

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
GOVERNING BOARD

Via GoToWebinar

April 28, 2021

Meeting Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Mr. Bruce called the meeting to order at 12:13 p.m.

Members present: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates

Members absent: Mr. Hicks

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Bruce deemed the agenda approved as posted.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mrs. Cegavske moved approval of the March 24, 2021 minutes as presented.
Motion carried.

V. TRPA CONSENT CALENDAR

1. March Financials
2. Adjustments to Fiscal Year 2021 Budget
3. Twin Pines Driveway & Parking Area 853 Stateline Ave., City of South Lake Tahoe, California, TRPA File Number ERSP2020-1397 Assessor's Parcel Numbers 029-010-022, 029-010-024, 029-010-025, 029-010-026
4. Gonowabie Properties, LLC Pier Expansion/Relocation and Multiple Parcel Pier Designation, Washoe County APNs 123-131-04 & 123-131-05, 460 & 470 Gonowabie Road, Crystal Bay, NV, TRPA File Number ERSP2019-1498
5. Lakepoint Beach Resort Addition/Modification and Multiple Parcel Pier Designation, Placer County APNs 117-140-017, 117-140-009, 117-140-010, 117-140-011, and 117-140-012, 7650, 7658, 7662, 7668, and 7672 N Lake Boulevard, Kings Beach, CA, TRPA File Number ERSP2020-1104

Ms. Aldean said the Operations and Governance Committee recommended approval of items one and two.

Public Comments & Questions

None.

GOVERNING BOARD

April 28, 2021

Ms. Novasel moved approval of the consent calendar.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates
Motion carried.

Mr. Yeates moved to adjourn as the TRPA and convene as the TMPO.
Motion carried.

VI. TAHOE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Amendment No. 1 to the FY 2021 Federal Transportation Improvement Program
2. Amendment No. 2 to the FY 2021 Transportation Overall Work Program

Ms. Aldean said the Operations and Governance Committee recommended approval of items one and two.

Ms. Hill reported out on the recent action taken on April 27, 2021 by the Washoe County Commission in regard to Amendment No. 1 to the FY 2021 Federal Transportation Improvement Program.

The Board of County Commissioners considered the bond matching funding by Washoe County for both of the projects on the consent calendar for item number one. The item didn't pass at the Board of County Commissioners meeting yesterday because of some concerns on how the agenda item was written. It was written very specifically to fund the Southwood property for the old elementary school acquisition for the Tahoe Transportation District. Their board wanted to give more flexibility if TTD decided to sell the property as the TTD board has discussed while going through the alternative site analysis. They also had some concerns with the WC-1 funds and whether they were a bond fund or a fund account. Staff will clarify that language in the agenda item and will go back to the County Commission in May. Overall, the Commission is supportive of this concept.

Public Comments & Questions

None.

Ms. Aldean moved approval of the consent calendar.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates
Motion carried.

Mr. Lawrence moved to adjourn as TMPO and reconvene as the TRPA.
Motion carried.

VII. TRPA PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. Threshold Update Initiative regarding the existing nitrate deposition threshold standard and implementation program:

- 1) Amend the existing nitrate deposition threshold standard (AQ14) to a per capita VMT standard to reduce reliance on the automobile, reduce GHG emissions, and promote

mobility

- 2) Amendments to the implementing Goals and Policies of the Regional Plan to accelerate attainment of the per capita VMT standard and implement the Regional Transportation Plan, including the Regional Plan Chapter 3 (Transportation Element) and Chapter 7 (Implementation Element) and Code Chapter 50 to attain the per capita VMT standard and implement the Regional Transportation Plan
- 3) Amendments on revisions to the transportation project impact assessment and air quality mitigation fee (Code Chapter 65.2), including related amendments to Chapters 2, 3, 22, 34, 39, 50, 65, 82, and 90 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances

TRPA staff Mr. Segan, Ms. Glickert, and Ms. Sloan provided the presentation.

Ms. Marchetta made opening remarks.

