Lake Tahoe. The legislative intent of the timeshare ordinance was to protect the City's housing stock. There is a clear nexus between the loss of residential units and preservation of housing stock, but that is not true for the loss of motel units. While there may be other compelling reasons to prohibit conversion of motels to timeshares, they are unrelated to housing needs.

Building Codes and Their Enforcement

Overview

Through building codes and other land use requirements, local governments influence the style, quality, size, and costs of residential development. Building codes and their enforcement can increase the cost of housing and impact the feasibility of rehabilitating older properties that must be upgraded to current code standards. In this manner, buildings codes and their enforcement act as a constraint on the amount of housing and its affordability.

State law prohibits modifications to building codes except where local variations are necessary for reasons of climate, geology, or topography (Health and Safety Code Section 17958.5). The City has adopted the 2010 California Building Code, which determines the minimum residential construction requirements throughout California. The City also has adopted a Green Building Code which encourages sustainable materials and practices in new buildings. Because of Tahoe's high elevation, susceptibility to fire, and snowy climate, special requirements have been adopted for snow loads, wind shear, fire protection (sprinklers and smoke detectors) and frost line/freeze protection listed in the *Fire-Resistive Design Manual*, Eighteenth Edition, dated June 2009, published by the Gypsum Association.

The state's Uniform Housing Code regulates the condition of habitable structures (health and safety standards) and provides for the conservation and rehabilitation of housing. The City responds to code enforcement problems on a complaint basis. Based on community dialogue from previous Housing Element updates, the City learned that there is a community perception that code enforcement has, in the past, been lax. The City initiated the Housing Issues Hotline as a forum for code enforcement complaints. Because much of the least expensive, market-rate housing stock is older, often not well maintained, substandard, or owned by absentee landlords who are not responsive to tenants' complaints, the hotline has proven valuable to tenants. Between 2009 and present, the City received over 2,000 complaints. The usual process is for a building inspector to conduct a field investigation after a complaint has been submitted. If the complaint is determined to be valid, the immediacy and severity of the problem is evaluated. There is no indication that code enforcement practices have unduly penalized older structures.

Conclusion

City building code modifications and code enforcement are not an "actual constraint" to providing housing for all income levels in South Lake Tahoe. There is no indication that code enforcement practices have unduly penalized older structures. Should the City take over mobile home park enforcement, there needs to be enough code enforcement staff to adequately address the concerns. If a building must be vacated for violation of housing and building codes, tenants may be left without housing. The City Council could consider establishing a program by ordinance that requires owners of such rental units to pay the costs of relocating displaced residents. Such an ordinance could encourage owners of blighted properties to repair and maintain them. Any ordinance must not penalize property owners for blighted conditions created by the occupants of their rental properties. The Housing Issues Hotline will continue to be administered during the 2014–2022 planning period (see Program 5-1).

On/Off-Site Improvements

South Lake Tahoe requires the installation of certain on- and off-site improvements to ensure the safety and livability of its neighborhoods. Requirements include parking, streets, curb, gutter, and sidewalk improvements.

Parking Standards

Overview

Since off-street parking often requires large amounts of land, parking requirements are one of the development standards that can most negatively impact the development of affordable housing. Off-street parking requirements increase the cost of development, limiting the funds available for providing housing. Many municipalities have adopted parking standards that exceed the actual parking needs of the population. Table 4-57 summarizes the City's parking requirements associated with residential uses.

TABLE 4-57
PARKING STANDARDS FOR RESIDENTIAL USES
South Lake Tahoe
2013

Residential Use	Parking Requirements
Single-family	2 spaces per unit
Multi-family	2 spaces per unit
Employee housing	2 spaces per unit
Multi-person dwelling	1 space per 2 beds; and 1 space per 10 beds (guest parking)
Nursing and personal care facility	1 space per 3 beds; and 1 space per employee
Residential care	1 space per 4 beds; and 1 space per live-in employee; and 1 space per 5 beds (guest parking)
Condominium	1 space per unit; and ½ space per bedroom
Vacation rentals or guest houses	1 space per unit; and ½ space per bedroom
Secondary residence	1 space per unit; and ½ space per bedroom

Note: Fractions of one-half or greater require the additional parking space, while fractions of less than one-half are disregarded.
Source: City of South Lake Tahoe Municipal Code 2013.

The City and TRPA codes provide for the submittal of a justification for the case-by-case reduction of parking requirements. This performance-based standard has resulted in 50 percent parking reductions being granted to recent deed-restricted affordable housing projects in South Lake Tahoe. All parking reductions granted must consider snow removal conditions, during which vehicles parked on the street are towed, as they interfere with snow-removal activities. Therefore, creating too little parking adversely affects residents, which is why case-by-case analysis of the use is important as to whether reductions should be granted. Design standards do not include garage requirements.

Conclusions

There is no "actual constraint" related to housing associated with South Lake Tahoe's parking standards. The City's parking standards are similar to those in other jurisdictions, and therefore do not represent a development constraint above and beyond that of other local jurisdictions. However, parking standards in most jurisdictions have been arbitrarily established and do not necessarily represent the needs of the people living in the developments. This is especially true for senior and affordable housing developments where occupants are less likely to require more than one parking space.

The cost of land associated with parking, in addition to the costs of construction, paving, and maintenance, drive up the overall cost of development, reducing funds available for the development of affordable housing. While the City and TRPA allow flexibility in parking standards on a case-by-case basis, reducing parking requirements could increase the viability of affordable housing.

Streets

Overview

The City's current street standards are contained in the City of South Lake Tahoe Public Improvement and Engineering Standards, which are currently under development. The City requires that all public streets within the city shall have a minimum width of 24 feet (12 feet per lane). The City ensures that the design, construction, and maintenance of roads are performed in accordance with the 2006 State of California Department of Transportation Standard Specifications.

Conclusions

The city's street standards are comparable to other jurisdictions, and are not an "actual constraint" on the production of housing.

Other Improvements

Overview

All projects approved through special use permits require off-site improvements if requested by the City Engineer. Required improvements include curb, gutter and sidewalk. These improvements are not mandated for "allowable" uses.

Conclusions

In conclusion, on- and off-site improvement requirements for special use projects are not an "actual constraint" for affordable housing projects, although they can increase project costs. The amenities that required improvements provide for residents typically justify the expense.

City Fees and Other Exactions

Overview

Table 4-58 summarizes the City of South Lake Tahoe planning-related fees. Building permit fees are based upon the valuation of the project. The valuation is determined by the type of construction and square footage based upon the building standards publication. The cost is 2 percent of the computed valuation (minimum $60). In addition, a state of California "Strong Motion Instrumentation Program" fee of .0001 of valuation is also collected. The Lake Tahoe Unified School District has a developer fee collected on all new residential development of $2.24 per square foot of habitable space and $0.50 per square foot for commercial space.

The City code provides nonprofit developers the opportunity to request a waiver of the planning fees for their project. Such a waiver was granted to Accessible Space, Inc. for the Sky Forest Acres project when it filed for a Plan Area Statement amendment to add multi-family housing as a permissible use.

TABLE 4-58 FEE SCHEDULE South Lake Tahoe 2012	
Allocations	
Deposit	$1,000
Application Fee	$577/Unit
General Permits	
General Planning Application	$1,634
(Major design review, use permit, variance, timeshare use permit, etc.)	
Requires TRPA Review by City under MOU (in addition to application fee)	$278
Requires a Public Hearing/Noticing (in addition to application fee)	$577
Requires both Planning Commission and City Council Hearing (in addition to application fee)	$1,407
General Planning Permit Revision	$213
City/TRPA MOU Permit Revision	$304
General Planning Permit Extension	$111
Other Permits	
Minor Design Review	$182
Sign Permit Application	$150
Temporary Use Permit	$202
Home Occupation Permit	$61
Planning Documents	
General Plan Amendment / City Code	$4,549
Community Plan / PAS Amendment	$5,419
Transfer of Land Rights	
Transfer of Development Right or Unit of Use into or within the City	$162/Right or Unit
Transfer of Development Right Outside of the City	$4,810/Right
Transfer of Unit of Use to El Dorado County	$12,545/Unit
Transfer of Land Coverage	$162
Other Services	
Zoning Letter	$50
Public Notice Address Label Preparation	$152
Pre-Application Meeting Deposit (Applied to application fees when project application is submitted)	$638
Appeals	$208

Source: City of South Lake Tahoe Planning Division Service Fee 2012

Based on the fee schedules above and estimated construction costs for South Lake Tahoe, Table 4-59 presents typical fees and costs for single- and multi-family housing development in the City. When compared to the cost of construction and land, the total fees for a single-family unit is 0.7 percent of the estimated development cost and for a multi-family unit is 1.4 percent of the estimated development cost and these costs do not pose a constraint to residential development in the city.

TABLE 4-59 TOTAL PROCESSING AND IMPACT FEES FOR SINGLE- AND MULTI-FAMILY UNITS South Lake Tahoe			
Housing Type	**Total Fees**	**Estimated Development Cost per Unit**	**Estimated Proportion of Fees to Development Costs per Unit**
Single-family unit	$2,712	$563,644	0.5%
Multi-family unit	$2,712-3,567	$350,000	0.5-1.0%

Source: City of South Lake Tahoe 2013.

Conclusions

City fees are not an "actual constraint" as they are reasonable and customary. In fact since developers must pay TRPA fees in addition to city fees, the City's planning-related fees are much lower than the fees of other comparable cities in California. Affordable housing projects by nonprofit developers can request a planning fee waiver.

Density Bonus

Overview

A density bonus is the allocation of development rights that allows a parcel to accommodate additional square footage or additional residential units beyond the maximum for which the parcel is zoned. In 2005, new laws affecting Government Code Section 65915 increased the amount of density bonus that jurisdictions are required to offer developers to a maximum of 35 percent, and increased the number of incentives that jurisdictions must provide to affordable housing developers (see Section TRPA Constraints, Preemption of State Law, Density Bonus).

Currently, the City of South Lake Tahoe offers a 25 percent density bonus to developers of affordable housing. As previously stated in the TRPA Constraints Section, codified densities and density bonuses are typically not achievable due to other site conditions which limit land coverage availability. Increasing the density bonus would not change the actual density to which developers could build.

Conclusions

The City's density bonus is an "actual constraint" to the development of affordable housing. State law requires jurisdictions to provide a maximum 35 percent density bonus and a maximum of three incentives to affordable housing developers. However, the TRPA restricts the allowable density bonus to 25 percent in the Tahoe Basin, and without changes to the TRPA's code of ordinances, the City cannot increase the density bonus that it offers developers. However, most multi-family projects are unable to build to current maximum densities due to land coverage limitations and other site requirements. Therefore, increasing the density bonus to be consistent with state law might mislead developers into thinking that they could build to higher densities, which are currently unattainable in the Tahoe Basin due to TRPA regulations. Program 1-7 commits the City to continuing to work for basin-wide change which would allow the City to comply with state density bonus law.

Development, Maintenance, and Improvement of Housing for Persons with Disabilities

Overview

In accordance with SB 520 (Chapter 671, Statutes of 2001), the City has analyzed the potential and actual governmental constraints on the development of housing for persons with disabilities. South Lake Tahoe has adopted the California Building Code, including Title 24 regulations of the code dealing with accessibility for persons with disabilities. The City has not adopted any additional universal design elements in its building code beyond Title 24 requirements.

As discussed earlier in this document Chapter 30 of TRPA's code includes an opportunity for reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities. Specifically, development which is required to be compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is exempt from the calculation of land coverage. This exemption does not apply however to the land coverages associated with parking and other vehicular uses. This accommodation allows for greater ADA accessibility in existing public/commercial facilities and private residences.

Conclusions

While the addition of the ADA exemption to the TRPA code provides some opportunity for reasonable accommodation, the City additionally proposes Program 4-1 to amend the City zoning code to specifically allow reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities. Such an ordinance will create a codified process for persons with disabilities to request a modification to or exception from zoning and building laws, and permit processing procedures through a standard application and administrative review process.

Buy-Out Programs

Overview

The US Forest Service Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit and the California Tahoe Conservancy (CTC) have legislatively mandated buy-out programs primarily for sensitive lands within the Lake Tahoe Basin, including South Lake Tahoe. Some people believe that these acquisition programs have removed important development potential from the city's land supply. However, both programs stem from a mandate to retire sensitive parcels ineligible for development in the Tahoe Basin and have provided financial relief to people who might otherwise find limited economic value associated with their undevelopable lots.

These buy-out programs have occasionally resulted in the acquisition of lands that would otherwise be capable of development, such as when they were part of a "package" acquisition that included sensitive lands. These are the minority of the total number held by the agencies. In some cases the CTC has indicated a willingness to utilize non-sensitive properties to meet Community Plan objectives. There may be some parcels owned by the CTC that would be appropriate for affordable or workforce housing.

Conclusions

There is an "actual constraint" associated with the buy-out programs. In some cases, they decrease the supply of developable, non-sensitive parcels, which limits the City's ability to provide affordable housing, and could affect the price of remaining vacant land.

Article 34

Overview

Article 34 of the California Constitution requires voter approval for specified low-rent housing projects that involve certain types of public agency participation. Generally, a project is subject to Article 34 if more than 49 percent of its units will be rented to low-income persons. If a project is subject to Article 34, it will require an approval from the local electorate. This can constrain the production of affordable housing, since the process to seek ballot approval for affordable housing projects can be costly and time-consuming, with no guarantee of success.

The provisions of Article 34 allow local jurisdictions to seek voter approval for "general authority" to develop low-income housing without identifying specific projects or sites. If the electorate approves general parameters for certain types of affordable housing development, the local jurisdiction will be able to move more quickly in response to housing opportunities that fall within those parameters.

Thus far, the City of South Lake Tahoe has not built housing itself, so it has not needed Article 34 authorization. Historically, most affordable housing projects have been built by private developers, who sought financial assistance from the City's Housing Division.

Conclusions

The lack of Article 34 authorization has not served as a constraint to the development of affordable housing.

Potential Non-Governmental Constraints

Non-governmental constraints are primarily market-driven and generally outside of direct governmental control. By understanding these market forces, however, local governments can try to influence and offset the negative impacts upon the maintenance, improvement, or development of housing for all income levels through responsive and effective programs and policies.

Land Costs

Land prices in South Lake Tahoe that were relatively stable in the 1980s and early 1990s have significantly increased since about 1998. Between 1980 and 1997, $8,000 to $12,000 was the typical price for a standard single-family lot in a residential neighborhood. In summer 2013, city lots started at $30,000 and cost as much as $1,400,000. The average per acre cost of lots is $356,000[7]. High land costs within the urban areas are exacerbated because the supply of developable land is more limited, especially for large parcels. Property values of large parcels which allow multi-family dwellings have prices reflective of the range of potential uses. Affordable-housing developers have been purchasing, for lower prices, larger parcels that are limited to single-family dwellings and have been requesting Plan Area Statement amendments. In all cases to date, the changes have been supportable. However, it is possible in the future that such a land use change would be an inappropriate land use decision due to an inconsistency with the adjacent neighborhood, distance from services, lack of a transit connection, etc.

[7] Based on search of properties listed for sale on Realtor.com, July 9, 2013.

Rehabilitation and consolidation of existing units to create affordable housing is another alternative to building on vacant land, but it can also be expensive. It is not easy to consolidate residential properties to make a rehabilitation project financially feasible and to create reasonably secure investments for a developer. Rehabilitation of older units can require the relocation of existing residents, loan/grant application processes, and unforeseen construction complications due to the condition of older buildings. These factors, and the limited building season (which leads to labor shortages and increased labor costs), create higher costs for repairing substandard housing than in other California communities.

Availability of Financing and Insurance

The average interest rate for a 30-year fixed-rate mortgage was 4.45 percent in June 2013[8]. Overall, financing for single-family and multi-family housing (four units or less) is available in the community. The exceptions have been in cases in which the homes require major repairs, such as lacking permanent foundations, or are located on private, unpaved roads. Since financing for multi-family housing of more than four units is considered commercial, obtaining financing can be more challenging.

Insuring South Lake Tahoe properties, however, is more difficult than obtaining financing. Residents of South Lake Tahoe are likely to pay higher insurance rates since the mountain community is surrounded by national forest. This desirable setting has risks due to the high fire danger. The threat of a large conflagration taking out entire neighborhoods makes insurance companies want to reduce their risk of having to pay a large number of claims at one time. This problem is exacerbated by the number of older dwellings with shake roofs. Some property owners have been noticing that their policies will not be renewed unless their roofs are replaced. The City's only fire-safe building codes relate to installation of sprinklers for residential developments over 5,000 square feet and requirements for smoke detector installation. Finally, as in other areas, concern about health effects related to mold is leading to policy cancellations. People believe that their claims related to water damage, while paid, have lead to non-renewal of their policy.

For credit-worthy projects, residential construction loan rates are relatively low. However, since interest rates reflect deliberate monetary policy selected by the Federal Reserve Board, it is not possible to forecast what will happen to interest rates during the upcoming Housing Element planning period. With the housing mortgage crisis bringing interest rates to all-time lows, it is very likely that future interest rate increases will occur. If interest rates rise, not only will it make new construction more costly (since construction period loans are short-term and bear a higher interest rate than amortized mortgages), but it will also lower the sales price that buyers can afford to pay. In the affordability examples presented earlier in this document, a seven percent interest rate was used.

Development Costs

Development is a costly venture in the Lake Tahoe Basin. CEQA analyses, expensive vacant land, and permitting costs are all constraining factors to development in California. In many communities, large, unconstrained sites are available and have relatively low environmental concerns. South Lake Tahoe differs in that few large parcels exist to accommodate significant numbers of housing units. Developers tend to prefer larger, undeveloped parcels because it is more cost-effective to distribute the costs of development over more housing units. Further, the city's geography and location increase the expense of

[8] http://www.zillow.com/mortgage-rates/30-year-fixed/

bringing materials into the basin, which contributes to the cost of building or rehabilitating housing. Over the long term, utility, building maintenance, and repair costs are higher than in areas with mild climates.

A local developer with experience building affordable housing in the Tahoe Basin estimated that construction costs alone are currently (2013) between $175 to $400 per square foot in the Tahoe Basin. This cost does not include land cost, fees, and entitlement costs. The competition for labor and materials during the housing boom of the past recent years caused an increase in labor and material costs; however, this competition is now diminishing with the recent decline in the housing market, causing labor costs to drop and material prices to stabilize.

Environmental Constraints

South Lake Tahoe's ability to grow outward is constrained by the political and environmental boundaries surrounding the city. Because of the city's physical limitations, future housing development will occur almost entirely through infill and redevelopment.

The sites identified in Appendix A, Tables 4-42 and 4-43 and Figure 4-8 all have development potential based on the TRPA's development standards and regulations. None of these sites are further limited by environmental constraints than identified and analyzed in the tables and accompanying narrative.

Prevailing Wage

When private development projects receive government subsidies, such as redevelopment tax increment funds, they are classified as public work projects. Any public work project must pay workers the prevailing wage, or the minimum wage rates payable to construction workers who are employed on public works projects in California. The hourly work rates are published quarterly by the California Department of Industrial Relations (DIR). In general, prevailing wage requirements have caused labor costs to increase anywhere between 5 and 30 percent in urban areas and up to 40 percent in rural areas.

For now, projects using low-income housing tax credits and tax-exempt bonds but no other subsidy are not required to pay construction crews the prevailing wage. In 2005, the DIR determined that a project which had been awarded 4 percent low-income housing tax credits and tax-exempt bonds was not a public work. If the project was not a public work, then it was not covered by California's onerous prevailing-wage laws. However, prevailing wage law is a recent development in California, and it is impossible to predict the effect that prevailing wage will have on affordable housing projects in the future.

Developer Trends

With higher profitability in the upper-end ownership market, for-profit builders tend to focus more on luxury housing development rather than on the first-time homebuyer market and the rental market. Many of the newer houses in the city are the product of speculative development geared to out-of-area, upper-income buyers. The housing market has not been responsive to the needs of the city's year-round residents, but is driven more by the demand for vacation rentals and second homes. Affordable housing development in South Lake Tahoe has required cooperation with nonprofits and deep subsidies in order to be effective.

4.5 EVALUATION

2008 to 2013 Accomplishments

The last five years have been a challenging time for the development of housing with the downturn in the housing market and the elimination of redevelopment agencies. In addition, City resources have been reduced, making it difficult for the City to administer housing programs and provide funding for housing projects. The City has continued to be proactive when possible in dealing with housing issues. Using HOME funds the City has approved and construction is under way on The Aspens Project which will provide 47 units housing very low- and low-income households.

Review of Existing Housing Element

Table 4-60 summarizes the City's RHNA for the period from January 2006 through December 2012 and the number of housing units built or approved during that time period. During that time frame the City constructed or approved 251 units. Of these units 17 were for lower income households and were part of the Sky Forest Acres project.

TABLE 4-60
PROGRESS DURING PREVIOUS PLANNING PERIOD
South Lake Tahoe
January 1, 2006 through December 31, 2012

	Extremely Low	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
2006-2013 RHNA						
	4	5	9	9	191	218
Project						
Sky Forest Acres		17		1		18
Kelly Ridge (Tahoe Senior Plaza II)			33			33
Single-family Dwellings					200	200
Totals	**0**	**17**	**33**	**1**	**200**	**251**

Source: City of South Lake Tahoe 2013.

The following section reviews and evaluates the City's progress in implementing the 2008–2013 Housing Element. It reviews the results and effectiveness of policies, programs, and objectives for the previous Housing Element planning period. Table 4-61 provides an evaluation of the 2008–2013 South Lake Tahoe Housing Element's implementation programs.

TABLE 4-61 EVALUATION OF 2008–2013 SOUTH LAKE TAHOE HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS			
Implementation Program Summary	**Status**	**Evaluation**	**Continue/ Modify/Delete**
Program 1-1 MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT. The City shall create incentives (i.e., alternative parking requirements, streamlined permitting) to encourage production of housing in non-traditional (i.e., commercial) areas where residential use is appropriate to the setting and where mixed-use projects could either address job and housing needs or the desires of second homeowners. The City shall provide information regarding the new incentives at City Planning Division and Housing Division offices and on the City website and an information packet will be distributed to local developers. **Responsible Party:** Planning Division and Redevelopment Agency **Funding:** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** FY 2009 **Quantified Objective:** 20 residential units in mixed-use developments	Incentives have been provided in the newly adopted Tourist Core Area Plans and will also be provided in the Tahoe Valley Area Plan (in progress). The City's Housing Division has been eliminated due to reductions in the City's financial resources.	This program has been partially implemented and will continue to be implemented through the completion of the Tahoe Valley Area Plan.	Modify to eliminate references to the redevelopment agency and continue.
Program 1-2 CONDOMINIUMIZATION OF NEW DEVELOPMENT. The City shall codify City policies related to construction of new market-rate condominiums (currently defined as clusters of at least two attached units). The City shall modify the allocation process so that the criteria for using multi-family allocations from the City's list for condominium development are based on a minimum density rather than whether the condominium is attached or detached. **Responsible Party:** Planning Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** FY 2008 **Quantified Objective:** N/A	This program has not been completed and will be continued.	This program has not been completed due to limited staff resources and will be implemented during the 5th cycle planning period.	Continue.
Program 1-3 REDUCE ALLOCATION BACKLOG. The City shall meet with the TRPA Governing Board as part of the Pathway 2007 process, and annually thereafter, to find solutions that reduce the current backlog for residential allocations. **Responsible Party**: Planning Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** FY 2008, in conjunction with the Pathway 2007 update **Quantified Objective:** N/A	Currently, there is no backlog due to decreased demand. This program will be continued and implemented as needed if backlog occurs during the 2014–2022 planning period.	Program has been unnecessary since adoption of the Housing Element due to the slow housing market.	Continue.
Program 1-4 VACANT LAND INVENTORY. The City shall maintain an updated inventory of vacant, buildable land. The City shall make this information available to the public by providing the inventory at the Planning	This program has not been completed and will be continued.	This program has not been implemented due to limited staff resources. The land inventory in this Housing Element update will serve as the baseline land inventory and	Continue.

TABLE 4-61 EVALUATION OF 2008–2013 SOUTH LAKE TAHOE HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS			
Implementation Program Summary	**Status**	**Evaluation**	**Continue/ Modify/Delete**
Department counter and on the City's website. **Responsible Party:** Planning Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** FY 2008 and Ongoing **Quantified Objective:** N/A		will be updated during the 5th cycle planning period.	
Program 1-5 DEVELOPMENT OF SUBSTANDARD/UNDERUTILIZED SITES. The City shall maintain an inventory of the underutilized sites with development potential identified in the Housing Element Background Report. **Responsible Party:** Housing Division and Planning Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fun **Timeframe: FY** 2008 and ongoing **Quantified Objective:** N/A	This program has not been completed and will be continued.	This program has not been implemented due to limited staff resources. The list of underutilized sites in this Housing Element update will serve as the baseline list of sites and will be updated during the 5th cycle planning period.	Continue.
Program 1-6 STATE AND FEDERAL SUPPORT. If efforts to remove TRPA-related constraints are unsuccessful, the City shall seek redress from the State Department of Housing and Community Development, and other State and Federal agencies, to further the City's ability to comply with State housing laws and address the city's housing needs. **Responsible Party:** Planning Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** Ongoing **Quantified Objective:** N/A	The City worked with TRPA during the TRPA Regional Plan update process and is currently participating in TRPA-organized efforts to evaluate Basin-wide regulations related to housing.	The Basin-wide working group to address housing regulations is the City's current preferred approach to working toward compliance with state housing laws. Depending on the outcomes of the process with TRPA and other Basin-wide agencies the City will consider additional steps to address housing-related constraints.	Delete.
Program 1-7 PARKING BEST PRACTICES. The City shall research best practices for parking standards, and continue to allow more flexible parking standards for mixed-use and other housing projects on a case-by-case basis. The City's flexible parking standards could include one or more of the following practices: • continuing to allow parking reductions for affordable and mixed-use projects; • promoting shared parking for mixed use projects located in commercial areas; • allowing and encouraging affordable housing developers to unbundle parking and rent parking spaces separately from the units; and • allowing affordable housing developers to pay an in-lieu fee to support	In August 2011, Kimley Horn completed the South Lake Tahoe East Parking Study which includes recommendations and implementation strategies.	The City has implemented various recommendations from the study and will continue to do so through continuing this program.	Continue.

TABLE 4-61 EVALUATION OF 2008–2013 SOUTH LAKE TAHOE HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS			
Implementation Program Summary	**Status**	**Evaluation**	**Continue/ Modify/Delete**
public transportation access to the project site in place of some of the parking requirements. **Responsible Party:** Planning Division **Funding** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** FY 2009 **Quantified Objective:** N/A			
Program 1-8 UTILIZING DENSITY INCENTIVES. The City shall work with affordable, workforce, and other multi-family housing proponents to direct them to Community Plan areas where incentives are already in place to allow for the additional coverage that could enable achievement of the densities necessary to make a project "pencil out." The City shall produce an informational packet which describes all of the incentives for multi-family and affordable housing, including bonus units, land coverage within Community Plans, and/or density bonuses. The information will be available at the City Planning Division and Housing Division offices and on the City website and the information packet will be distributed to local developers. **Responsible Party:** Housing Division and Planning Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** FY 2008 **Quantified Objective:** N/A	The Tourist Core Area Plan was adopted in November 2013. The Tahoe Valley Area Plan is in progress. Implementation of this program is ongoing.	The City has incorporated incentives into the Tourist Core Area Plan and will incorporate incentives into the Tahoe Valley Area Plan.	Modify to specify incentives which will target lower-income households and continue.
Program 1-9 MINIMUM DENSITY REQUIREMENTS. The City shall establish minimum density standards for multi-family eligible parcels of a certain size located in area within walking distance of public transit and services. **Responsible Party:** Planning Division **Funding:** Staff time **Timeframe:** FY 2009 **Quantified Objective:** N/A	This program has not been completed.	Implementation of this program has not been completed and is no longer considered feasible by the City, given current resources. This program will be deleted.	Delete.
Program 1-10 CLARIFYING THE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS. The City shall provide information on the City website to clarify the development process for developers/builders who are looking to construct housing in South Lake Tahoe and are unfamiliar with the process. The website shall provide an outline of the various steps of the development process including the regulatory review and permitting processes. **Responsible Party:** Planning Division and Building Division	This program was completed with launch of the City's new website in early 2011. The City continues to update the information on the website as needed.	This program was effective because the information has been helpful for developers.	Modify to continue to update information on the website and continue.

