

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, TRANSPORTATION, & PUBLIC OUTREACH COMMITTEE

Zoom

April 27, 2022

Meeting Minutes

CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Mr. Lawrence called the meeting to order at 9:16 a.m. on April 27, 2022.

Members present: Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Hill, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates.

Members absent: Ms. Gustafson.

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Regan stated no changes to the agenda.

Chair Lawrence deemed the agenda approved as posted.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Hill moved approval of the February 23, 2022 minutes as presented.

Motion carried by voice vote.

III. TRANSPORTATION FUNDING INITIATIVE BRIEFING AND STAFF DIRECTION (ACTION)

Julie Regan introduced the item to the committee. [Slide 2] To frame up what the committee will here with this presentation from Regional Government Services (“RGS”) consulting, the committee has been talking about a regional set of transportation priorities as part of the Regional Transportation Plan (“RTP”) which the board adopted in the capacity of being a Metropolitan Planning Organization (“MPO”) in April 2021. This is a \$2.5 billion plan but the committee will recall there is a \$20 million annual gap for funding that we are trying to fill with this initiative which has been an all-hands on deck shared approach which is called the 7-7-7 funding strategy.

Instead of looking at this as a \$400 million hole in the RTP, what we’ve been able to do is build on the success of the Environmental Improvement Program (“EIP”) model where each sector has a committed share target. In this case, that share is \$7 million new dollars from the Federal Government, \$7 million new dollars from both states, \$7 million from the local governments and private sector annually and we’ve got some good progress along this front and we feel like we’re finally moving the ball towards the target. It’s been particularly difficult with Tahoe being a quite rural community whose visitation swells to an annual visitation base of 15 million.

We’ve made some progress on communications around this [plan]. We have some products that will help all of you [committee members] along the way in conversations with your constituents to articulate what it is we are trying to fund in terms of projects and benefits.

April 27, 2022

Bob Spencer with RGS continued the presentation [Slide 3]. This slide shows the very hard work the Tahoe Transportation Improvement Committee (“TTIC”) to identify an initial list of priority projects that have unfunded needs. This is not the whole RTP by any means but high priority projects that are still looking for funding within a 10-year Continuous Improvement Program (“CIP”). It’s aligned with the RTP along with the State, Federal, Regional, and Local policy objectives so there’s a merger of the Local Jurisdiction CIPs and their regionally significant transportation that would overlap with the RTP. Then we’re looking across the State/Federal sector as well as the Local/Private sector to identify what’s secured and what’s needed for funding. This is an ongoing process to continue to identify and update the priorities for Tahoe, where we should be seeking funding, and how much funding we need.

[Slide 4] There’s a tremendous amount of benefits that come out of these projects and we understand it’s critical to members of this committee and our broader audiences – the public and legislatures – that these projects be characterized not just in their actual description but what they will actually deliver in terms of safety, congestion relief, quality of life, the environment, local economy, and address equity issues. Those are being quantified in connection with each project. [Slide 5] This is the share funding commitment that Julie Regan referred to. It’s \$7 million Federal, \$7 million State, and \$7 million Local/Private as part of the full RTP. [Slide 5] We’ll be tracking this by sector and the state sector will be broken out to California 2/3 and Nevada 1/3. We have some preliminary progress [Slide 6]. We have some great commitments coming through including the \$2 million awarded to the SR28 Community Funded Project, New transit funding for operations \$773k/yr, Fanny Bridge Federal Lands Access Program awarded \$4.5 million, and increased formula funds from IJA of \$200k. This is where the project list that the TTIC put together is playing a great job coordinating these asks. We have one list and we can talk as a region about where we should be coordinating our efforts and asks of Federal and State agencies.

[Slide 7] The State sector for California we’ve got legislative sponsorship for a \$4.5 million/year direct appropriation over 5 years. This will be moving through the legislative process and we’re hoping with the budget surplus numbers coming in to Sacramento that we’ll be able to get this funding. We’re getting legislative co-sponsors as we speak because there’s a lot of interest in Tahoe and recognition of Tahoe’s special role as a recreation center for the entire state and the need for the state to step up because, as a rural community, the funding is just not there locally as it may be in more urban areas. The Fanny Bridge application there is also noted and we’re also still pursuing some long-term ongoing sources; adjusting formula funds potentially from the state and continuing to get support for priority projects. [Slide 8] The Nevada sector is \$2.5M per year which is Nevada’s share of the \$7M State sector. We do have a EIP Bonds under consideration and there is a Conserve Nevada program that has an allocation for the East Shore trail. The State Infrastructure Bank is a loan so won’t be as helpful because it requires a payment source to repay that loan which works well for utilities or public enterprise and agencies that have ongoing fee and charge revenue streams but that’s not typically found in the transportation sector. We are, of course, looking for a direct budget appropriate too similar to the California side. The next big step here is going before the Oversight Committee in May and bringing proposals there directly for Nevada’s support.