The Governing Board will be asked to approve a proactive and comprehensive package of changes. First, to adopt a new transportation and sustainable communities threshold standard and with it changes to the Regional Plan and Code of Ordinances to implement that new standard. The Regional Plan Implementation Committee unanimously recommended the package for Governing Board approval. In a subsequent agenda item, the board will be asked to approve the 2020 Regional Transportation Plan that embeds all of those Regional Plan changes that the board will have just adopted and then is the blueprint that implements the transportation vision needed to achieve that new threshold standard. Adoption of that updated Regional Transportation Plan has been recommended for approval by the Tahoe Transportation Commission and earlier today by TRPA's Environmental Improvement, Transportation, & Public Outreach Committee.

Transportation is one the most difficult areas of regional planning context to simplify and to fully understand because it's complex and highly networked with a lot of related moving parts. Since 2015, staff has been touching, updating, adapting, and making more effective every relevant puzzle piece of Tahoe's transportation system. That system is a cascading regulatory pyramid; it starts at the top with the measures of success that are in the form of the threshold standards and includes improvements to the transportation model that was used to measure that threshold standard. The system then cascades down to the plans needed to achieve those intended measures. Then staff enacts implementing strategies for the plans and embed those strategies in code as well as in implementing projects and programs identified in the Regional Transportation Plan. Lastly, they focused on securing the funding needed to implement all of those programs and projects of those enhanced plans.

After almost six years of focused work prioritizing the transportation system improvements, the region is now poised to bring all those puzzle pieces of an integrated system of land use and transportation for Tahoe up to date. It is a vastly improved and far more coherent system because the regulatory system now; the thresholds, the plans, and the project assessment is married to the transportation funding strategy that will implement it all.

Today's proposals meet the Bi-State Compacts required outcomes and more. They've started where the Compact has them starting by updating to a more relevant vehicle miles traveled threshold standard that's tied directly to implementation and funding of the Regional Transportation Plan. This new threshold is something big for Tahoe. There are about 150

GOVERNING BOARD

April 28, 2021

threshold standards regionally. Since 2015, it's been a top priority to update and bring current the regions thresholds that were adopted 40 years ago that are no longer meaningfully provide guidance for the programs and management. All of the prior adopted threshold standards either prevent something bad or they restore something that's lost.

None, until today have been oriented around creating something new, a necessary desired outcome for the region. Staff is recommending the first new threshold in 40 years in a new category for sustainable Tahoe. Like the clarity threshold, it sets the desired outcome and this outcome is an integrated land use and transportation system for Tahoe. It's the desired outcome for Tahoe's built environment. It was set as the goal in the 2012 Regional Plan Update.

The new threshold addresses and delivers importantly on the Compacts directive to reduce reliance on the private automobile by making more efficient use of other transportation modes. Until today, the 40 year old vehicle miles traveled standard has never been tied to the implementation of Tahoe's transportation vision in the Regional Transportation Plan. They've been making futile attempts for decades to motivate multi million dollars in land use and transportation projects by penalizing a few annual residential allocations if we didn't reach the vehicle miles traveled goals.

The next puzzle piece of the Compacts transportation system are the plans for achieving that threshold and is why as part of this package the next four year update of Tahoe's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). They've strengthened the policies and programs of that RTP. They did it in 2016 and now they've gone further in 2020. The RTP now emphasizes transportation strategies designed to address visitation congestion, to reduce auto reliance, to implement the states greenhouse gas emissions reduction policies in both California's Assembly Bill 32 and Nevada's State Climate policy as well as implementing California's Senate Bill 375 policies that require them to integrate land use and transportation planning.

Those new RTP strategies when implemented will decrease per capita VMT and will hold absolute VMT to nearly zero. It's an outcome that's not just consistent with but out performs all of those related statewide requirements.

With today's set of actions, they will have met the best of both not only meeting what the Compact requires but will meet and exceed those related state policies. Having improved the threshold standards and the plans to implement that standard, they then looked deeper into the system on how to apply that threshold measure at the project level to development projects.

