

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Zoom

April 12, 2023

Meeting Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Ms. Carr called the meeting to order at 9:34 a.m.

Members present: Mr. Alling, Ms. Carr, Ms. Chandler, Mr. Drake, Ms. Ferris, Mr. Lindgren (for Mr. Guevin), Mr. Hill, Ms. Setzer (for Ms. Jacobsen), Ms. Simon, Ms. Stahler, Mr. Teshara, Mr. Young

Members absent: Mr. Drew, Mr. Ferry, Mr. Letton Ms. Moroles O'Neil, Ms. Roverud, Mr. Smokey

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Carr deemed the agenda approved as posted.

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Mr. Doug Flaherty said he would like to gently remind Commission Members, that as stewards of Lake Tahoe, their job is not to simply rubber stamp TRPA's quest for continued growth and over capacity, but to provide leadership to help preserve Lake Tahoe's environment. He said that Lake Tahoe is classified as an impaired water under the Clean Water Act, and that any reasonable person reviewing the recent 2022 UC Davis State of the Lake Report, and past UC Davis Reports would conclude that the Lake Tahoe basin continues to experience long term environmental degradation. And while the temporary news of Tahoe's water clarity is indeed good news, it is only temporary, since the TERC has indicated that the change is primarily due to increases in zooplankton, and the TERC noted, "however, the assistance provided by natures clean-up crew, may be only short term. Mysis shrimp populations are expected to rebound, and as they consume zooplankton, the clarity will return to what we have seen in the last 20 years".

Mr. Flaherty said the TRPA continues to ignore the cumulative environmental impacts on the Lake Tahoe basin, and must be required to perform a Lake Tahoe basin wide, supplemental cumulative environmental impact statement, connected with all past, current, and future, public, and major private projects. This includes all projects connected with the TRPA Environmental Improvement Program. The current system that allows inclusions of projects determined to be environmental improvements are often subjective and lack basin wide cumulative environmental impact statements before EIP conclusion. More cumulative impact

April 12, 2023

analysis and environmental oversight of TRPA's priorities is needed now more than ever, as TRPA and the Tahoe Transportation District continue to aggressively move further and further away from protecting the natural resources of Lake Tahoe basin, in favor of other self-determined priorities. This includes currently proposed and significant code changes to increase height, density, and coverage. This, while lacking any specific requirement to consider basin wide cumulative environmental impacts in connection with incremental projects and code change approvals over the last 50 years, including since the 2012 Regional Plan Update.

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

Mr. Teshara moved approval of the March 8, 2023 minutes, as amended.

Ms. Chandler seconded the motion.

Mr. Alling, Mr. Hill, and Ms. Setzer abstained.

Motion passed.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

[Agenda Item No. V.A. Achievable Housing Definition](#)

TRPA Housing Ombudsman Karen Fink presented the item. Ms. Fink said she is presenting a change to the definition of achievable housing, which is one type of housing that TRPA incentivizes through their bonus unit program. She said the point of the amendment is to update the definition so that it better serves local workers. Ms. Fink added that staff are moving on this after hearing a sense of urgency from several board members, and some stakeholders. Ms. Fink said that what staff are bringing forward today is simply a code fix that emerged from other items they were working on with the Tahoe Living Working Group. She added that they are working on a much more comprehensive set of changes to make local and workforce housing more financially feasible, and will be bringing more in-depth presentations on those at a later date.

Ms. Fink said that in a place like Lake Tahoe, it is very hard to carve out a niche of housing for the missing middle, and by the missing middle we mean those households that make too much money to qualify for subsidized housing, but not enough money to buy their own home. She said that under normal circumstances we would expect the market to provide a diversity of housing types that would provide housing for this group. But with such a high demand for second homes in Lake Tahoe, we just find that local housing stock and new housing stock is being diverted into the second home market. So with the achievable definition, and with the pool of development rights that we call the Bonus Unit Development Rights, we are seeking to incentivize housing for this group and recreate that niche of housing.

Ms. Fink explained how the existing definition of achievable housing works and why they want to change it. In 2018, we created this achievable category and added it to the uses of our bonus unit pool, and for the definition we set the income cap at the percent of area median income needed to afford the medium-priced home. However, over the past few years we've really seen home prices skyrocketing, and we're finding that area median income needed to afford the median price home is also increasing. Since we did not include any sort of requirement to work

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

April 12, 2023

for a local employer in that original definition, the current definition could be subsidizing, or providing TRPA incentives for housing that is serving people with pretty high incomes, who aren't necessarily working in the basin, and that isn't really in alignment with the intent of the program. So what we are proposing is to add that local employment component, based on what we've seen in other areas, such as Vail, Summit, County, Eagle County, and Placer County.

Ms. Fink highlighted some other important aspects of the current deed restriction, which is that it must be used as a primary residence, it cannot be used as a second home or a vacation home rental, and the owners must submit an annual compliance form. There is also an income cap currently that is inclusive of the two other categories of deed restriction that the bonus unit pool is used for - moderate income and affordable income, and those definitions align with state and federal definitions for affordable and moderate-income housing, and those are generally categories that are eligible for some State and Federal subsidy.

The proposed change is to replace the income cap with a local employment requirement for households that make more than 120% of area median income. Similar to the previous definition, this new definition would still be inclusive of those two subsidized categories, but once your income is above that, then you need to show that at least one member of the household works for a local employer a minimum of 30 hours a week, or full time equivalency.

Other ways to qualify are if you're in that moderate income category or below, or if you are retired household that has lived in the Tahoe Basin in a deed restricted unit for at least 7 years. These requirements apply for both rentals and sales.

Ms. Fink said they released an errata sheet last night, and she wanted to point out a couple of changes that would be included in the proposal today. One is a clarification that failure to comply with the requirements of the deed restriction could be subject to the full civil penalty that we can impose under the compact of up to \$5,000 per day. She also wanted to clarify that, for home purchasers, if the buyer is actively engaged in seeking employment that meets these requirements, they could still purchase the home with the understanding that immediately upon moving into the home they would be subject to those three qualifying criteria. Ms. Fink added that they also wanted to call out that for companies that are buying blocks of apartment buildings, they wanted to make sure that it was clear that that company would not have to comply with those household qualifying criteria.

Finally, Ms. Fink said another component of the proposed package is a small change to the requirements for driveways for accessory dwelling units. This change would allow a second driveway for an accessory dwelling unit, when doing so would result in less environmental disturbance than allowing one driveway. Currently, we do allow one circular driveway, and we're finding that that can result in more coverage and more tree removal than just allowing two separate smaller driveways.

Describing the next steps, Ms. Fink said that following input from APC today, this proposal will be taken to the Governing Board later this month for further input or for consideration.

Commission Comments/Questions

Mr. Alling asked what defines a local employer? Does the employer have to be within the Tahoe basin? What's the definition? Ms. Fink responded that a map in the packet shows the region, which is the Tahoe region, plus the Truckee School District, and the local employer needs to have a business license in the Tahoe Basin.

Following up on Mr. Alling's question, Mr. Teshara said that Douglas County does not have a requirement for business licenses. Ms. Carr said she recalled language in the packet about not necessarily requiring a business license, but a business address or a tax ID address. Mr. Hester said they would consult with the State of Nevada because while every business may not require a license, every business must be registered with the Secretary of State.

Ms. Simon asked how enforcement and resale is handled. Ms. Fink responded that there is a requirement to submit an annual compliance form to TRPA. That can be submitted online, and an annual reminder is sent to the homes. In addition, when the home is sold, there's a requirement to submit a real estate disclosure form to TRPA upon completion of the sale.