TABLE 4-61 EVALUATION OF 2008–2013 SOUTH LAKE TAHOE HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS			
Implementation Program Summary	**Status**	**Evaluation**	**Continue/ Modify/Delete**
Funding: Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** FY 2009 **Quantified Objective:** N/A			
Program 2-1 LOW- AND MODERATE-INCOME HOUSING FUNDS. The City's Redevelopment Agency shall use its existing and projected Low- and Moderate-Income Housing Funds (20 percent set-aside funds) to assist in the creation or improvement of housing for extremely low-, very low-, low-, and moderate-income residents, and for public infrastructure improvements needed to serve persons of lower and moderate incomes within the provisions of State law. **Responsible Party:** Redevelopment Agency **Funding:** Staff time, set-aside funds **Timeframe:** Ongoing **Quantified Objective:** 32 total lower-income housing units (6 extremely low-income, 6 very low- and 20 low-income housing units)	The City consistently utilized its funds to assist low- and moderate-income housing including for the Kelly Ridge Project completed in June 2009. Due to the dissolution of redevelopment agencies in 2011, low- and moderate-income housing funds are no longer available. This program will not be continued.	This program was effective prior to dissolution of the City's redevelopment agency.	Delete.
Program 2-2 PURSUE STATE AND FEDERAL FUNDS. To support the creation of quality, affordable rental housing, the City and the Redevelopment Agency shall seek and pursue State and Federal funds annually, or as the funding becomes available, to leverage the 20 percent set-aside funds as deemed appropriate by the Agency board. **Responsible Party:** Housing Division and Redevelopment Agency **Funding:** 20 percent set-aside funds to be leveraged with HOME funds, Section 811 funds, Section 202 funds, State and Federal tax credits, CDBG funds, CalHome funds **Timeframe:** 2008 and ongoing **Quantified Objective:** Construction of at least 32 new rental units (20 low-, 6 very low-, and 6 extremely low-income units).	In 2010, the City successfully competed for a $1.5 million federal grant to improve low-income multi-family rental housing. Implementation of this program is ongoing.	This program has been effectively implemented and will be continued. Redevelopment set-aside funds are no longer available to leverage. The City will pursue other funding sources.	Modify to eliminate references to the redevelopment agency and specify that funding will be sought to serve lower-income households and continue.
Program 2-3 HOUSING TRUST FUND. The City shall establish a Housing Trust Fund to provide subsidies for the development of new affordable housing, or establish a City account with the St. Joseph Community Land Trust. The fund could be capitalized with new development/housing linkage fees, real estate transfer taxes, and private donations. **Responsible Party:** Housing Division and Redevelopment Agency **Funding:** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** FY 2008	In April 2009, the City Council approved the establishment of a housing trust fund.	Due to the downturn in the economy, the elimination of redevelopment, and reduction of staff resources at the City, this program is no longer feasible and will be deleted.	Delete.

TABLE 4-61 EVALUATION OF 2008–2013 SOUTH LAKE TAHOE HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS			
Implementation Program Summary	**Status**	**Evaluation**	**Continue/ Modify/Delete**
Quantified Objective: N/A			
Program 2-4 REAL ESTATE TRANSFER TAX. The City shall adopt a Real Estate Transfer Tax (RETT) ordinance and negotiate with El Dorado County to establish the terms of collection for its half of the RETT imposed on all real estate transactions occurring within city limits. All revenues collected from the RETT shall be placed in the Housing Trust Fund, and shall be earmarked for affordable and workforce housing. **Responsible Party:** Planning Division, Housing Division, and Finance Department **Funding:** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** FY 2009 **Quantified Objective:** N/A	Adoption of a real estate transfer tax has not been feasible due to the economic recession.	If feasible, the City will consider adoption of this type of tax during the 2014–2022 planning period.	Modify to state that the City will consider adoption of a real estate transfer tax and continue.
Program 2-5 LINKAGE PROGRAM. The City shall analyze appropriate fees, thresholds of significance, standards, and criteria for a linkage program, which would connect new development to the housing demand that it creates. Once the City establishes appropriate fees and standards, the City shall consider adopting a linkage ordinance, and the fees collected from the program shall be placed in a housing trust fund to provide housing for the South Lake Tahoe workforce. The City shall consider offering developers of applicable projects one or more of the following options: • Developers shall build affordable workforce housing units; • Developers shall contribute land for the production of affordable and/or workforce housing; and • Developers shall pay an in-lieu of fee into the housing trust fund to help finance the production of affordable and/or workforce housing. The City shall consider offering incentives to developers participating in the program. **Responsible Party:** Planning Division, Housing Division, and Redevelopment Agency **Funding:** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** FY 2009 **Quantified Objective:** N/A	This program has not been implemented due to lack of political interest in increasing financial burdens on developers during the recession.	This program may become more feasible as the housing market improves and will be continued.	Continue.

TABLE 4-61 EVALUATION OF 2008–2013 SOUTH LAKE TAHOE HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS			
Implementation Program Summary	**Status**	**Evaluation**	**Continue/ Modify/Delete**
Program 2-6 PARTNERSHIPS FOR WORKFORCE HOUSING. The City shall continue to work with Barton Hospital and the Lake Tahoe Community College to develop new affordable workforce housing opportunities for hospital, college, and City employees through public-private partnerships between the employers, developers, and local government. Responsible Party: Housing Division and Planning Division Funding: Staff time, general fund Timeframe: 2008 and ongoing Quantified Objective: N/A	Implementation of this program is ongoing.	Meetings and discussions have occurred but with no concrete results to date.	Modify by combining some of Program 2-10 into this program and continue.
Program 2-7 INTER-JURISDICTIONAL COOPERATION FOR WORKFORCE HOUSING. The City shall meet with surrounding jurisdictions in the Tahoe Basin to discuss workforce housing issues and develop cooperative strategies that address identified workforce housing needs. The City shall participate with jurisdictions on the North Shore in the Housing Needs Assessment to determine the actual housing needs of the local workforce. **Responsible Party:** Planning Division and Housing Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** 2009 and ongoing **Quantified Objective:** N/A	Workforce housing issues were addressed in the Lake Tahoe Basin Prosperity Plan and the City Council Strategic Plan. Implementation of this program is ongoing.	TRPA is currently working on a Basin-wide Housing analysis.	Modify to remove the reference to the Housing Needs Assessment and continue.
Program 2-8 ANALYSIS OF FEDERAL AND STATE LANDS. The City shall analyze the potential for developing quality workforce and affordable housing on non-environmentally-sensitive lands owned by the California Tahoe Conservancy (CTC) and the United States Forest Service (USFS) located in the focus areas identified in the Background Report. The City shall ensure that important natural resources are protected and only pursue surplus lands that do not have a clear and compatible conservation or recreation purpose (i.e. bike trails, wildlife corridors). **Responsible Party:** Planning Division, Housing Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund, 20 percent set-aside funds **Timeframe:** Initial meeting with CTC and USFS: October 2009 **Begin site analysis:** December 2009 Meet with CTC and USFS to discuss options: see Program 2-9 **Quantified Objective:** N/A	City met with and evaluated potential land trade with California Tahoe Conservancy (CTC) and are still in the discussion phase regarding any potential land trade.	Parcels have been exchanged between City and CTC but not for housing purposes. The City will continue to look for housing-related parcel exchange opportunities.	Continue and combine with Program 2-9.

TABLE 4-61 EVALUATION OF 2008–2013 SOUTH LAKE TAHOE HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS			
Implementation Program Summary	**Status**	**Evaluation**	**Continue/ Modify/Delete**
Program 2-9 WORKFORCE HOUSING ON FEDERAL AND STATE LANDS. The City shall meet with the California Tahoe Conservancy (CTC) and United States Forest Service (USFS) to discuss the possibilities of developing quality workforce and affordable housing on vacant, non-environmentally sensitive CTC- and USFS-owned land located in - and adjacent to - the city limits. The City shall consider the annexation of such lands contingent upon an agreement with the CTC and USFS. **Responsible Party:** Planning Division and Housing Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund, 20 percent set-aside funds **Timeframe:** Meet with CTC and USFS to discuss options: January 2010. If necessary, initiate annexation within six months of initial meeting **Quantified Objective:** 15 low-, and 20 moderate-income housing units	City met with and evaluated potential land trade with California Tahoe Conservancy (CTC) and are still in the discussion phase regarding any potential land trade.	Parcels have been exchanged between City and CTC but not for housing purposes. The City will continue to look for housing-related parcel exchange opportunities.	This program will be combined into Program 2-8.
Program 2-10 SEASONAL EMPLOYEE HOUSING. The City shall organize workshops on public-private partnerships to assist employers of seasonal workers and local public agencies in developing a cooperative approach to meeting the housing needs of seasonal employees. **Responsible Party:** Housing Division and Planning Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** Fall 2009, ongoing **Quantified Objective:** N/A	Some portions of this program have been implemented.	The City does not have the resources to continue all aspects of this program at this time.	A portion of this program will be combined into Program 2-6 and this program will be deleted.
Program 2-11 STUDENT HOUSING. The City shall provide assistance to the Lake Tahoe Community College to examine the need for, and feasibility of, developing student housing. The City shall help facilitate new construction on campus, and identify opportunities for reuse of existing off-campus properties as permanent student housing. The City and college shall explore alternative management solutions to minimize the role of the College in maintaining student housing. **Responsible Party:** Housing Division and Planning Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** FY 2009 **Quantified Objective:** N/A	This program has not been completed and will be continued.	The City continues to meet with South Lake Tahoe Community College. Until recently the College did not express a lot of interest primarily due to lack of funds. Recently the College has begun expressing more interest in building housing.	Continue.
Program 2-12 PUBLIC EMPLOYER-ASSISTED HOUSING PROGRAM. The City shall consider establishing an Employer-Assisted Housing (EAH) program that provides financial and/or technical assistance to public service employees to reduce the cost of renting, buying, or repairing a	This program has not been successfully implemented. The City does not have the resources to	This program will not be continued.	Delete.

TABLE 4-61 EVALUATION OF 2008–2013 SOUTH LAKE TAHOE HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS			
Implementation Program Summary	**Status**	**Evaluation**	**Continue/ Modify/Delete**
home within city limits. The EAH program could include one or more of the following forms of assistance: • Low-cost mortgages; • Deferred loans; • Forgivable loans; • Grants; • Reduced sales prices for new homes; • Discounted realtor fees; • Rental assistance • Housing counseling; and • Property search assistance. **Responsible Party:** Housing Division **Funding:** Staff time, Housing Trust Fund, CDBG funds, set-aside funds, HOME funds **Timeframe:** FY 2010 **Quantified Objective:** N/A	establish this program at this time.		
Program 2-13 PRIVATE EMPLOYER-ASSISTED HOUSING PROGRAM. The City shall meet with local employers to discuss the benefits of establishing Employer-Assisted Housing (EAH) programs that provide financial and/or technical assistance to local employees to reduce the cost of buying or repairing a home within city limits. The City shall market EAH programs to local employers and ensure that government housing assistance can be used in conjunction with EAH assistance. **Responsible Party:** Housing Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund, 20 percent set-aside funds **Timeframe:** FY 2010 **Quantified Objective:** Meet with at least five major employers	This program has not been successfully implemented.	The City does not have the resources to establish this program at this time.	Delete.
Program 2-14 ASSIST NON-PROFIT HOUSING DEVELOPERS. The City shall provide technical and financial support to local, regional, and state-	Implementation of this program is	The City provided assistance for the Kelly Ridge Project completed in 2009 and has	Modify to remove references to the

TABLE 4-61
EVALUATION OF 2008–2013 SOUTH LAKE TAHOE HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS

Implementation Program Summary	Status	Evaluation	Continue/ Modify/Delete
wide not-for-profit housing sponsors that facilitate the creation of affordable housing. Such support can include the donation of City or RDA-owned sites, the use of existing City housing programs for project clients when appropriate, the prompt processing of needed applications, the preparation of funding applications, and leverage of the 20 percent Set-Aside funds. **Responsible Party:** Housing Division and Redevelopment Agency **Funding:** Staff time, set-aside funds, surplus property, Housing Trust Fund **Timeframe:** Ongoing **Quantified Objective:** 50 total units (10 extremely low-, 10 very low-, 20 low-, and 10 moderate-income units)	ongoing.	met with various other nonprofit developers on potential projects.	redevelopment agency and continue.
Program 2-15 FIRST-TIME HOMEBUYER PROGRAM. To support the creation of quality, affordable ownership housing, the City shall continue the First-Time Homebuyer program. The City shall amend the program to allow first-time homebuyers to purchase mobile homes or mobile home lots in recently subdivided mobile home parks. In addition, the City shall submit a re-use plan to utilize the loan repayments to create a pool of funds that will assist other affordable housing projects via low interest loans. **Responsible Party:** Housing Division **Funding:** Set-aside funds or other RDA funds may be leveraged with HOME funds, CDBG funds, CalHome funds **Timeframe:** 2009 and ongoing **Quantified Objective:** Creation of at least 20 new low-income homeowners in the planning period.	The City's First-Time Homebuyer Program was continued from 2009–2012 and provided 13 First-Time Homebuyer loans during that time period totaling $1,105,287. Due to reduced staff resources, as of June 2013, the First-Time Homebuyer Program is no longer accepting applications.	The City no longer has staff to administer this program.	Modify to state that the City will pursue the option of another agency administering a First-Time Homebuyer Program in the city and continue.
Program 2-16 MODERATE-INCOME HOMEBUYER PROGRAM. As funding is available, the City shall continue the Moderate-Income Homebuyer Program to support affordable ownership opportunities for moderate-income residents. The City shall amend the program to allow moderate-income first-time homebuyers to purchase mobile homes or mobile home lots in recently subdivided mobile home parks. **Responsible Party:** Housing Division **Funding:** Set-aside funds **Timeframe:** 2009 and ongoing **Quantified Objective:** Creation of 7 new moderate-income homeowners in the planning period.	The City provided funding for the Moderate-Income Homebuyer Program from 2007–2009; 12 moderate-income homebuyers were assisted with a total of $1,045,273. This program was funded by the low- and moderate-income housing funds and is no longer available due to the dissolution of the City's redevelopment agency.	This program was successful in assisting homebuyers while funding was available.	Delete.

TABLE 4-61 EVALUATION OF 2008–2013 SOUTH LAKE TAHOE HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS			
Implementation Program Summary	**Status**	**Evaluation**	**Continue/ Modify/Delete**
Program 2-17 HOMEBUYER EDUCATION PROGRAM. The City shall establish a Homebuyer Education Program. The program shall include workshops and/or the distribution of information regarding readiness to purchase a home, money management, understanding credit, obtaining a loan, shopping for a home, home maintenance, financial management, and foreclosure prevention. The City shall promote the program on the City website, through brochures available at the City offices, and/or in local newspaper advertisements, as well as through partnerships with local realtors. **Responsible Party:** Housing Division **Funding:** Set-aside funds or other RDA funds may be leveraged with HOME funds, CDBG funds, CalHome funds, Staff time **Timeframe:** Fall 2008 and ongoing **Quantified Objective:** Education of at least 20 new lower-income homeowners in the planning period.	The City initiated the "Keys to Homeownership" education program with more than 30 participants. As of 2013, this program is no longer available.	This program is no longer provided because the City does not have staff to administer it.	Delete.
Program 2-18 MITIGATION OF TRPA REGULATIONS. If not already addressed in the TRPA Pathway 2007 Regional Plan, the City shall continue to recommend that TRPA make the following changes to reduce restrictions on affordable, workforce, and mixed-use housing developments: • Allow mixed-use development in all community plans (CP) and Plan Area Statements (PAS) that allow commercial uses; • Enable mixed-use projects with an affordable multi-family housing component to be developed at maximum allowable density as if a stand-alone project rather than reducing the number of units that can be developed according to the ratio of the project area devoted to housing; • Allow the transfer of additional land coverage for deed-restricted affordable and moderate-income housing projects, even when located outside of Community Plan (CP) areas, up to 50 percent outside of CP areas and up to 70 percent within CP areas; • Provide exceptions that will allow for additional height for mixed-use and affordable housing projects to be consistent with tourist, public service, and recreation uses; • Offer fee reductions or fee deferrals for non-profit affordable housing projects;	The City participated in Regional Plan update process and continues to participate in the Regional Housing policy recommendations process. The City is in the process of preparing the Tahoe Valley Area Plan and has recently adopted the Tourist Core Area Plan which will implement many of the updated regulations from the TRPA Regional Plan.	Some of the regulatory changes which resulted from the TRPA Regional Plan update: • Mixed use now allowed in town and regional centers – Need to adopt Area Plans to amend zoning. • 70% coverage allowed in town and regional centers • Additional height allowed with adoption of an Area Plan • Transfer bonuses for residential unit transfers in to town or regional centers. • Condo subdivisions are allowed TRPA is considering greater allowance for second units as part of the regional housing policy recommendations.	Modify to refer to the 2012 TRPA Regional Plan update and remove items that have already been addressed and continue.

TABLE 4-61 EVALUATION OF 2008–2013 SOUTH LAKE TAHOE HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS			
Implementation Program Summary	**Status**	**Evaluation**	**Continue/ Modify/Delete**
• Allow bonus unit substitution to include deed-restricted workforce housing; • Facilitate development of second units by allowing them on parcels smaller than one acre, encouraging the use of bonus units for creation of deed-restricted affordable second units, and reducing fees; • Allow the subdivision of property for the development of affordable low- and moderate-income rental and owner-occupied housing; and • Based on future changes to current TRPA regulations, the City shall explore potential incentives for affordable housing developers. **Responsible Party:** Planning Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** FY 2008 **Quantified Objective:** N/A			
Program 2-19 PUBLIC EDUCATION. The City shall provide information such as a presentation/slide show (e.g., the Local Government Commission's Compact Development Compact Disc: A Toolkit to Build Support for Higher Density Housing) that describes the myths and realities of multi-family and affordable housing development. The City shall make the information available on the city website, and, when needed, shall make this presentation/slide show available to housing advocates and to developers involved in local affordable housing projects. The City shall encourage local housing advocates to make presentations to local builders and developers, Chamber of Commerce, civic groups, and the local community. Additionally, the City shall publicize the Affordable Housing Resources page of the City's Housing Division website as a source of information on housing programs (e.g., brochure available at the planning counter). **Responsible Party:** Housing Division and Planning Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** FY 2008 and ongoing **Quantified Objective:** N/A	The City created public education materials and posted on them on the City website, attended business expo workshops to promote housing programs, and presented a Housing PowerPoint to local Realtors. Implementation of this program is ongoing.	This program will be continued.	Modify to correct the information available on the Housing Division website and continue.
Program 2-20 PUBLICIZE AVAILABLE PROGRAMS. The City shall continue to publicize programs, such as the First-Time Homebuyer Program and Housing Rehabilitation Program, currently available to South Lake Tahoe residents by making brochures available at the Planning Division and Housing Division offices, posting information on the City's website, and distributing	Information on these programs was posted on the City's website and provided at workshops and expos in addition to being available at City Hall. The City made at least	The City will pursue the option of another agency administering a First-Time Homebuyer Program in the city.	Modify to publicize current programs available to City residents and

TABLE 4-61 EVALUATION OF 2008–2013 SOUTH LAKE TAHOE HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS			
Implementation Program Summary	**Status**	**Evaluation**	**Continue/ Modify/Delete**
information to an e-mail contact database. **Responsible Party:** Housing Division and Planning Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** FY 2009 and ongoing **Quantified Objective:** N/A	10 presentations to the community between 2009 and 2012. Due to reduced staff resources, as of June 2013, the First-Time Homebuyer Program and Housing Rehabilitation Program are no longer accepting applications.		continue.
Program 2-21 PUBLICIZE FORECLOSURE ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS. The City shall post information on the City website about existing toll-free hotlines, foreclosure counseling, foreclosure prevention programs, and other resources available for residents facing possible foreclosures. **Responsible Party:** Housing Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** FY 2008 **Quantified Objective:** N/A	This program has not been implemented and foreclosures are no longer as significant of an issue in the City. The City does not have resources to devote to this program at this time. The program will not be continued.	N/A	Delete.
Program 3-1 REHABILITATION LOAN PROGRAM. The City shall regularly complete an application for rehabilitation funds, and continue to target the Rehabilitation Loan Program to both single- and multi-family dwellings occupied by lower-income households. The City shall require that owner-investor rental properties remain affordable for at least three years. As part of rehabilitation improvements, the City shall also address installation of Best Management Practices required for water quality improvements. The City shall market the Rehabilitation Loan Program, and other City housing programs, through a variety of forums, not limited to: • continued mailing to all City property owners marketing the availability of housing programs; • speaking at meetings of various community groups; • the City website; • brochures available at the City offices; • at individual client consultations; • at locally sponsored housing fairs; and	Four rehabilitation loans totaling $110,550 have been made by the City since the beginning of 2009. Information about the program is posted on City's website. Implementation of this program is ongoing. This program is no longer operational due to reductions in staff resources. The City will continue to pursue funds for rehabilitation, when feasible. It is anticipated that funds secured would be administered by another agency through an agreement with the City.	This program has been successful. The City will continue to work toward arrangements to continue assisting with rehabilitation in the City within the constraints of limited staffing.	Modify to state that the City will pursue the option of another agency administering a Rehabilitation Loan Program in the city and continue.

TABLE 4-61 EVALUATION OF 2008–2013 SOUTH LAKE TAHOE HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS			
Implementation Program Summary	**Status**	**Evaluation**	**Continue/ Modify/Delete**
• in collaboration with local realtors, lenders, and escrow companies. **Responsible Party:** Housing Division **Funding:** CDBG, HOME funds, CalHome funds, CA Rental Housing Rehabilitation Program, set-aside funds **Timeframe:** 2008 and ongoing **Quantified Objective:** 20 low-income owner-occupied units and 5 low-income rental units.			
Program 3-2 REHABILITATION LOAN PROGRAM EXPANSION. Since current funding sources limit the Rehabilitation Loan Program to low-income households, the City shall explore alternative funding options to fund expansion of the program to include moderate-income households. Expansion of the program is predicated upon securing adequate funds for operation. **Responsible Party:** Housing Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund, and TBD **Timeframe:** Ongoing **Quantified Objective:** Rehabilitation of 10 moderate-income owner-occupied housing units	Due to a lack of staff to implement the Rehabilitation Loan Program this program will not be continued. Efforts will focus on maintaining some option for rehabilitation for citizens of South Lake Tahoe.	This program was not successfully implemented due to a reduction in City resources.	Delete.
Program 3-3 MULTIPLE FAMILY DWELLING INSPECTION AND MAINTENANCE PROGRAM EXPANSION. The City shall consider expanding the Multiple Family Dwelling Inspection and Maintenance Program to include multi-family projects containing fewer units contingent upon adequate funding. **Responsible Party:** Building Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** February 2009 **Quantified Objective:** N/A	Expansion of the Multiple Family Dwelling Inspection and Maintenance Program was approved by the City Council in late 2010.	The City Council expanded the program to properties with six units or more on their meeting on September 17, 2013.	Continue.
Program 3-4 PRESERVING MOBILE HOME PARKS. The City shall examine mobile home parks and identify those mobile home parks in which the park infrastructure and the majority of units are feasible to preserve, and those mobile home parks in need of replacement. Upon request, the City shall assist mobile home park owners in applying for state funds to rehabilitate park infrastructure and assist park residents in applying for state aid from the Mobilehome Park Resident Ownership Program (MPROP) to purchase the park. Additionally, the City will continue to provide loans for mobile home repairs and rehabilitations through the Rehabilitation Loan program (See	The City developed a high-medium-low risk Mobile Home Park evaluation and rated all parks in the City for needed improvement. Implementation of this program is ongoing. No park owners have been assisted in apply for funding for rehabilitation.	This program has been partially implemented and will be continued.	Modify to remove the task of identifying mobile homes in need of replacement and continue.

TABLE 4-61 EVALUATION OF 2008–2013 SOUTH LAKE TAHOE HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS			
Implementation Program Summary	**Status**	**Evaluation**	**Continue/ Modify/Delete**
Program 3-1), and contact mobile home parks that are eligible for the loans. **Responsible Party:** Housing Division and Planning Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund, HOME and CDBG funds **Timeframe:** FY 2009, and ongoing **Quantified Objective:** N/A			
Program 3-5 MOBILE HOME PARK ORDINANCES. The City shall modify the mobile home parks ordinances to: • Address conversion of mobile home parks to other uses (quantifying what constitutes a change of use, the definition of "cessation", such as all or part of a park, immediately or gradually when relocation payment is required, etc.); • Reduce the 10-acre new park requirement to a size appropriate for development of a quality park with amenities for its residents (possibly five acres); • Consider taking over the Title 25 mobile home park inspection program/enforcement, while ensuring that the City can afford to do so within State-prescribed fees; and/or • Address design and amenities required in new and enlarged parks, such as fencing requirements. **Responsible Party:** Planning Division and Building Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** FY 2010 **Quantified Objective:** N/A	This program has not been implemented and will be continued.	This program was not implemented as it wasn't a priority for use of limited staff time.	Continue.
Program 3-6 ACQUISITION OF AT-RISK PROPERTIES. The City shall continue to provide technical and financial assistance to the St. Joseph Community Land Trust and other non-profit housing organizations that might be interested in, and have the capacity to, step in to acquire and rehabilitate at-risk or substandard properties to maintain, or create, long-term, affordable rental housing. **Responsible Party:** Planning Division and Housing Division **Funding:** Staff time, Set-Aside funds, Housing **Timeframe:** Ongoing **Quantified Objective:** N/A	The City has provided assistance as needed. Implementation of this program is ongoing.	The City continues to assist when projects arise or units become at-risk of converting to market rate. This program has been successfully implemented when needed.	Continue.

TABLE 4-61 EVALUATION OF 2008–2013 SOUTH LAKE TAHOE HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS			
Implementation Program Summary	**Status**	**Evaluation**	**Continue/ Modify/Delete**
Program 3-7 ANALYSIS OF BARRIERS TO MOTEL CONVERSIONS. The City shall analyze the barriers to converting motel properties to deed-restricted, affordable housing. **Responsible Party:** Planning Division, Housing Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** FY 2010 **Quantified Objective:** N/A	This program has not been implemented and will be continued. The barriers to motel conversions surround the issue of Tourist Accommodation Units (TAU) as opposed to Residential Units of Use (RUU). Affordable units can only be created using RUUs.	The opportunity to convert a motel property did not occur during this planning period but the program will remain in place for the next planning period.	Continue.
Program 4-1 REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION. The City shall review and amend, if necessary, its Code of Ordinances to provide individuals, family members, caregivers, and/or anyone acting on behalf of the person with disabilities reasonable accommodation in rules, policies, practices, and procedures that may be necessary to ensure equal access to housing. **Responsible Party:** Building Division, Planning Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** FY 2009 **Quantified Objective:** N/A	This program has not been implemented. TRPA has land use and environmental regulatory authority in the Tahoe region. As a result, the City must adhere to TRPA plans and regulations adopted pursuant to the Bi-State Compact, including land use regulation. All changes to land use regulation, including zoning, are required to be approved by TRPA. In 2007 the TRPA Governing Board directed TRPA staff not to accept Plan Area Statements or Community Plan Amendments that were not health and safety related until the Regional Plan update was completed. As part of the Regional Plan update TRPA made very few changes to address housing issues. However, in February 2013, the Governing Board directed staff to prioritize an evaluation of affordable housing policies which would involve a focused review of housing affordability and would presumably result in zoning and code amendments to improve the	The City will continue to work toward changes to TRPA regulations that will allow the City to have an HCD-compliant reasonable accommodation procedure or ordinance within the 2014–2022 planning period.	Combine with Program 4-4 and 4-2.