The development, redevelopment projects are only a very small increment of the Regional Transportation Plan implementation. They account for about 7 percent of the regional vehicle miles traveled. None the less, they are a part of an improved transportation implementation system, a better way to assess whether redevelopment projects would have a significant effect on VMT at the project level. They also looked at how would those projects then mitigate those potential VMT effects. They then made that project assessment consistent with TRPA's project assessment of VMT impacts and aligned that with new California legislation Senate Bill 743 that California local governments must now also meet. TRPA has streamlined their project review for Tahoe projects and there now needs to be little difference between California and TRPA project analysis.

She thanked the Governing Board members on the Regional Plan Implementation Committee and the Environmental Improvement, Transportation, & Public Outreach Committee as well as

GOVERNING BOARD

April 28, 2021

the board overall who have been highly active and collaborative in helping staff get to this widely supported set of proposals. Along the way, some of the stakeholders wanted TRPA to use much more regulatory hammers, others wanted more incentives, still others wanted more specificity about funding. What they do know is systems change is often a mix of regulation, incentive, and funding partnerships. They've combined all three into today's recommended approach. There's been debate with different advocates about what the right mix of strategies is to deliver this new transportation system structure and its implementation. They've been in this for earnest for three to four years with hundreds of meetings, thousands of hours of explanation, input, and adjustments with stakeholders and feel staff has set the right mix, used the right tools, and the right part of the system to achieve those different desired ends and settled on the right policy compromises.

Today's recommendations are a total remake that 40 years later now aligns the desired transportation outcomes with the plans, projects, and funding that are needed to deliver what everyone has been clamoring for a number of decades which is a transportation system that looks forward to the needs of the 21st century.

The actions today are requesting approval of the new Transportation and Sustainable Communities Threshold standard that is based on VMT per capita and that repeals and replaces the outdated air quality nitrate standard that is measured currently by a cap on VMT. The next request for approval will be on amendments to the Regional Plan Goals and Policies. One set adopts enhancements to the Regional Transportation Plan as conforming amendments to the Goals and Policies of the Regional Plan. The other Regional Plan amendments will implement the new threshold standard. Lastly, the request will be to approve Code of Ordinance changes that implement a modified project assessment also to conform project review to this new threshold standard.

Mr. Segan's presentation:

Mr. Segan said yesterday there was an errata issued that provided a couple of corrections and clarifications.

(Slide 4) At the center of the 'TRPA wheel' is the attainment and maintenance of threshold standards which is always at the center of everything as directed by the Compact. The Compact establishes the threshold standards as the shared environmental goals and aspirations for the Tahoe region. It directs TRPA to work with the collaborative partnership to ensure those standards are attained and maintained. This is done through preparing and maintaining Regional Plan and code that advocates and ensures those standards are attained, implementing that code through the permitting and compliance departments, and then implementing that Regional Plan through the partnership of the Environmental Improvement Program. The threshold standards also direct the monies spent through that program. The nearly \$2 billion dollars that's been spent are to promote threshold standard attainment. As shown on the outside of that wheel, they implemented through broad collaboration outside the region.

Given the importance of these standards, many people are often surprised that they haven't paid more attention to what's actually in them and to continually update those. There are threshold standards that direct TRPA to protect habitat for the Canada Goose but there are no standards related to wildfire. There are 22 vegetation standards but not one mentions wildfire. There are standards related to the protection of habitat for deer but no standards for the transportation system. Fundamentally, that is why we're here today because we've let the plans get ahead of the

GOVERNING BOARD

April 28, 2021

goals and somewhat complacent in updating those goals as they've continued to update the plans. Then others start to redefine what the goals were there for in the first place. While most assume that the VMT standard was somehow a goal for the transportation system, it owes its adoptions to the same concerns around declining clarity that motivated adoption of nearly one third of the threshold standards in 1982. It was believed at that time that excess algal growth that was responsible for declining clarity of the Lake and that nitrogen is a nutrient that causes algal growth. Nitrogen is also a byproduct of combustion engines and as cars drove more there were more nitrogen emissions. The nitrogen deposition standard was established to reduce nitrogen emissions within the region and thus reduce nitrogen loading to the Lake.