Ms. Fink added that it's her understanding that there is no requirement at the local jurisdiction level because this is a TRPA deed restriction. Right now we only have about 30 units that have received an achievable deed restriction, but as we start to introduce more incentives, we expect that we're going to start to see more units, and would like to look at potentially enhancing the enforcement program as part of our next Tahoe Living proposal. That could be working with local jurisdictions to potentially have a joint deed restriction, with different tools available for enforcement.

Ms. Stahler said she had two questions. She said if she is correctly understanding the definition, it's her impression that there is a preference for for-profit corporations as employers, when there are a number of public agencies and nonprofit organizations who are significant employers in the Basin. She wondered if this definition captures them as well. Ms. Fink said the intent is definitely to capture them, and asked if Ms. Stahler saw something that excluded them. Ms. Fink added that the thought was that nonprofits and other agencies would also have a business license or a tax address in the Tahoe Basin. Ms. Stahler said she was satisfied that answered her question.

Ms. Stahler asked if TRPA deed restrictions are recorded with the County recorder's office, so that they run with the property, and the public can see the deed restriction by looking at the county recorder's website. Ms. Fink affirmed that they are recorded and also linked on the Lake Tahoe Info Parcel Tracker.

Ms. Setzer thanked staff for the presentation, and said she was excited to see this go forward. She added that Placer County has a number of plans and programs, and code amendments that will hinge on this new definition of achievable housing, so they fully support it.

Following up on Ms. Stahler's question, Mr. Hester said he is pretty sure that every single employer has an employee identification number that is the same at the Federal level and at the Secretary of State Level for both States. Staff will check that and make sure it's clear for the Governing Board packet.

Mr. Young said he thinks the Mr. Hester's solution of an employee identification number might be the way to go, as the broadest, most general way to capture everybody. He added his thanks to Ms. Fink and to the Tahoe Living Working Group, who seem to be a very productive group that really is trying hard to deal with the problem that just about every jurisdiction has.

Mr. Young said that so much of this is founded on the concept that if you work in the basin, you should be able to live in the basin, which has developed as a principle that many of us have. He said he thinks this amendment would benefit from a discussion of why that's a principle we want to pursue. We can all say it, but he doesn't think it's spelled out clearly enough, he thinks it needs to be very directly stated.

Mr. Hester said that quickly off the top, the first reason is that one of our newest thresholds standards, the VMT standard, aims to reduce vehicle miles travel per capita. People living and working in the same community supports that. Also, under the compact, we are required to address public services and facilities as one of the elements of the regional plan, and clearly as we've heard from local utilities, school districts, fire protection districts, and sheriff's offices, they have a lot of employees who can't afford to live here, and that reduces the level of public service and facilities that can be provided to residents in the basin. And so, trying to enhance the ability for people to live and work here, addresses the public services and facilities requirement as well.

Mr. Young said those two points alone are very meaningful, and it would be great to give them more profile in this amendment.

Ms. Chandler added that the community has a right to advocate for higher wages, so that people can afford to live in the community. It shouldn't only be the community that's providing housing for people with lower wages. But there should be a way to put pressure on employers to give these people livable incomes.

Mr. Teshara said he doesn't see a downside in adding specific language that covers public agencies, so that it's very clear that if you work for a public agency locally, that qualifies.

Ms. Simon asked if there was a list of the current 30 deed restricted units. Ms. Fink said they are working on putting that information in a digestible format on the TRPA website. So not currently publicly available, but it will be in a couple of weeks.

Ms. Carr said that as she was reading through this, she understood the desire to address the idea of living/working within the basin concept as opposed to remote workers. Not necessarily a second home, not necessarily a short term rental, but during the pandemic the landscape of who lives where changed fundamentally, probably forever. And so there are a lot of remote workers that maybe used to be in cities, and now live in the country or in beautiful places like Tahoe. She said it sounds like it's an unintended consequence of this achievable definition that we're working to address. She was wondering about grandfathering, and questioning what would happen to remote workers that are currently occupying one of these deed restricted properties going forward. She said it looks like there is a grandfathering clause at the end of 90.2 where we define achievable housing. It says achievable deed restrictions issued before (the date that it goes into effect) can utilize either the new definition, or the old definition that went into

April 12, 2023

effect in December 2018. Ms. Carr asked if that was intended to be the grandfathering clause for remote workers in these units right now.

Ms. Fink said it is intended to be the grandfathering clause for units that already have a deed restriction. They entered into an agreement with TRPA under the terms of the old deed restriction, so we can't change that without their agreement. So those old deed restrictions would remain in place unless they want to change to this new definition, in which case we would do a new deed restriction with them. But yes, the older deed restrictions would allow remote workers. So if a remote worker is living in one of those older units, they could still continue to live in that unit, if the owner maintained their previous deed restriction.

Ms. Carr said her second question/comment refers to the environmental checklist under transportation. If there is a remote worker, and then that property becomes occupied by someone who works locally, it seems like VMT has the potential to go up, because that person will be travelling back and forth to work in the basin. But it seems like that is offset by folks that work in the Basin, but are currently commuting from outside the basin, and contributing a lot of VMT to the region. Is that sort the thinking that went into the IEC - that there would be an overall benefit, or non adverse effect on transportation as a result of this.

Ms. Fink said the intent is to try to make more of these units available for people working locally, so they don't need to commute into the basin anymore. And also just the fact that although some of these units might have been used by remote workers, they weren't all going to be used by remote workers. So the shift, we believe, is pretty small. Ms. Fink added that when the achievable definition was approved, it was approved with the idea that these would be used by local workers, and that was what was analyzed in the IEC. She said that what we're proposing today is really just a fix to make sure that that original intent is carried out. So having remote workers in these units was never the intent of code that we passed or analyzed.

Public Comment

Mr. Doug Flaherty, TahoeCleanAir.org said, well you guys continue to do it again, basically on the issue of driveways, not on the issue of achievable housing, which is not within his parameter to comment on. Mr. Flaherty said the tyranny of incremental effects or impacts lead to cumulative impact, adversely impacting the Lake Tahoe basin, and for staff to mention that we're just going to add driveways today because it's going to make it easier for us to reach these goals of affordable or achievable or workforce housing or whatever it is. You've provided no data in the Environmental Checklist, which I continue to call a sham. It's a desktop Initial Environmental Checklist that's been developed by TRPA to avoid the gathering of the data to assess environmental impacts that are cumulative.

So adding driveways, which is subjective, to make this easier as far as deed restricted units is a significant impact on the environment. You need to analyze past, current, and future projects. So an Initial Environmental Checklist for the driveway issue, at least we should see an Environmental Assessment, done under the TRPA Code of Ordinances. And the reason you guys aren't doing that is because once you start realizing that you're contributing to the degradation of the Lake Tahoe basin by avoiding cumulative Environmental Impact Statements and data, then your game's going to be up on creating growth and new construction. So, you're well

April 12, 2023

intentioned on the affordability issue, but to sidestep this idea that you're going to allow an increase in driveways needs to have more than just an environmental checklist analysis.

Mr. Brandon Reinhardt said he was working on a project where they were considering including an ADU, until the architect put together what it would take to create one driveway, that accesses both units. This is a parcel that's more landscaped oriented, which is not the standard, and the amount of coverage and space that would be required to build an accessible driveway from one access point off the street was like the entire coverage of all the units of housing that would be created just to be able to create a shared driveway in a scenario like this. Mr. Reinhardt said two driveways in this scenario would be a substantial net decrease in impacts to the environment.