TABLE 4-61 EVALUATION OF 2008–2013 SOUTH LAKE TAHOE HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS			
Implementation Program Summary	**Status**	**Evaluation**	**Continue/ Modify/Delete**
	availability of more affordable housing options.		
Program 4-2 PUBLICIZING REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION. The City shall create a public information brochure on reasonable accommodation for disabled persons and provide that information on the City's website. **Responsible Party:** Building Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** FY 2010 **Quantified Objective:** N/A	This program has not been implemented for the same reasons detailed under Program 4-1.	This program will be combined with Program 4-1.	Combine with Program 4-1 and 4-4.
Program 4-3 UNIVERSAL DESIGN. The City shall adopt specific universal design standards for new construction and rehabilitation to encourage accessibility to the greatest extent possible. **Responsible Party:** Planning Division, Housing Division, and Building Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** FY 2010 **Quantified Objective:** N/A	This program has not been implemented and will be continued.	This program was not implemented as it wasn't a priority for use of limited staff time.	Continue.
Program 4-4 INCREASED LAND COVERAGE FOR ACCESSIBILITY. The City shall work with TRPA to devise methods for accommodating requests by persons with disabilities for additional land coverage for necessary site improvements. The City shall explore the following alternatives as possible means of accommodating the special requests: • TRPA accepting a mitigation fee for excess land coverage that the City could help fund; • CTC providing coverage from their land bank at a discounted rate; or • The City maintaining a bank of land coverage that can be used to help with special requests. **Responsible Party:** Planning Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** FY 2010 **Quantified Objective:** N/A	This program has not been implemented. TRPA has land use and environmental regulatory authority in the Tahoe Region. As a result, the City must adhere to TRPA plans and regulations adopted pursuant to the Compact, including land use regulation. All changes to land use regulation, including zoning, are required to be approved by TRPA. In 2007 the TRPA Governing Board directed TRPA staff not to accept Plan Area Statements or Community Plan Amendments that were not health and safety related until the Regional Plan update was	The exception was included in the Regional Plan update.	Modify to explain that the City will continue its efforts within the constraints of TRPA regulations and combine with Program 4-1.

TABLE 4-61 EVALUATION OF 2008–2013 SOUTH LAKE TAHOE HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS			
Implementation Program Summary	**Status**	**Evaluation**	**Continue/ Modify/Delete**
	completed. Chapter 30, Land Coverage, of the updated TRPA Code of Ordinances includes an opportunity for reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities. Specifically, development which is required to be compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is exempt from the calculation of land coverage. This exemption does not apply however to the land coverages associated with parking and other vehicular uses. This accommodation allows for greater ADA accessibility in existing public/commercial facilities and private residences. In February 2013, the Governing Board directed staff to prioritize an evaluation of affordable housing policies which would involve a focused review of housing affordability and would presumably result in zoning and code amendments to improve the availability of more affordable housing options. The City will continue to work on allowing other land coverage reductions to accommodate those with disabilities within the confines of TRPA regulations.		
Program 4-5 EMERGENCY SHELTERS. The City shall hold discussions with surrounding jurisdictions to determine how to address the needs of homeless residents, and identify potential sites and funding sources for an emergency shelter.	Implementation of this program is ongoing. Discussions with surrounding jurisdictions have occurred.	This program has been successfully implemented and will be continued.	Combine with Program 4-8 and continue.

TABLE 4-61 EVALUATION OF 2008–2013 SOUTH LAKE TAHOE HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS			
Implementation Program Summary	**Status**	**Evaluation**	**Continue/ Modify/Delete**
Responsible Party: Housing Division and Planning Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** Ongoing **Quantified Objective:** N/A			
Program 4-6 SENIORS HELPING SENIORS. If funding is available, the City shall establish a program to provide free assistance for minor home repairs, including energy efficiency and weatherization improvements, to low-income senior homeowners in South Lake Tahoe. When possible, the City shall send a qualified senior tradesman to perform the repairs. The program will provide needed home repairs for senior homeowners and additional income for senior tradesmen. **Responsible Party:** Housing Division, Planning Division, and Redevelopment Agency **Funding:** Staff time, general fund, set-aside funds **Timeframe:** FY 2010 **Quantified Objective:** Repairs to 20 senior households	This program has not been successfully implemented.	The City does not have the resources to establish this program at this time.	Delete.
Program 4-7 FAMILY HOUSING. The City shall provide regulatory incentives (e.g., parking reductions) to developers of multi-family housing projects that include three- and four-bedroom units. **Responsible Party:** Planning Division, Housing Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** Ongoing **Quantified Objective:** N/A	Implementation of this program is ongoing.	This program will be continued.	Modify to include single-family units and continue.
Program 4-8 DEFINITION OF MULTI-PERSON DWELLING. To clarify that emergency shelters, transitional and supportive housing, and single-room occupancy housing are allowed without a conditional use permit or other discretionary action in Plan Area Statements that allow multi-person dwellings, the City shall recommend that TRPA revise the definition of Multi-Person Dwelling to include the aforementioned uses. The City shall also recommend that TRPA add definitions of transitional and supportive housing to Chapter 2 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances that explain that such uses are subject to the same restrictions that apply to other residential uses of the same type in the same zone. **Responsible Party:** Planning Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund	This program has not been fully implemented. TRPA has land use and environmental regulatory authority in the Tahoe Region. As a result, the City must adhere to TRPA plans and regulations adopted pursuant to the Compact, including land use regulation. All changes to land use regulation, including zoning, are required to be approved by TRPA. In 2007 the TRPA Governing Board directed TRPA staff not to accept Plan Area	The City has worked with TRPA to confirm that the Social Service Organization use in the TRPA Code of Ordinances includes emergency shelter uses. This use is allowed without a conditional use permit in five Plan Areas/Area Plans/Community Plans or subareas in the City. Additionally Program 2-10 proposes to create a separate definition of emergency shelter in the TRPA Code of Ordinances. The portion of this program proposing to allow transitional and supportive housing	Delete.

TABLE 4-61 EVALUATION OF 2008–2013 SOUTH LAKE TAHOE HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS			
Implementation Program Summary	**Status**	**Evaluation**	**Continue/ Modify/Delete**
Timeframe: FY 2009 **Quantified Objective:** N/A	Statements or Community Plan Amendments that were not health and safety related until the Regional Plan update was completed. As part of the Regional Plan update TRPA made very few changes to address housing issues. However, in February 2013, the Governing Board directed staff to prioritize an evaluation of affordable housing policies which would involve a focused review of housing affordability and would presumably result in zoning and code amendments to improve the availability of more affordable housing options.	per state law has not been implemented and has been added to Program 2-10. The portion of this program to allow single-room occupancy housing has not been implemented and has been modified and added to Program 2-10.	
Program 5-1 HOUSING ISSUES HOTLINE. The City shall continue to use the bilingual Housing Issues Hotline and/or other effective means to ensure the dissemination of fair housing information and available services. The City shall continue to disseminate fair housing information through radio ads, local newspapers, through distribution of printed materials and/or at community meetings. The City shall provide appropriate follow-through in response to housing concerns and complaints through either Building Division inspections or appropriate housing referrals to: • existing affordable housing projects within the city; • the El Dorado County Community Services/Housing Choice Voucher Program; • the State of California's Landlord/Tenant Dispute line or Mobile home Park Ombudsman; • the Voluntary Action Center (low cost legal assistance in resolving housing issues); • the Women's Center for transitional housing opportunities for women escaping violent situations;	The Housing Issues Hotline assisted with approximately 2,000 housing issues cases in between 2009 and September 2013. Implementation of this program is ongoing.	This program has been effective.	Continue.

TABLE 4-61 EVALUATION OF 2008–2013 SOUTH LAKE TAHOE HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS			
Implementation Program Summary	**Status**	**Evaluation**	**Continue/ Modify/Delete**
• the El Dorado County Health Department; and • the California Department of Fair Housing and Employment. **Responsible Party:** Housing Division **Funding:** Set-aside funds **Timeframe:** Ongoing **Quantified Objective:** N/A			
Program 5-2 DEPOSIT LOAN PROGRAM. The City shall explore reinstating a deposit loan program to help residents who are displaced when multi-family housing is deemed uninhabitable with payment of first and last months' rent, and security deposit. The City shall explore best management practices for proper enforcement and administration of the program. **Responsible Party:** Housing Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund, set-aside funds **Timeframe:** Ongoing **Quantified Objective:** N/A	This program has not been successfully implemented.	The City does not have the resources to establish this program at this time.	Delete.
Program 6-1 ENERGY CONSERVATION. The City shall continue to provide funds for energy conservation and weatherization through the City's Housing Rehabilitation Program. The City shall also continue to pursue grants from the gas and electric companies to cover a portion of the cost for energy conservation improvements. **Responsible Party:** Housing Division **Funding:** CDBG, Set-Aside funds, HOME funds, CDBG funds, CalHome funds **Timeframe:** Ongoing **Quantified Objective:** 25 retrofitted units	The City submitted federal and state grant applications but did not receive funding. The City continues to apply for funding when options are available.	Due to reduced staff resources, as of June 2013, the Housing Rehabilitation Program is no longer accepting applications.	Delete.
Program 6-2 GREEN BUILDING ORDINANCE. The City shall consider adopting a green building ordinance that would reward developers for building green projects. The City shall rely on nationally accepted standards, such as Build it Green or Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED), to define a "green project" or "green building", and amend the City Code to include the definitions. **Responsible Party:** Planning Division, Building Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** FY 2009	The City adopted a green building incentive program in November 2010.	This program was not effective primarily because no project applications were approved requesting green incentives.	Modify to note that the City has adopted a green building incentive program and continue.

TABLE 4-61 EVALUATION OF 2008–2013 SOUTH LAKE TAHOE HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS			
Implementation Program Summary	**Status**	**Evaluation**	**Continue/ Modify/Delete**
Quantified Objective: N/A			
Program 6-3 FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR GREEN, AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROJECTS. The City shall research state, federal, and private financial assistance programs available for the development of green, affordable housing. The City will post information about the available financial assistance programs (e.g., Enterprise Green Communities, State and Federal Tax Credit Programs) on the City website. **Responsible Party:** Planning Division, Housing Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** FY 2009 **Quantified Objective:** N/A	This program has not been implemented and will be modified and continued.	This program will be modified and continued.	Modify to eliminate City financial assistance but continue providing information about opportunities for energy conservation funding and assistance.
Program 7-1 MAINTAINING NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER. The City shall work with project proponents and community special interest groups to integrate affordable and workforce housing into existing neighborhoods–including smaller duplex and triplex projects–while addressing local concerns and maintaining the character and environmental quality of the surrounding area. **Responsible Party:** Planning Division and Housing Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** Ongoing **Quantified Objective:** N/A	Implementation of this program is ongoing.	The City has successfully worked with property owners and will continue to reach out to other groups moving forward.	Continue.
Program 7-2 AMENITIES FOR NEW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT. The City shall modify design guidelines to address and/or include requirements for residential projects of eight units or more to include appropriate amenities. The City shall assure that the modified guidelines do not unduly impact the cost of development and approval certainty, or otherwise unfairly burden the developer. **Responsible Party:** Planning Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** FY 2010 **Quantified Objective:** N/A	An administrative draft of Design Guidelines was completed.	The guidelines have not been completed and adopted but will be adopted in 2015.	Continue.
Program 8-1 IMPLEMENTATION TRACKING MATRIX. The City shall use the Implementation Tracking Matrix (see Table 4-1) to continually track	The City continues to track implementation of the Housing	This program has been effective.	Continue.

TABLE 4-61 EVALUATION OF 2008–2013 SOUTH LAKE TAHOE HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS			
Implementation Program Summary	**Status**	**Evaluation**	**Continue/ Modify/Delete**
the progress of Housing Element programs. **Responsible Party:** Housing Division, Planning Division, and Redevelopment Agency **Funding:** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** Ongoing **Quantified Objective:** N/A	Element programs. Implementation of this program is ongoing.		
Program 8-2 BI-ANNUAL STAFF MEETINGS. The City staff members involved in the implementation of Housing Element programs shall meet quarterly to review progress in addressing housing issues, especially issues relating to workforce housing. **Responsible Party:** Housing Division, Planning Division, and Redevelopment Agency **Funding:** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** Quarterly **Quantified Objective:** N/A	The City no longer has staff working solely on housing issues.	This program has been effective. The timing will be modified to fit with current staffing resources.	Modify to include discussion of housing issues in weekly Planning and Building staff meetings.
Program 8-3 REPORTING HOUSING ELEMENT IMPLEMENTATION. The City shall annually review and report on the implementation of Housing Element programs and the City's effectiveness in meeting the programs' objectives. **Responsible Party:** Housing Division and Planning Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** Annually **Quantified Objective:** N/A	The City completes Housing Element annual reports each year.	This program has been effective.	Continue.
Program 8-4 ANNUAL REAL ESTATE MARKET MONITORING. The City shall establish and implement a comprehensive annual monitoring program to document the sales prices or rental rates for all new units constructed or rehabilitated in the previous year and to determine housing affordability levels. The City shall also regularly monitor housing sales price trends of existing units. **Responsible Party:** Housing Division **Funding:** Staff time, general fund **Timeframe:** Annually **Quantified Objective:** N/A	This program has not been successfully implemented.	The City does not have the resources to establish this program at this time.	Delete.

TABLE 4-61 EVALUATION OF 2008–2013 SOUTH LAKE TAHOE HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS			
Implementation Program Summary	**Status**	**Evaluation**	**Continue/ Modify/Delete**
Program 8-5 REDEVELOPMENT IMPLEMENTATION PLAN. The City shall continue to revise the Redevelopment Agency Inclusionary Housing Plan to be consistent with this updated Housing Element. Include it in the Five-Year Redevelopment Implementation Plan (due in 2010). **Responsible Party:** Redevelopment Agency and Housing Division **Funding:** Staff time, general funds **Timeframe:** FY 2008 **Quantified Objective:** N/A	The five-year update draft of the Redevelopment Implementation Plan was completed. Due to the dissolution of the City's redevelopment agency, this program will not be continued.	This program is no longer applicable due to the dissolution of the redevelopment agency.	Delete.

REFERENCES

Bijou/Al Tahoe Community Plan, Land Use Element. 1995.

Bledsoe, Tim. South Lake Tahoe Public Utilities District (STPUD). Personal Communication. December 17, 2013.

Cecchettini, Amy. California Tahoe Conservancy (CTC). Personal Communication. December 17, 2013.

City of South Lake Tahoe Code of Ordinances. 2013.

City of South Lake Tahoe Planning Division Service Fee Schedule. 2012.

City of South Lake Tahoe. Comprehensive Annual Financial Report. 2012.

Craigslist.org. 2013. Rental Listings for South Lake Tahoe, May 1 through July 1 2013.

DOF (California Department of Finance). 2007. http://www.dof.ca.gov

EDD (California Employment Development Department), Employment by Industry. http://edd.ca.gov. July 2013.

Goldfarb & Lipman, LLC., SB 1818 Q & A.

HCD (California Department of Housing and Community Development). 2013. 2013 State Income Limits.

Parsons HBA. 2003. Housing Conditions Survey Report.

National Homebuyers Fund, Inc. 2013. Personal correspondence with staff.

Sacramento Area Council of Governments. 2012. Housing Element Data Packet.

———. 2012. Regional Housing Needs Plan, 2013–2021.

South Tahoe Association of Realtors. 2013. Multiple Listing Service.

South Tahoe Public Utility District. 2012. Comprehensive Annual Financial Report.

———. 2013. Urban Water Management Plan, 2010 Update.

Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan. 1994. Land Use Element.

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency. 2009. Application Filing Fee Schedule.

———. 2012. Code of Ordinances.

HUD (US Department of Housing and Urban Development). 2013. Consolidated Plan and Continuum of Care Planning Tool.

———. 2013. Fair Market Rent User Data Sets, Fiscal Year 2013.

———. 2013. Fiscal Year 2013 El Dorado County Income Limits.

US Census Bureau. 1990 Census.

———.2000 Census.

———.2008-2010 American Community Study.

———.2010 Census.

———. 2013. Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics, OnTheMap application. http://onthemap.ces.census.gov/.

US Department of Agriculture. 2007. Census of Agriculture.

US Social Security Administration. 2007. http://www.ssa.gov. .

Zillow.com. 2013. Thirty Year Fixed Mortgage Rates.

APPENDIX A: PUBLIC MEETING PARTICIPANTS

Workshop #1: Attendees

David Jinkens

Craig Woodward

Planning Commissioners

Workshop #2 Attendees

Lyn Barnett

Tim Ganyo

David Jinkens

Leanne Wagner

Craig Woodward

Gary Bowen

Planning Commissioners

2/18/2014 Presentation to City Council – Speakers

Ed Mosier

City Council members

APPENDIX B – VACANT PARCELS

APN	PAS/CP	Name of PAS/CP	Acres	IPES	Housing Types	Density (units/acre)	Bonus Units	Preferred AH	Multi-Unit Incentive	Max Unit Capacity	Realistic Unit Capacity
028-161-11	085	Lakeview Heights	0.81775956875	377	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
030-403-02	085	Lakeview Heights	0.44775532295	408	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
028-111-04	085	Lakeview Heights	0.61525611782	423	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
030-352-04	085	Lakeview Heights	0.25137520113	427	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
030-403-06	085	Lakeview Heights	0.30935741517	427	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
028-161-10	085	Lakeview Heights	0.86245057748	431	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
028-153-05	085	Lakeview Heights	0.42126842969	465	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
028-161-14	085	Lakeview Heights	0.39092807559	492	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
028-154-02	085	Lakeview Heights	0.78153517926	506	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
028-123-09	085	Lakeview Heights	0.16030500250	600	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
028-111-09	085	Lakeview Heights	0.26446190707	611	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
028-051-30	085	Lakeview Heights	0.22971451547	613	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
028-111-06	085	Lakeview Heights	0.44372916015	617	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
028-122-20	085	Lakeview Heights	0.13779457511	627	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
030-352-30	085	Lakeview Heights	0.35298219825	628	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
028-070-14	085	Lakeview Heights	0.25716041804	637	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
028-152-40	085	Lakeview Heights	0.38353712530	641	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-510-64	085	Lakeview Heights	0.26467730630	646	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
028-090-93	085	Lakeview Heights	0.30345080279	646	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
030-352-23	085	Lakeview Heights	0.27496100240	650	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
028-052-07	085	Lakeview Heights	0.23523847903	655	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-510-75	085	Lakeview Heights	0.26731213213	658	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
028-070-20	085	Lakeview Heights	0.25541747092	659	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
028-051-17	085	Lakeview Heights	0.22991104959	662	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-770-03	085	Lakeview Heights	0.26640033576	666	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-510-72	085	Lakeview Heights	0.26506369941	667	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-321-01	085	Lakeview Heights	0.27840738496	669	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
030-352-15	085	Lakeview Heights	0.27425588544	678	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
029-415-04	085	Lakeview Heights	0.24080473529	681	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
030-353-05	085	Lakeview Heights	0.24142102825	683	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
030-352-26	085	Lakeview Heights	0.24367443936	688	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
028-131-18	085	Lakeview Heights	0.22813476306	691	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
028-123-07	085	Lakeview Heights	0.21877536233	693	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
030-380-58	085	Lakeview Heights	0.26439149125	693	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-770-04	085	Lakeview Heights	0.51248616417	696	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
030-352-09	085	Lakeview Heights	0.27224633335	705	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1

APN	PAS/CP	Name of PAS/CP	Acres	IPES	Housing Types	Density (units/acre)	Bonus Units	Preferred AH	Multi-Unit Incentive	Max Unit Capacity	Realistic Unit Capacity
028-320-07	085	Lakeview Heights	0.22296061929	709	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
028-320-08	085	Lakeview Heights	0.21781441113	709	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
029-421-03	085	Lakeview Heights	0.22678169244	709	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
028-062-13	085	Lakeview Heights	0.22957271580	719	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
029-391-23	085	Lakeview Heights	0.29412206582	721	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
029-422-22	085	Lakeview Heights	0.19949452773	721	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
028-052-04	085	Lakeview Heights	0.22968430085	726	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
030-351-13	085	Lakeview Heights	0.26773926634	726	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
028-100-31	085	Lakeview Heights	0.20511959158	727	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
029-421-02	085	Lakeview Heights	0.26607808977	741	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
028-070-28	085	Lakeview Heights	0.22219457302	742	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
028-061-46	085	Lakeview Heights	0.23982702472	746	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
028-100-26	085	Lakeview Heights	0.24784883833	747	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
030-380-42	085	Lakeview Heights	0.26579107929	747	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-580-14	085	Lakeview Heights	1.12773642187	752	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
028-061-07	085	Lakeview Heights	0.22995114402	753	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
028-100-39	085	Lakeview Heights	0.23069231371	753	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
028-052-12	085	Lakeview Heights	0.23119578633	757	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
030-380-55	085	Lakeview Heights	1.02850985947	769	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
029-300-14	085	Lakeview Heights	0.48203577757	777	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
030-353-04	085	Lakeview Heights	0.21631330228	777	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
030-380-70	085	Lakeview Heights	0.28694734962	777	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
030-351-06	085	Lakeview Heights	0.27490215760	780	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
028-190-31	085	Lakeview Heights	0.26604037887	817	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
028-082-01	085	Lakeview Heights	0.30334287820	835	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
028-062-04	085	Lakeview Heights	0.23044330301	840	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
029-106-05	090	Tahoe Meadows	0.36748959473	464	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
029-104-07	090	Tahoe Meadows	0.11478750459	749	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
029-105-28	090	Tahoe Meadows	0.59441922622	754	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
029-094-03	090	Tahoe Meadows	0.17216870807	785	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
029-104-04	090	Tahoe Meadows	0.11484761191	790	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
029-094-01	090	Tahoe Meadows	0.11443741183	804	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
029-104-10	090	Tahoe Meadows	0.11471730189	807	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
029-104-06	090	Tahoe Meadows	0.11499683137	808	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
029-104-08	090	Tahoe Meadows	0.11471747422	813	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
029-104-09	090	Tahoe Meadows	0.11471677000	814	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
029-104-05	090	Tahoe Meadows	0.11463524421	816	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
029-104-03	090	Tahoe Meadows	0.12611523230	825	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1

APN	PAS/CP	Name of PAS/CP	Acres	IPES	Housing Types	Density (units/acre)	Bonus Units	Preferred AH	Multi-Unit Incentive	Max Unit Capacity	Realistic Unit Capacity
029-094-02	090	Tahoe Meadows	0.11482752468	828	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
029-104-02	090	Tahoe Meadows	0.11736909574	828	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
029-094-04	090	Tahoe Meadows	0.17222553246	867	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
029-095-21	090	Tahoe Meadows	0.37456243793	917	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
029-091-14	090	Tahoe Meadows	0.31141650749	936	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
027-113-17	093 SA-1	Bijou	0.11485345278	673	SFR	1 unit per parcel	30 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
027-113-19	093 SA-1	Bijou	0.11484159779	702	SFR	1 unit per parcel	30 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
027-112-09	093 SA-1	Bijou	0.11484197439	713	SFR	1 unit per parcel	30 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
027-355-17	093 SA-1	Bijou	0.35758762009	840	SFR	1 unit per parcel	30 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
027-354-15	093 SA-1	Bijou	0.17211600446	891	SFR	1 unit per parcel	30 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
027-202-12	093 SA-1	Bijou	0.21818119525	915	SFR	1 unit per parcel	30 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
027-342-17	093 SA-1	Bijou	0.17227813810	968	SFR	1 unit per parcel	30 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
025-371-06	097	Bijou Pines	0.13770630746	665	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
027-251-01	097	Bijou Pines	0.93474809016	789	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-373-01	097	Bijou Pines	0.11792068416	805	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-372-17	097	Bijou Pines	0.11484733701	812	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-371-02	097	Bijou Pines	0.13783178113	816	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
027-251-18	097	Bijou Pines	0.81663409690	816	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-372-06	097	Bijou Pines	0.12397411616	822	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
027-222-18	097	Bijou Pines	0.12732911011	827	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-374-03	097	Bijou Pines	0.12398846420	830	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
027-222-07	097	Bijou Pines	0.11479032241	839	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
027-225-28	097	Bijou Pines	0.11487067046	840	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
027-235-18	097	Bijou Pines	0.12901782194	846	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-372-28	097	Bijou Pines	0.12478938150	849	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-374-02	097	Bijou Pines	0.12398846420	859	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-375-32	097	Bijou Pines	0.12851282600	868	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
027-233-26	097	Bijou Pines	0.11487104704	874	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
027-241-30	097	Bijou Pines	0.56023346008	874	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-377-09	097	Bijou Pines	0.13921315424	880	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
027-251-16	097	Bijou Pines	0.21284336974	901	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
027-235-21	097	Bijou Pines	0.13239669281	914	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
027-235-15	097	Bijou Pines	0.14238156929	935	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
027-364-15	097	Bijou Pines	0.55657805295	939	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
027-221-45	097	Bijou Pines	0.18589445594	973	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
027-231-42	097	Bijou Pines	0.12062709835	980	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
026-145-10	099	Al Tahoe	0.13795664003	690	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-122-15	099	Al Tahoe	0.23659566017	736	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1

APN	PAS/CP	Name of PAS/CP	Acres	IPES	Housing Types	Density (units/acre)	Bonus Units	Preferred AH	Multi-Unit Incentive	Max Unit Capacity	Realistic Unit Capacity
026-061-07	099	Al Tahoe	0.24311916703	739	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-154-29	099	Al Tahoe	0.11491658598	758	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-061-05	099	Al Tahoe	0.17401899043	762	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-061-08	099	Al Tahoe	0.17509496906	777	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-142-03	099	Al Tahoe	0.13235661687	783	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-061-06	099	Al Tahoe	0.21417767587	793	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-134-14	099	Al Tahoe	0.13776437649	806	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-153-09	099	Al Tahoe	0.13499234172	808	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-061-14	099	Al Tahoe	0.14743205834	815	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-097-02	099	Al Tahoe	0.13804235541	834	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-153-11	099	Al Tahoe	0.13405916458	834	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-061-13	099	Al Tahoe	0.18554184850	846	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-061-15	099	Al Tahoe	0.18043055828	859	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-098-16	099	Al Tahoe	0.13785667836	866	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-061-12	099	Al Tahoe	0.21395968003	868	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-094-23	099	Al Tahoe	0.15332962604	870	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-123-05	099	Al Tahoe	0.13731815100	871	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-124-07	099	Al Tahoe	0.13795664004	871	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-125-09	099	Al Tahoe	0.13785667834	874	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-096-05	099	Al Tahoe	0.13785620386	878	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-125-06	099	Al Tahoe	0.13776437645	879	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-131-08	099	Al Tahoe	0.13795664003	879	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-091-16	099	Al Tahoe	0.16547397861	884	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-096-04	099	Al Tahoe	0.13795664004	884	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-097-11	099	Al Tahoe	0.13785620386	885	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-124-18	099	Al Tahoe	0.13804235537	887	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-139-26	099	Al Tahoe	0.14442760344	887	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-109-13	099	Al Tahoe	0.13795651951	890	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-095-12	099	Al Tahoe	0.13793942237	895	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-095-14	099	Al Tahoe	0.13776485102	895	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-097-08	099	Al Tahoe	0.13785620388	895	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-124-04	099	Al Tahoe	0.13776437650	895	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-123-06	099	Al Tahoe	0.13785667838	902	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-139-35	099	Al Tahoe	0.14268453175	903	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-139-08	099	Al Tahoe	0.13795664003	905	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-135-17	099	Al Tahoe	0.13776473048	907	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-107-09	099	Al Tahoe	0.13776483689	917	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-109-15	099	Al Tahoe	0.13712551659	917	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1