They've known that VMT may not be the best measure for nitrogen deposition within the region. It was first highlighted in the 2001 Threshold Evaluation and was becoming apparent that maybe this indicator no longer served the purpose for which it was initially established. That recommendation can also be found in the 2006, 2011, 2015 Threshold Evaluation.

Two things have changed that motivated the past four threshold evaluations dating back 20 years to recommend that we revisit this standard. First is that cars are far cleaner as a result of the first tailpipe emissions standards that the Environmental Protection Agency adopted in 1975. The success of the implementation of those and new car production, cars today are 99 percent cleaner than they were when the standard was adopted. If there's concern about NOx emissions, one would have to drive 100 miles in one of today's model cars to emit as much NOx as was emitted by one mile of driving in the mid- 1970s.

NOx emissions have declined significantly well beyond the 10 percent reduction goal established in the threshold standard and the forecast is that it will continue to go down even further in the future. Today, we're at one third of level that we were 20 years ago in 2000 which is far below the level we were at in 1990 and 1980.

The second item that's changed is that they've invested nearly \$10 million dollars in science to better understand why clarity loss was happening in Lake Tahoe. Those investments led to the development of the Lake Tahoe Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL). The TMDL identified that it wasn't algal growth within the Lake that was predominately responsible for clarity loss but was inorganic fine sediment particles that were responsible for nearly two thirds of the clarity loss of the Lake. The TMDL further identified an implementation plan to reduce loading of both nutrients and these inorganic particles that were driving clarity loss to restore the historic clarity of the Lake over the next 65 years.

In light of those changes, the recommendations of the 2015 Threshold Evaluation along with prior ones, and the larger acknowledgment that the vast majority of the threshold standards, these goals that guide not only the work of the Agency but the Environmental Improvement Program partnership were more than 40 years old. The Governing Board directed staff to engage in a wholesale update of the threshold standards to ensure that they were still grounded in the best science and reflected the goals of the Agency and the region today. Nearly four years ago, TRPA started working with the Tahoe Science Advisory Council. They spent a lot of time thinking about the mundane questions such as what types of measures belong as threshold standards, what types of things belong in other parts of the system, and how should a threshold standards be written? The results of many of those discussions were codified in the threshold standards and Regional Plan that was done just over one year ago. Those changes laid the foundation not just for the action being proposed today but for future actions that will likely be proposed to bring other threshold standards up to the practice with the best science, the best information, and implement

adaptive management systems that drives change towards achieving all of those directives. All the work done with the Science Advisory Council laid the foundation and the groundwork for the standard that's being proposed today.

TRPA started work on the threshold standard nearly four years ago when the Advisory Planning Commission was asked to convene a transportation measures working group that was tasked with surveying the transportation landscape and identifying which measure were good for which things. Then proposing how they could then apply those measures to our practice.

Off the heels of that report, they started this threshold update process where the Bi-State Compact has them start these processes. It starts with considering what is the goal of the standard today and what are they trying to drive action towards. The old VMT standard was rooted in concerns about NOx emissions, clarity loss, and algal growth. But the discourse had clearly changed. Over one year ago there were a series of conversations to try and identify what it was they were doing with the standard today, why was it that they cared about VMT today, and what were they trying to accomplish? As a result of those discussions with stakeholders, they identified three core items: Trying to increase mobility to be able to walk, bike, and take transit, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and support efforts within the two states to do that, and reduce overall dependence on the automobile.