He said that in terms of vehicle miles travelled, people are going to need vehicles to get to and from. In this instance, Mr. Reinhardt said that two driveways off the street, would be a substantially reduced impact over one driveway accessing both units.

Ms. Ronda Tycer said she will be sending Ms. Fink a summary of her critique of the Tahoe Prosperity Center, WSW 2021 study, entitled Washoe Tahoe Local Employee Housing Needs and Opportunities, which is now being used by Ms. Fink and others, to base decisions about housing in the Washoe Tahoe area. Today, to give a glimpse of her critique, she will present data showing that the introductory paragraph from the WSW report is invalid. They write, "overall this information shows that Washoe Tahoe is becoming more exclusive and homogeneous. Little to no growth has occurred over the past decade, but shifts in resident characteristics show that the community is exchanging young families and core employees for older, more wealthy families and seniors". First, we can compare the WSW 2021 data estimated number of employees, which they estimate at 4960, to the number of employees presented in the 2009 praxis study of 4455.

The number of employees from 2009 to 2020, increased by 505 employees. There is no evidence of a decrease in employees in IVCB. The difference between 4455 and 4960 is an 11% increase from 2009 to 2021. This is a 1% year increase. Core employees are not being pushed out of IVCB.

Ms. Tycer continued, finding number two, IVCB is not becoming more exclusive and homogeneous, as stated on their page ES1. In 1990 whites comprised 95% of Incline. In 2000 93%. In 2010 65%, and in 2020 back up to 71%. Although there was a slight increase in the proportion of whites from 2010 to 2020, there was no increase in the percentage of whites from 2000 to 2020. 2000 had 93%, 2020 had 71%. By making this claim the researchers show a bias against white residents. So these are just a couple of my criticisms of this report. She will be sending her entire criticism of all the 190 pages to Ms. Fink, so that she makes sure that decisions being made about housing in the Incline Village and Crystal Bay area are made on sound data.

Committee Comments/Questions

With respect to the issue of the driveways for accessory dwelling units, Mr. Teshara said he read in the packet that one accessory dwelling unit may be served by a separate driveway, only when doing so would result in less environmental disturbance than a single driveway. For example, sensitive land disturbance, land coverage, tree removal, and grading. So when the unit is

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

April 12, 2023

considered by the approving authority, an analysis presumably would be done to ascertain if there are any disturbances that shouldn't be allowed. He asked Ms. Fink if that understanding was correct and Ms. Fink affirmed. Mr. Teshara added that he thinks it important that is on the record based on the public comments heard today.

Ms. Carr asked if the change being contemplated today merely creates an ability for someone to design their driveway access slightly differently, but coverage etc. will be evaluated under all the project level basis of review. Ms. Fink confirmed that was the case, and added that this proposal doesn't change allowable coverage, or any other TRPA rules related to development.

Ms. Simon said she thinks that the Tahoe Prosperity Center data really does need to be analyzed, and would urge staff to do that. She said the people are well intentioned, but they are not elected or appointed by anybody. They're a self-ad hoc body, so she's not sure of their data collection, or whether that's valid or how that should be accepted.

Mr. Drake asked if there were any incentives built into the bonus housing program for ADUs to be created without additional driveways – in other words creating additional housing opportunities without additional parking to disincentivize VMT. He said there are plenty of people who love to live near where they work, and would walk, ride, and take transit.

Ms. Fink said that currently, most parking regulations are delegated to the local jurisdiction, so TRPA doesn't currently have any parking incentives related to accessory dwelling units. She said that on the California side there is State law that requires that accessory dwelling units within a half mile of transit not be required to have an additional parking space, so that allows for someone to potentially not need as much coverage, because they wouldn't need to provide a driveway for their ADU. Moving forward as we're looking at the next phase of the Tahoe Living working group, parking is part of the analysis, because parking does add a significant expense to housing. That's one of the things that we find really drives up the cost of housing quite a bit. And so we are looking for ways to incentivize locating these accessory dwelling units close to transit, so that there's less need for a reliance on a private vehicle.

In response to Miss Simon's comment, Ms. Fink said that staff did review the Washoe County Needs Assessment, and did check their data against our data, and found it to be generally consistent. Staff did feel that it was valid, but she is happy to take another look at it.

Mr. Teshara made a motion to recommend adoption of the required findings (Attachment E), including a finding of no significant effect, for the adoption of Amendments to the TRPA Code of Ordinances related to: 1) the "achievable" deed restriction category definition, including changes to Sections 52.3.4 and 90.2, and 2) driveways for accessory dwelling units, including changes to Section 34.3.3 as described in the staff report, including the errata as provided

Ms. Stahler seconded the motion.

Ayes: Mr. Alling, Ms. Carr, Ms. Chandler, Mr. Drake, Ms. Ferris, Mr. Lindgren (for Mr. Guevin), Mr. Hill, Ms. Setzer (for Ms. Jacobsen), Ms. Simon, Ms. Stahler, Mr. Teshara, Mr. Young

Absent: Mr. Drew, Mr. Ferry, Mr. Letton Ms. Moroles O'Neil, Ms. Roverud, Mr. Smokey

April 12, 2023

Motion Passed.

Mr. Teshara made a motion to recommend adoption of Ordinance 23-__ (Attachment A) amending Ordinance 87-9, as amended, for the adoption of amendments to the TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapters 34, 52, and 90, including the errata as provided

Ms. Stahler seconded the motion.

Ayes: Mr. Alling, Ms. Carr, Ms. Chandler, Mr. Drake, Ms. Ferris, Mr. Lindgren (for Mr. Guevin), Mr. Hill, Ms. Setzer (for Ms. Jacobsen), Ms. Simon, Ms. Stahler, Mr. Teshara, Mr. Young

Absent: Mr. Drew, Mr. Ferry, Mr. Letton Ms. Moroles O'Neil, Ms. Roverud, Mr. Smokey

Motion Passed.

[Agenda Item No. V.B. Transportation Performance and Recommendations Report Framework](#)

Michelle Glickert, TRPA Transportation Planning Program Manager presented the item. Ms. Glickert began with talking a little bit about the Regional Transportation Plan (commonly referred to as the RTP) as a refresher for all.

The RTP is updated every four years, as one our Metropolitan Planning Organization requirements. The RTP sets the vision for Tahoe's transportation system: a system that is interconnected, inter-regional, and sustainable, connecting people and places in ways that reduce reliance on the private automobile.

The RTP has six goals, improving safety for all users, enhancing connectivity across and between modes, supporting economic vitality, protecting the environment with reductions in Green House Gas and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), preserving the transportation system and coordinating operations to better manage. These goals have numerous policies, all of which make up the Transportation Element of the Regional Plan.

Transportation Performance reporting is about tracking how well we are achieving those RTP Goals, and reducing our per capita VMT, as well as identifying adaptive management of the system if we are not on target.

So, on to the reporting framework that we have created with the help of the Transportation Performance Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), and consultant support from Cambridge Systematics. The TAC members represent agencies we continually work with to implement projects and programs, like Tahoe Transportation District, our two state Department of Transportation agencies, the north and south shore Transportation Management Associations, our county partners, the City of South Lake, the League to Save Lake Tahoe representing a Tahoe environmental agency, and Ms. Carole Black, a member of the general public.

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

April 12, 2023

Ms. Glickert said she will discuss metrics for reporting, how we have incorporated adaptive management into the framework, evaluating our performance and responses to adaptively manage the transportation system.