APN	PAS/CP	Name of PAS/CP	Acres	IPES	Housing Types	Density (units/acre)	Bonus Units	Preferred AH	Multi-Unit Incentive	Max Unit Capacity	Realistic Unit Capacity
026-123-03	099	Al Tahoe	0.13793942240	917	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-134-05	099	Al Tahoe	0.13793942241	917	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-108-19	099	Al Tahoe	0.13738207411	920	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-132-03	099	Al Tahoe	0.13721675455	926	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-132-04	099	Al Tahoe	0.13776485101	926	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-132-14	099	Al Tahoe	0.13776400367	926	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-134-07	099	Al Tahoe	0.13721675460	926	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-139-36	099	Al Tahoe	0.14261407911	926	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-139-37	099	Al Tahoe	0.14254913706	926	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-252-09	099	Al Tahoe	0.20186722985	932	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-107-02	099	Al Tahoe	0.13785620383	936	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-115-02	099	Al Tahoe	0.36052530338	973	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-115-04	099	Al Tahoe	0.19819039516	973	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-115-05	099	Al Tahoe	0.19094611112	973	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-139-23	099	Al Tahoe	0.32444605015	997	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	No	1	1
025-483-01	101	Bijou Meadow	0.13763343663	543	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-551-15	101	Bijou Meadow	0.29653569556	577	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-670-04	101	Bijou Meadow	0.37833801925	672	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-481-46	101	Bijou Meadow	0.13943177524	681	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-492-02	101	Bijou Meadow	0.13884297518	703	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-551-09	101	Bijou Meadow	0.23038092109	706	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-553-06	101	Bijou Meadow	0.23138354491	707	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-401-10	101	Bijou Meadow	0.13849980508	728	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-554-09	101	Bijou Meadow	0.23058865864	728	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-554-07	101	Bijou Meadow	0.23408385087	738	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-670-21	101	Bijou Meadow	0.98877431170	742	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-481-44	101	Bijou Meadow	0.16671251162	751	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-541-27	101	Bijou Meadow	0.23158344664	753	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-261-13	101	Bijou Meadow	0.26460688895	756	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-394-12	101	Bijou Meadow	0.13849980504	758	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-544-11	101	Bijou Meadow	0.24698185510	760	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-263-08	101	Bijou Meadow	0.19254277368	762	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-554-01	101	Bijou Meadow	0.31172174389	765	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-282-09	101	Bijou Meadow	0.22380590439	767	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-261-10	101	Bijou Meadow	0.26511108929	772	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-551-01	101	Bijou Meadow	0.25119109261	788	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-262-06	101	Bijou Meadow	0.26554440065	794	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-544-01	101	Bijou Meadow	0.22938912982	796	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1

APN	PAS/CP	Name of PAS/CP	Acres	IPES	Housing Types	Density (units/acre)	Bonus Units	Preferred AH	Multi-Unit Incentive	Max Unit Capacity	Realistic Unit Capacity
025-543-08	101	Bijou Meadow	0.23057851236	803	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-552-11	101	Bijou Meadow	0.22963018511	813	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-544-10	101	Bijou Meadow	0.22985980534	814	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-681-10	101	Bijou Meadow	0.20010429905	816	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-021-78	101	Bijou Meadow	1.00089197186	817	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-541-05	101	Bijou Meadow	0.23124774048	824	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-201-04	101	Bijou Meadow	0.26523878678	830	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-021-80	101	Bijou Meadow	0.99944885776	833	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-021-79	101	Bijou Meadow	0.99977955258	836	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-551-30	101	Bijou Meadow	0.23067065419	842	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-262-04	101	Bijou Meadow	0.26511078332	843	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-670-03	101	Bijou Meadow	0.32056851618	849	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-670-34	101	Bijou Meadow	0.37333034079	852	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-413-07	101	Bijou Meadow	0.13791229201	853	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-225-16	101	Bijou Meadow	0.26514552457	855	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-282-13	101	Bijou Meadow	0.26435892980	861	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-394-06	101	Bijou Meadow	0.13849912720	863	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-223-07	101	Bijou Meadow	0.26487004149	865	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-542-08	101	Bijou Meadow	0.23105640243	865	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-201-05	101	Bijou Meadow	0.26514552456	871	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-554-10	101	Bijou Meadow	0.23050883222	871	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-393-19	101	Bijou Meadow	0.13849912722	882	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-282-18	101	Bijou Meadow	0.18557512385	896	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-292-03	101	Bijou Meadow	0.18051061913	897	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-541-20	101	Bijou Meadow	0.27889669127	898	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-223-08	101	Bijou Meadow	0.26479381436	901	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-225-15	101	Bijou Meadow	0.26523866429	902	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-211-03	101	Bijou Meadow	0.26465469784	909	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-211-01	101	Bijou Meadow	0.26479381435	919	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-292-02	101	Bijou Meadow	0.19767518583	919	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-292-06	101	Bijou Meadow	0.19423310294	928	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-291-02	101	Bijou Meadow	0.27044799090	929	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-293-01	101	Bijou Meadow	0.26503194453	932	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-191-06	101	Bijou Meadow	0.26523878677	937	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-261-05	101	Bijou Meadow	0.26465463847	939	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-226-03	101	Bijou Meadow	0.26479399701	940	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-223-04	101	Bijou Meadow	0.26488092023	941	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-223-01	101	Bijou Meadow	0.26467310175	943	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1

APN	PAS/CP	Name of PAS/CP	Acres	IPES	Housing Types	Density (units/acre)	Bonus Units	Preferred AH	Multi-Unit Incentive	Max Unit Capacity	Realistic Unit Capacity
025-292-01	101	Bijou Meadow	0.18426420954	945	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-224-15	101	Bijou Meadow	0.26419855294	952	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-226-02	101	Bijou Meadow	0.26479399702	952	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-291-08	101	Bijou Meadow	0.43446113339	958	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-261-09	101	Bijou Meadow	0.26554427731	965	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-226-08	101	Bijou Meadow	0.26479399697	973	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-214-08	101	Bijou Meadow	0.26523878673	981	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-201-08	101	Bijou Meadow	0.26451564531	982	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-291-10	101	Bijou Meadow	0.26234621717	983	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-191-03	101	Bijou Meadow	0.26514492487	988	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-201-20	101	Bijou Meadow	0.39525944748	998	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-681-14	101	Bijou Meadow	0.20073280565	1005	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-682-01	101	Bijou Meadow	0.20059023860	1006	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-682-04	101	Bijou Meadow	0.19986911851	1006	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-201-07	101	Bijou Meadow	0.26523860403	1007	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
025-224-05	101	Bijou Meadow	0.26465482120	1017	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
022-182-21	102	Tahoe Keys	0.13385594040	61	SFR	1 unit per parcel	10 total	No	No	1	1
022-171-12	102	Tahoe Keys	0.17865255079	442	SFR	1 unit per parcel	10 total	No	No	1	1
022-171-33	102	Tahoe Keys	0.12190390033	443	SFR	1 unit per parcel	10 total	No	No	1	1
022-222-18	102	Tahoe Keys	0.11453730009	484	SFR	1 unit per parcel	10 total	No	No	1	1
022-222-16	102	Tahoe Keys	0.12021520458	486	SFR	1 unit per parcel	10 total	No	No	1	1
022-171-49	102	Tahoe Keys	0.15602574618	490	SFR	1 unit per parcel	10 total	No	No	1	1
022-221-16	102	Tahoe Keys	0.15497686032	490	SFR	1 unit per parcel	10 total	No	No	1	1
022-171-60	102	Tahoe Keys	0.18635958704	511	SFR	1 unit per parcel	10 total	No	No	1	1
022-192-13	102	Tahoe Keys	0.20107377459	589	SFR	1 unit per parcel	10 total	No	No	1	1
022-171-42	102	Tahoe Keys	0.16860820874	590	SFR	1 unit per parcel	10 total	No	No	1	1
022-342-12	102	Tahoe Keys	0.17632469275	647	SFR	1 unit per parcel	10 total	No	No	1	1
022-031-33	102	Tahoe Keys	0.17341936636	710	SFR	1 unit per parcel	10 total	No	No	1	1
022-051-86	102	Tahoe Keys	0.17119731280	728	SFR	1 unit per parcel	10 total	No	No	1	1
022-061-10	102	Tahoe Keys	0.23447034844	741	SFR	1 unit per parcel	10 total	No	No	1	1
022-321-24	102	Tahoe Keys	0.13818480752	760	SFR	1 unit per parcel	10 total	No	No	1	1
022-344-24	102	Tahoe Keys	0.21840041660	776	SFR	1 unit per parcel	10 total	No	No	1	1
022-344-11	102	Tahoe Keys	0.18443287039	787	SFR	1 unit per parcel	10 total	No	No	1	1
022-251-02	102	Tahoe Keys	0.22578881185	797	SFR	1 unit per parcel	10 total	No	No	1	1
022-344-23	102	Tahoe Keys	0.23553873884	800	SFR	1 unit per parcel	10 total	No	No	1	1
022-232-18	102	Tahoe Keys	0.28443375724	809	SFR	1 unit per parcel	10 total	No	No	1	1
031-322-11	104	Highland Woods	0.14606555012	769	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
031-333-01	104	Highland Woods	0.13745599751	831	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1

APN	PAS/CP	Name of PAS/CP	Acres	IPES	Housing Types	Density (units/acre)	Bonus Units	Preferred AH	Multi-Unit Incentive	Max Unit Capacity	Realistic Unit Capacity
031-333-14	104	Highland Woods	0.13955607210	843	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
031-334-03	104	Highland Woods	0.13791011630	855	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
031-321-21	104	Highland Woods	0.14310191925	871	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
031-319-05	104	Highland Woods	0.15065426995	880	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
031-344-05	104	Highland Woods	0.13971605069	885	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
031-314-10	104	Highland Woods	0.14808884295	887	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
031-322-07	104	Highland Woods	0.21070510717	894	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
031-322-08	104	Highland Woods	0.16306863182	894	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
031-332-07	104	Highland Woods	0.16863350609	897	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
031-313-15	104	Highland Woods	0.14589143904	901	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
031-344-07	104	Highland Woods	0.13963498619	905	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
031-341-12	104	Highland Woods	0.15467503495	906	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
031-322-20	104	Highland Woods	0.14925008120	912	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
031-281-16	104	Highland Woods	0.17479438166	919	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
031-333-16	104	Highland Woods	0.17484934573	930	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
031-333-18	104	Highland Woods	0.13971864350	938	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
031-313-14	104	Highland Woods	0.14625803489	942	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
031-322-19	104	Highland Woods	0.20625953147	951	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
031-321-14	104	Highland Woods	0.17461504640	953	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
031-281-06	104	Highland Woods	0.23281790402	970	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
031-281-22	104	Highland Woods	0.19565881278	1002	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
031-211-06	105	Sierra Tract	0.11463551718	694	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-113-13	105	Sierra Tract	0.11463526771	718	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-211-16	105	Sierra Tract	0.11463537695	721	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-185-23	105	Sierra Tract	0.11440881742	727	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-276-01	105	Sierra Tract	0.12361190759	743	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-213-02	105	Sierra Tract	0.13763386785	759	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-211-09	105	Sierra Tract	0.11492090263	760	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-212-05	105	Sierra Tract	0.11449230243	766	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-182-08	105	Sierra Tract	0.11492104483	772	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-182-09	105	Sierra Tract	0.11480222073	772	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-182-10	105	Sierra Tract	0.11463498621	772	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-123-21	105	Sierra Tract	0.11463578366	773	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-213-11	105	Sierra Tract	0.10331008954	773	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-215-05	105	Sierra Tract	0.11446609945	781	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-151-02	105	Sierra Tract	0.11480181404	782	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-114-03	105	Sierra Tract	0.11439719874	786	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-162-11	105	Sierra Tract	0.11475591635	786	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1

APN	PAS/CP	Name of PAS/CP	Acres	IPES	Housing Types	Density (units/acre)	Bonus Units	Preferred AH	Multi-Unit Incentive	Max Unit Capacity	Realistic Unit Capacity
031-103-28	105	Sierra Tract	0.23620115814	787	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-262-01	105	Sierra Tract	0.11464853876	787	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-114-13	105	Sierra Tract	0.11473008896	789	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-146-11	105	Sierra Tract	0.11480142334	789	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-215-02	105	Sierra Tract	0.11522676702	789	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-114-01	105	Sierra Tract	0.11463526774	798	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-277-03	105	Sierra Tract	0.11439760454	799	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-114-04	105	Sierra Tract	0.11502881130	801	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-123-20	105	Sierra Tract	0.11492104478	801	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-131-01	105	Sierra Tract	0.11480181402	804	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-114-16	105	Sierra Tract	0.11463562548	806	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-166-15	105	Sierra Tract	0.11502892056	811	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-166-03	105	Sierra Tract	0.11480181498	812	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-133-13	105	Sierra Tract	0.11480195523	813	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-153-06	105	Sierra Tract	0.11511213904	813	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-194-10	105	Sierra Tract	0.11481330845	813	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-277-02	105	Sierra Tract	0.11463539296	813	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-184-12	105	Sierra Tract	0.11523083603	815	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-114-14	105	Sierra Tract	0.11499264370	816	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-146-08	105	Sierra Tract	0.11480211154	816	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-152-04	105	Sierra Tract	0.11449175640	816	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-165-17	105	Sierra Tract	0.11492076235	816	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-181-08	105	Sierra Tract	0.11463562549	816	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-174-01	105	Sierra Tract	0.09938446967	818	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-205-08	105	Sierra Tract	0.11480183002	818	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-151-17	105	Sierra Tract	0.11494490354	820	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-204-08	105	Sierra Tract	0.11480222079	820	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-225-08	105	Sierra Tract	0.11440869412	823	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-155-01	105	Sierra Tract	0.11463526770	824	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-161-04	105	Sierra Tract	0.11502881128	824	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-192-11	105	Sierra Tract	0.11480181498	824	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-153-01	105	Sierra Tract	0.11480211154	826	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-205-04	105	Sierra Tract	0.11440828741	826	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-164-19	105	Sierra Tract	0.11463578366	830	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-163-17	105	Sierra Tract	0.11463562552	833	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-205-18	105	Sierra Tract	0.11480181405	833	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-207-02	105	Sierra Tract	0.11470423332	833	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-231-19	105	Sierra Tract	0.11492104481	833	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1

APN	PAS/CP	Name of PAS/CP	Acres	IPES	Housing Types	Density (units/acre)	Bonus Units	Preferred AH	Multi-Unit Incentive	Max Unit Capacity	Realistic Unit Capacity
031-232-06	105	Sierra Tract	0.11492079441	833	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-196-10	105	Sierra Tract	0.11475630706	836	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-114-11	105	Sierra Tract	0.11463539294	840	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-236-09	105	Sierra Tract	0.13273270862	841	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-231-18	105	Sierra Tract	0.11480181406	843	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-162-19	105	Sierra Tract	0.11480181402	844	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-163-02	105	Sierra Tract	0.11492091866	844	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-164-18	105	Sierra Tract	0.11480223579	844	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-155-18	105	Sierra Tract	0.11463523475	852	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-174-03	105	Sierra Tract	0.11345346019	852	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-191-03	105	Sierra Tract	0.11464855470	852	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-196-08	105	Sierra Tract	0.11480222079	852	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-233-14	105	Sierra Tract	0.10324913678	852	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-124-03	105	Sierra Tract	0.11440856798	853	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-112-20	105	Sierra Tract	0.11480206447	856	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-122-10	105	Sierra Tract	0.11464853869	858	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-133-17	105	Sierra Tract	0.11463551628	858	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-123-15	105	Sierra Tract	0.11502812216	861	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-235-07	105	Sierra Tract	0.11448231534	861	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-202-19	105	Sierra Tract	0.16998714437	864	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-163-01	105	Sierra Tract	0.11480181405	865	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-233-13	105	Sierra Tract	0.10311639118	866	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-161-09	105	Sierra Tract	0.11480195529	867	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-195-02	105	Sierra Tract	0.11480211150	867	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-205-14	105	Sierra Tract	0.11502892046	867	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-133-18	105	Sierra Tract	0.11492130934	869	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-133-19	105	Sierra Tract	0.11480142334	869	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-144-11	105	Sierra Tract	0.11480142334	872	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-124-13	105	Sierra Tract	0.11533869758	873	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-143-07	105	Sierra Tract	0.11480170480	873	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-144-12	105	Sierra Tract	0.11439762052	873	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-144-15	105	Sierra Tract	0.11480142331	873	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-145-14	105	Sierra Tract	0.11480168883	873	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-162-05	105	Sierra Tract	0.11511187358	873	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-262-12	105	Sierra Tract	0.17069248827	874	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-222-11	105	Sierra Tract	0.11463498629	876	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-155-04	105	Sierra Tract	0.11511162315	880	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-156-09	105	Sierra Tract	0.11480211155	880	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1

APN	PAS/CP	Name of PAS/CP	Acres	IPES	Housing Types	Density (units/acre)	Bonus Units	Preferred AH	Multi-Unit Incentive	Max Unit Capacity	Realistic Unit Capacity
031-211-14	105	Sierra Tract	0.11439719876	880	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-185-16	105	Sierra Tract	0.11480181406	887	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-223-03	105	Sierra Tract	0.13757604450	888	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-224-02	105	Sierra Tract	0.13815807537	888	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-134-08	105	Sierra Tract	0.11502892050	891	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-172-12	105	Sierra Tract	0.20026919205	894	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-222-16	105	Sierra Tract	0.11480142334	896	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-171-08	105	Sierra Tract	0.19672920183	941	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-172-01	105	Sierra Tract	0.21346350381	948	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-236-15	105	Sierra Tract	0.24496644771	949	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-103-29	105	Sierra Tract	0.21186961708	954	SFR	1 unit per parcel	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-051-01	108	Winnemucca	0.11456652243	427	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
031-051-02	108	Winnemucca	0.11456611569	427	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
031-045-08	108	Winnemucca	0.11540260559	763	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
031-043-10	108	Winnemucca	0.11486350962	816	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
031-045-12	108	Winnemucca	0.11456652242	824	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-393-24	108	Winnemucca	0.27187954170	838	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-393-25	108	Winnemucca	0.32003737380	838	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
031-043-06	108	Winnemucca	0.11456691217	845	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
031-043-04	108	Winnemucca	0.11516051375	851	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
031-043-08	108	Winnemucca	0.11549811973	880	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-362-07	108	Winnemucca	0.19469409732	920	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-372-07	108	Winnemucca	0.27820419279	947	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-362-08	108	Winnemucca	0.19495147388	951	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
022-142-13	111	Tahoe Island	0.13798839683	38	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
022-141-03	111	Tahoe Island	0.21404060232	559	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-102-18	111	Tahoe Island	0.12185491278	663	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-102-14	111	Tahoe Island	0.12185491274	747	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-763-01	111	Tahoe Island	0.21296877941	752	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-741-01	111	Tahoe Island	0.15035945946	754	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-644-13	111	Tahoe Island	0.18902279818	760	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
022-141-19	111	Tahoe Island	0.24216002691	772	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
022-121-05	111	Tahoe Island	0.13962475525	776	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-683-01	111	Tahoe Island	0.14948528813	777	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-744-02	111	Tahoe Island	0.12906415553	791	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
022-134-06	111	Tahoe Island	0.13956973187	794	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
022-122-07	111	Tahoe Island	0.14459732055	796	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
022-123-10	111	Tahoe Island	0.19783693537	800	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1

APN	PAS/CP	Name of PAS/CP	Acres	IPES	Housing Types	Density (units/acre)	Bonus Units	Preferred AH	Multi-Unit Incentive	Max Unit Capacity	Realistic Unit Capacity
023-892-15	111	Tahoe Island	0.17161430279	808	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
022-023-03	111	Tahoe Island	0.18014615479	817	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-684-05	111	Tahoe Island	0.15227493878	818	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-902-06	111	Tahoe Island	0.14060574786	824	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-744-28	111	Tahoe Island	0.16821768825	827	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-102-36	111	Tahoe Island	0.12154537199	828	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-782-16	111	Tahoe Island	0.12577853572	833	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
022-123-12	111	Tahoe Island	0.22195332104	836	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-771-26	111	Tahoe Island	0.14007159176	843	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-741-09	111	Tahoe Island	0.14005765229	845	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-103-11	111	Tahoe Island	0.12154616943	855	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-782-18	111	Tahoe Island	0.12598755463	857	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-101-02	111	Tahoe Island	0.12171522639	858	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-111-14	111	Tahoe Island	0.12180937566	868	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-912-04	111	Tahoe Island	0.15107559923	870	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-102-41	111	Tahoe Island	0.12123688851	871	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-734-12	111	Tahoe Island	0.14040782041	872	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-734-13	111	Tahoe Island	0.14070475019	874	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-745-08	111	Tahoe Island	0.12409670423	875	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-685-03	111	Tahoe Island	0.15269821309	876	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-772-08	111	Tahoe Island	0.13988793330	880	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-742-10	111	Tahoe Island	0.14065007329	881	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-102-42	111	Tahoe Island	0.12185528936	882	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-103-14	111	Tahoe Island	0.12185608774	882	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-111-24	111	Tahoe Island	0.12180899913	882	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-643-01	111	Tahoe Island	0.20499288890	882	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-101-15	111	Tahoe Island	0.12174310079	884	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-904-08	111	Tahoe Island	0.14018674689	885	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-681-06	111	Tahoe Island	0.15111276846	888	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-553-01	111	Tahoe Island	0.17723679599	889	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-902-13	111	Tahoe Island	0.14078079469	892	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-103-16	111	Tahoe Island	0.12185528936	898	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-541-26	111	Tahoe Island	0.17258235767	902	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-572-02	111	Tahoe Island	0.17473824927	902	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-761-01	111	Tahoe Island	0.14015759143	902	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-745-11	111	Tahoe Island	0.14074922718	904	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-773-21	111	Tahoe Island	0.13988833529	909	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-741-13	111	Tahoe Island	0.14102426582	912	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1

APN	PAS/CP	Name of PAS/CP	Acres	IPES	Housing Types	Density (units/acre)	Bonus Units	Preferred AH	Multi-Unit Incentive	Max Unit Capacity	Realistic Unit Capacity
023-741-17	111	Tahoe Island	0.14031407337	912	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-753-04	111	Tahoe Island	0.12892647465	912	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-551-15	111	Tahoe Island	0.17221599628	915	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-783-08	111	Tahoe Island	0.14031263861	917	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-682-03	111	Tahoe Island	0.15489157989	920	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-682-04	111	Tahoe Island	0.15506290050	920	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-682-26	111	Tahoe Island	0.15420632150	920	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-646-06	111	Tahoe Island	0.18120372196	922	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-743-11	111	Tahoe Island	0.14066705553	922	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-751-16	111	Tahoe Island	0.14045221178	922	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-912-05	111	Tahoe Island	0.16464933425	922	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-581-02	111	Tahoe Island	0.17083586588	925	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-781-06	111	Tahoe Island	0.16261572093	925	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-755-10	111	Tahoe Island	0.14650978249	926	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-541-02	111	Tahoe Island	0.17197031647	930	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-541-24	111	Tahoe Island	0.17188444669	931	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-771-21	111	Tahoe Island	0.14012138427	931	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-753-08	111	Tahoe Island	0.12696280988	932	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-571-12	111	Tahoe Island	0.17229171884	933	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-663-03	111	Tahoe Island	0.17379211559	933	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-751-23	111	Tahoe Island	0.16456256353	933	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-743-28	111	Tahoe Island	0.13652515947	935	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-645-12	111	Tahoe Island	0.18354343877	937	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-543-18	111	Tahoe Island	0.17241205679	939	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-543-19	111	Tahoe Island	0.17195441032	939	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-552-06	111	Tahoe Island	0.18459993826	939	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-772-27	111	Tahoe Island	0.13988793609	939	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-903-01	111	Tahoe Island	0.18594792488	939	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-543-05	111	Tahoe Island	0.17763957444	942	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-654-18	111	Tahoe Island	0.19310916108	946	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-551-16	111	Tahoe Island	0.17221540598	947	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-782-10	111	Tahoe Island	0.14011359929	948	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-782-19	111	Tahoe Island	0.13988833525	948	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-552-07	111	Tahoe Island	0.21923496326	953	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-773-27	111	Tahoe Island	0.13988820220	956	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-671-05	111	Tahoe Island	0.17184439838	958	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-672-19	111	Tahoe Island	0.17204625836	958	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-686-17	111	Tahoe Island	0.17179034666	961	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1

APN	PAS/CP	Name of PAS/CP	Acres	IPES	Housing Types	Density (units/acre)	Bonus Units	Preferred AH	Multi-Unit Incentive	Max Unit Capacity	Realistic Unit Capacity
023-571-05	111	Tahoe Island	0.17008898052	966	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-652-08	111	Tahoe Island	0.17530501977	968	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-646-02	111	Tahoe Island	0.19767233884	969	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-892-02	111	Tahoe Island	0.18970911300	971	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-542-09	111	Tahoe Island	0.17879837332	972	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-554-07	111	Tahoe Island	0.22687321280	972	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-571-01	111	Tahoe Island	0.17275128025	976	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-892-09	111	Tahoe Island	0.18390674975	983	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-554-10	111	Tahoe Island	0.57452419245	984	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-571-14	111	Tahoe Island	0.23590563965	984	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-582-11	111	Tahoe Island	0.18114714611	984	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-645-28	111	Tahoe Island	0.22248661753	984	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-542-06	111	Tahoe Island	0.23573486326	991	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-581-07	111	Tahoe Island	0.17307774493	999	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-542-01	111	Tahoe Island	0.20400203720	1001	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-655-01	111	Tahoe Island	0.17909019662	1001	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-653-24	111	Tahoe Island	0.21720566196	1020	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-461-22	112	Gardner Mountain	0.08612430677	600	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-442-18	112	Gardner Mountain	0.22870215596	740	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-462-28	112	Gardner Mountain	0.15022470853	743	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-626-08	112	Gardner Mountain	0.15238607665	744	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-691-27	112	Gardner Mountain	0.15301308544	772	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-693-14	112	Gardner Mountain	0.16207284308	785	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-694-07	112	Gardner Mountain	0.15145530968	788	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-626-07	112	Gardner Mountain	0.15301392144	790	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-442-31	112	Gardner Mountain	0.22715099521	798	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-321-07	112	Gardner Mountain	1.00259606055	809	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-632-06	112	Gardner Mountain	0.15162838422	810	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-621-16	112	Gardner Mountain	0.14939870006	814	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-624-01	112	Gardner Mountain	0.15134051987	816	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-695-19	112	Gardner Mountain	0.15145488977	816	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-341-12	112	Gardner Mountain	0.48466226933	819	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-441-37	112	Gardner Mountain	0.13750787808	821	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-341-15	112	Gardner Mountain	0.17168244079	824	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-442-11	112	Gardner Mountain	0.22870293172	825	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-351-13	112	Gardner Mountain	0.26196248427	830	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-602-06	112	Gardner Mountain	0.15163597810	833	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-693-05	112	Gardner Mountain	0.16786183837	835	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1

APN	PAS/CP	Name of PAS/CP	Acres	IPES	Housing Types	Density (units/acre)	Bonus Units	Preferred AH	Multi-Unit Incentive	Max Unit Capacity	Realistic Unit Capacity
023-621-15	112	Gardner Mountain	0.14934847626	836	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-441-19	112	Gardner Mountain	0.23015704763	838	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-696-21	112	Gardner Mountain	0.15161890926	839	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-623-17	112	Gardner Mountain	0.15163612679	845	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-624-03	112	Gardner Mountain	0.15131185389	845	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-801-15	112	Gardner Mountain	0.23895951906	846	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-321-04	112	Gardner Mountain	1.00281837004	848	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-152-04	112	Gardner Mountain	0.98515099475	849	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-341-14	112	Gardner Mountain	0.17137043624	852	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-491-13	112	Gardner Mountain	0.23015782431	852	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-462-07	112	Gardner Mountain	0.22976880261	855	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-696-15	112	Gardner Mountain	0.15163694968	855	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-802-12	112	Gardner Mountain	0.13701762951	861	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-801-11	112	Gardner Mountain	0.20947929059	866	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-481-09	112	Gardner Mountain	0.22765114320	875	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-182-13	112	Gardner Mountain	0.12541668964	879	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-452-04	112	Gardner Mountain	0.22977898841	885	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-451-06	112	Gardner Mountain	0.22898128444	887	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-451-08	112	Gardner Mountain	0.23015782430	887	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-695-23	112	Gardner Mountain	0.15162748034	890	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-693-03	112	Gardner Mountain	0.15552154207	891	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-441-05	112	Gardner Mountain	0.22873449165	892	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-442-21	112	Gardner Mountain	0.22908928147	892	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-142-03	112	Gardner Mountain	1.00441938777	894	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-152-06	112	Gardner Mountain	1.00297548762	894	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-451-02	112	Gardner Mountain	0.22897411031	894	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-693-25	112	Gardner Mountain	0.16184901389	895	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-801-10	112	Gardner Mountain	0.21567939627	897	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-696-08	112	Gardner Mountain	0.15145571737	902	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-692-03	112	Gardner Mountain	0.15053874765	904	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-601-16	112	Gardner Mountain	0.15102490753	905	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-512-09	112	Gardner Mountain	0.22914279568	906	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-632-02	112	Gardner Mountain	0.15161973773	908	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-172-19	112	Gardner Mountain	0.12524843740	909	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-591-06	112	Gardner Mountain	0.22909037195	913	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-602-02	112	Gardner Mountain	0.17283719807	922	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-502-18	112	Gardner Mountain	0.22853065558	930	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-162-12	112	Gardner Mountain	0.23813823105	932	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1