That aspiration to reduce reliance on the automobile dates back well over 50 years. We're not the first or only place thinking about how to promote mobility, reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the transportation sector, and reduce overall dependence on the automobile. Collectively, when those are talked about, what it's often called is building more sustainable communities. There are a number of cities and states across the country that have thought about how to build more sustainable communities and nearly everyone has landed on the same thing that there needs to be better coordination on the land use and transportation planning. They've landed on that by reflecting on the lessons of the past. For the vast majority of the country's history we've let our land use decisions drive our investments in the transportation system. For example, a new outlet mall is built on the outskirts of town and then a new highway is built to get there. Build a new subdivision on the outskirts of town and then roadway capacity would need to be expanded to and from. As this entire process played itself out all over the country, people started looking at the results and evaluated the wisdom letting the land use planning dictate the transportation investments. When this pattern is continued of making land use decisions, reflecting on that, and making a transportation system to accommodate that land use decision, people spend more time in their cars needing to drive farther distances and more time in traffic. It's acknowledged that it is a broken cycle. Tahoe is fortunate that we opted out of that cycle a long time ago because they decided to stop building new subdivisions within the region and expanding the roadway networks.

The solution is coordinating land use and transportation planning. That means two things: Provide people with more transportation options and making using those options more amenable. Second, put more people in the places where they have the opportunity to use those options. The later part of the presentations in this sequence are focusing on those two things. Ms. Glickert will present on how the Regional Transportation Plan that contains the strategies for providing people with more transportation options to get where they want to go and incentives to use non-auto modes. The presentation will include how we're promoting those options within the region. Ms. Sloan will present on how the Regional Plan encourages people to locate themselves in those places where they are more likely to be able to take advantage of those options. The refinements being proposed today will augment the existing Regional Plan and help focus people in those areas.

GOVERNING BOARD

April 28, 2021

It's important to put those changes we're making to how we evaluate development projects in the larger context of the Regional Plan. The 2012 Regional Plan was born in this era when people were actively thinking about how to better coordinate land use and transportation policy. It has its roots in that same time period when California passed Senate Bill 375 requiring metropolitan planning organizations all over the state to better integrate land use and transportation planning, to reduce emissions, and make more environmentally friendly communities. Also, overall allow people to spend more time outside of their cars doing the things they like. The 2012 Regional Plan kicked off this process for Tahoe by looking at density, coverage, and transfer incentives which were focused on promoting redevelopment in the town and regional centers and providing the opportunity to take transit to all the different amenities around the region.

Because we're not the first to think about how to promote more sustainable communities, they're also not the first to consider how best to measure their success in better integrating land use and transportation. The measure being proposed as part of the threshold standard is VMT per capita. This is same measure the people all over the country have landed on including California for both Senate Bill 375 and 743. Fundamentally, what it is a measure of is how far each person needs to drive each day. What they found by looking at the overall transportation landscape in different cities for example, consider the differences between New York and Houston. New York is a more compact metropolis with lots of bike, pedestrian, and transit opportunities and Houston is more sprawling metropolis. The average person in New York travels about 15 miles per day in the region in their car. While the average person in Houston travels just under 40 miles per day. By concentrating development and putting people in places where they have the opportunity to take advantage of transit and non-auto opportunities that it results in regions with lower VMT per capita. If there's sprawling development patterns then there's higher VMT per capita.

This can also be seen in how the measure plays out, not just when evaluating the existing land use and transportation footprint of a region but also what happens when you add new development or a new person to the region. For example, if there were three people, each of which had to drive ten miles per day, is ten VMT per capita in that region. If a person and new home is added in a far flown part of the region and then add that person's driving to calculate the new VMT per capita footprint within the region. What is found that if those people drive more than VMT per capita in the region, it goes up.

If you locate that next development or relocate development into areas where people drive shorter distances and take advantage of other opportunities such as transit, walk, or bike to destinations that the VMT of that next person goes down and as a result the VMT per capita for the entire region goes down.

By identifying the measure of success, they identified a three step process to establish a new threshold standard target. Staff convened a technical advisory group this past summer to help work through the technical question related to the three steps of this process. First, what's the best measure of VMT within the region today? Second, what's the best measure of how many people there are traveling within the region today? To do that, they engaged the assistance of the Science Advisory Council to get a more appropriate overall estimate of the total number of people traveling in the Tahoe region on an average day. As a result of the first two steps, they calculated the VMT per capita, the average traveler within the Tahoe region today is about 12.5 miles. If people are traveling about 12.5 miles in a car today, what's the goal for them in the future?