[Slide 9] On the Local side, there’s a lot of activity around the micro-transit on the South Shore. Agencies have really stepped up their commitment to making that happen. This is part of the Event Center project as committee members may remember. We’ve have broad participation there which is a really exciting example of local agencies coming together to fund a priority regional transportation need. Placer County has significant match monies from their transient

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, TRANSPORTATION, & PUBLIC OUTREACH COMMITTEE

April 27, 2022

occupancy tax ("TOT") revenues and their general fund for their projects. The new revenue source consideration on the left side [of the slide] is this Zonal Congestion fee. We do have a separate transportation consultant engaged that has experience worldwide with congestion management fees. Applying one in a recreation area like this as opposed to an urban commute zone is going to be a new and exciting effort for TRPA and we're hoping to get some sketch level revenue estimates here in the next 30-60 days to see what that might generate. To manage expectations, we should assume that we won't be able to generate any more revenue than we'd need to fund the improvements in those corridors themselves; the transit improvements, the parking improvements, the maintenance improvements, the trail improvements. But, if we can just do that, of course those two corridors [SR28 and Hwy 89] are significantly impacted by the day-use recreation peak during the summer, that would really mitigate a significant pain point in the basin right now. New and expanding funding sources, the TOT and Sales Tax sources, etc., are still under consideration as well as new private partnerships.

Julie Regan continued the presentation [Slide 10] on the NV Oversight Committee. To refresh the EITPO committee, we have a resolution that was adopted in the last session of the legislature in Nevada. TRPA has a Legislative Oversight Committee that meets in the interim of which there's been one meeting. We have a substantive meeting coming up on May 27 where we will be reporting out on our progress in what was outlined in the resolution which was to come up with a transportation bi-state action plan specifically looking at Regional Priority projects, identifying benefits for those [projects]. Also looking at the impacts of transportation in the efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions advancing bi-state climate goals and targets, and identifying barriers to equity and inclusion, and the funding challenges. We will be delivering a report to the committee in advance of that meeting and providing remarks to the six members of that committee. It will be in person at TRPA and include a morning field tour.

[Slide 11] Bob Spencer continued the presentation. There's been a lot of work done in the last month to up the communication game to see where we may have fallen behind as we proceeded with some detailed and intricate conversations with our partners and we realized that we really need to also reach out to make sure that everyone is being informed, bringing everyone along, and moving at the speed of trust on this initiative. We're developing an action plan that will summarize the TTIC process with those regionally significant projects, how they align with our public policy objectives, identify the benefits we've been alluding to, and identifying funding needs. [Slide 12] These outreach materials will be intended for various audiences including General Public, Decision-Makers, State and Federal Officials, and we'll have a larger, full-summary, 8-page briefing brochure for general education and also 2-pagers that target specific audiences as appropriate.

[Slide 13] To wrap up, this is where we are in our process. We've got some TTD board meeting coming up. The TTD board has endorsed the 7-7-7 initiative and they're holding a special meeting in May to further refine the local/private sector involvement in that initiative. We'll then be moving to the NV Oversight committee on May 27 for specific asks for NV state support and the annual Tahoe Summit coming up in August.

Presentation can be found here: <https://www.trpa.gov/wp-content/uploads/RGS-TRPA-Sustainable-Transportation-Funding-EITPO-042722-6.pdf>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, TRANSPORTATION, & PUBLIC OUTREACH COMMITTEE

April 27, 2022

Committee Comments & Questions

Chair Lawrence comments on the May 27 NV Oversight Committee that Julie Regan did a great job summarizing the resolution and what the bi-state committee will be presenting to the Oversight Committee. They won't necessarily be making any recommendations at that meeting because it will largely be informational. Final recommendations and asks are done during their work session at their final meeting which will be in August. The upcoming May meeting is very important to get all of the issues and ideas on the table in order to set up for a legislative ask at the last meeting in August.