APN	PAS/CP	Name of PAS/CP	Acres	IPES	Housing Types	Density (units/acre)	Bonus Units	Preferred AH	Multi-Unit Incentive	Max Unit Capacity	Realistic Unit Capacity
023-623-19	112	Gardner Mountain	0.15163612685	934	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-633-08	112	Gardner Mountain	0.15177379445	934	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-601-04	112	Gardner Mountain	0.15183842273	936	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-611-04	112	Gardner Mountain	0.15101238219	936	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-623-05	112	Gardner Mountain	0.15156967399	940	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-696-13	112	Gardner Mountain	0.17155268721	941	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-695-12	112	Gardner Mountain	0.17442711830	946	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-492-19	112	Gardner Mountain	0.14211761455	947	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-502-42	112	Gardner Mountain	0.16100725303	949	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-693-02	112	Gardner Mountain	0.16658390287	954	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-501-05	112	Gardner Mountain	0.23040267090	957	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-801-14	112	Gardner Mountain	0.19947098619	959	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-601-03	112	Gardner Mountain	0.15105531896	961	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-632-11	112	Gardner Mountain	0.15145544563	961	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-512-14	112	Gardner Mountain	0.23054460062	962	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-182-26	112	Gardner Mountain	0.25024655347	965	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-471-11	112	Gardner Mountain	0.22953067728	967	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-331-22	112	Gardner Mountain	0.71390658665	971	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-162-02	112	Gardner Mountain	1.00488634719	974	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-631-08	112	Gardner Mountain	0.19291327099	978	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-511-11	112	Gardner Mountain	0.22958758543	984	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-162-06	112	Gardner Mountain	0.97421570905	989	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-481-01	112	Gardner Mountain	0.26389151272	989	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-481-02	112	Gardner Mountain	0.22964928857	989	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-481-03	112	Gardner Mountain	0.22931210989	989	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-501-01	112	Gardner Mountain	0.22985262090	989	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-472-07	112	Gardner Mountain	0.22895770521	992	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-501-13	112	Gardner Mountain	0.22634831431	993	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-501-22	112	Gardner Mountain	0.22440365406	995	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-491-19	112	Gardner Mountain	0.22893641033	1004	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-132-15	112	Gardner Mountain	0.25414122814	1012	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-162-03	112	Gardner Mountain	1.01217712895	1012	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-452-15	112	Gardner Mountain	0.22991137159	1013	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-162-04	112	Gardner Mountain	0.98711167547	1015	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-471-14	112	Gardner Mountain	0.22958811169	1032	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-282-03	114	Bonanza	0.11996139705	758	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-282-04	114	Bonanza	0.11485383883	758	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-282-15	114	Bonanza	0.11473690147	781	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1

APN	PAS/CP	Name of PAS/CP	Acres	IPES	Housing Types	Density (units/acre)	Bonus Units	Preferred AH	Multi-Unit Incentive	Max Unit Capacity	Realistic Unit Capacity
032-282-43	114	Bonanza	0.11432219924	791	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-264-09	114	Bonanza	0.23989935150	792	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-262-07	114	Bonanza	0.23963292906	800	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-173-08	114	Bonanza	0.14981958911	813	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-173-07	114	Bonanza	0.50094141689	817	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-262-05	114	Bonanza	0.23990056215	823	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-152-16	114	Bonanza	0.13755602650	828	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-279-09	114	Bonanza	0.11501706553	834	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-281-21	114	Bonanza	0.11500263697	834	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-171-01	114	Bonanza	1.00258601363	837	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-262-06	114	Bonanza	0.23963212134	838	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-278-34	114	Bonanza	0.11516332779	843	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-262-11	114	Bonanza	0.25103498312	848	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-283-19	114	Bonanza	0.11498110742	852	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-279-08	114	Bonanza	0.11461524071	853	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-171-02	114	Bonanza	1.00278792546	857	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-152-06	114	Bonanza	1.00251988052	859	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-282-33	114	Bonanza	0.11448251347	862	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-278-10	114	Bonanza	0.11464250201	871	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-282-17	114	Bonanza	0.11500271747	871	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-283-04	114	Bonanza	0.11460232001	871	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-283-08	114	Bonanza	0.11484159780	871	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-283-10	114	Bonanza	0.11422819899	873	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-274-03	114	Bonanza	0.11522325526	880	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-274-07	114	Bonanza	0.11458265265	880	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-282-27	114	Bonanza	0.11535745592	883	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-241-25	114	Bonanza	0.11458189854	891	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-275-05	114	Bonanza	0.11522325527	891	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-278-11	114	Bonanza	0.11485349801	891	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-152-18	114	Bonanza	0.20417213944	896	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-282-40	114	Bonanza	0.11432253259	900	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-152-17	114	Bonanza	0.22992316162	905	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-264-04	114	Bonanza	0.23994033366	907	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-173-02	114	Bonanza	1.00221979686	915	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-277-44	114	Bonanza	0.15748433318	921	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-252-30	114	Bonanza	0.14936656948	932	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-162-06	114	Bonanza	0.62751885333	936	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-173-06	114	Bonanza	0.50110564537	939	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1

APN	PAS/CP	Name of PAS/CP	Acres	IPES	Housing Types	Density (units/acre)	Bonus Units	Preferred AH	Multi-Unit Incentive	Max Unit Capacity	Realistic Unit Capacity
032-242-18	114	Bonanza	0.24990125757	942	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-171-03	114	Bonanza	0.89685011876	943	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-261-05	114	Bonanza	0.31745536932	944	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-277-01	114	Bonanza	0.15687068957	951	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-162-02	114	Bonanza	0.63362948125	958	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-252-29	114	Bonanza	0.14948104866	963	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-162-09	114	Bonanza	0.31576652580	965	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-242-08	114	Bonanza	0.24039594082	970	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-251-15	114	Bonanza	0.25115340801	991	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-252-16	114	Bonanza	0.25116153108	991	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-242-05	114	Bonanza	0.23979762728	1011	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-242-06	114	Bonanza	0.23995893536	1011	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-251-04	114	Bonanza	0.24655125666	1034	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
032-251-11	114	Bonanza	0.25115267844	1041	SFR	1 unit per parcel	0	No	No	1	1
023-141-29	111 SA-1	Tahoe Island	0.12515003006	776	SFR and MFR	8	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-141-30	111 SA-1	Tahoe Island	0.12519153961	776	SFR and MFR	8	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-141-18	111 SA-1	Tahoe Island	0.50171138532	930	SFR and MFR	8	0	Yes	Yes	4	3
023-151-21	111 SA-1	Tahoe Island	0.79205349283	984	SFR and MFR	8	0	Yes	Yes	6	5
023-531-12	111 SA-2	Tahoe Island	0.12448527871	487	SFR and MFR	8	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-531-10	111 SA-2	Tahoe Island	0.12275387304	778	SFR and MFR	8	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-531-13	111 SA-2	Tahoe Island	0.12480954409	790	SFR and MFR	8	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-531-14	111 SA-2	Tahoe Island	0.12339691975	801	SFR and MFR	8	0	Yes	Yes	1	1
023-221-12	111 SA-2	Tahoe Island	0.26150968776	965	SFR and MFR	8	0	Yes	Yes	2	2
023-151-35	111 SA-2	Tahoe Island	0.47811812352	979	SFR and MFR	8	0	Yes	Yes	4	3
023-161-32	111 SA-2	Tahoe Island	0.23111641458	979	SFR and MFR	8	0	Yes	Yes	2	1
023-141-21	111 SA-2	Tahoe Island	0.50119614338	988	SFR and MFR	8	0	Yes	Yes	4	3
023-141-15	111 SA-2	Tahoe Island	0.25081257276	1012	SFR and MFR	8	0	Yes	Yes	2	2
023-151-07	111 SA-2	Tahoe Island	0.26385707850	1012	SFR and MFR	8	0	Yes	Yes	2	2
023-161-29	111 SA-2	Tahoe Island	0.26754304479	1012	SFR and MFR	8	0	Yes	Yes	2	2
023-271-10	111 SA-2	Tahoe Island	1.00184554411	1021	SFR and MFR	8	0	Yes	Yes	8	6
023-281-17	111 SA-2	Tahoe Island	0.34223131422	1021	SFR and MFR	8	0	Yes	Yes	3	2
023-532-03	112 SA-1	Gardner Mountain	0.12142804864	783	SFR and MFR	8	0	No	No	1	1
023-532-07	112 SA-1	Gardner Mountain	0.11976047192	893	SFR and MFR	8	0	No	No	1	1
023-132-32	112 SA-1	Gardner Mountain	0.31793101771	988	SFR and MFR	8	0	No	No	3	2
032-171-06	114 SA-3	Bonanza	0.22404302436	898	SFR and MFR	8	50 total	No	Yes	2	1
031-285-07	104 SA-1	Highland Woods	0.14036673555	931	SFR and MFR	12	0	No	No	2	1
031-290-12	104 SA-1	Highland Woods	2.07800527587	937	SFR and MFR	12	0	No	No	25	20
031-252-04	104 SA-1	Highland Woods	0.18544201200	950	SFR and MFR	12	0	No	No	2	2

APN	PAS/CP	Name of PAS/CP	Acres	IPES	Housing Types	Density (units/acre)	Bonus Units	Preferred AH	Multi-Unit Incentive	Max Unit Capacity	Realistic Unit Capacity
031-284-04	104 SA-1	Highland Woods	0.17646314407	950	SFR and MFR	12	0	No	No	2	2
031-283-10	104 SA-1	Highland Woods	0.19565931925	989	SFR and MFR	12	0	No	No	2	2
031-142-17	105 SA-1	Sierra Tract	0.11480211159	677	SFR and MFR	12	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-146-02	105 SA-1	Sierra Tract	0.11480222076	718	SFR and MFR	12	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-123-19	105 SA-1	Sierra Tract	0.11463567447	738	SFR and MFR	12	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-084-02	105 SA-1	Sierra Tract	0.11464818191	770	SFR and MFR	12	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-074-10	105 SA-1	Sierra Tract	0.11449178657	785	SFR and MFR	12	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-193-21	105 SA-1	Sierra Tract	0.22960350374	809	SFR and MFR	12	180 total	Yes	Yes	3	2
031-075-01	105 SA-1	Sierra Tract	0.11475590037	816	SFR and MFR	12	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-182-17	105 SA-1	Sierra Tract	0.11480195526	824	SFR and MFR	12	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-184-19	105 SA-1	Sierra Tract	0.11480142334	824	SFR and MFR	12	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-076-09	105 SA-1	Sierra Tract	0.11449150594	836	SFR and MFR	12	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-083-09	105 SA-1	Sierra Tract	0.11480183006	836	SFR and MFR	12	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-084-15	105 SA-1	Sierra Tract	0.11450298436	837	SFR and MFR	12	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-223-12	105 SA-1	Sierra Tract	0.10311959502	840	SFR and MFR	12	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-092-04	105 SA-1	Sierra Tract	0.16867781129	851	SFR and MFR	12	180 total	Yes	Yes	2	2
031-221-09	105 SA-1	Sierra Tract	0.11480142331	851	SFR and MFR	12	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-084-06	105 SA-1	Sierra Tract	0.11480183006	865	SFR and MFR	12	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-084-11	105 SA-1	Sierra Tract	0.11480206446	865	SFR and MFR	12	180 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
031-214-17	105 SA-1	Sierra Tract	0.13757634393	900	SFR and MFR	12	180 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
031-093-12	105 SA-1	Sierra Tract	0.18177458344	920	SFR and MFR	12	180 total	Yes	Yes	2	2
031-214-02	105 SA-1	Sierra Tract	0.13831581995	937	SFR and MFR	12	180 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
031-214-03	105 SA-1	Sierra Tract	0.13757638254	937	SFR and MFR	12	180 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
031-094-17	105 SA-1	Sierra Tract	0.18165848758	981	SFR and MFR	12	180 total	Yes	Yes	2	2
031-155-20	105 SA-1	Sierra Tract	0.17245230653	982	SFR and MFR	12	180 total	Yes	Yes	2	2
029-010-15	089	Lakeside Park	0.79691730597	165	SFR and MFR	15	0	No	No	12	10
029-074-17	089	Lakeside Park	0.13151158032	840	SFR and MFR	15	0	No	No	2	2
029-362-09	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.05892702960	258	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
029-362-10	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.05902431488	258	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
029-362-12	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.06110060621	258	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
029-362-13	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.07587875784	258	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
029-362-14	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.06645678014	258	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
029-362-15	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.05882199658	258	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
029-362-16	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.06012421173	258	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
029-362-17	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.05868023979	258	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
029-362-18	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.06081173964	258	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	1	1
029-415-11	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.11488788803	445	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
029-403-02	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.11472435637	674	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	1

APN	PAS/CP	Name of PAS/CP	Acres	IPES	Housing Types	Density (units/acre)	Bonus Units	Preferred AH	Multi-Unit Incentive	Max Unit Capacity	Realistic Unit Capacity
027-161-21	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.11484488637	700	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
029-403-25	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.11505431103	709	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
027-133-03	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.11477229327	713	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
029-403-26	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.11503996297	716	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
029-412-14	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.11660225872	728	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
029-381-19	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.10908584773	734	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
027-142-29	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.11509167331	736	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
029-375-06	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.12686093892	742	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	2
029-411-16	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.11551345443	743	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
027-133-05	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.11413312538	748	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
028-042-12	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.23219235743	754	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	3	3
029-381-20	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.11947348882	754	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
029-402-16	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.11493418304	756	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
029-364-03	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.32130818519	757	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	5	4
029-401-09	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.12012925199	757	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
029-371-20	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.11452526056	761	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
027-084-15	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.11410771888	767	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
029-362-08	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.43444827362	778	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	7	5
029-403-22	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.11472429517	805	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
029-402-05	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.11458976359	806	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
029-363-02	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.17205375721	810	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	3	2
029-404-02	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.11485632245	812	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
029-361-16	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.11451049171	813	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
029-343-17	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.11501989089	819	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
028-081-02	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.92664203089	820	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	14	11
028-121-14	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.15788828478	820	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	2
029-381-28	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.15463819798	820	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	2
027-153-21	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.11509125345	825	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
028-121-18	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.13897398379	825	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	2
029-401-04	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.11425504233	826	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
029-401-05	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.11431453052	826	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
029-332-12	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.11451049168	828	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
029-402-12	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.11476304708	842	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
029-402-13	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.11418808284	842	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
029-181-20	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.14379771092	845	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	2
029-391-08	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.18004246581	845	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	3	2
029-402-31	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.23005626402	847	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	3	3
029-181-19	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.14350070681	850	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	2

APN	PAS/CP	Name of PAS/CP	Acres	IPES	Housing Types	Density (units/acre)	Bonus Units	Preferred AH	Multi-Unit Incentive	Max Unit Capacity	Realistic Unit Capacity
029-371-07	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.22983772875	853	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	3	3
029-181-21	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.14330751688	856	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	2
029-351-15	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.11502094812	856	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
029-351-16	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.11508597839	856	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
027-136-12	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.11474725670	873	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
028-121-25	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.60987920223	896	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	9	7
029-181-15	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.14369726444	899	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	2
028-121-07	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.16794828427	902	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	3	2
029-181-30	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.14344525410	902	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	2
029-181-10	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.14362454048	903	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	2
029-341-03	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.22959605017	903	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	3	3
027-085-04	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.15335703785	908	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	2
029-341-01	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.23004007448	919	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	3	3
029-341-02	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.22915894569	919	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	3	3
027-085-08	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.20803851154	926	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	3	2
029-351-22	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.11451041447	928	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
028-081-13	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.22347956494	944	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	3	3
028-081-14	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.22345895144	944	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	3	3
028-121-24	092	Pioneer/Ski Run	0.55337416046	970	SFR and MFR	15	190 total	Yes	Yes	8	7
027-322-18	093	Bijou	0.29522522629	558	SFR and MFR	15	30 total	Yes	Yes	4	4
027-313-06	093	Bijou	0.11413169062	659	SFR and MFR	15	30 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
027-313-14	093	Bijou	0.11486356798	659	SFR and MFR	15	30 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
027-122-14	093	Bijou	0.11474722277	672	SFR and MFR	15	30 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
027-122-15	093	Bijou	0.11474767660	679	SFR and MFR	15	30 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
027-122-09	093	Bijou	0.11410775275	695	SFR and MFR	15	30 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
027-312-23	093	Bijou	0.11509125342	701	SFR and MFR	15	30 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
027-122-17	093	Bijou	0.11477272725	702	SFR and MFR	15	30 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
027-311-31	093	Bijou	0.11509202927	703	SFR and MFR	15	30 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
027-311-32	093	Bijou	0.11410729900	703	SFR and MFR	15	30 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
027-101-04	093	Bijou	0.10436036498	707	SFR and MFR	15	30 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
027-122-18	093	Bijou	0.11477308313	711	SFR and MFR	15	30 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
027-313-12	093	Bijou	0.11509160930	713	SFR and MFR	15	30 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
027-053-10	093	Bijou	0.11509157733	719	SFR and MFR	15	30 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
027-125-06	093	Bijou	0.11511564510	723	SFR and MFR	15	30 total	Yes	Yes	2	1
025-252-08	093	Bijou	0.26671650529	732	SFR and MFR	15	30 total	Yes	Yes	4	3
027-354-01	093	Bijou	0.17000734087	762	SFR and MFR	15	30 total	Yes	Yes	3	2
025-252-04	093	Bijou	0.26656168884	764	SFR and MFR	15	30 total	Yes	Yes	4	3
027-124-04	093	Bijou	0.34406893191	807	SFR and MFR	15	30 total	Yes	Yes	5	4

APN	PAS/CP	Name of PAS/CP	Acres	IPES	Housing Types	Density (units/acre)	Bonus Units	Preferred AH	Multi-Unit Incentive	Max Unit Capacity	Realistic Unit Capacity
027-321-02	093	Bijou	0.51003685606	836	SFR and MFR	15	30 total	Yes	Yes	8	6
027-204-31	093	Bijou	0.17202134986	901	SFR and MFR	15	30 total	Yes	Yes	3	2
025-241-08	093	Bijou	1.04736453878	923	SFR and MFR	15	30 total	Yes	Yes	16	13
028-141-21	093	Bijou	0.23563711595	945	SFR and MFR	15	30 total	Yes	Yes	4	3
027-311-06	093	Bijou	0.17209504073	948	SFR and MFR	15	30 total	Yes	Yes	3	2
027-322-03	093	Bijou	0.27612606397	968	SFR and MFR	15	30 total	Yes	Yes	4	3
027-364-09	097 SA-1	Bijou Pines	0.13790302324	895	SFR and MFR	15	0	No	No	2	2
027-364-04	097 SA-1	Bijou Pines	0.13769407493	904	SFR and MFR	15	0	No	No	2	2
027-364-17	097 SA-1	Bijou Pines	0.25275967140	915	SFR and MFR	15	0	No	No	4	3
027-364-05	097 SA-1	Bijou Pines	0.13774859739	917	SFR and MFR	15	0	No	No	2	2
026-035-17	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.06945652632	783	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-062-20	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.11436702275	785	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	1
026-094-09	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.11977554870	792	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	1
026-064-16	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.11438676539	802	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	1
026-039-21	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.10384850578	809	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	1
026-064-15	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.11499730212	814	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	1
026-026-19	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.11481330194	820	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	1
026-044-13	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.11481330183	820	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	1
026-064-18	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.11481327460	820	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	1
026-024-13	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.09929156152	825	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	1	1
026-038-08	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.11487677778	825	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	1
026-062-17	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.11481388747	825	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	1
026-024-15	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.11778949481	826	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	1
026-026-13	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.11499767495	826	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	1
026-063-13	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.11481290177	826	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	1
026-037-14	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.11487078549	840	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	1
026-085-21	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.11428800500	842	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	1
026-025-05	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.11489792792	847	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	1
026-071-06	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.11481290174	847	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	1
026-071-08	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.11491373806	847	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	1
026-039-20	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.11448815908	848	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	1
026-047-12	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.11481401926	848	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	1
026-073-23	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.11481364644	848	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	1
026-073-26	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.11490510194	848	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	1
026-073-28	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.11428776400	848	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	1
026-074-03	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.11491371075	848	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	1
026-074-08	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.11481290174	848	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	1
026-062-16	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.11489755509	856	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	1

APN	PAS/CP	Name of PAS/CP	Acres	IPES	Housing Types	Density (units/acre)	Bonus Units	Preferred AH	Multi-Unit Incentive	Max Unit Capacity	Realistic Unit Capacity
026-068-10	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.13776400366	859	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	2
026-067-10	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.13731904544	860	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	2
026-103-16	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.13785667837	860	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	2
026-068-02	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.13776437646	868	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	2
026-092-17	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.13776437653	868	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	2
026-095-08	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.13776526999	868	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	2
026-081-04	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.11481330188	869	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	1
026-067-07	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.13776485102	874	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	2
026-085-10	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.11428853506	875	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	1
026-068-18	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.13785583104	884	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	2
026-101-09	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.13731815102	889	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	2
026-087-02	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.13712551655	895	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	2
026-087-07	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.13731862648	895	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	2
026-112-03	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.13785620390	895	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	2
026-112-17	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.13785583103	895	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	2
026-079-19	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.13784865702	897	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	2
026-093-19	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.13721680346	897	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	2
026-094-26	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.13785667837	897	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	2
026-077-17	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.13785630558	903	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	2
026-104-05	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.13795711546	904	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	2
026-088-18	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.13793942245	905	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	2
026-104-12	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.13776526997	909	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	2
026-105-02	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.13785630554	909	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	2
026-093-06	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.13785655788	914	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	2
026-093-08	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.13776447815	914	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	2
026-102-10	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.13795664000	919	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	2	2
026-045-20	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.25531034369	943	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	4	3
026-077-01	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.27581272341	943	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	4	3
026-037-07	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.22989485717	999	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	3	3
026-102-26	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.27571240768	999	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	4	3
026-048-06	099 SA-1	Al Tahoe	0.22972698533	1008	SFR and MFR	15	0	Yes	No	3	3
022-021-02	102 SA-2	Tahoe Keys	0.17144835808	789	SFR and MFR	15	10 total	No	No	3	2
022-021-03	102 SA-2	Tahoe Keys	0.15256583559	790	SFR and MFR	15	10 total	No	No	2	2
031-290-29	103	Sierra Tract Commercial	0.93880729246	783	SFR and MFR	15	0	No	No	14	11
031-290-01	103	Sierra Tract Commercial	0.74390759108	847	SFR and MFR	15	0	No	No	11	9
031-241-14	103	Sierra Tract Commercial	3.11026751621	920	SFR and MFR	15	0	No	No	47	37
032-141-04	110	So. "Y"	0.25687670372	873	MFR	15	0	Yes	No	4	3
032-192-06	110	So. "Y"	0.50054894855	967	MFR	15	0	Yes	No	8	6

APN	PAS/CP	Name of PAS/CP	Acres	IPES	Housing Types	Density (units/acre)	Bonus Units	Preferred AH	Multi-Unit Incentive	Max Unit Capacity	Realistic Unit Capacity
023-392-22	110 SA-2	So. "Y"	0.13006952278	778	SFR and MFR	15	175 total	Yes	Yes	2	2
023-251-13	110 SA-2	So. "Y"	0.12649733795	827	SFR and MFR	15	175 total	Yes	Yes	2	2
023-251-24	110 SA-2	So. "Y"	0.12562741734	864	SFR and MFR	15	175 total	Yes	Yes	2	2
023-241-26	110 SA-2	So. "Y"	0.14751292603	871	SFR and MFR	15	175 total	Yes	Yes	2	2
023-391-08	110 SA-2	So. "Y"	0.70211181189	904	SFR and MFR	15	175 total	Yes	Yes	11	8
023-241-42	110 SA-2	So. "Y"	0.98169356490	949	SFR and MFR	15	175 total	Yes	Yes	15	12
023-241-44	110 SA-2	So. "Y"	0.94858558213	978	SFR and MFR	15	175 total	Yes	Yes	14	11
023-393-17	110 SA-2	So. "Y"	0.48957127874	979	SFR and MFR	15	175 total	Yes	Yes	7	6
023-251-25	110 SA-2	So. "Y"	0.25147895947	994	SFR and MFR	15	175 total	Yes	Yes	4	3
023-392-28	110 SA-2	So. "Y"	0.59279715926	997	SFR and MFR	15	175 total	Yes	Yes	9	7
023-392-30	110 SA-2	So. "Y"	1.07195255007	1030	SFR and MFR	15	175 total	Yes	Yes	16	13
032-141-18	114 SA-1	Bonanza	0.95277331148	826	SFR and MFR	15	50 total	No	Yes	14	11
032-161-12	114 SA-1	Bonanza	0.85499780237	833	SFR and MFR	15	50 total	No	Yes	13	10
032-161-01	114 SA-1	Bonanza	0.92888536020	839	SFR and MFR	15	50 total	No	Yes	14	11
032-161-06	114 SA-1	Bonanza	0.89423943481	840	SFR and MFR	15	50 total	No	Yes	13	11
032-161-08	114 SA-1	Bonanza	0.82395763243	903	SFR and MFR	15	50 total	No	Yes	12	10
032-161-04	114 SA-1	Bonanza	0.97773091214	966	SFR and MFR	15	50 total	No	Yes	15	12
032-141-10	114 SA-1	Bonanza	0.50167579481	969	SFR and MFR	15	50 total	No	Yes	8	6
032-141-11	114 SA-1	Bonanza	1.00245439854	969	SFR and MFR	15	50 total	No	Yes	15	12
032-161-02	114 SA-1	Bonanza	0.97943162684	995	SFR and MFR	15	50 total	No	Yes	15	12
032-161-03	114 SA-1	Bonanza	0.97741878726	1005	SFR and MFR	15	50 total	No	Yes	15	12
032-221-02	114 SA-1	Bonanza	0.64101191326	1005	SFR and MFR	15	50 total	No	Yes	10	8
032-201-08	114 SA-1	Bonanza	0.75485240824	1024	SFR and MFR	15	50 total	No	Yes	11	9
032-151-04	114 SA-1	Bonanza	1.00327129524	1034	SFR and MFR	15	50 total	No	Yes	15	12
032-151-05	114 SA-1	Bonanza	1.00327056469	1034	SFR and MFR	15	50 total	No	Yes	15	12
032-151-07	114 SA-1	Bonanza	0.50054894851	1034	SFR and MFR	15	50 total	No	Yes	8	6
026-086-02	Bijou/Al Tahoe 2	Bijou/Al Tahoe 2	0.11491371073	847	SFR and MFR	15				2	1

APPENDIX C: GLOSSARY

Acre: A unit of land measure equal to 43,560 square feet.

Acreage: Net: The portion of a site exclusive of existing or planned public or private road rights-of-way.

Affordability Covenant: A property title agreement which places resale or rental restrictions on a housing unit.

Affordable Housing: Under state and federal statutes, housing which costs no more than 30 percent of gross household income. Housing costs include rent or mortgage payments, utilities, taxes, insurance, homeowner association fees, and other related costs. The TRPA defines affordable housing as deed-restricted housing to be used exclusively for lower-income households (income not in excess of 80 percent of the county's median income) and for very low-income households (income not in excess of 50 percent of the county's median income), and with costs that do not exceed recommended state and federal standards.

Affordable Units: Units for which households do not pay more than 30 percent of income for payment of rent (including monthly allowance for utilities) or monthly mortgage and related expenses. Since above moderate-income households do not generally have problems in locating affordable units, affordable units are often defined as those that low- to moderate-income households can afford.

Annexation: The incorporation of land area into the jurisdiction of an existing city with a resulting change in the boundaries of that city.