With the Adoption of the 2021 RTP - The Regional Plan Implementation Element was updated identifying five specific actions:

1. Establishing a schedule of milestones to measure progress towards the per capita VMT reduction goals (completed in April 2021 along with the adoption of the RTP)
2. Establishment of a technical advisory body for transportation , the Transportation Performance Technical Advisory Committee (completed last March)
3. Preparation of a charter, primary objectives, and work plan to be approved by Governing Board – over the summer the Transportation Performance Technical Advisory Committee met and developed the charter and materials (that was approved this past September)

The last two actions required are what I will be focusing on today:

1. The reports the Technical advisory body must prepare and transmit to the TRPA and Tahoe MPO governing boards
2. And the adaptive management responses if scheduled milestones are not met to be approved by TRPA/TMPO.

On slide 4 of her presentation, Ms. Glickert showed an overview of the report content as identified by the Technical Advisory Committee:

1. High-level transportation metrics to track implementation of Vehicle Miles Traveled reduction and the achievement of our Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Goals
2. Reports to Provide guidance on program, policy, and project modifications necessary to attain and maintain the new VMT Threshold Standard
3. And lastly adaptive management responses that can be implemented if the region is not reaching Vehicle Miles Traveled milestones and achieving our Transportation Goals

Every two years, staff and the Transportation Performance TAC will prepare and transmit a Performance and Recommendations Report to the Governing Board. This starts with the framework which I will discuss today.

Then in 2024, the first full report will be a Regional Transportation Plan Sustainable Community Strategy Analysis and Recommendations Report . This report sets the stage for the next RTP, this performance report contains forecasts for growth, achievement of goals and VMT reduction. The second report two years later will be a check on VMT specifically in 2026.

Ms. Glickert said she would discuss the framework and the content of the reports before coming back to the report schedule. The biennial reports will be structured by travel mode, in alignment with past RTPs. The framework will utilize a tiered measurement system, beginning with the primary metrics. We have transit, where transit ridership will be looked at for fixed route, and now new micro transit shuttles. That'll be collected, and we'll consider how much service and

April 12, 2023

neighborhoods are actually served by those services. And then we're going to be obviously seeking an increase in this ridership.

For active transportation, bike path, overall mode share, and low stress bike/ped lane miles will be collected. This one is new. We've continually looked at collecting lane miles. Are we connecting our paths around the lake? We look at bike/ped facilities. But we've not really actually looked at the details around them – the human element. Is it a striped lane that we've increased? Or is it lying adjacent to fast moving vehicles? Is it a protected lane? Like our paved system today, are there slow streets that feel safer when biking?

Diving in a little bit deeper to some of those elements that can actually encourage people to cycle, and again looking to increase our non-auto trips and complete our bike path network. For automobiles, we'll look at annual average daily VMT per capita. Currently the baseline, that we're tracking against is an annual average of 12.48 miles per person each day. The goal is to reduce this to 12.35 when we complete our next report at the end of this year. It's important to know that these regional primary metrics are collected every two years, and we'll be continually utilizing the best available data sources.

The framework has a 2nd tier of metrics - organized by supply, condition and state of repair and program & information. These are all part of the adaptive management system. We have developed a menu of 2nd tier metrics that will be collected if the primary metrics are not on track, or maybe there are some circumstances the Technical Advisory Committee feels warrant a deeper dive.

So using Transit as an example, after we collect our primary metrics, let's say we see a dip in transit ridership. We can then look to see exactly how much service is actually being delivered vs what's scheduled, speaking to supply. Are riders able to access the bus stops, are they cleared of snow, where are the stop locations, etc. helping us understand the condition for example.

And are people able to get transit information? Are they aware of the variety of options? We have a great real time app, but it is not always showing the real time. With the bus arrival as an example, when buses only arrive hourly and that app isn't showing the correct time, that isn't going to convince anyone to take transit today. This is a critical element to getting people on the bus.

This structure - collecting primary metrics every two years, taking a deeper look into the explanatory factors as needed, is all part of that Adaptive Management process. Furthering that, the biennial reports will utilize the data from those primary and secondary metrics as needed to understand the transportation system performance. The Transportation Performance TAC will then be brought together to review those results, potentially identifying other available metrics that can also inform performance. Then the committee, with public involvement, will decide what needs to change to get us back on track.

For example, using the Transit Ridership decline mentioned earlier, if the regional mode share analysis shows pedestrian and bike trips are holding flat and transit ridership is decreasing, recommendations could include additional analysis to better understand where and why the routes are underperforming. That additional analysis could then lead to potential policy decisions within the regional grant program administered by the TMPO.

April 12, 2023

For example, all eligible sources that qualify for transit operations should be considered first for transit operations, giving transit operations the priority for those funds. Additionally, planning funds could be focused on working more with our transit operators and TMAs on more program outreach, that encourages getting more people on the bus, and/or implementing the transit operators transit plans. So the adaptive management process provides a menu of options based on the data driven analysis that's collected every two years.

Ms. Glickert described the report schedule, as shown on slide 8. The top of the chart shows TRPA Governing Board, Advisory Planning Commission and committees, and the lower half identifies data gathering and outreach with partner agencies who are also on the Transportation Performance TAC. Over the next year the focus is to prepare the RTP performance report. We have already begun to focus on data collection for those primary metrics. After data collection we will reconvene the Transportation Performance Committee TAC to review all the progress and development of collective recommendations on adaptive measures, as preparation for that draft RTP/SCS performance report. The EITPO committee will then have an opportunity to review/comment, prior to seeking adoption of the report and recommendations in early 2024.

The 2024 performance report will be used to inform the development of the 2025 Regional Transportation Plan - identifying existing conditions and forecasts for the RTP, how are we doing on VMT reduction, and recommended needs, that will fold into the plan, policy, and program development. Again, this will include TAC members in their agency roles as project/program implementors, and of course, entail all of you, through public outreach and development of the next RTP. As we develop the next RTP, we will come to this Commission, we will go before the Regional Plan Implementation Committee, and we will continue to use the EITPO as our primary committee. That sets us on that two-year cycle, so in 2026 we will provide a report to check in on VMT per capita reductions. And then in 2028 it will be back to a focused report on the RTP/SCS, as we prepare for our 2029 RTP.

Committee Comments/Questions

Ms. Simon asked if staff planned to do some analysis on the effect of the winter on availability during bad weather, and whether micro transit was able to access the neighborhoods. She also wondered about the effect of tourists and guest workers on the transportation system. She said that in her area (north shore) there had been a two-hour gap between buses for the last several months, and she's not sure if TART are planning to increase that, or what the deal was. Ms. Simon said she has also noticed, especially during the icy weather, that it's very difficult to get on-demand rides to our hospitals and medical center. So that's just another wrinkle to this past winter.

Ms. Glickert said that Ms. Simon was bringing up everything that the Technical Advisory Committee had said - we can't just look at an annual data. We're going to look at winter, summer and why did this occur. As for tourists, we are going to be updating those data settings that are going to allow us to identify who made that trip.

Ms. Glickert added that the transit operators are on that Technical Advisory Committee, so will be fully abreast on the plans to improve what's really happening. She said they already know that a lot of services didn't get deployed because of the weather, or didn't get deployed because

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

April 12, 2023

of the driver shortage, and all of that has to be taken into consideration in our planning process, and what we want to recommend for the future.

As for the hospitals, we're going to have some good analysis that actually shows employment centers served, hospital served – all those points of interest, so that we can get a feedback loop for the transit operators. This analysis will help them understand some of the changes that they might want to make.

Mr. Hester said that transportation data and analysis, and planning, is undergoing a huge change right now. With big data, people are putting together information based on credit card swipes and cell phone data, and they're almost creating a whole new way to look at transportation. It's not fine-tuned yet, but it's emerging, and that's one of the exciting things about these new measures.