GOVERNING BOARD

April 28, 2021

They looked to the two plans and coordinated effort for land use and transportation planning and looked at those incentives within the Regional Plan to create a more compact development footprint within the region. They looked at the projects within the Regional Transportation Plan to provide more options. They analyzed full implementation of each. Full implementation means that they are consolidating more and more development within the town and regional centers, then providing 15 minute transit service between those town centers and core recreation destinations within the region. They are providing 30 to 60 minute transit service between the other neighborhoods in the town centers and providing waterborne transit across the Lake. As a result of those investments they expect to see transit ridership within the region increase fivefold. They've also completed the multi-use trail around Lake Tahoe and improved connectivity between the individual communities. Closing those gaps in the sidewalks and trail systems to allow people to use those trails for everyday activities and enhance accessibility for people with disabilities within the region. They are talking about building 110 miles of new bike and pedestrian paths, creating 17 mobility hubs and transit centers within the region, to allow augmented access to this new series of trails within the region, and to expand the network. They're also providing people with the information through investments and technology to make better decisions when they want to travel places, where there's opportunity, where parking spaces may be full, or if there's a new shuttle to take someone to a destination.

When they analyzed all those investments and that future development footprint they're trying to create, they believe by implementing those two plans they can reduce the average number of miles that a person spends in their car by 6.8 percent. That's a little over one mile per day less time in a car and just over 300 miles per year. This gives someone 8 or so hours back each year. Think about that target in context of other goals for the region, it's important to consider it in light of the goal established as a California Metropolitan Planning Organization under Senate Bill 375. The goal being proposed today is twice as large as the currently adopted standard under SB 375. The SB 375 goal extends on to 2035 and the goal today is that we would have additional reductions beyond 2035 to 2045. It's more ambitious in the year 2035 and continues those ambitions into the future.

This proposal is not just a new threshold standard but is also being proposed to be a new threshold standard category. Today, there are nine categories of standards and it was realized that those aspirations and the goals of this new standard didn't fit well into those existing categories. They weren't just about improving air and water quality like its predecessor was. The new category is Transportation and Sustainable Communities Threshold category.

This goal being established will take a little over 20 years to achieve. Staff is proposing a number of additions to the Goals and Policies of the Regional Plan that allow them to implement and drive progress towards that threshold standard and attainment.

There are three core elements that are the hallmarks of this system. First, is independent guidance through the establishment of an advisory body. Second, are milestones for progress, and the third is triggered management responses if they fall behind those milestones.

Details of the independent advisory body can be found in the Goals and Policies, DP-5.1, DP-5.2, and DP-5.3. Those contain the details on the membership, the reporting cycle, what's expected in those reports, and transmission of those reports. These technical experts of the advisory body are being asked to do three things: Every two years they're being asked to summarize progress and what's been working over those two years; what things are helping reduce VMT per capita and help drive towards attainment of the threshold standards? Second, they're asked to identify

GOVERNING BOARD

April 28, 2021

what's not working; what in the system did they expect to work but somehow has not been implemented or is not having the intended affect? Third, they are being asked to make recommendations for modifications of the land use policies within the Regional Plan or modifications to the Regional Transportation Plan to accelerate threshold standard attainment.

All of that is the core of this adaptive management process, this independent guidance. Because one of the themes that they've heard throughout this process is that transforming a transportation and land use system to better align with one another is hard work. They can't assume they have all the answers to the challenges today. With that humility in mind that the foundation of the implementation proposal is a robust adaptive management framework. At the core of that framework is these two year reports that the independent advisory body is transmitting to the Governing Board to encourage and accelerate attainment of this threshold standard. Layered on top of that framework is what they've done to align that two year adaptive management cycle with the existing planning processes.