Assisted Housing: Housing that has been subsidized by federal, state, or local housing programs.

Assisted Housing Developments: Multi-family rental housing that receives governmental assistance under federal programs listed in subdivision (a) of Sec. 65863.10, state and local multi-family revenue bond programs, local redevelopment programs, the federal Community Development Block Grant Program, or local in-lieu fees. The term also includes multi-family rental units that were developed pursuant to a local inclusionary housing program or used to a quality for a density bonus pursuant to Government Code Section 65915.

At-Risk Housing: Multi-family rental housing that is at risk of losing its status as housing affordable for low- and moderate-income tenants due to the expiration of federal, state, or local agreements.

Below-Market-Rate: Any housing unit specifically priced to be sold or rented to low- or moderate- income households for an amount less than the fair-market value of the unit. Both the state of California and the US Department of Housing and Urban Development set standards for determining which households qualify as "low income" or "moderate income." The financing of housing at less than prevailing interest rates.

California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD): The state department responsible for administering state-sponsored housing programs and for reviewing housing elements to determine compliance with state housing law.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA): A state law requiring state and local agencies to regulate activities with consideration for environmental protection. If a proposed activity has the potential for a significant

adverse environmental impact, an environmental impact report must be prepared and certified as to its adequacy before taking action on the proposed project.

California Housing Finance Agency (CHFA): A state agency, established by the Housing and Home Finance Act of 1975, which is authorized to sell revenue bonds and generate funds for the development, rehabilitation, and conservation of low- and moderate-income housing.

Census: The official United States decennial enumeration of the population conducted by the federal government.

City: City with a capital "C" generally refers to City of South Lake Tahoe government or administration. City with a lower case "c" generally refers to the geographical area of the city.

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG): A grant program administered by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) on a formula basis for entitlement communities, and by the California Department of Housing and Community Development for non-entitled jurisdictions. This grant allots money to cities and counties for housing rehabilitation and community development, including public facilities and economic development.

Compatible: Capable of existing together without conflict or ill effects.

Condominium: A building or group of buildings in which units are owned individually, but the structure, common areas, and facilities are owned by all owners on a proportional, undivided basis.

Consistent: Free from variation or contradiction. Programs in the General Plan are to be consistent, not contradictory or preferential. State law requires consistency between a general plan and implementation measures such as the zoning code.

Contract Rent: The monthly rent agreed to, or contracted for regardless of any furnishings, utilities, or services that may be included.

Dedication, In lieu of: Cash payments that may be required of an owner or developer as a substitute for a dedication of land, usually calculated in dollars per lot, and referred to as in-lieu fees or in-lieu contributions.

Density: The number of dwelling units per unit of land. Density usually is expressed “per acre,” e.g., a development with 100 units located on 20 acres has density of 5.0 units per acre.

Density, Residential: The number of permanent residential dwelling units per acre of land. Densities specified in the General Plan may be expressed in units per gross acre or per net developable acre.

Density Bonus: The allocation of development rights that allows a parcel to accommodate additional square footage or additional residential units beyond the maximum for which the parcel is zoned. Under Government Code Section 65915, a housing development that provides 20 percent of its units for lower-income households, or 10 percent of its units for very low-income households, or 50 percent of its units for seniors, is entitled to a density bonus and other concessions.

Developable Land: Land that is suitable as a location for structures and that can be developed free of hazards to, and without disruption of, or significant impact on, natural resource areas.

Development Impact Fees: A fee or charge imposed on developers to pay for a jurisdiction's costs of providing services to new development.

Development Right: The right granted to a land owner or other authorized party to improve a property. Such right is usually expressed in terms of a use and intensity allowed under existing zoning regulation. For example, a development right may specify the maximum number of residential dwelling units permitted per acre of land.

Dwelling, Multi-family: A building containing two or more dwelling units for the use of individual households; an apartment or condominium building is an example of this dwelling unit type.

Dwelling, Single-family Attached: A one-family dwelling attached to one or more other one-family dwellings by a common vertical wall. Row houses and town homes are examples of this dwelling unit type.

Dwelling, Single-family Detached: A dwelling, not attached to any other dwelling, which is designed for and occupied by not more than one family and surrounded by open space or yards.

Dwelling Unit: A room or group of rooms (including sleeping, eating, cooking, and sanitation facilities, but not more than one kitchen), that constitutes an independent housekeeping unit, occupied or intended for occupancy by one household on a long-term basis.

Elderly Household: As defined by HUD, elderly households are one- or two- member (family or non-family) households in which the head or spouse is age 62 or older.

Element: A division or chapter of the General Plan.

Emergency Shelter: An emergency shelter is a facility that provides shelter to homeless families and/or homeless individuals on a limited short-term basis.

Emergency Shelter Grants: A grant program administered by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development provided on a formula basis to large entitlement jurisdictions.

Encourage: To stimulate or foster a particular condition through direct or indirect action by the private sector or government agencies.

Enhance: To improve existing conditions by increasing the quantity or quality of beneficial uses or features.

Environmental Impact Report: A report that assesses all the environmental characteristics of an area and determines what effects or impacts will result if the area is altered or disturbed by a proposed action.

Fair Market Rent: The rent, including utility allowances, determined by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development for purposes of administering the Section 8 Existing Housing Program.

Family: (1) Two or more persons related by birth, marriage, or adoption [U. Bureau of the Census]. (2) An individual or a group of persons living together who constitute a bona fide single-family housekeeping unit in a dwelling unit, not including a fraternity, sorority, club, or other group of persons occupying a hotel, lodging house or institution of any kind [California].

Feasible: Capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, and technological factors.

First-Time Home Buyer: Defined by HUD as an individual or family who has not owned a home during the three-year period preceding the HUD-assisted purchase of a home. Jurisdictions may adopt local definitions for first-time home buyer programs which differ from non-federally funded programs.

General Plan: A general plan is a legal document, adopted by the legislative body of a city or county, setting forth policies regarding long-term development. california law requires the preparation of seven elements or chapters in the general plan: land use, housing, circulation, conservation, open space, noise, and safety. Additional elements are permitted, such as economic development, urban design, and similar local concerns.

Goal: The ultimate purpose of an effort stated in a way that is general in nature and immeasurable.

Green Building: Any building that is sited, designed, constructed, operated, and maintained for the health and well-being of the occupants, while minimizing impact on the environment.

Gross Rent: Contract rent plus the estimated average monthly cost of utilities (water, electricity, gas) and fuels (oil, kerosene, wood, etc.) To the extent that these are paid for by the renter (or paid for by a relative, welfare agency, or friend) in addition to the rent.

Group Quarters: A facility which houses groups of unrelated persons not living in households (US Census definition). Examples of group quarters include institutions, dormitories, shelters, military quarters, assisted living facilities and other quarters, including single-room occupancy housing, where 10 or more unrelated individuals are housed.

Homeless: Unsheltered homeless are families and individuals whose primary nighttime residence is a public or private place not designed for, or ordinarily used as, a regular sleeping accommodation for human beings (e.g., the street, sidewalks, cars, vacant and abandoned buildings). Sheltered homeless are families and persons whose primary nighttime residence is a supervised publicly or privately operated shelter (e.g., emergency, transitional, battered women, and homeless youth shelters; and commercial hotels used to house the homeless).

Home Mortgage Disclosure Act: The Home Mortgage Disclosure Act requires larger lending institutions making home mortgage loans to publicly disclose the location and disposition of home purchase, refinance, and improvement loans. Institutions subject to the act must also disclose the gender, race, and income of loan applicants.

HOME Program: The HOME Investment Partnership Act, Title II of the National Affordable Housing Act of 1990. HOME is a federal program administered by HUD which provides formula grants to states and localities to fund activities that build, buy, and/or rehabilitate affordable housing for rent or home ownership or provide direct rental assistance to low-income people.

Household: All those persons—related or unrelated—who occupy a single housing unit.

Household Income: The total income of all the persons living in a household. A household is usually described as very low income, low income, moderate income, and upper income based upon household size, and income, relative to the regional median income.

Households, Number of: The count of all year-round housing units occupied by one or more persons. The concept of household is important because the formation of new households generates the demand for housing. Each new household formed creates the need for one additional housing unit or requires that one existing housing unit be shared by two households. Thus, household formation can continue to take place even without an increase in population, thereby increasing the demand for housing.

Housing and Urban Development, US Department of (HUD): A cabinet-level department of the federal government that administers housing and community development programs.

Housing Authority, Local: Local housing agency established in state law, subject to local activation and operation. Originally intended to manage certain federal subsidies, but vested with broad powers to develop and manage other forms of affordable housing.

Housing Problems: Defined by HUD as a household which: (1) occupies a unit with physical defects (lacks complete kitchen or bathroom); (2) meets the definition of overcrowded; or (3) spends more than 30 percent of income on housing cost.

Housing Subsidy: Housing subsidies refer to government assistance aimed at reducing housing sales or rent prices to more affordable levels. Two general types of housing subsidy exist. Where a housing subsidy is linked to a particular house or apartment, housing subsidy is project- or unit-based. In Section 8 rental assistance programs the subsidy is linked to the family and assistance provided to any number of families accepted by willing private landlords. This type of subsidy is said to be tenant-based.

Housing Unit: The place of permanent or customary abode of a person or family. A housing unit may be a single-family dwelling, a multi-family dwelling, a condominium, a modular home, a mobile home, a cooperative, or any other residential unit considered real property under state law. A housing unit has, at least, cooking facilities, a bathroom, and a place to sleep. It also is a dwelling that cannot be moved without substantial damage or unreasonable cost.

Impact Fee: A fee, also called a development fee, levied on the developer of a project by a city, county, or other public agency as compensation for otherwise-unmitigated impacts the project will produce.

Implementation Program: An action, procedures, program, or technique that carries out general plan policy. Implementation programs also specify primary responsibility for carrying out the action and a time frame for its accomplishment.

Inclusionary Zoning: Provisions established by a public agency to require that a specific percentage of housing units in a project or development remain affordable to very low-, low-, or moderate-income households for a specified period.

Income Category: Four categories are used to classify a household according to income based on the median income for the county. Under state housing statutes, these categories are defined as follows: very low (0-50% of county median); low (51-80% of county median); moderate (81-120% of county median); and upper (over 120% of county median).

Infill Development: Development of vacant land (usually individual lots or leftover properties) within areas that are already largely developed.

Jobs/Housing Balance; Jobs/Housing Ratio: The availability of affordable housing for employees. The jobs/housing ratio divides the number of jobs in an area by the number of employed residents. A ratio of 1.0 indicates a balance. A ratio greater than 1.0 indicates a net in-commute; less than 1.0 indicates a net out-commute.

Jobs/Housing Linkage Fee: Fee that local governments place on new employment-generating development to offset the impact that new employment has on housing needs within a community.

Large Household: A household with five or more members.

Lease: A contractual agreement by which an owner of real property (the lessor) gives the right of possession to another (a lessee) for a specified period of time (term) and for a specified consideration (rent).

Low-income Housing Tax Credits: Tax reductions provided by the federal and state governments for investors in housing for low-income households.

Manufactured Housing: Housing that is constructed of manufactured components, assembled partly at the site rather than totally at the site. Also referred to as modular housing.

Market-Rate Housing: Housing which is available on the open market without any subsidy. The price for housing is determined by the market forces of supply and demand and varies by location.

Mean: The average of a range of numbers.

Median: The mid-point in a range of numbers.

Median Income: The annual income for each household size within a region which is defined annually by HUD. Half of the households in the region have incomes above the median and half have incomes below the median.

Mitigate: To ameliorate, alleviate, or avoid to the extent reasonably feasible.

Mixed-use: Properties on which various uses, such as office, commercial, institutional, and residential, are combined in a single building or on a single site in an integrated development project with significant functional interrelationships and a coherent physical design. A "single site" may include contiguous properties.

Mobile Home: A structure, transportable in one or more sections, built on a permanent chassis and designed for use as a single-family dwelling unit and which (1) has a minimum of 400 square feet of living space; (2) has a minimum width in excess of 102 inches; (3) is connected to all available permanent utilities; and (4) is tied down (a) to a permanent foundation on a lot either owned or leased by the homeowner or (b) is set on piers, with wheels removed and skirted, in a mobile home park.

Mortgage Revenue Bond: A state, county, or city program providing financing for the development of housing through the sale of tax-exempt bonds.

Multi-family Dwelling Unit: A building or portion thereof designed for or occupied by two or more families living independently of each other, including duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes, apartments, and condominiums.

Overcrowding: Households or occupied housing units with 1.01 or more persons per room.

Parcel: A lot in single ownership or under single control, usually considered a unit for purposes of development.

Physical Defects: A housing unit lacking complete kitchen or bathroom facilities (US Census definition). Jurisdictions may expand the Census definition in defining units with physical defects.

Poverty Level: As used by the US Census, families and unrelated individuals are classified as being above or below the poverty level based on a poverty index that provides a range of income cutoffs or poverty thresholds varying by size of family, number of children, and age of householder. The income cutoffs are updated each year to reflect the change in the Consumer Price Index.

Project-Based Rental Assistance: Rental assistance provided for a project, not for a specific tenant. A tenant receiving project-based rental assistance gives up the right to that assistance upon moving from the project.

Public Housing: A project-based low-rent housing program operated by independent local public housing authorities. A low-income family applies to the local public housing authority in the area in which they want to live.

Quantified Objective: The housing element must include quantified objectives which specify the maximum number of housing units that can be constructed, rehabilitated, and conserved by income level within an eight-year time frame, based on the needs, resources, and constraints identified in the housing element (Sec. 65583 (b)). The number of units that can be conserved should include a subtotal for the number of existing assisted units subject to conversion to non-low-income households. Whenever possible, objectives should be set for each particular housing program, establishing a numerical target for the effective period of the program. Ideally, the sum of the quantified objectives will be equal to the identified housing needs. However, identified needs may exceed available resources and limitations imposed by other requirements of state planning law. Where this is the case, the quantified objectives need not equal the identified housing needs, but should establish the maximum number of units that can be constructed, rehabilitated, and conserved (including existing subsidized units subject to conversion which can be preserved for lower-income use), given the constraints.

Redevelop: To demolish existing buildings; or to increase the overall floor area existing on a property; or both, irrespective of whether a change occurs in land use.

Regional Housing Needs Plan: The Regional Housing Needs Plan is based on state of California projections of population growth and housing unit demand and assigns a share of the region's future housing need to each jurisdiction within the Sacramento Area Council of Governments. These housing need numbers serve as the basis for the update of the housing element in each California city and county.

Regional Housing Needs Share: A quantification by a Council of Government or by HCD of existing and projected housing need, by household income group, for all localities within a region.

Rehabilitation: The repair, preservation, and/or improvement of substandard housing.

Residential, Multiple-family: Usually three or more dwelling units on a single site, which may be in the same or separate buildings.

Residential, Single-family: A single-dwelling unit on a building site.

Rezoning: An amendment to the map and/or text of a zoning ordinance to effect a change in the nature, density, or intensity of uses allowed in a zoning district and/or on a designated parcel or land area.

Second Unit: A self-contained living unit, either attached to or detached from, and in addition to, the primary residential unit on a single lot. "Granny flat" is one type of second unit intended for the elderly.

Section 8 Rental Assistance Program: A federal (HUD) rent-subsidy program that is one of the main sources of federal housing assistance for low-income households. The program operates by providing housing assistance payments to owners, developers, and public housing agencies to make up the difference between the fair market rent of a unit (set by HUD) and the household's contribution toward the rent, which is calculated at 30 percent of the household's adjusted gross monthly income Section 8 includes programs for new construction, existing housing, and substantial or moderate housing rehabilitation.

Seniors: Persons age 65 and older.

Service Needs: The particular services required by special populations, typically including needs such as transportation, personal care, housekeeping, counseling, meals, case management, personal emergency response, and other services preventing premature institutionalization and assisting individuals to continue living independently.

Site: A parcel of land used or intended for one use or a group of uses and having frontage on a public or an approved private street. A lot.

Small Household: Pursuant to HUD definition, a small household consists of two to four non-elderly persons.

Special Needs Groups: Those segments of the population which have a more difficult time finding decent affordable housing due to special circumstances. Under California housing element statutes, these special needs groups consist of the elderly, handicapped, large families, female-headed households, farmworkers, and the homeless. A jurisdiction may also choose to consider additional special needs groups in the Housing Element, such as students, military households, other groups present in their community.

Subdivision: The division of a tract of land into defined lots, either improved or unimproved, which can be separately conveyed by sale or lease, and which can be altered or developed.

Subdivision Map Act: Section 66410 et seq. of the California Government Code, this act vests in local legislative bodies the regulation and control of the design and improvement of subdivisions, including the requirement for tentative and final maps.

Subsidize: To assist by payment of a sum of money or by the granting of terms or favors that reduce the need for monetary expenditures. Housing subsidies may take the forms of mortgage interest deductions or tax credits from federal and/or state income taxes, sale or lease at less than market value of land to be used for the construction of housing, payments to supplement a minimum affordable rent, and the like.

Substandard Housing: Residential dwellings that, because of their physical condition, do not provide safe and sanitary housing.

Substandard, Suitable for Rehabilitation: Substandard units which are structurally sound and where the cost of rehabilitation is economically warranted.

Substandard, Needs Replacement: Substandard units which are structurally unsound and for which the cost of rehabilitation is considered infeasible, such as instances where the majority of a unit has been damaged by fire.

Supportive Housing: Housing with a supporting environment, such as group homes or single room occupancy housing and other housing that includes a supportive service component such as those defined below.

Supportive Services: Services provided to residents of supportive housing for the purpose of facilitating the independence of residents. Some examples are case management, medical or psychological counseling and supervision, child care, transportation, and job training.

Tenant-Based Rental Assistance: A form of rental assistance in which the assisted tenant may move from a dwelling unit with a right to continued assistance. The assistance is provided for the tenant, not for the project.

Transient Occupancy Buildings: Buildings that have an occupancy of 30 days or fewer, such as boarding houses, hospices, hostels, and emergency shelters.

Transit Occupancy Tax: A tax imposed by a jurisdiction upon travelers to the area, collected by hotel, bed and breakfast, and condominium operators.

Transitional Housing: Transitional housing is temporary (often six months to two years) housing for a homeless individual or family who is transitioning to permanent housing. Transitional housing often includes a supportive services component (e.g., job skills training, rehabilitation counseling) to allow individuals to gain necessary life skills in support of independent living.

Universal Design: The creation of products and environments meant to be usable by all people, to the greatest extent possible, without the need for adaptation or specialization.

Vacant: Lands or buildings that are not actively used for any purpose.

Workforce Housing: Housing that is affordable to working households that do not qualify for publicly subsidized housing, and cannot afford market-rate housing in their own community. Ideally, workforce housing in South Lake Tahoe will satisfy the housing needs of family households earning between 60 and 120 percent of the median-household income.

Zoning: The division of a city or county by legislative regulations into areas, or zones, which specify allowable uses for real property and size restrictions for buildings within these areas; a program that implements policies of the general plan.

PART II
CITY OF SOUTH LAKE TAHOE
HOUSING ELEMENT POLICY DOCUMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION **1**
NEW CONSTRUCTION **2**
GOAL HE-1 2
AFFORDABLE HOUSING **7**
GOAL HE-2 7
REHABILITATION/CONSERVATION **13**
GOAL HE-3 13
SPECIAL NEEDS HOUSING **16**
GOAL HE-4 16
EQUAL OPPORTUNITY HOUSING & DISCRIMINATION PREVENTION **19**
GOAL HE-5 19
ENERGY CONSERVATION OPPORTUNITIES **20**
GOAL HE-6 21
NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION **22**
GOAL HE-7 22
IMPLEMENTATION MONITORING **23**
GOAL HE-8 23
QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES **24**
LIST OF TABLES
TABLE HE-1: SUMMARY OF QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES HE-28
TABLE HE-2: IMPLEMENTATION TRACKING MATRIX HE-29

INTRODUCTION

Under California law, the housing element must include the community's goals, policies, quantified objectives, and housing programs for the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing.

This Housing Element includes eight goal statements. Under each goal statement, the element sets out policies that amplify each goal statement. Implementation programs are listed at the end of the corresponding group of policies and describe briefly the proposed action, the City departments with primary responsibility for carrying out the program, the funding source, and the time frame for accomplishing the program.

The following definitions describe the nature of the statements of goals, policies, implementation programs, and quantified objectives as they are used in the Housing Element Policy Document:

> **Goal**: Ultimate purpose of an effort stated in a way that is general in nature and immeasurable.
>
> **Policy**: Specific statement guiding action and implying clear commitment.
>
> **Implementation Program**: An action, procedure, program, or technique that carries out policy. Implementation programs also specify primary responsibility for carrying out the action and an estimated time frame for its accomplishment. The time frame indicates the fiscal year in which the activity is scheduled to be completed. These time frames are general guidelines and may be adjusted based on City staffing and budgetary considerations.
>
> **Quantified Objective**: The number of housing units that the City expects to be constructed, conserved, or rehabilitated, or the number of households the City expects will be assisted through Housing Element programs based on general market conditions during the time frame of the Housing Element.

Housing element law recognizes that in developing housing policy and programs, identified housing needs may exceed available resources and the community's ability to satisfy these needs. The quantified objectives of the housing element, therefore, need not be identical to the identified housing need, but should establish the maximum number of housing units that can be constructed, rehabilitated, and conserved, or households assisted over a five-year time frame.

The following list shows the definition of housing income limits as they are applied to housing units in South Lake Tahoe.

- **Extremely Low-Income Housing:** affordable to households whose combined income is between the floor set at the minimum Supplemental Security Income and 30 percent of the median income for El Dorado County.
- **Very Low-Income Housing**: affordable to households whose combined income is at or lower than 50 percent of the county median income.
- **Low-Income Housing**: affordable to a household whose combined income is at or between 51 percent and 80 percent of the county median income.

- **Moderate-Income Housing**: affordable to a household whose combined income is at or between 81 percent and 120 percent of the county median income.
- **Middle-Income Housing:** affordable to a household whose combined income is at or between 121 percent and 160 percent of the county median income. (*Note: as defined by the City of South Lake Tahoe.)
- **Above-Moderate Income Housing:** affordable to a household whose combined income is above 120 percent of the county median income.
- **Workforce Housing:** for South Lake Tahoe, workforce housing is intended to meet the needs of working family households earning between 60 and 180 percent of the median-household income.

NEW CONSTRUCTION

New construction in South Lake Tahoe is limited by the TRPA's residential allocation system, which regulates the number of new housing units that can be constructed each year within each jurisdiction. In 2013, the City received 19 residential allocations for distribution within the city limits for moderate- and above moderate-income housing. The waiting list for TRPA allocations in the city is approximately six to eight years. While the TRPA's growth-control mechanisms act as a constraint on the production of new housing, they are the foundation of the Regional Plan. The City strives to find environmentally appropriate solutions to its housing problems.

Goal HE-1	To provide housing opportunities for South Lake Tahoe residents of all economic levels.

POLICIES

Policy 1-1 The City shall adopt programs, ordinances, incentives, land use plans and other regulatory mechanisms that provide opportunities for the private sector to address the housing needs of citizens of all economic levels.

Policy 1-2 The City shall work with the TRPA to expeditiously process residential development proposals that conform to the City's Housing Element policies.

Policy 1-3 The City shall work with the California Department of Housing and Community Development and through the California Legislature to remove unreasonable barriers to the implementation of the goals, policies, and programs of the City's Housing Element and to maintain consistency with state law.

Policy 1-4 The City shall encourage the consolidation of parcels to facilitate more effective multi-family residential development.

Policy 1-5 The City shall encourage development that reuses infrastructure associated with existing underutilized sites to help developers benefit from "grandfathered" excess land coverage, existing sewer units, air quality mitigation fee reductions, and other benefits associated with the redevelopment of existing lots.

Policy 1-6 The City shall encourage the production of housing as part of mixed-use projects in commercial nodes, Town Centers and Regional Centers and any other high-density area that may be identified in the future.

Policy 1-7 The City shall direct high-density residential development to sites located within walking distance of public transit and services. The City shall consider minimum density requirements in these areas.

Policy 1-8 The City shall support the establishment of Pedestrian and Transit-Oriented Development districts in which developers of mixed-use and high-density residential developments shall receive incentives (i.e., increased density, height, commercial floor area, residential allocations, and the ability to subdivide into condominiums).

Policy 1-9 Support the efforts of the California Tahoe Conservancy in the Tahoe Livable Communities program to remove blighted properties and repurpose associated development commodities. Encourage the use of residential commodities for affordable housing located in Town Centers.

PROGRAMS

Program 1-1 MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT

The City shall continue to create incentives (i.e., alternative parking requirements, streamlined permitting) to encourage production of housing in non-traditional (i.e., commercial) areas where residential use is appropriate to the setting and where mixed-use projects could either address job and housing needs or the desires of second homeowners. The incentives have been included in the Tourist Core Area Plan and will be included in the Tahoe Valley Area Plan. The City shall provide information regarding the incentives at City Planning Division offices and on the City website, and an information packet will be distributed to local developers.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division
Funding:	Staff time, general fund
Time Frame:	Tourist Core Area Plan was adopted in 2013; expected adoption of Tahoe Valley Area Plan in late 2014.

Program 1-2 CONDOMINIUMIZATION OF NEW DEVELOPMENT

The City shall codify City policies related to construction of new market-rate condominiums (currently defined as clusters of at least two attached units). The City shall modify the allocation process so that the criteria for using multi-family allocations from

the City's list for condominium development are based on a minimum density rather than whether the condominium is attached or detached.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division
Funding:	Staff time, general fund
Time Frame:	By the end of 2014

Program 1-3 REDUCE ALLOCATION BACKLOG

The City shall meet with the TRPA Governing Board annually to find solutions that reduce the current backlog for residential allocations as needed.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division
Funding:	Staff time, general fund
Time Frame:	Annually

Program 1-4 VACANT LAND INVENTORY

The City shall maintain an updated inventory of vacant, buildable land. The City shall make this information available to the public by providing the inventory at the Planning Department counter and on the City's website.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division
Funding:	Staff time, general fund
Time Frame:	FY 14/15 and ongoing

Program 1-5 DEVELOPMENT OF SUBSTANDARD/UNDERUTILIZED SITES

The City shall maintain an inventory of the underutilized sites with development potential identified in the Housing Element Background Report.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division
Funding	Staff time, general fund
Time Frame:	FY 14/15 and ongoing

Program 1-6 PARKING BEST PRACTICES

The City shall continue to research best practices for parking standards, and continue to allow more flexible parking standards for mixed-use and other housing projects on a case-by-case basis. The City's flexible parking standards could include one or more of the following practices:

- Continuing to allow parking reductions for affordable and mixed-use projects.
- Promoting shared parking for mixed-use projects located in commercial areas.
- Allowing and encouraging affordable housing developers to unbundle parking and rent parking spaces separately from the units.

- Allowing affordable housing developers to pay an in-lieu fee to support public transportation access to the project site in place of some of the parking requirements.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division
Funding	Staff time, general fund
Time Frame:	Ongoing, as projects are processed through the Planning Division.

Program 1-7 UTILIZING DENSITY INCENTIVES

The City shall work with affordable, workforce, and other multi-family housing proponents to direct them to Community Plan or Area Plan areas where incentives are already in place to allow for the additional coverage that could enable achievement of the densities necessary to make a project "pencil out." The City has incorporated incentives into the recently adopted Tourist Core Area Plan and will also incorporate incentives into the Tahoe Valley Area Plan, currently in progress. The City shall produce an informational packet which describes all of the incentives for multi-family and affordable housing for extremely low-, very low-, and low-income households, including bonus units, land coverage within Community Plans, and/or density bonuses. The information will be available at the City Planning Division offices and on the City website, and the information packet will be distributed to local developers.

In addition, the City will continue to work with TRPA and other Tahoe Basin agencies toward amending Basin-wide regulations to allow the City to offer density bonuses consistent with the State Density Bonus Law (GC Section 65915, et seq.).

Responsible Party:	Planning Division
Funding:	Staff time, general fund
Time Frame:	June 2015

Program 1-8 CLARIFYING THE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

The City shall continue to provide information on the City website to clarify the development process for developers/builders who are looking to construct housing in South Lake Tahoe and are unfamiliar with the process.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division and Building Division
Funding:	Staff time, general fund
Time Frame:	Ongoing, updated as needed.