Mr. Drake said that we are basically still treating VMT the same way we've been doing it for 20, 30, 40 years. Using assumptions built around land uses, that have come from national averages that just don't make sense in Tahoe. We're using count stations around the basin that are totally outdated and not statistically defensible, and at the end of the day, it's a modeling exercise that is pretty detached from reality. Mr. Drake said he has had some good conversations with staff to understand what is changing and it's super complex. He commended Ms. Glickert for keeping her arms around it. He said he was also happy to hear Mr. Hester point to some of the things that are changing, because he thinks some of the baseline assumptions are just flawed, and the data coming into our system to analyze results is not tied to reality.

Mr. Drake said that investment in transportation, in public transportation, and bike lanes are essential. They're important, and hopefully we will see increased usership of those. But those are the carrots, and the elephant in the room is still parking policy, and that's the stick. We're still stuck in decades ago with parking policies with minimum parking requirements, and he honestly doesn't see us making any significant progress on real VMT reduction until we get honest about the amount of parking we have already, and the fact that we're still requiring additional to be built. He added that there are some great quotes about how parking is the fertility drug for congestion. The problem is not the number of people up in Tahoe, it's the number of vehicles. So he's happy to hear that we're going through a modernization of the way we think about transportation planning and VMT as a whole, because VMT is an important issue, but the data we have coming in to track it, is just not as useful as we once thought it was.

Addressing Mr. Hester, Mr. Drake said he knows this is going to be a topic at an upcoming Governing Board, and he hopes some of the conversation and the outcomes of that discussion can be brought back to the APC, because he feels that the intentions are moving in the right direction, but we do need some APC and Governing Board leadership to really change policy and modernize the way we look at VMT in the overall transportation system.

Mr. Young said that discussion on the previous item had talked about potentially relaxing parking requirements for ADUs, or in general, for the 'missing middle'. Key to that 'missing middle' planning approach is eliminating parking requirements, and ensuring that transit is available. He feels that somehow these two items need to be linked going forward – it seems it might be beneficial for the 2025 Plan to link these concepts together.

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

April 12, 2023

Referring to a point in the Staff Report, 'Implementing adaptive management responses of scheduled milestones are not met', Mr. Teshara said it's his recollection that there is a milestone coming up at the end of 2023 with regard to the adequacy of transportation and transit funding.

And if that doesn't come through in the so called 7-7-7 sustainable funding plan, then any new development would have the requirement to have no new VMT associated with the project. He asked if that understanding was correct. Ms. Glickert said it was correct, and clarified that originally in the Regional Transportation Plan, we had sustainable funding of \$20 million each year, and over time with representatives from the two States getting together, we developed a programmatic approach to how we're going to achieve that, and that's known as the 7-7-7 strategy. This month at the EITPO meeting, Nick Haven will be reporting on that progress. Ms. Glickert confirmed that Mr. Teshara was correct that if at the end of 2023, we have not achieved what we've set out to with that funding program, we will go a phase of no new unmitigated VMT. She said that in some situations that might already exist. For example outside of a town center, it can be more challenging to have new to development. So there are some levers that are also in the program.

Mr. Teshara thanked Ms. Glickert for her response, but added that wasn't sure that the word progress is applicable in the situation, because he does not think the 7-7-7 strategy has blossomed as hoped, and does not see that happening by the end of this year. He further thinks that there's going to be a lot of people who are very surprised when this adaptive management response kicks in, and he hopes there will be some information shared by the agency in the community about it, so that people don't wake up on the first of January next year wondering what happened.

Mr. Teshara said he wonders whether the Report will speak to the factors that are beyond our control. He referred to an article written by Bill Higgins, Executive Director of the California Association of Councils of Government, which represents many of the MPOs in the State of California, including the Tahoe MPO. The title of the article is 'Broadening Accountability for SCS Implementation', and it basically, in a very polite but very specific way, points out that not all the partners are doing their share. So if we fail to meet our VMT targets and the other things set by the California Air Resources Board, is it completely our fault?

Mr. Higgins makes the case that you have a partner in the State of California that is not increasing the amount of money available for transit, and not taking other actions to help MPOs implement their RTP and SCS at the local level. Mr. Teshara said he doesn't know if it's appropriate or politically correct to have a section of the report that talks about those kinds of issues - where we don't have the ability to control all the factors that are impacting our VMT and related strategies. He said he would like to see the report include some reference to those issues, because he thinks they are serious issues. Ms. Glickert said she would be happy to include that. She added that there are some basic elements that every report is going to include, but they need to tell the story, they need to talk about these things.

Public Comments & Questions

Mr. Doug Flaherty, TahoeCleanAir.org, said that Ms. Black had mentioned the concept of the winter perils that affect transportation, and he believes staff mentioned the four seasons, Winter, Summer, Spring and Fall, and he commented that any future plan, strategy, process,

April 12, 2023

needs to address the real elephant in the room, as far as public safety, a cumulative Environmental Impact Statement, considering public safety with regard to wildfire evacuation.

He said that TRPA has continued to ignore the issue of wildfire evacuation. They need to complete a comprehensive, road by road, capacity assessment. The TRPA continues to support growth and over capacity, and without this analysis, it's dangerous to the public. We need to take a look at what we all know is a very dangerous situation in the Tahoe basin.

Notwithstanding the ability of our great fire districts, who will do anything it takes to suppress fires, that's not the issue. The issue right now revolves around right now revolves around the U.S. Forest Service's either inability to control fires outside the Tahoe Basin, or their willingness to let fires burn for Forest Resource purposes. They're your partner, but we don't hear from them, so we need to get serious about a roadway-by-roadway capacity assessment for safe wildfire evacuation, for both visitors and the residents, and how public transportation is going to be impacted by that. Or perhaps, public transportation will actually create a significant situation where the public using that transportation is trapped or they have an inability once dropped off to get out of the basin.

This item was informational only.

[Agenda Item No. V.C. Lake Tahoe Region Vision Zero Strategy Briefing](#)

Assistant Transportation Planner, Rachel Shaw, presented an informational update on the Lake Tahoe Region Vision Zero Strategy. Vision Zero is a strategy to improve safety for all modes of transportation on our roadways, with a focus on reducing fatal and severe crashes.

This is not a new plan, but rather an update to the 2019 Safety Strategy with an emphasis on Vision Zero. We will be revisiting the recommendations that came out of the previous strategy including the recommended MOUs. One recommendation was to "re-evaluate Tahoe Region Safety Performance in three to five years" so we are right on track with that at four years. This supports the Regional Transportation Plan safety goals and aligns with the strategic initiative Keeping Tahoe moving.

Implementing this strategy will bring us in conformance with both states, who have adopted Vision Zero goals. It also aligns with the federal level, as the U.S. Dept of Transportation has a National Roadway Safety Strategy in line with Vision Zero and just launched a [Call to Action campaign](#), asking stakeholders to commit to specific actions in 2023 to reduce serious injuries and deaths on our roadways.

TRPA has a few roles that we fill when it comes to roadway safety. First, as the MPO we are required to establish and report on annual safety targets to each state. We also have a role in establishing policies, and we will be revisiting the safety policies in the last Regional Transportation Plan and making recommendations on them as needed to inform the 2025 RTP.

We also have a role in regional coordination, and this is extremely important for safety as we need a coordinated and systems approach. Lastly, TRPA provides funding for safety projects such as the Regional Grant Program and supports local eligibility for funding opportunities.