Ms. Conrad-Saydah remembers that when the committee met in February they discussed the dramatic differences in the costs of implementation for each of the proposals included in the presentation. Looking again here two months later, Ms. Conrad-Saydah didn't note that this was discussed. If you think about the cost of implementation for each of the options to raise the dollars it varies in terms of where the jobs land to implement those policies, where the costs come from, and where the benefits come from. We really need to be looking at those. Additionally, in thinking about the congestion fee, I've been pretty clear that it's not high on my list of cost of implementation preference nor policy preference so seeing it continually in the discussion and spending consultant and staff time on that is somewhat concerning. Ms. Conrad-Saydah would really like to ask for the cost of implementation comparison and for hearing from some of the committee members where it's clear that supporting a congestion fee will be really challenging for us so spending significant public dollars on exploring that feels concerning.

Mr. Lawrence agrees with Ms. Conrad-Saydah in waiting to know the different levels of estimated total costs and diving into the costs of implementation is something that needs to be done. He surmises that the NV Legislative Body would be interested in having that information as well.

Ms. Hill points out that Washoe County is also supporting micro-transit at \$100k for the next fiscal year which wasn't in the presentation. She was curious about the projects for Washoe County. She only saw road improvements but there's also some visioning for future projects to be on SR28 so she wants to make sure those are included and isn't sure who is coordinating with Washoe County so Ms. Hill can ensure the right information is getting to the TRPA team.

Mr. Lawrence asks for clarification on Ms. Hill's questions regarding Washoe County coordination and notes that this project list looks slightly different from what came out of the bi-state committee. He also noted that it's striking when one jurisdiction is noted as having maintenance needs but another isn't, it seems like an all or nothing situation. He asks for some input on how the project list was put together.

Bob Spencer responds to Ms. Conrad-Saydah comments regarding cost of implementation. Determining and allocating for that costs, because they have total project costs identified but they could look closer at how those break out and the lead agency indicates for a project where it's going to be located. That would be an indication where the economic developments are most likely to fall.

Ms. Conrad-Saydah states she's thinking about the policy costs of implementation. Where would the staffing come from to implement each of the policies we're comparing. Thinking of a congestion fee there needs to be collection of those fees, assignment of those fees out to people and so the jobs necessarily aren't located in the Basin. They could be located anywhere where as some of these other projects the jobs could be located or coming from the Basin.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, TRANSPORTATION, & PUBLIC OUTREACH COMMITTEE

April 27, 2022

When you think about costs of implementation; what do these public entities need to take on in terms of staffing, infrastructure, and long-term management of the policies. What is that cost like on an annual basis, what percentage of the funds derived from those policies goes into implementation. Ultimately, if you're looking to raise X amount of dollars from that policy, you need to factor in again the cost of implementation. And from the perspective of the locals, are those jobs going to fall where the impacts of the policies are accruing. It helps us understand the value of one policy over another for the locals of the region for the state.

Mr. Spencer responds that the capital projects are pretty much one-time funding so for those we're talking about the one-time benefits of a construction project and we can look at providing more detail there as the project descriptions get fleshed out. Where the spending would ultimately occur or where the direct benefits might ultimately fall might depend to some degree on the contractors selected. Of course Tahoe, being a rural area, is very limited in public works contracting or private-sector firms available for these kinds of large construction projects so we can look at where those might fall outside the basin if that would be helpful. The ongoing maintenance of those projects is captured in the separate line item, the street road maintenance and bike/trail maintenance line items in the RTP. The ongoing costs would then fall to separate tracking. As far as staffing, the lead agencies are committed to provide the staffing necessary to get these projects over the finish line. It's a different story when we talk about the ongoing transit service that are a major line item and the TTD's work there. The ongoing transit service involves ongoing expenditures for bus drivers, etc., in the basin. The employment base in the basin is so small that a lot of times those bus drivers are recruited from outside but we can look at that and bring the kind of detail back to the committee including regarding the congestion management fee. That would be an ongoing program and those costs would be identified as part of any project moving forward.

To address Member Hill's comment, we are looking for a deeper partnership with Washoe County. It's Mr. Spencer's understanding that, although his colleague Josh Metz has been more involved in the TTIC conversations, we're looking for staff from Washoe to connect with to make sure they've got the priority projects identified from Washoe so he'd appreciate Member Hill's offer to link up.