Program 1-9 CLARIFY HOW RESIDENTIAL-CARE FACILITIES ARE ALLOWED PER STATE LAW

The City will amend the zoning code to specify that residential care facilities (group homes) for six persons or fewer are allowed by right in all residential districts.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division

Funding:	Staff time, general fund
Time Frame:	Amend code by the end of 2015.

Program 1-10 SMALL LOT CONSOLIDATION

To ensure that there is a sufficient supply of multi-family zoned land to meet the City's RHNA, the City will encourage lot consolidations to combine small residential lots into larger developable lots by meeting with local developers to discuss development opportunities and incentives for lot consolidation to accommodate affordable housing units and making applicants aware of these opportunities at the planning counter. In addition the City will allow administrative processing of lot consolidation. As developers/owners approach the City interested in lot consolidation for the development of affordable housing, the City will offer one or more of the following incentives on a project-by-project basis:

- Lessen set-backs. Note that any reduction in setbacks would require a public hearing and noticing.
- Reduce parking requirements.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division
Funding:	Staff time, general fund
Time Frame:	Establish program in FY 14/15 and as applicants come forward.

Program 1-11 TAHOE VALLEY AREA PLAN

The City is currently preparing the Tahoe Valley Area Plan. In addition to the City's vision for the plan area, this plan will implement new regulations from the updated TRPA Regional Plan. As part of the planning process the City will evaluate appropriate sites for housing in the plan area and will consider allowing densities up to 25 units per acre or minimum density standards for some of the sites in the plan area.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division
Funding:	Staff time
Time Frame:	Adoption expected in late 2014.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

There is a general disparity between wages and the cost of housing in South Lake Tahoe. Many of the city's year-round residents who live and work in the city find it difficult to afford housing. While the city's year-round population is growing slowly, the city continues to be a popular resort destination and tourist-based employment continues to expand. Low-wage service industry jobs create a need for affordable[1] low-income housing. Middle-income residents are also experiencing difficulty affording safe and decent housing.

The shortage of affordable housing is an issue facing many communities in California and throughout the nation, especially resort communities with high-end real estate and low-paying jobs. There is no best strategy for providing affordable housing in resort locations. Cities can address the problem with a mix of incentives and restrictions. Unlike other communities, South Lake Tahoe's ability to provide incentives for affordable housing, such as additional height and land coverage, and reduction of TRPA mitigation fees, is limited by TRPA regulations. The City has recently addressed some of these issues through adoption of the Tourist Core Area Plan which implements some changes to development standards allowed by the TRPA Regional Plan update. The City is also currently working on the Tahoe Valley Area Plan which will include additional incentives. The City can continue to address the affordable housing shortage through the creative use of funds, development of new partnerships with both the public and private sectors, and by working with the TRPA on recommendations for changes to TRPA housing regulations and policies.

Goal HE-2	To encourage construction and maintenance of affordable and/or workforce housing in South Lake Tahoe.

POLICIES

Policy 2-1 The City shall ensure a stable community by helping tenants to become homeowners and preserving the ability for children to afford housing in the community where they grew up.

Policy 2-2 The City shall enable opportunities for deed-restricted affordable ownership housing to ensure long-term affordability.

Policy 2-3 The City shall encourage a range of housing options so that people who work in South Lake Tahoe can choose to live in the city.

[1] Under state and federal statutes "affordable housing" is defined as housing which costs no more than 30 percent of gross household income. The California Department of Housing and Community Development's (HCD) definition of affordable housing applies to housing for moderate-income households and below. The TRPA's definition of "affordable housing" includes the state and federal definition, but refers exclusively to deed-restricted housing for lower-income households (income not in excess of 80 percent of the county's median income) and very low-income households (income not in excess of 50 percent of the county's median income). In general, this section uses HCD's definition of "affordable housing"; however, when discussing TRPA-related programs, "affordable housing" is based on the TRPA's definition.

Policy 2-4 The City shall inform and educate the public regarding the myths and realities of multi-family housing and affordable housing.

Policy 2-5 The City shall recognize that it will become difficult to attract employees if they cannot afford to purchase or rent housing in South Lake Tahoe. The City shall encourage and support programs and activities that create a robust local economy that provides residents with good paying employment and the means to purchase and/or rent housing in the city.

Policy 2-6 The City shall ensure that deed-restricted affordable housing is created using attractive, long-lasting, low-maintenance materials.

Policy 2-7 The City shall encourage employers with a large seasonal workforce located in or near South Lake Tahoe to develop or acquire employee housing for their seasonal workers.

Policy 2-8 The City shall support the efforts of the Lake Tahoe Community College in planning for and developing affordable student, faculty, and employee housing on campus.

Policy 2-9 The City shall strive to provide housing opportunities that are affordable for workers earning between 60 and 180 percent of the area median income. The City shall recognize that police and fire personnel, school teachers, nurses, and other public service employees are an essential component of the local workforce.

Policy 2-10 The City shall support efforts to create a bi-state HOME Consortium if it is found to be a feasible option for securing funding for affordable housing.

PROGRAMS

Program 2-1 PURSUE STATE AND FEDERAL FUNDS

To support the creation of quality, affordable housing options for extremely low-, very low-, and low-income households, the City shall seek and when appropriate and feasible pursue grant opportunities for state and federal funds.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division
Funding:	Section 811 funds, Section 202 funds, state and federal tax credits, CDBG funds, CalHome funds, HOME funds
Time Frame:	FY 14/15 and ongoing

Program 2-2 REAL ESTATE TRANSFER TAX

The City shall consider adoption of a Real Estate Transfer Tax (RETT) ordinance and negotiate with El Dorado County to establish the terms of collection for its half of the RETT imposed on all real estate transactions occurring within city limits. All revenues collected from the RETT shall be earmarked for affordable and workforce housing.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division and Finance Department
Funding:	Staff time, general fund
Time Frame:	FY 15/16

Program 2-3 LINKAGE PROGRAM

The City shall analyze appropriate fees, thresholds of significance, standards, and criteria for a linkage program, which would connect new development to the housing demand that it creates. Once the City establishes appropriate fees and standards, the City shall consider adopting a linkage ordinance, and the fees collected from the program shall be placed in a housing trust fund to provide housing for the South Lake Tahoe workforce. The City shall consider offering developers of applicable projects one or more of the following options:

- Developers shall build affordable workforce housing units.
- Developers shall contribute land for the production of affordable and/or workforce housing.
- Developers shall pay an in-lieu of fee into the housing trust fund to help finance the production of affordable and/or workforce housing.

The City shall consider offering incentives to developers participating in the program.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division
Funding:	Staff time, general fund
Time Frame:	FY 15/16

Program 2-4 PARTNERSHIPS FOR WORKFORCE HOUSING

The City shall continue to work with larger employers in the City (e.g., Barton Hospital, the Lake Tahoe Community College, and resorts) to develop new affordable seasonal employee housing and workforce housing opportunities for employees through public-private partnerships between the employers, developers, and local government.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division
Funding:	Staff time, general fund
Time Frame:	Ongoing

Program 2-5 INTER-JURISDICTIONAL COOPERATION FOR WORKFORCE HOUSING

The City shall continue to meet with surrounding jurisdictions in the Tahoe Basin to discuss workforce housing issues and develop cooperative strategies that address identified workforce housing needs.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division
Funding:	Staff time, general fund
Time Frame:	Ongoing

Program 2-6 ANALYSIS OF FEDERAL AND STATE LANDS

The City shall continue discussing the potential for developing quality workforce and affordable housing on non-environmentally sensitive lands owned by the California Tahoe Conservancy (CTC) and the United States Forest Service (USFS). The City shall ensure that important natural resources are protected and only pursue surplus lands that these agencies have determined do not have a clear and compatible conservation or recreation purpose consistent with agency goals.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division
Funding	General fund
Time Frame:	Ongoing

Program 2-7 STUDENT HOUSING

The City shall provide assistance to the Lake Tahoe Community College to examine the need for, and feasibility of, developing student housing. The City shall help identify opportunities for reuse of existing off-campus properties as permanent student housing. The City and college shall explore alternative management solutions to minimize the role of the College in maintaining student housing.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division
Funding:	Staff time, general fund
Time Frame:	FY 15/16

Program 2-8 ASSIST NONPROFIT HOUSING DEVELOPERS

The City shall provide technical and financial support (when feasible) to local, regional, and statewide not-for-profit housing sponsors that facilitate the creation of affordable housing. Such support can include the donation of City-owned sites, the use of existing City housing programs for project clients when appropriate, the prompt processing of needed applications, and the preparation of funding applications.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division
Funding:	Staff time, surplus property
Time Frame:	Ongoing, as projects are processed through the Planning Division.

Program 2-9 FIRST-TIME HOMEBUYER PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION PARTNERING

To support the creation of quality, affordable ownership housing, the City has historically administered the First-Time Homebuyer program. Currently, the City does not have resources to administer the program. The City will initiate discussions with other agencies or organizations that may be able to take on the administration of a first-time homebuyer program for residents of the city.

Responsible Party: Planning Division
Funding: N/A
Time Frame: FY 14/15

Program 2-10 MITIGATION OF TRPA REGULATIONS

If not already addressed in the 2012 TRPA Regional Plan update and through the Tourist Core Area Plan, the City shall continue to recommend that TRPA make the following changes to reduce restrictions on affordable, workforce, and mixed-use housing developments:

- Allow mixed-use development in all Community Plans (CP), Area Plans and Plan Area Statements (PAS) that allow commercial uses.
- Enable mixed-use projects with an affordable multi-family housing component to be developed at maximum allowable density as if a stand-alone project rather than reducing the number of units that can be developed according to the ratio of the project area devoted to housing.
- Offer fee reductions or fee deferrals for nonprofit affordable housing projects.
- Allow bonus unit substitution to include deed-restricted workforce housing.
- Facilitate development of second units by allowing them on parcels smaller than one acre, encouraging the use of bonus units for creation of deed-restricted affordable second units, and reducing fees.
- Allow the subdivision of property for the development of affordable low- and moderate-income rental and owner-occupied housing.
- Provide bonus units for all multi-family mixed use development projects in Town or Regional Centers.
- Based on future changes to current TRPA regulations, the City shall explore potential incentives for affordable housing developers.
- To clarify that transitional and supportive housing are allowed without a conditional use permit or other discretionary action in Plan Areas, Area Plan areas, and Community Plan areas that allow residential development add definitions of transitional and supportive housing to Chapter 21 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. These uses such uses shall be allowed in the same way and subject to the same restrictions that apply to other residential uses of the same type in the same zone. The definitions will be included as defined in Government Code Sections 65582(f), (g) and (h).

- To clarify that emergency shelters are allowed without a conditional use permit or other discretionary action in Plan Areas, Area Plan areas, and Community Plan areas that allow Social Service Organization uses, add a definitions of emergency shelter to Chapter 21 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

- Create a simple process for the conversion of TAUs to RUUs in motels providing long term (30 days or longer) occupancies where the property meets all minimum building, housing and property maintenance code standards as well as limited development standards without requiring the property to meet all TRPA Code development standards.

- Create a simple process for the conversion of motels to single room occupancy (SRO) properties providing long term (30 days or longer) rent where the property meets all minimum building, housing and property maintenance code standards as well as limited development standards without requiring the property to meet all TRPA Code of Ordinances development standards. A definition of SRO will be added to the TRPA Code of Ordinances and single room occupancy units shall be allowed with a conditional use permit. The areas of the City where SROs will be allowed shall be determined based on the conclusions from the TRPA process and a public process to determine the appropriate criteria for allowing motel conversion to SROs.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division
Funding:	Staff time, general fund
Time Frame:	June 2014 for TRPA Regional Housing Needs Study, June 2015 for follow up on actions not addressed by the study or actions to be taken by the City as a result of the study, and ongoing

Program 2-11 PUBLIC EDUCATION

The City shall continue to provide information that describes the myths and realities of multi-family and affordable housing development. Information is available on the City website, and, when needed, the City makes this presentation/slide show available to housing advocates and to developers involved in local affordable housing projects. The City shall continue to encourage local housing advocates to make presentations to local builders and developers, Chamber of Commerce, civic groups, and the local community. Additionally, the City shall publicize the Affordable Housing Resources page of the City's website as a source of information on housing programs (e.g., brochure available at the planning counter).

Responsible Party:	Planning Division
Funding:	Staff time, general fund
Time Frame:	Ongoing

Program 2-12 PUBLICIZE AVAILABLE PROGRAMS

The City shall continue to publicize programs such as energy efficiency programs and state and federal funding programs currently available to South Lake Tahoe residents by making brochures available at the Planning Division offices, posting information on the City's website, and distributing information to an e-mail contact database.

Responsible Party: Planning Division

Funding: Staff time, general fund

Time Frame: Ongoing

REHABILITATION/CONSERVATION

While it is important to encourage the development of new affordable housing, reinvestment in the existing supply of housing is equally important. A large percentage of the city's existing housing stock is in need of some form of rehabilitation. Based on findings from a 2002 Housing Conditions Survey, about one-quarter, or 631 units, of the properties with one to four dwelling units that were surveyed (a total of 2,640) needed rehabilitation. Among properties with five or more dwelling units, about 34 percent of the surveyed units required rehabilitation, and 1 percent required replacement. Of those with more than 20 units, 23 percent required rehabilitation. Many of the city's mobile home parks are in need of substantial rehabilitation. Common problems found during the mobile home park portion of the survey included cracked and broken roofs, siding in need of patchwork and repainting, and windows and doors in need of repainting.

Goal HE-3	To preserve and enhance the existing supply of housing.

POLICIES

Policy 3-1 The City shall encourage private reinvestment in residential neighborhoods and private rehabilitation of housing.

Policy 3-2 The City shall continue to ensure that housing in the city is decent, safe, and sanitary for its occupants.

Policy 3-3 The City shall support good property management practices, long-term maintenance and improvement of existing housing through follow-up to complaints left on the Housing Issues Hotline, code enforcement activities, and the rehabilitation loan program.

Policy 3-4 The City shall take all reasonable steps to ensure that proposed redevelopment, mobile home park closures or subdivisions do not result in the displacement of persons of low and moderate income. In the case of displacement, project applicants shall be required to relocate low- and moderate-income tenants and/or replace the lost low- and moderate-income housing units.

Policy 3-5 The City shall consider the feasibility of converting substandard mobile home parks and motels to higher-density affordable housing and/or mixed-use developments when such conversions could create additional affordable housing opportunities.

Policy 3-6 The City shall consider implementation of an inspection program, similar to the Multi-Family Dwelling inspection program, for motels providing long term (30 days or longer) occupancies. The purpose of this program would be to identify blighted and deteriorated units, fulfilling housing needs and to provide for the rehabilitation of units that do not meet minimum building, housing, property maintenance code standards, and city-wide design standards, or is not safe to occupy.

Policy 3-7 Transfers of residential commodities including development rights, allocations, and residential units of use shall only be allowed out of the City where it can be found that the City would benefit (i) economically, (ii) socially, and/or (iii) environmentally from the transfer.

PROGRAMS

Program 3-1 REHABILITATION LOAN PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION PARTNERING

The City shall continue to regularly complete an application for rehabilitation funds to serve City residents. The City has historically administered the Rehabilitation Loan Program to both single- and multi-family dwellings occupied by lower-income households. Currently, the City does not have resources to administer the program. The City will initiate discussions with other agencies or organizations that may be able to take on the administration of rehabilitation loans for residents of the city.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division
Funding:	N/A
Time Frame:	FY 14/15 and ongoing

Program 3-2 MULTIPLE FAMILY DWELLING INSPECTION AND MAINTENANCE PROGRAM

Continue the Multiple Family Dwelling Inspection and Maintenance Program on multi-family projects of six units or more (or smaller projects if approved by City Council) to identify blighted and deteriorated housing stock and to provide for the rehabilitation of housing that does not meet minimum building, housing and property maintenance code standards, and site maintenance standards as well as citywide design standards, or is not safe to occupy, and further, to preserve and enhance the quality of life for residents of the city living in multi-family dwelling units.

Responsible Party:	Building Division
Funding:	Staff time, general fund
Time Frame:	Ongoing

Program 3-3 MOBILE HOME PARKS ORDINANCES

The City shall modify the mobile home parks ordinances to:

- Address conversion of mobile home parks to other uses (quantifying what constitutes a change of use, the definition of "cessation," such as all or part of a park, immediately or gradually when relocation payment is required, etc.).
- Reduce the 10-acre new park requirement to a size appropriate for development of a quality park with amenities for its residents (possibly five acres).
- Consider taking over the Title 25 mobile home park inspection program/enforcement, while ensuring that the City can afford to do so within state-prescribed fees.
- Address design and amenities required in new and enlarged parks, such as fencing requirements.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division and Building Division
Funding:	Staff time, general fund
Time Frame:	FY 14/15

Program 3-4 ACQUISITION OF AT-RISK PROPERTIES

The City shall continue to provide technical and financial assistance to the St. Joseph Community Land Trust and other nonprofit housing organizations that might be interested in, and have the capacity to, step in to acquire and rehabilitate any of the at-risk (185 units) or substandard properties to maintain, or create, long-term, affordable rental housing.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division
Funding:	Staff time
Time Frame:	2014 and ongoing

Program 3-5 ANALYSIS OF BARRIERS TO MOTEL CONVERSIONS

The City shall analyze the barriers to converting motel properties to deed-restricted, affordable housing that meets health and safety standards for long term residences.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division
Funding:	Staff time, general fund
Time Frame:	FY 15/16

Program 3-6 HOUSING CONDITION SURVEY

Continue to enforce City building, fire, health, and zoning codes to remedy existing pockets of blight and deterioration to conserve and improve the condition of existing housing stock in coordination with rehabilitation and other infrastructure improvement programs. Conduct a Housing Condition Survey prior to completion of the 6th cycle Housing Element update.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division and Building Division
Funding:	Staff time, general fund
Time Frame:	Ongoing and by 2022 for Housing Condition Survey.

SPECIAL NEEDS HOUSING

Within the general population there are several groups of people who have special housing needs. These special needs can make it difficult for members of these groups to locate suitable housing. In South Lake Tahoe, special needs groups include single female-headed households, seasonal workers, students, seniors, disabled persons (including those with developmental disabilities), homeless persons, and large families.

Disabled persons often require special housing features to accommodate physical limitations. The City has processes in place for persons with disabilities to request reasonable accommodation for exceptions for placement of carports and when needed at City facilities and functions. While the City has shown a commitment to the creation of housing that is accessible to persons with disabilities, the City continues to evaluate other types of accommodation needed by those with disabilities.

Although there are a number of services available to homeless residents of South Lake Tahoe, there is a lack of emergency housing. Motel vouchers may provide some relief for homeless residents seeking shelter from harsh winter weather.

Goal HE-4	To provide a range of housing services for households with special needs within South Lake Tahoe.

POLICIES

Policy 4-1 The City shall ensure equal access to housing by providing reasonable accommodation for individuals with disabilities. The City shall provide a more comprehensive process for individuals with disabilities to make requests for reasonable accommodation in regard to relief from the City's various land use, zoning, or building laws, rules, policies, practices, and/or procedures.

Policy 4-2 The City shall work with surrounding jurisdictions to address the causes of homelessness and the needs of the transient homeless persons on a regional basis. The City shall support the El Dorado County Community Services in its countywide programs that address the needs of homeless persons.

Policy 4-3 The City shall encourage the development of rental units for large families in roughly the same proportion as the percentage of large family renter households within the total renter population (17 percent).

Policy 4-4 The City shall provide priority permit processing of projects which are targeted toward special needs groups, such as seniors, the disabled (including the developmentally disabled), and the homeless, including priority for building plan check, subdivision map review, improvement plans for roadways and utilities, and environmental impact analysis.

Policy 4-5 The City shall consider special needs housing in City-partnered affordable housing projects based on existing demand. The City shall incorporate universal design concepts whenever possible to meet the needs and special requirements of our community.

Policy 4-6 The City shall strive to address the unique housing needs of seniors, large families, single female-headed households, the homeless, persons with disabilities (including developmental disabilities), extremely low-income persons, seasonal employees, and students.

PROGRAMS

Program 4-1 REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION AND LAND COVERAGE

The City shall review and amend its Code of Ordinances or prepare a written procedure to provide individuals, family members, caregivers, and/or anyone acting on behalf of the person with disabilities reasonable accommodation in rules, policies, practices, and procedures that may be necessary to ensure equal access to housing. This procedure will include but will not be limited to the existing City procedure to grant exception for carport structures for persons with disabilities. This procedure will be a ministerial process subject to approval by the Director of Development Services. The City shall also continue to work with TRPA to address any needs for accommodation by persons with disabilities for additional land coverage for necessary site improvements beyond the additional land coverage allowances for ADA improvements in Chapter 30 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

Responsible Party:	Building Division, Planning Division
Funding:	Staff time, general fund
Time Frame:	The City shall adopt a reasonable accommodation ordinance or procedure and create a public information brochure on reasonable accommodation for disabled persons and provide that information on the City's website in FY 14/15.

Program 4-2 UNIVERSAL DESIGN

The City shall adopt specific universal design standards for new construction and rehabilitation to encourage accessibility to the greatest extent possible.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division and Building Division
Funding:	Staff time, general fund
Time Frame:	FY 14/15

Program 4-3 FAMILY HOUSING

The City shall provide regulatory incentives (e.g., parking reductions) to developers of single-family and multi-family housing projects that include three- and four-bedroom units.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division
Funding:	Staff time, general fund
Time Frame:	Ongoing

Program 4-4 EMPLOYEE HOUSING ACT COMPLIANCE

To comply with the State Employee Housing Act (Health and Safety Code Sections 17021.5 and 17021.6), the City will amend the zoning code to treat employee housing that serves six or fewer persons as a single-family structure and permitted in the same manner as other single-family structures of the same type in the same zone (Section 17021.5). The zoning code will also be amended to treat employee housing consisting of no more than 12 units or 36 beds as an agricultural use and permitted in the same manner as other agricultural uses in the same zone (Section 17021.6) in zones where agricultural uses are permitted.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division
Funding:	Staff time, general fund
Time Frame:	FY 2015

Program 4-5 SPECIAL NEEDS HOUSING

Work with housing providers to ensure that special housing needs are addressed for seniors, large families, female-headed households, single-parent households with children, persons with disabilities and developmental disabilities, those with extremely low incomes, and homeless individuals and families. The City will seek to meet these special housing needs through a combination of regulatory incentives, zoning standards, new housing construction programs, and supportive services programs. Program 1-7 contains incentives the City plans to implement. In addition, the City may seek funding under the federal Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS, California Child Care Facilities Finance Program, and other state and federal programs designated specifically for special needs groups such as seniors, persons with physical and developmental disabilities, and persons at risk for homelessness.

The City shall also hold discussions with surrounding jurisdictions to determine how to address the needs of homeless residents, and identify potential sites and funding sources for an emergency shelter.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division
Funding:	Staff time, general fund
Time Frame:	FY 14/15 for discussions with surrounding jurisdictions and ongoing

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY HOUSING & DISCRIMINATION PREVENTION

According to California State law, all households in South Lake Tahoe have the right to rent or purchase housing without discrimination. The City has continued to ensure equal housing opportunity through the enforcement of fair housing practices and the dissemination of fair housing information throughout the community. The Housing Issues Hotline has proven to be an effective means for addressing housing issues and ensuring fair housing in the city.

Goal HE-5	To provide decent housing and quality living environment for all South Lake Tahoe residents regardless of age, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, marital status, ancestry, national origin, disability, or economic level.

POLICIES

Policy 5-1 The City shall promote housing opportunities for all persons regardless of source of income, age, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, marital/ familial status, national origin, disability, economic level, or other barriers that prevent choice in housing.

Policy 5-2 The City shall cooperate with community-based organizations which provide services or information to victims of housing discrimination.

Policy 5-3 When possible, the City shall provide a Spanish language translator at community housing events.

PROGRAMS

Program 5-1 HOUSING ISSUES HOTLINE

The City shall continue to use the bilingual Housing Issues Hotline and/or other effective means to ensure the dissemination of fair housing information and available services. The City shall continue to disseminate fair housing information through radio ads, local newspapers, distribution of printed materials, and/or at community meetings. The City shall provide appropriate follow-through in response to housing concerns and complaints through either Building Division inspections or appropriate housing referrals to:

- Existing affordable housing projects within the city.
- The El Dorado County Community Services/Housing Choice Voucher Program (when available).
- The State of California's Landlord/Tenant Dispute line or Mobile Home Park Ombudsman.
- The Legal Services Center (low-cost legal assistance in resolving housing issues).
- The Women's Center for transitional housing opportunities for women escaping violent situations.
- The El Dorado County Health Department.
- The California Department of Fair Housing and Employment.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division
Funding:	General Fund
Time Frame:	Ongoing

ENERGY CONSERVATION OPPORTUNITIES

Energy efficiency has direct application to affordable housing. The more money spent on energy, the less available for rent or mortgage payments. High energy costs have particularly detrimental effects on low-income households that do not have enough income or cash reserves to absorb cost increases and must choose between basic needs such as shelter, food, and energy.

Many of South Lake Tahoe's homes were originally built for summer-only occupancy and are now being resided in year-round. Consequently, energy conservation retrofits are an important component of City rehabilitation loan programs. Such retrofits can benefit residents through reduced monthly utility costs.

Goal HE-6	To ensure energy efficiency and appropriate weatherization for all new and existing housing.

POLICIES

Policy 6-1 The City shall ensure that new construction meets Title 24 energy conservation requirements and shall enable older summer seasonal housing to be made suitable for year-round occupancy.

Policy 6-2 The City shall encourage the use of energy conservation devices and passive design concepts which make use of natural climate to increase energy efficiency and reduce housing costs.

Policy 6-3 The City shall encourage and promote green building practices during the development review process and implement the City's Green Building Incentive Program.

PROGRAMS

Program 6-1 GREEN BUILDING INCENTIVE PROGRAM

The City shall continue to implement its green building incentive program that rewards developers for building green projects.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division, Building Division
Funding:	Staff time, general fund
Time Frame:	Ongoing

Program 6-2 ENERGY CONSERVATION

The City shall continue to require applicants for building permits to demonstrate compliance with the state energy conservation requirements at the time building plans are submitted. Additionally, the City will consider including weatherization and energy conservation as eligible activities should housing rehabilitation efforts resume. The City will provide information and refer eligible property owners to other programs offered by Liberty Utilities and nonprofit organizations. The City will also refer interested individuals to energy rebate and conservation assistance programs offered by others and maintain information on these programs at City Hall.

Responsible Party:	Planning and Building Divisions
Funding:	Permit Fees
Time Frame:	Ongoing

NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION

The Lake Tahoe Basin is renowned for its unique natural beauty. The character of South Lake Tahoe's built environment should complement the Basin's distinctive natural environment. This character is essential to the city's sense of place and economic vitality as a tourist attraction. New development needs to be sensitive to the city's distinctive character.

There is often public anxiety based on the misperception that affordable housing will devalue the neighborhoods in which they are established. Careful design and enforcement of design standards can ensure compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods and reduce opposition. Recent affordable housing projects in South Lake Tahoe have helped to dispel misperceptions of affordable and multi-family housing by maintaining high-quality, Tahoe-sensitive design standards.

Goal HE-7	To provide for a variety of housing types, sizes, price ranges, and densities compatible with the existing character and integrity of residential neighborhoods.

POLICIES

Policy 7-1 The City shall continue to promote quality design and appearance of all new multi-family and affordable housing projects so that they blend in with the existing community fabric, add value to the community's built environment, and strengthen acceptance by the local community.

Policy 7-2 The City shall encourage compatibility of physical design, building structure, and lot layout relationships between existing and new construction to help the new developments complement the surrounding neighborhoods.

Policy 7-3 The City shall strive to raise and enforce current design standards for all rental properties in the community.

Policy 7-4 The City shall ensure that adequate provisions are made in new developments of eight units or more for amenities, such as tot lots, play yards, child care, computer centers, etc., appropriate to the targeted resident population.

Policy 7-5 To create a balanced community, the City shall promote mixed-income neighborhoods by encouraging innovative design (e.g., second units, co-housing, halfplexes, zipper lots, zero-lot lines, alley-loaded parking, six pack subdivisions, live-work units).