Why do we need a Vision Zero strategy? One of the reasons we need to update our Safety Strategy is the number of crashes on our roadways. The last Safety Strategy was based on crash data from 2012-2016. In the years since that strategy, from 2017-2021 there have been 19 fatalities and 109 severe injuries. This is an average of 4 fatalities and 22 severe injuries each year. This is with the caveat that 2021 data is preliminary, and we haven't received all of this data yet from states, so these numbers may actually be higher. I want to acknowledge when I mention this data that these are not just numbers, but family members, friends, colleagues, and community members. This is being called a preventable health crisis on the national level, by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) and CDC). We have a role in addressing our portion of this crisis for our region.

Another driving reason for this update is eligibility for new and existing funding sources. We know that in order to make significant impacts on crashes, we need to implement infrastructure, and local jurisdictions need more funding. We are designing this plan with funding in mind and to make agencies more competitive and eligible for new and existing grants. One new funding source is the 'Safe Streets and Roads for All', or SS4A which was established by the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law and has \$5 billion available over 5 years. One of the requirements for implementation grants is to have a Vision Zero Plan that covers your area, so with this strategy update, both TRPA and the local agencies within the basin will be eligible to apply for \$5-30M. The first cycle was just awarded in January and the average award for implementation grants was \$16M. A lot of these projects were packaged projects for multiple safety improvements, including addressing multiple intersections or roadways segments across a city or a county. This could have a big impact on the numbers for our region. Having a Vision Zero strategy will help with competitiveness for not just SS4A, but other state and federal funding.

I realize that Vision Zero isn't a new concept and many of you are familiar with it, but since this will be a guiding principle for this strategy, I think it's important we are all on the same page. It began in Sweden in 1990s and has since spread to other countries and being adopted by more than 45 cities, counties, and regions in the U.S. Since its inception, Swedish fatalities for all road users has dropped by more than 50 percent, even while traffic volumes have increased. Similar results have also occurred across other European Vision Zero countries and has begun to manifest in the United States as well. Vision Zero has one main goal since it's inception, which is to eliminate all traffic fatalities and severe injuries.

While Vision Zero has been a bit of a buzz word lately, it is not a slogan or a tagline, it's a fundamentally different way to approach traffic safety. The traditional approach has the narrative that traffic deaths are inevitable, and that the responsibility is on individuals. Roadway design focuses on individual responsibility and says saving lives is expensive. Vision Zero seeks to move beyond traditional transportation safety practices to address one of the largest preventable health crises. It says that although human mistakes are inevitable, traffic deaths are preventable. It focuses on a systems approach with shared responsibility and shifts the narrative to say saving lives is not expensive. I want to acknowledge that Tahoe is not still in this traditional approach, we've made some progress in moving away from it, like the last Strategy stopped using the word "accidents" to describe crashes. Maybe we are somewhere in the middle, but we still have work to do.

Vision Zero is based on the Safe System approach which is shown in the top right circle on slide 6. The six Safe System “principles,” shown around the outside ring of the graphic, are the fundamental beliefs that the approach is built on: Death/Serious Injury is unacceptable, humans make mistakes, redundancy is crucial, safety is proactive, responsibility is shared, and humans are vulnerable.

The five Safe System “elements,” highlighted in the middle ring of the graphic, are conduits through which the Safe System approach must be implemented: safe road users, safe vehicles, post-crash care, safe roads, and safe speeds. Our strategy will be driven and framed by the Safe Systems Approach. This is the approach that the National Roadway Safety Strategy is based on.

This strategy has 4 main objectives:

1. Achieve significant declines in roadway fatalities and serious injuries, with a long-term goal of zero. We are considering a goal of 2050, as it aligns with both California and Nevada’s Strategic Highway Safety Plans.
2. Next, this strategy will aim to support and accelerate attainment of the Regional Transportation plan goals, as well as feed into developing the goals and policies for the next 2025 plan.
3. This connects to Michelle's item on the work we've been doing to establish an adaptive management framework for the transportation metrics. The biennial reports will tell us how we are doing on our metrics including safety. The annual safety targets for each state will also be a way to track progress.
4. Lastly, this strategy will aim to enable local agencies in the basin to be eligible for new and existing funding to get safety improvements implemented.

Referencing slide 8, Ms. Shaw said they intend to include the displayed elements in the strategy. The asterisks denote elements that are new to this update, a goal of Vision Zero, equity considerations, a look at funding opportunities, and a description of how progress will be measured over time. Some of these new elements are spurred by a new funding source, and to meet the eligibility requirements. We are also seeing equity considerations and requirements included throughout many transportation grants. This strategy aims to consider equity and will be informed by the Transportation Equity Study which is due to wrap up in June 2023. The crash data analysis will also be a core component of the plan. Looking at what’s causing crashes, what are the roadway characteristics, and that information will inform the project list and countermeasures for reducing those crashes.

Ms. Shaw highlighted the ‘level of traffic stress analysis’ because this one is more applicable to some of the commission members, but I'm happy to provide clarification on any of the other elements. We realize that crash data doesn't tell the full story, because you can have a roadway or intersection that feels very unsafe, maybe even has had a few near miss crashes, but no fatal or severe crashes. We can look at the high injury network and then identify common trends for crashes occurring.

The ‘level of traffic stress analysis’ is being developed as part of the Active Transportation Plan update, but it also has a big tie to safety. The ‘level of traffic stress’ is a way to quantify the level of discomfort while biking. How many lanes are on the roadway, what is the speed of the roadway, what is the volume etc., to quantify the level of discomfort on a scale of 1-4.

April 12, 2023

The pedestrian environment index is essentially a pedestrian version of this, and incorporates infrastructure and built environment data to quantify the pedestrian experience, for each block, so that's looking at sidewalk condition, number of adjacent lanes, posted travel lane speed, block length and mid-block crossings, building setbacks, presence of driveways, number of addresses. Driveways can create conflict points between pedestrians and motorists accessing residences and businesses across the sidewalk. Motorists, especially those turning left across oncoming traffic to access a driveway, may not see or look for pedestrians on the sidewalk. In many cases, driveways also increase sidewalk cross-slope, decreasing pedestrian accessibility.

Buildings that are far away from the street create a sense of openness and expanse that can be uncomfortable for pedestrians.⁵ For example, parking lots between a building and sidewalk indicates the prioritization of driving over walking. Conversely, buildings that are closer to the street create a street wall that "encloses" the streetscape, provides engaging frontages and sidewalk shade, which is especially important for communities with warmer climates such as Fort Worth.

Blocks that are more visually interesting, are dense with businesses, and have more attractions to draw pedestrians are more likely to be pedestrian-friendly than those with fewer frontages and businesses. The number of addresses on a block face is a proxy for its attractiveness for pedestrian activity. City-provided address point data was used to assign block faces with more addresses scores better than those with fewer addresses.

These are some of the built environment data they could look at. Ms. Shaw said they are still reviewing what kind of data we have for Tahoe and the best way to quantify the index for us. This also touches on earlier comments from Mr. Drake about how we are going to get people out of their vehicles, and walking and biking more. If people have a high level of stress when walking and biking then naturally they will be more inclined to choose driving. These scores will not only improve safety, but will help inform how to get that mode shift.

As far as stakeholder involvement is concerned, the strategy will be developed with input from a Technical Advisory Committee that we've convened. Invited to participate are both State DOTs, local and state law enforcement, local jurisdictions, and advocacy groups, such as Achieve Tahoe and Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition. We will also be coordinating the local plans, including the City of South Lake Tahoe, who were just awarded SS4A planning funds to develop a Vision Zero Plan.