Nick Haven, TRPA Transportation Manager, also responds to Member Hill's question that they have been working with Mr. Dave Solaro and are well aware of what's going on with the mobility plan work in Incline. As Mr. Spencer stated this is an ongoing process and we look forward to including the Washoe County projects as they become more ready to include. Back to Mr. Lawrence's question on how the [TTIC Priority Project] list was developed and what it's intention is; this is more of an iteration that includes those bi-state priorities. If you look at the 4 big priorities that were included in the last round of the bi-state consultation those are all in there including the Placer County transit priority lanes, SR 28 corridor enhancements, Hwy 89/Emerald Bay enhancements, and US 50 in South Shore. They're all in there and what you're seeing now is a deeper partnership with local governments around local projects that are regionally significant. You're essentially seeing a Regional Capital Improvement program that drives implementation of the RTP. As we've advanced in this process and as we've begun to look at this 7-7-7 distribution of funding as well as even within the "local 7" distributing that amongst the local governments and trying to better understand what those local governments can contribute, that connect to projects that are delivered by local agencies that are regionally significant is important for political support, any increases in TOT or sales tax, going out to the voters, there needs to be that connection to the communities while still retaining regional significance and contributions to regional mobility.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, TRANSPORTATION, & PUBLIC OUTREACH COMMITTEE

April 27, 2022

Mr. Lawrence responds that Mr. Spencer's and Mr. Haven's response did help clarify. He understands that this is an iterative process and there's a desire to get more Washoe County involvement to help with the [priority project] list. Mr. Lawrence has his eye on the legislative committee coming up on May 27 where they're asking for a priority list and so the goal should be to have a final list, recognizing that it will be a little organic, but at least that everyone has participated in. This list that has been presented today, is this what TTIC feels is the final list to present to the May [NV Oversight] Committee? Or does more work need to be done?

Carl Hasty, TTD Executive Director, responds to reinforce what Mr. Haven stated and to answer Mr. Lawrence's question, this list is what the technical side is proposing to the policy side as the recommendation. This has been vetted and discussed with the public works departments of the local jurisdictions and we've also been having meetings, we have one with Commissioner Hill coming up, to talk with each of the local elected officials. For the first time, and this is a very qualitative advancement that's been a bit obscured in the discussion going on this morning, is thinking regionally. This is a significant step. For the first time in Mr. Hasty's 30 years of working on transportation in the Basin, this is very significant. The discussion has been going on at the local level and how the discussion has been bridging from the public works side to the elected official side has been a very important development. This list has helped foster this discussion. This is the technical recommendation and it's up to the policy side whether they want to refine that list or not. It [the list] does include the types of things that have been discussed in the bi-state [committee] for the last 5 years as well as more thinking from the local side of what is significant to them locally but also regionally.

Mr. Lawrence responds that Mr. Hasty's response is helpful. Is it TRPA or TTD's thought that the check-in on the policy side will be done before presenting to the Legislative committee or what's the timing leading up to the May 27 meeting?

Mr. Haven answers that yes, they will have a final list and Carl [Hasty]'s meeting on May 4 is a critical juncture so once they wrap up that conversation with the TTD board, we'll be able to finalize the list. Mr. Haven doesn't anticipate it moving much from what was presented today but it needs some final checks on the policy side.

Julie Regan adds that what they plan to do is summarize some key examples from that list in the outreach document that was up on the screen so that we'll have some collaborative material to provide to the committee and then the detailed list will be an appendix in the overall report that will be submitted a week in advance of the May 27 committee meeting. Ms. Regan appreciates Mr. Hasty's color around this list development, for those checking in here and there at these meetings, it sounds like this list is taking a long time, and it is, but we've had some breakthroughs in connecting up the technical side with the policy side and that will be coming together in this final package. As Mr. Lawrence indicated, this is not a silver-bullet solution recommendation but an overall look at what we think is realistic to run at in the coming years. There will be some more analysis needed in some of those policy ideas.

Ms. Conrad-Saydah comments that based on the presentation today and in February, and the conversations she's had in-between, she's not sure this is ready for a broader policy discussion about the costs and benefits beyond just the financial costs and benefits but also the social or jobs costs and benefits; the broad range of the types of things we're trying to achieve with this bi-state action and with the broad group of people represented on this board and trying to think about bringing benefits not only to the locals but to the visitors who come to the Basin. She thinks that based on the past two presentations, February and today, she hasn't seen enough progress to make a recommendation that this is ready for legislative members or executive

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, TRANSPORTATION, & PUBLIC OUTREACH COMMITTEE

April 27, 2022

branch members in California. It doesn't weigh enough of those trade-offs in thinking about how to come to the decisions on funding sources, implementation plans, and policy decisions. She would like to see more work on it before those things go forward.