Policy 7-6 The City shall improve infrastructure to foster private investment and rehabilitation of older neighborhoods.

Policy 7-7 The City shall consider using HOME funds to support the development of mixed-income housing.

PROGRAMS

Program 7-1 MAINTAINING NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

The City shall work with project proponents and community special interest groups to integrate affordable and workforce housing into existing neighborhoods—including smaller duplex and triplex projects—while addressing local concerns and maintaining the character and environmental quality of the surrounding area.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division
Funding:	Staff time, general fund
Time Frame:	Ongoing

Program 7-2 AMENITIES FOR NEW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

The City shall modify design guidelines to address and/or include requirements for residential projects of eight units or more to include appropriate amenities. The City shall ensure that the modified guidelines do not unduly impact the cost of development and approval certainty, or otherwise unfairly burden the developer.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division
Funding:	Staff time, general fund
Time Frame:	FY 2015

IMPLEMENTATION MONITORING

The City is committed to addressing the various housing needs of its residents. Ensuring that the policies and programs contained in this Housing Element are implemented to the greatest extent feasible requires increased communication between City departments and close monitoring of progress.

Goal HE-8	To ensure that Housing Element programs are implemented on a timely basis and progress of each program is monitored and evaluated annually.

POLICIES

Policy 8-1 The City shall continually work to improve the implementation of Housing Element programs.

PROGRAMS

Program 8-1 IMPLEMENTATION TRACKING MATRIX

The City shall use the Implementation Tracking Matrix (see Table HE-2) to continually track the progress of Housing Element programs.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division
Funding:	Staff time, general fund
Time Frame:	Ongoing

Program 8-2 STAFF MEETINGS

The City staff members involved in the implementation of Housing Element programs shall review progress in addressing housing issues, especially issues relating to workforce housing during weekly Planning and Building Division staff meetings.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division
Funding:	Staff time, general fund
Time Frame:	Weekly

Program 8-3 REPORTING HOUSING ELEMENT IMPLEMENTATION

The City shall annually review and report on the implementation of Housing Element programs and the City's effectiveness in meeting the programs' objectives.

Responsible Party:	Planning Division
Funding:	Staff time, general fund
Time Frame:	Annually
Quantified Objective:	N/A

QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES

One of the requirements of state law (California Government Code Section 65583[b]) is that the Housing Element contain quantified objectives for the maintenance, preservation, improvement, and development of housing. State law recognizes that the total housing need identified by a community may exceed available resources and the community's ability to satisfy this need. Under these circumstances, the quantified objectives need not be identical to the total housing needs. The City has established a target for the maximum number of housing units for each income category that can be constructed, rehabilitated, and conserved over an eight-year time period based on available resources (see Table HE-1).

TABLE HE-1 Summary of Quantified Objectives						
Objective Category/Program	**Extremely Low[1]**	**Very Low**	**Low**	**Moderate**	**Above Moderate**	**Total**
FAIR SHARE ALLOCATION						
Total RHNP Allocation (Jan. 1, 2013-October 31, 2021)	27	27	38	63	181	**336**
Development Activity (Jan. 1, 2013-			47[2]	5[3]	36	**88**
Remaining Need (2013–2021)			**45**	**58**	**145**	**248**
QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES: JANUARY 2013 TO OCTOBER 2021						
New Construction	18	22	28	55	103	226
Rehabilitation	-	-	16	4	-	20
Conservation/Preservation[4]	8	101	76	-	-	185
TOTAL	**26**	**123**	**120**	**59**	**103**	**431**

1. The RHNA does not include units for extremely low-income housing; however, assuming that extremely low-income households make up half of the very low-income housing need, there is a need for 27 extremely low-income units in the city.
2. These 47 units are part of the Aspens project, currently under construction, which will provide deed-restricted units affordable to low and very low-income residents.
3. One of these units is the manager unit for the Aspens project. Four of these units have been permitted and are expected to provide units affordable to moderate-income households based on square footage and average price per square foot in the City.
4. The 185 units to be conserved/preserved correspond to the assisted units at risk of converting to market-rate during the planning period.
Source: City of South Lake Tahoe and PMC, 2013.

This page intentionally left blank.

TABLE HE-2
Implementation Tracking Matrix

	Program	Responsibility M (Main) & S (Support)			Target Time Frame						Funding				Related Policies	Tracking Implementation		Priority
		Planning Division	Building Division	Finance Department	FY 14/15	FY 15/16	FY 21/22	Ongoing	Annually	Weekly	Staff Time/General Fund	CDBG Funds	HOME Funds	Other Funds		Date Completed	Ongoing	1 to 5 (High to Low)
NEW CONSTRUCTION																		
1-1	**MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT** The City shall continue to create incentives (i.e., alternative parking requirements, streamlined permitting) to encourage production of housing in non-traditional (i.e., commercial) areas where residential use is appropriate to the setting and where mixed-use projects could either address job and housing needs or the desires of second homeowners. The incentives have been included in the Tourist Core Area Plan and will be included in the Tahoe Valley Area Plan. The City shall provide information regarding the incentives at City Planning Division offices and on the City website, and an information packet will be distributed to local developers.	M			✓						$				Policy 1-6 Policy 1-7 Policy 1-8			1
1-2	**CONDOMINIUMIZATION OF NEW DEVELOPMENT** The City shall codify City policies related to construction of new market-rate condominiums (currently defined as clusters of at least two attached units). The City shall modify the allocation process so that the criteria for using multi-family allocations from the City's list for condominium development are based on a minimum density rather than whether the condominium is attached or detached.	M			✓						$				Policy 1-1			2
1-3	**REDUCE ALLOCATION BACKLOG** The City shall meet with the TRPA Governing Board annually to find solutions that reduce the current backlog for residential allocations as needed.	M							✓		$				Policy 1-3			2
1-4	**VACANT LAND INVENTORY** The City shall maintain an updated inventory of vacant, buildable land. The City shall make this information available to the public by providing the inventory at the Planning Department counter and on the City's website.	M			✓			✓			$				Policy 1-1			3
1-5	**DEVELOPMENT OF SUBSTANDARD/UNDERUTILIZED SITES** The City shall maintain an inventory of the underutilized sites with development potential identified in the Housing Element Background Report.	M			✓			✓			$				Policy 1-4 Policy 1-5			3
1-6	**PARKING BEST PRACTICES** The City shall continue to research best practices for parking standards, and continue to allow more flexible parking standards for mixed-use and other housing projects on a case-by-case basis. The City's flexible parking standards could include one or more of the following practices: • Continuing to allow parking reductions for affordable and mixed-use projects. • Promoting shared parking for mixed-use projects located in commercial areas. • Allowing and encouraging affordable housing developers to unbundle parking and rent parking spaces separately from the units. • Allowing affordable housing developers to pay an in-lieu fee to support public transportation access to the project site in place of some of the parking requirements.	M						✓			$				Policy 1-1			1
1-7	**UTILIZING DENSITY INCENTIVES** The City shall work with affordable, workforce, and other multi-family housing proponents to direct them to Community Plan or Area Plan areas where incentives are already in place to allow for the additional coverage that could enable achievement of the densities necessary to make a project "pencil out." The City has incorporated incentives into the recently adopted Tourist Core Area Plan and will also incorporate incentives	M				✓					$				Policy 1-1			3

TABLE HE-2
Implementation Tracking Matrix

	Program	Responsibility M (Main) & S (Support)			Target Time Frame						Funding				Related Policies	Tracking Implementation		Priority
		Planning Division	Building Division	Finance Department	FY 14/15	FY 15/16	FY 21/22	Ongoing	Annually	Weekly	Staff Time/General Fund	CDBG Funds	HOME Funds	Other Funds		Date Completed	Ongoing	1 to 5 (High to Low)
	into the Tahoe Valley Area Plan, currently in progress. The City shall produce an informational packet which describes all of the incentives for multi-family and affordable housing for extremely low-, very low-, and low-income households, including bonus units, land coverage within Community Plans, and/or density bonuses. The information will be available at the City Planning Division offices and on the City website, and the information packet will be distributed to local developers. In addition, the City will continue to work with TRPA and other Tahoe Basin agencies toward amending Basin-wide regulations to allow the City to offer density bonuses consistent with the State Density Bonus Law (GC Section 65915, et seq.).																	
1-8	**CLARIFYING THE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS** The City shall continue to provide information on the City website to clarify the development process for developers/builders who are looking to construct housing in South Lake Tahoe and are unfamiliar with the process.	S	M					✓			$				N/A			3
1-9	**CLARIFY HOW RESIDENTIAL-CARE FACILITIES ARE ALLOWED PER STATE LAW** The City will amend the zoning code to specify that residential care facilities (group homes) for six persons or fewer are allowed by right in all residential districts.	M				✓					$				Policy 1-3			2
1-10	**SMALL LOT CONSOLIDATION** To ensure that there is a sufficient supply of multi-family zoned land to meet the City's RHNA, the City will encourage lot consolidations to combine small residential lots into larger developable lots by meeting with local developers to discuss development opportunities and incentives for lot consolidation to accommodate affordable housing units and making applicants aware of these opportunities at the planning counter. In addition the City will allow administrative processing of lot consolidation. As developers/owners approach the City interested in lot consolidation for the development of affordable housing, the City will offer one or more of the following incentives on a project-by-project basis: • Lessen set-backs. Note that any reduction in setbacks would require a public hearing and noticing. • Reduce parking requirements.	M			✓			✓			$				Policy 1-6 Policy 1-7			1
1-11	**TAHOE VALLEY AREA PLAN** The City is currently preparing the Tahoe Valley Area Plan. In addition to the City's vision for the plan area, this plan will implement new regulations from the updated TRPA Regional Plan. As part of the planning process the City will evaluate appropriate sites for housing in the plan area and will consider allowing densities up to 25 units per acre or minimum density standards for some of the sites in the plan area.	M			✓						$				Policy 1-6 Policy 1-7			1
AFFORDABLE HOUSING																		
2-1	**PURSUE STATE AND FEDERAL FUNDS** To support the creation of quality, affordable housing options for extremely low-, very low-, and low-income households, the City shall seek and when appropriate and feasible pursue grant opportunities for state and federal funds.	M			✓			✓			$			$	Policy 2-3			1
2-2	**REAL ESTATE TRANSFER TAX** The City shall consider adoption of a Real Estate Transfer Tax (RETT) ordinance and negotiate with El Dorado County to establish the terms of collection for its half of the RETT imposed on all real estate transactions occurring within city limits. All revenues collected from the RETT shall be earmarked for affordable and workforce housing.	M		S		✓					$				Policy 2-1			4

TABLE HE-2
Implementation Tracking Matrix

	Program	Responsibility M (Main) & S (Support)			Target Time Frame						Funding				Related Policies	Tracking Implementation		Priority
		Planning Division	Building Division	Finance Department	FY 14/15	FY 15/16	FY 21/22	Ongoing	Annually	Weekly	Staff Time/General Fund	CDBG Funds	HOME Funds	Other Funds		Date Completed	Ongoing	1 to 5 (High to Low)
2-3	**LINKAGE PROGRAM** The City shall analyze appropriate fees, thresholds of significance, standards, and criteria for a linkage program, which would connect new development to the housing demand that it creates. Once the City establishes appropriate fees and standards, the City shall consider adopting a linkage ordinance, and the fees collected from the program shall be placed in a housing trust fund to provide housing for the South Lake Tahoe workforce. The City shall consider offering developers of applicable projects one or more of the following options: • Developers shall build affordable workforce housing units. • Developers shall contribute land for the production of affordable and/or workforce housing. • Developers shall pay an in-lieu of fee into the housing trust fund to help finance the production of affordable and/or workforce housing. The City shall consider offering incentives to developers participating in the program.	**M**				✓					**$**				Policy 2-1			4
2-4	**PARTNERSHIPS FOR WORKFORCE HOUSING** The City shall continue to work with larger employers in the City (e.g., Barton Hospital, the Lake Tahoe Community College, and resorts) to develop new affordable seasonal employee housing and workforce housing opportunities for employees through public-private partnerships between the employers, developers, and local government.	**M**						✓			**$**				Policy 2-7 Policy 2-8 Policy 2-10			2
2-5	**INTER-JURISDICTIONAL COOPERATION FOR WORKFORCE HOUSING** The City shall continue to meet with surrounding jurisdictions in the Tahoe Basin to discuss workforce housing issues and develop cooperative strategies that address identified workforce housing needs.	**M**						✓			**$**				Policy 2-7			2
2-6	**ANALYSIS OF FEDERAL AND STATE LANDS** The City shall continue discussing the potential for developing quality workforce and affordable housing on non-environmentally sensitive lands owned by the California Tahoe Conservancy (CTC) and the United States Forest Service (USFS). The City shall ensure that important natural resources are protected and only pursue surplus lands that these agencies have determined do not have a clear and compatible conservation or recreation purpose consistent with agency goals.	**M**						✓			**$**				Policy 2-3			5
2-7	**STUDENT HOUSING** The City shall provide assistance to the Lake Tahoe Community College to examine the need for, and feasibility of, developing student housing. The City shall help identify opportunities for reuse of existing off-campus properties as permanent student housing. The City and college shall explore alternative management solutions to minimize the role of the College in maintaining student housing.	**M**				✓					**$**				Policy 2-8			2
2-8	**ASSIST NONPROFIT HOUSING DEVELOPERS** The City shall provide technical and financial support (when feasible) to local, regional, and statewide not-for-profit housing sponsors that facilitate the creation of affordable housing. Such support can include the donation of City-owned sites, the use of existing City housing programs for project clients when appropriate, the prompt processing of needed applications, and the preparation of funding applications.	**M**						✓			**$**			Surplus Property	Policy 2-3			2
2-9	**FIRST-TIME HOMEBUYER PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION PARTNERING** To support the creation of quality, affordable ownership housing, the City has historically administered the First-Time Homebuyer program. Currently, the City does not have resources to administer the program. The City will initiate discussions with other agencies or organizations that may be able to take on the administration of a first-time homebuyer program for residents of the city.	**M**			✓						-	-	-	-	Policy 2-1			2

TABLE HE-2
Implementation Tracking Matrix

	Program	Responsibility M (Main) & S (Support)			Target Time Frame						Funding				Related Policies	Tracking Implementation		Priority
		Planning Division	Building Division	Finance Department	FY 14/15	FY 15/16	FY 21/22	Ongoing	Annually	Weekly	Staff Time/General Fund	CDBG Funds	HOME Funds	Other Funds		Date Completed	Ongoing	1 to 5 (High to Low)
2-10	**MITIGATION OF TRPA REGULATIONS** If not already addressed in the 2012 TRPA Regional Plan update and through the Tourist Core Area Plan, the City shall continue to recommend that TRPA make the following changes to reduce restrictions on affordable, workforce, and mixed-use housing developments: • Allow mixed-use development in all Community Plans (CP), Area Plans and Plan Area Statements (PAS) that allow commercial uses. • Enable mixed-use projects with an affordable multi-family housing component to be developed at maximum allowable density as if a stand-alone project rather than reducing the number of units that can be developed according to the ratio of the project area devoted to housing. • Offer fee reductions or fee deferrals for nonprofit affordable housing projects. • Allow bonus unit substitution to include deed-restricted workforce housing. • Facilitate development of second units by allowing them on parcels smaller than one acre, encouraging the use of bonus units for creation of deed-restricted affordable second units, and reducing fees. • Allow the subdivision of property for the development of affordable low- and moderate-income rental and owner-occupied housing. • Provide bonus units for all multi-family mixed use development projects in Town or Regional Centers. • Based on future changes to current TRPA regulations, the City shall explore potential incentives for affordable housing developers. • To clarify that transitional and supportive housing are allowed without a conditional use permit or other discretionary action in Plan Areas, Area Plan areas, and Community Plan areas that allow residential development add definitions of transitional and supportive housing to Chapter 21 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. These uses such uses shall be allowed in the same way and subject to the same restrictions that apply to other residential uses of the same type in the same zone. The definitions will be included as defined in Government Code Sections 65582(f), (g) and (h). • To clarify that emergency shelters are allowed without a conditional use permit or other discretionary action in Plan Areas, Area Plan areas, and Community Plan areas that allow Social Service Organization uses, add a definitions of emergency shelter to Chapter 21 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. • Create a simple process for the conversion of TAUs to RUUs in motels providing long term (30 days or longer) occupancies where the property meets all minimum building, housing and property maintenance code standards as well as limited development standards without requiring the property to meet all TRPA Code development standards. • Create a simple process for the conversion of motels to single room occupancy (SRO) properties providing long term (30 days or longer) rent where the property meets all minimum building, housing and property maintenance code standards as well as limited development standards without requiring the property to meet all TRPA Code of Ordinances development standards. A definition of SRO will be added to the TRPA Code of Ordinances and single room occupancy units shall be allowed with a conditional use permit. The areas of the City where SROs will be allowed shall be determined based on the conclusions from the TRPA process and a public process to determine the appropriate criteria for allowing motel conversion to SROs.	**M**				✓		✓			**$**				Policy 2-3			1
2-11	**PUBLIC EDUCATION** The City shall continue to provide information that describes the myths and realities of multi-family and affordable housing development. Information is available on the City website, and, when needed, the City makes this presentation/slide show available to housing advocates and to developers involved in local affordable housing projects. The City shall continue to encourage local housing advocates to make presentations to local builders and developers, Chamber of Commerce, civic groups, and the local community. Additionally, the City shall publicize the Affordable Housing Resources page of the City's website as a source of information on housing programs (e.g., brochure available at the planning counter).	**M**						✓			**$**				Policy 2-4			3

TABLE HE-2
Implementation Tracking Matrix

	Program	Responsibility M (Main) & S (Support)			Target Time Frame						Funding				Related Policies	Tracking Implementation		Priority
		Planning Division	Building Division	Finance Department	FY 14/15	FY 15/16	FY 21/22	Ongoing	Annually	Weekly	Staff Time/General Fund	CDBG Funds	HOME Funds	Other Funds		Date Completed	Ongoing	1 to 5 (High to Low)
2-12	**PUBLICIZE AVAILABLE PROGRAMS** The City shall continue to publicize programs such as energy efficiency programs and state and federal funding programs currently available to South Lake Tahoe residents by making brochures available at the Planning Division offices, posting information on the City's website, and distributing information to an e-mail contact database.	M						✓			$				Policy 2-2 Policy 2-3 Policy 2-4			3
REHABILITATION/CONSERVATION																		
3-1	**REHABILITATION LOAN PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION PARTNERING** The City shall continue to regularly complete an application for rehabilitation funds to serve City residents. The City has historically administered the Rehabilitation Loan Program to both single- and multi-family dwellings occupied by lower-income households. Currently, the City does not have resources to administer the program. The City will initiate discussions with other agencies or organizations that may be able to take on the administration of rehabilitation loans for residents of the city.	M			✓			✓							Policy 3-3			2
3-2	**MULTIPLE FAMILY DWELLING INSPECTION AND MAINTENANCE PROGRAM** Continue the Multiple Family Dwelling Inspection and Maintenance Program on multi-family projects of six units or more (or smaller projects if approved by City Council) to identify blighted and deteriorated housing stock and to provide for the rehabilitation of housing that does not meet minimum building, housing and property maintenance code standards, and site maintenance standards as well as citywide design standards, or is not safe to occupy, and further, to preserve and enhance the quality of life for residents of the city living in multi-family dwelling units.		M					✓			$				Policy 3-2 Policy 3-3			1
3-3	**MOBILE HOME PARKS ORDINANCES** The City shall modify the mobile home parks ordinances to: • Address conversion of mobile home parks to other uses (quantifying what constitutes a change of use, the definition of "cessation," such as all or part of a park, immediately or gradually when relocation payment is required, etc.). • Reduce the 10-acre new park requirement to a size appropriate for development of a quality park with amenities for its residents (possibly five acres). • Consider taking over the Title 25 mobile home park inspection program/enforcement, while ensuring that the City can afford to do so within state-prescribed fees. • Address design and amenities required in new and enlarged parks, such as fencing requirements.	M	S		✓						$				Policy 3-4 Policy 3-5			2
3-4	**ACQUISITION OF AT-RISK PROPERTIES** The City shall continue to provide technical and financial assistance to the St. Joseph Community Land Trust and other nonprofit housing organizations that might be interested in, and have the capacity to, step in to acquire and rehabilitate any of the at-risk (185 units) or substandard properties to maintain, or create, long-term, affordable rental housing.	M			✓			✓			$				Policy 3-1 Policy 3-3			1
3-5	**ANALYSIS OF BARRIERS TO MOTEL CONVERSIONS** The City shall analyze the barriers to converting motel properties to deed-restricted, affordable housing.	M				✓					$				Policy 3-1			4

TABLE HE-2
Implementation Tracking Matrix

	Program	Responsibility M (Main) & S (Support)			Target Time Frame						Funding				Related Policies	Tracking Implementation		Priority
		Planning Division	Building Division	Finance Department	FY 14/15	FY 15/16	FY 21/22	Ongoing	Annually	Weekly	Staff Time/General Fund	CDBG Funds	HOME Funds	Other Funds		Date Completed	Ongoing	1 to 5 (High to Low)
3-6	**HOUSING CONDITION SURVEY** Continue to enforce City building, fire, health, and zoning codes to remedy existing pockets of blight and deterioration to conserve and improve the condition of existing housing stock in coordination with rehabilitation and other infrastructure improvement programs. Conduct a Housing Condition Survey prior to completion of the 6th cycle Housing Element update.	M	S				✓	✓			$				Policy 3-2 Policy 3-3			5
SPECIAL NEEDS HOUSING																		
4-1	**REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION AND LAND COVERAGE** The City shall review and amend its Code of Ordinances or prepare a written procedure to provide individuals, family members, caregivers, and/or anyone acting on behalf of the person with disabilities reasonable accommodation in rules, policies, practices, and procedures that may be necessary to ensure equal access to housing. This procedure will include but will not be limited to the existing City procedure to grant exception for carport structures for persons with disabilities. This procedure will be a ministerial process subject to approval by the Director of Development Services. The City shall also continue to work with TRPA to address any needs for accommodation by persons with disabilities for additional land coverage for necessary site improvements beyond the additional land coverage allowances for ADA improvements in Chapter 30 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.	S	M		✓						$				Policy 4-1			1
4-2	**UNIVERSAL DESIGN** The City shall adopt specific universal design standards for new construction and rehabilitation to encourage accessibility to the greatest extent possible.	M	S		✓						$				Policy 4-5 Policy 4-6			2
4-3	**FAMILY HOUSING** The City shall provide regulatory incentives (e.g., parking reductions) to developers of single-family and multi-family housing projects that include three- and four-bedroom units.	M						✓			$				Policy 4-3 Policy 4-6			4
4-4	**EMPLOYEE HOUSING ACT COMPLIANCE** To comply with the State Employee Housing Act (Health and Safety Code Sections 17021.5 and 17021.6), the City will amend the zoning code to treat employee housing that serves six or fewer persons as a single-family structure and permitted in the same manner as other single-family structures of the same type in the same zone (Section 17021.5). The zoning code will also be amended to treat employee housing consisting of no more than 12 units or 36 beds as an agricultural use and permitted in the same manner as other agricultural uses in the same zone (Section 17021.6) in zones where agricultural uses are permitted.	M				✓					$				Policy 4-6			2
4-5	**SPECIAL NEEDS HOUSING** Work with housing providers to ensure that special housing needs are addressed for seniors, large families, female-headed households, single-parent households with children, persons with disabilities and developmental disabilities, those with extremely low incomes, and homeless individuals and families. The City will seek to meet these special housing needs through a combination of regulatory incentives, zoning standards, new housing construction programs, and supportive services programs. Program 1-7 contains incentives the City plans to implement. In addition, the City may seek funding under the federal Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS, California Child Care Facilities Finance Program, and other state and federal programs designated specifically for special needs groups such as seniors, persons with physical and developmental disabilities, and persons at risk for homelessness.	M						✓			$				Policy 4-6			2

TABLE HE-2
Implementation Tracking Matrix

	Program	Responsibility M (Main) & S (Support)			Target Time Frame						Funding				Related Policies	Tracking Implementation		Priority
		Planning Division	Building Division	Finance Department	FY 14/15	FY 15/16	FY 21/22	Ongoing	Annually	Weekly	Staff Time/General Fund	CDBG Funds	HOME Funds	Other Funds		Date Completed	Ongoing	1 to 5 (High to Low)
	The City shall also hold discussions with surrounding jurisdictions to determine how to address the needs of homeless residents, and identify potential sites and funding sources for an emergency shelter.																	
EQUAL OPPORTUNITY HOUSING & DISCRIMINATION PREVENTION																		
5-1	**HOUSING ISSUES HOTLINE** The City shall continue to use the bilingual Housing Issues Hotline and/or other effective means to ensure the dissemination of fair housing information and available services. The City shall continue to disseminate fair housing information through radio ads, local newspapers, distribution of printed materials, and/or at community meetings. The City shall provide appropriate follow-through in response to housing concerns and complaints through either Building Division inspections or appropriate housing referrals to: • Existing affordable housing projects within the city. • The El Dorado County Community Services/Housing Choice Voucher Program (when available). • The State of California's Landlord/Tenant Dispute line or Mobile Home Park Ombudsman. • The Legal Services Center (low-cost legal assistance in resolving housing issues). • The Women's Center for transitional housing opportunities for women escaping violent situations. • The El Dorado County Health Department. • The California Department of Fair Housing and Employment.	**M**						✓			**$**				Policy 5-1 Policy 5-2			1
ENERGY CONSERVATION OPPORTUNITIES																		
6-1	**GREEN BUILDING INCENTIVE PROGRAM** The City shall continue to implement its green building incentive program that rewards developers for building green projects.	**M**	**S**					✓			**$**				Policy 6-1 Policy 6-3			1
6-2	**ENERGY CONSERVATION** The City shall continue to require applicants for building permits to demonstrate compliance with the state energy conservation requirements at the time building plans are submitted. Additionally, the City will consider including weatherization and energy conservation as eligible activities should housing rehabilitation efforts resume. The City will provide information and refer eligible property owners to other programs offered by Liberty Utilities and nonprofit organizations. The City will also refer interested individuals to energy rebate and conservation assistance programs offered by others and maintain information on these programs at City Hall.	**M**	**S**					✓						Permit Fees	Policy 6-1 Policy 6-2			2
NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION																		
7-1	**MAINTAINING NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER** The City shall work with project proponents and community special interest groups to integrate affordable and workforce housing into existing neighborhoods—including smaller duplex and triplex projects—while addressing local concerns and maintaining the character and environmental quality of the surrounding area.	**M**						✓			**$**				Policy 7-1 Policy 7-2 Policy 7-5			5
7-2	**AMENITIES FOR NEW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT** The City shall modify design guidelines to address and/or include requirements for residential projects of eight units or more to include	**M**				✓					**$**				Policy 7-4			5

TABLE HE-2
Implementation Tracking Matrix

	Program	Responsibility M (Main) & S (Support)			Target Time Frame						Funding				Related Policies	Tracking Implementation		Priority
		Planning Division	Building Division	Finance Department	FY 14/15	FY 15/16	FY 21/22	Ongoing	Annually	Weekly	Staff Time/General Fund	CDBG Funds	HOME Funds	Other Funds		Date Completed	Ongoing	1 to 5 (High to Low)
	appropriate amenities. The City shall ensure that the modified guidelines do not unduly impact the cost of development and approval certainty, or otherwise unfairly burden the developer.																	
IMPLEMENTATION MONITORING																		
8-1	**IMPLEMENTATION TRACKING MATRIX** The City shall use the Implementation Tracking Matrix to continually track the progress of Housing Element programs.	**M**						✓			**$**				Policy 8-1			1
8-2	**STAFF MEETINGS** The City staff members involved in the implementation of Housing Element programs shall review progress in addressing housing issues, especially issues relating to workforce housing during weekly Planning and Building Division staff meetings.	**M**								✓	**$**				Policy 8-1			1
8-3	**REPORTING HOUSING ELEMENT IMPLEMENTATION** The City shall annually review and report on the implementation of Housing Element programs and the City's effectiveness in meeting the programs' objectives.	**M**							✓		**$**				Policy 8-1			1