APC Comments/Questions

Mr. Teshara said this is an example of something that really needs to be more effectively communicated to the public. As a prime example, he said that one of the partners whose logo was shown in the presentation, is getting absolutely assailed by people that don't want any multimodal safety. They just want cars.

Mr. Teshara recognized and commended Chief Lindgren and his team, who clean-up so many horrendous accidents on Highway 50 on the east shore, and yet that's not what's talked about. The talk is all about how we have to keep four lanes in all places, and we have to keep the speed limit the way that it is. And so there are people marching down to NDOT board meetings, and assailing their corridor management plan, which has many safety components. Mr. Teshara agreed with Ms. Shaw that these 'incidents' are not dots on a map, these are people, these are

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

April 12, 2023

members of our community, these are kids and people of all ages. And yes, we know it's a dangerous area, but that doesn't mean we just say we can't really do anything about it, we'll just count on the Chief and his team to deal with these horrendous situations. He said that we really need to underscore some of the themes that most people don't think about. This is a health crisis, and maybe we can use an upcoming edition of Tahoe in Depth to do a full spread on why it's important to have safety for pedestrians and cyclists as well as the motoring public. He said he doesn't think we do enough of a job explaining to people why we need to do some of the things that they find disagreeable. He suggested that we think about it as a group of people in our community, working with the agency, to see how we can more effectively get people to understand what it is we're trying to do. We're not trying to add 10 minutes to their trip, we're trying to make sure that if people want to use something other than a vehicle, they can feel safe doing so.

Ms. Shaw agreed and thanked Mr. Teshara. She said they have a planned advertisement in the next Tahoe in Depth to talk about some of the outreach opportunities for Vision Zero and the Active Transportation Plan, and she believes they can incorporate his feedback into that. Mr. Teshara added that it might be appropriate for Ms. Shaw and team to attend an upcoming meeting of the Douglas County Commission, where a lot of these people are standing at the podium on a regular basis, blasting NDOT and TRPA for even daring to suggest that lanes be reduced. That's just one example, but once something like that gets going, unfortunately, like a wildfire, it keeps on going. There's just a tremendous amount of misinformation out there, and he is very concerned that the Department of Transportation is going to back away because this has become such a such a volatile issue.

Referring to the slide showing data for fatalities and injuries, Mr. Alling asked if that also included bicycle and pedestrian injuries and fatalities. Ms. Shaw confirmed that it does.

Ms. Simon said that she thinks one of the things that needs to be better defined for the public is complete streets and communities. That's a street that is walkable, bikeable, and pedestrian safe, as well as a vehicle passage. She said that's a huge issue as our population increases, and people are used to just getting out and walking along the side of the road. She said she was surprised we didn't have more injuries during this winter when people were forced to walk on the road because there was no other avenue for them.

Chief Scott Lindgren, representing the Tahoe Fire Chiefs, said he really appreciated the presentation. As Mr. Teshara mentioned, this is a hot topic in the Douglas County portion of the lake with NDOT's corridor management plan for Highway 50. NDOT did receive good input from him, and the Sheriff related to the emergencies in Douglas County. Their concern, as emergency responders in that corridor, is that it is a very dangerous section of land. Chief Lindgren asked for a little more detail on TRPA's role with Vision Zero, and the coordination and cooperation with NDOT and their plan. Because there are some citizens that feel that NDOT just came up with their own plan, shoved it down the public's throat without taking their input, and then kind of backtracked. And then had a bunch of public meetings and a ton of people came, and he doesn't know where it sits right now. He said he knows there isn't funding to do what they want to do, but there is a lot of stuff going on there. The second part of his question refers to the public walking section, and he said he would like to understand that a little bit more, because they have massive sections of Highway 50 that the public parks on, that shouldn't be parked on, and then they walk on those sections. He doesn't believe there's anything that says that's a

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

April 12, 2023

good area to walk, but we have huge problems with the public in those areas - not just on Highway 50, but also up on Highway 28, especially now that they've done work in Incline and Sand Harbor, to make that a nicer, safer location. They've eliminated a lot of the on-highway parking, but it seems that the problem just keeps moving and getting worse.

Ms. Glickert thanked Chief Lindgren and said that as far as the NDOT project is concerned, she is representing TRPA on that steering committee, she is working closely with Ms. Shaw who is a member of her team. Ms. Glickert said this plan really helps us understand the countermeasures and strategies that define how we should be designing what we're trying to do with NDOT. So we have their goals, and their safety strategy, and our safety strategy coming together, and what we like about our safety strategy is that it speaks more to Tahoe, not just statewide.

This helps define our environment, with winter, with snowmelt, with berms, and how we need to design our roadways to be safer for everyone. So the connection is right here. Ms. Glickert added, that as much as we want it to serve all modes, number one and foremost is the safety aspect of the redesign of that roadway. So we're all in agreement there. Right now NDOT are working with the consultant team to put out a survey, because unfortunately, there are some voices that are overshadowing others. They want to ensure that we get a comprehensive survey that allows everyone to feel like they can report out, and discuss some of the things they're seeing, and the needs that they have.

Mr. Alling said he believes that one of the areas Chief Lindgren is referring to is directly across from the Warrior Way Fire Station in Zephyr Cove. He believes that the traffic light is going in this summer, and that associated with no parking, people will have an opportunity to use a crosswalk, instead of running across the Highway with people doing 65 miles an hour. So, hopefully that will alleviate some of those concerns.

Chief Lindgren agreed that was one of the areas of concern and added that there have been times that the pedestrian traffic is so crazy, with so many close calls, that they turn their red lights on and block the road, to allow people to come across and just to try to avoid accidents.

Chief Lindgren added that Douglas County is planning a County public paid parking area just on the north side of the Senior Center. He hopes when that is complete it will eliminate the on-street parking, which will also eliminate a lot of the problem. But these issues exist all the way around the lake.

Referring to evacuation in Douglas County, Chief Lindgren advised that the Douglas County Sheriff has the authority for evacuations, but they have been working together on fine-tuning the evacuation plan. He said that the Caldor Fire taught us a lot of things. There are a lot of people that say that the Caldor evacuation was successful because 20,000 people were moved in 5 hours. That's a nice way to say it, but in his professional opinion it was not a very good thing. It was a good thing for the City of South Lake Tahoe, because it got them out of there quickly, but it just locked up the Nevada side, and it was uncommunicated with the Nevada side, both state to state, and even fire district to fire district.

That led to him and the Sheriff working together to try to ease that evacuation plan, to make it simpler, and add zones etc. Chief Lindgren said he thinks that would be an interesting component to include in the current planning meetings. He suggested/offered that the fire

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

April 12, 2023

chiefs and sheriffs could join the meeting/s to talk about how they redefined their evacuation plans, because it definitely impacts what staff are working on. Ms. Shaw said she will work with Chief Lindgren to receive that feedback.

Ms. Stahler said she thinks a lot of these concepts are so important and worthwhile, and she is glad that this Vision Zero kind of program is being adopted here in Tahoe. The Lake Tahoe Environmental Improvement Program incorporates many working groups and subcommittees, including for Sustainable Recreation. She said that recreation also often invites people to use our roadways in order to access frequently use recreational amenities. She just wanted to make sure that there was participation and cross-pollination between this group and the Sustainable Recreation working groups, so that these important concepts can also be adopted in their planning.