Mr. Yeates states that Ms. Conrad-Saydah raised a lot of good points and that he's equally concerned. Mr. Yeates wonders if this presentation will answer the question "What's in it for me?" asked by the NV legislators. There's a lot of competition for funds and so what Ms. Conrad-Saydah's really asking for is something beyond the understanding of what Tahoe would like to have but how it translates as something beneficial for a politician to stick their neck out for funding as part of the 7-7-7 process. Mr. Yeates thinks that ties back to what was talked about earlier in terms of the communication that's ongoing over what we've been trying to do. Mr. Yeates senses from Mr. Lawrence's questions and body language that he's a little stressed about the May 27 Oversight Committee meeting and isn't confident those questions have been answered. Mr. Yeates would recommend staff take to heart that they've talked among themselves and to the TTIC and public works folks but now we have to translate that into what are the true benefits and costs of this and who is going to benefit and how do we know that these projects are going to be carried out so that they accomplish what we say they're going to do. Ms. Conrad-Saydah is much more involved in government than Mr. Yeates has been in the last few years and she's asking the tough questions that she's probably been asked several times about the true cost and true benefits and Mr. Yeates thinks we need to drill that down before May 27 otherwise it could be a very nice meeting that doesn't move much along.

Mr. Lawrence states that he has a lot of confidence in staff that this can be pulled together although he agrees there is more work to be done [before May 27]. He is mindful that one of the slides mentioned benefits, which he does think is key, said "to be updated" which he thinks shows that staff is aware that there is more work to be done in that area.

Ms. Hill comments that she agrees with Mr. Yeates' comments. When we meet as local governments we can hammer out what the projects will look like and how they can excite the NV Legislature committee. She states it's tough when there's a lot of work she's doing on the policy side but perhaps failing to loop in her public works team so that may be a disconnect. She's looking forward to clarifying some of those things and adding to the list to get folks excited about what they're planning.

Ms. Williamson thanks Ms. Conrad-Saydah and Mr. Yeates for their comments. She and Mr. Lawrence have been in front of the NV Legislature and those are questions that they'll ask. This is a conversation and there's huge confidence in staff. Having some of those costs and benefits concreted for that presentation will be really helpful.

Public Comments & Questions

No public comment.

Final Committee Comments & Questions

Julie Regan states that she appreciates the discussion and emphasizes that they have anticipated these questions as well and it's coming together. Staff will spend some time individually with members of this committee who have asked questions to work through it and identify where we do have gaps where we need additional analysis. Also to focus on where we've been in the last year which was a pretty intractable place on these policy considerations even just a year ago. As in all things Tahoe, there are many

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, TRANSPORTATION, & PUBLIC OUTREACH COMMITTEE

April 27, 2022

moving parts, but getting everyone around the table we feel that we will be able to deliver on the legislative intent of the resolution and we'll highlight where more work needs to be done. We'll be coming back to you at the Board meeting in May which will be just a few days ahead of the NV Oversight Committee to preview the presentation.

Mr. Lawrence stated that he hoped that would be the plan and is looking forward to seeing what that final presentation will be like. He appreciates that the technical group did a lot of work but we need to make sure everything is married up before the May Oversight Committee meeting because we don't want to find out months later that it won't work out on the policy side.

Mr. Yeates wants to be clear that he appreciates the work staff has done but that he's nervous to go into these legislative committees without answers to the questions that Ms. Conrad-Saydah raised. Also, it is a bit shocking to Mr. Yeates that we didn't have any public comment on the item when we're also saying everyone is on board. No one from the League, no one from the Visitor's Authority, everyone that's working hard on this and yet no one bothered to make public comment makes him nervous. There's got to be more going to this Legislative Committee with the strong public support we talk about yet we as committee members have our own private conversation with staff on this committee and he's surprised that none of the other groups have bothered to say they either like what we're doing or that more work needs to be done.

Mr. Lawrence agrees it would be good to see that we have all the stakeholders on board with this list, not just folks on staff.

IV. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS

No comments.

V. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Gavin Feiger wanted to respond to Mr. YEates' comment. The League has been working on this through all the channels, the bi-state consultation, the TTD board which our CEO Darcie sits on, and following all the TRPA meetings. We didn't have comments prepared as there was nothing new or specific to comment on but we do want to make sure that the committee, the Governing Board, and public knows that the League is tracking this and is deeply involved.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, TRANSPORTATION, & PUBLIC OUTREACH COMMITTEE

April 27, 2022

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Hill moved to adjourn.

The meeting was adjourned 10:12 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "K. Huston", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Katherine Huston
Paralegal, TRPA

The above meeting was recorded in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the recording may find it at <https://www.trpa.gov/meeting-materials/>. In addition, written documents submitted at the meeting are available for review. If you require assistance locating this information, please contact the TRPA at (775) 588-4547 or virtualmeetinghelp@trpa.gov.