Mr. Teshara asked Ms. Shaw if the safety grants she referred to were out of California, Nevada, or federal, and if they were formula grants. Ms. Shaw responded that they are competitive grants. Mr. Teshara said that his point is that it seems like, even though we have very urban area type of problems, including congestion, it's table scraps when it comes time to pitch a grant from Tahoe. We don't seem to be very competitive when competing with urban areas. He can understand that, they have a lot of issues, but it's just an overall concern he has about transportation grants. We're either formula, so we're rural and get not very much money, or we're competitive, but we're not very competitive, and we end up getting scraps or nothing. Obviously this is such an important set of issues, and he doesn't know how we raise our profile in this regard, but it's certainly something worth thinking about.

APC Member Comments/Questions

Mr. Doug Flaherty, Incline Village resident, said that he has had 50 years of emergency response experience, including as a retired Fire Battalion Chief, who lived and worked in the Santa Ana Canyon in Southern California, and witnessed and participated in many, many, many, evacuations. He wanted to comment on some information shared in the staff presentation regarding levels of traffic stress. He said they talked about a walkability score, a bicycle score, but he is not sure why staff are not including a wildfire evacuation score for Highway 28 for the 431, for Highway 50, and so on.

He said this goes back to something that is beyond a wildfire evacuation plan, which is commonly used to approve projects, but doesn't really take into consideration the evacuation roadway-by-roadway evacuation capacity during a wildfire. He said there is a difference, and he hopes that any wildfire evacuation plan considers a roadway-by-roadway capacity evacuation assessment. As far as preventing safety issues during a wildfire, he believes it goes back to the TRPA's unwillingness to consider a basin wide assessment of the cumulative impact of the incremental impacts when it comes to projects. He said that right now, the TRPA is involved in an aggressive quest to continue growth and over capacity, through increased height, density, and coverage requirements. There's been no cumulative impact analysis study done for the last 50 years, and he feels that the TRPA is negligent in not warning visitors based on the Caldor Fire evacuation which was not successful. He added that the TRPA need to warn the public about the hazards of wildfire evacuation.

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

April 12, 2023

Ms. Helen Neff, Incline Village resident, thanked Ms. Shaw for the presentation. She said it pains her to say that she is one of the numbers on the presentation. In 2021, she experienced severe injury trying to cross State Route 28 in the crosswalk in Incline Village, with the walk signal in her favor.

She said she would like to draw attention to the fact that increased density in a town center does not equate to a walkable town center, and she is so grateful to hear the emphasis on complete streets, because pedestrians and cyclists need to be considered, as well as vehicles, and street planning needs to be improved for any of our town centers, but especially for Incline Village to be walkable.

She said she was glad to see a crash data analysis, and that State Route 28 through Incline Village is as bad an urban thoroughfare. She said something needs to be done about the speed. The speed limit is 35, and most people go 45-50 mph, especially big vehicles that can severely injure someone. She said she used to walk everywhere, but does not now, without experiencing extreme PTSD. Ms. Neff said the Vision Zero work is very, very important. She said if there are people out there that don't agree that speed kills, or don't agree that large vehicles are as bad as a bullet when operated recklessly, she would be happy to talk to them.

Ms. Denise Davis said she is encouraged to hear that we're working on getting parking off State Route 28. However, paid parking is not a complete solution to the problem. As a resident who lives near the East Shore Trail parking lot, she said that on many days, there's plenty of parking available in the parking lot, but people choose not to park there. She said that in August 2022, you could have driven between Incline Village and Sand Harbor nearly any day, and found vehicles parked in that area.

Ms. Davis said that when you're planning these paid parking lots, you need to take into consideration whether law enforcement will be able to enforce the no parking on State Route 28. As we know, Nevada State Police is understaffed and unable to devote staff to State Route 28. So she is hopeful that paid parking will move people off the highway, but would just like TRPA to consider what happens if people choose not to use the paid parking.

VI. REPORTS

A. Executive Director

TRPA Deputy Director and Chief Operations Officer, Mr. John Hester advised that the Tahoe Living Working Group will meet on April 21, 2023. The Governing Board Retreat will be held on April 27, 2023 at TERC/UNR Campus in Incline Village. In May, the APC meeting will be followed by a 'Planning 102' Training Session, and in July we are tentatively scheduled for a joint GB/APC field trip to the North Shore following the Governing Board meeting on July 26, 2023.

As far as follow up to recent APC items, Mr. Hester reminded that the last action taken by APC was on the Incline Village Area Plan Amendment. That item continued to the Regional Plan Implementation Committee (RPIC), who on a split vote, said they would still like to see the mixed use and housing issues addressed, but they were ok with moving two of those parcels along, but not the whole area.

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

April 12, 2023

Mr. Teshara asked if the Bi-state Consultation Committee was still active. Ms. Glickert advised that they generally meet on an ad hoc basis, and believes they last met in Summer 2022. Mr. Teshara said he realized there were attendance issues on the Nevada side, due to elections and new officials, but he is concerned that this was supposed to be a key part of the 7-7-7 funding strategy, and its really not happening – which heightens his concern about the milestone for the end of this year and the adaptive management strategy kicking in.

Mr. Hester advised that TRPA staff recently attended a Nevada Legislature Committee, where the new DCNR Director James Settlemyer, and a number of others showed support for funding requests, that included funding for Tahoe Transportation District. Ms. Stahler confirmed that both the resolution and the bill for EIP Bonds moved forward through work session.

B. General Counsel

No report.

C. APC Member Reports

Mr. Teshara informed that starting this Friday, the Lake Link micro transit service around the lake will slightly expand its service area a little farther up Lower Kingsbury, Kale Drive & Oliver Park and also Lake Village. Mr. Teshara said these are modest but important additions to the Lake Link service area, and that they are actively working to court interest on the part of the Round Hill Square Mall property managers. He added that they are also working with Bob Hassett at Round Hill Pines Resort to see if they can do some service there this summer.

Ms. Simon said that not only is the Waldorf Astoria project coming before the TRPA Governing Board, but the Cal Neva Lodge & Casino has also been sold.

Ms. Chandler advised that Tahoe Keys Property Owners Association is moving forward with planning the Control Methods Test for year two and three, having deemed that year one was very successful. She will keep the APC members posted on progress.

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Doug Flaherty, Incline Village, NV resident, said he would prefer that the Commission not be strayed by a red herring comment that was made earlier. The comment was that TRPA is not responsible for wildfire evacuation, that is up to local law enforcement and fire personnel. Mr. Flaherty said that's very true, but the truth of the matter is that the Compact mentions public safety and public health. Mr. Flaherty said the TRPA has failed in their mission to create a public safety threshold relating to wildfire evacuation, and they failed to require comprehensive roadway-by-roadway evacuation capacity analysis. If we want to talk about measuring what matters, life safety matters.

Mr. Flaherty said his earlier comments about the Caldor Fire evacuation being a failure were not a failure on the part of the really dedicated fire districts and law enforcement folks. The failure is the overcapacity, which was demonstrated time and time again by numerous photographic evidence of people stranded and unable to get out.

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

April 12, 2023

Mr. Flaherty said he was dismayed to hear one staff member and one Commissioner demonstrate their disdain for people that show up and care about their community and safety when they talk about modifications to highways. It's not your job to express disdain and express words like "unfortunately, people showed up to overshadow other folks". That's not your role, your role is to listen to the facts, listen to the comments, and make decisions. So on the bureaucratic end of things continues with the TRPA and some of the members that really don't appreciate the amount of effort and research that goes into these public comments. I don't know of anyone that is against growth if it's reasonable, but I know that everyone is for safety.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Young moved to adjourn.

Chair Carr adjourned the meeting at 12:17 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Tracy Campbell
Clerk to the Advisory Planning Commission

The above meeting was recorded in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the tapes of the above mentioned meeting may call for an appointment at (775) 588-4547. In addition, written documents submitted at the meeting are available for review