They've linked the reports every four years with the four year development cycle for the Regional Transportation Plan. The 2024 advisory body report kicks off the 2025 RTP update cycle and provides the RTP and stakeholders the information to design those policies, programs, and projects to meet the needs that have been identified in this report. In addition, it is a robust adaptive management framework because they've specified certain requirements that this report is required to contain when they are not on target. If the 2024 report has evidence that it's fallen behind in the reductions of VMT per capita and not seeing the gains expected, the advisory body will be asked to develop a suite of recommendations to land use and transportation policy to get back on track by the next four year milestone. If the advisory body finds that they are on target then the advisory body has discretion on which changes to recommend that will be better accelerate delivery of the programs and policies that are already reducing VMT per capita.

The last part of this adaptive management framework is triggered management responses which is the backstop to the adaptive management process. These are things that they hope never go into effect because the collaborative process to implement the programs is working and they are hitting all the milestones that have been established. In the advent that it is not working, there are two triggers included in this proposal. The first is a funding trigger that goes into effect in 2024 and acknowledges that we know we need additional monies to implement the vision that's laid forth in the Regional Transportation Plan and drive progress towards standard attainment. They've established an aggressive goal for regional funding for the partnership to work towards. If that goal is not met then there's a trigger that states that the standard of significance for projects within the region will be no net unmitigated VMT. The second trigger relates to reduction of VMT per capita. It ensures that in 2045 we realize that we have a lot of work to do because we haven't been reducing per capita VMT along the way. Every eight years within this system they have a milestone which is a specific VMT per capita reduction target. If they do not achieve that milestone, two things happen. The mobility mitigation fee that helps implement the projects and drives progress towards that standard, goes up by ten percent and the standard of significance for projects outside of town centers and their buffers goes to no net VMT. While these consequences go into effect if the targets have not been met, they are also revoked automatically when they are back on track or when the funding sources have begun collection.

Through the work with the Science Advisory Council there's been a fair bit of opportunity to reflect on what those standards are, what they are not, and what they say about our goals for the region. Something that emerged from those discussions was a simple typology of the standards that we have today. Because we've adopted nearly 200 standards over the years and every one of them fits

into two categories; 1) Standards that are seeking to protect something from degradation such as preventing aquatic invasive species from entering the lake or protecting stream environment zones or wetlands from degradation. 2) Those that are seeking to restore something that's been lost such as restoring the lost clarity of the lake or restoring the old growth forest. The standard being proposed today is fundamentally different from both of these two standards.

This region has always been reliant on the automobile. There's no historic reference point that anyone has referenced in the discussion throughout this process that said, "That's the time I want to return to." We've never had the type of good transit, trails, and technology that we are aspiring to have and the vision for is laid out within the Regional Plan and Regional Transportation Plan. Within this standard they are trying to build something that never was because fundamentally there's no one saying, "Just stop building bike paths or stop investing in transit because we don't want other options to get to the recreation sites."

The threshold standard today is new from the older types of standards. It's a standard that establishes a goal to create something that never was in Tahoe but something they believe is possible. It's possible because they've seen elements of it expressed elsewhere in the world and throughout the country. They also know it's possible because as a partnership they've expressed a shared yearning for at least three generations. It's also a different type of standard because it's not rooted in a desire to protect something from being destroyed or restore something that's been lost and, in that sense, it's not rooted in fear like the existing standards we have are. We're not afraid of losing something here and not afraid that our actions or the actions of our predecessors and ancestors have harmed this place that we like in some way that requires us to rectify or repair it. The basis for this standard is itself rooted in hope and a fundamental belief in what the Tahoe partnership can do if it works together to collectively develop, fund, and implement the plans that will make the region better for tomorrow. It's rooted in a hope that we can transform the travel experience for everyone in the region. Also, the hope that the next generation that comes after will be talking more about the pleasure of biking around the Lake on the new bike trail and less about congestion on Echo Summit or more about the beach they just discovered on the East Shore via shuttle and less about how they waited in line to park at Sand Harbor only to miss out on the last parking space. This is what creates a more sustainable and mobile future and is the goal of this threshold standard.

Ms. Glickert's presentation:

Ms. Glickert said our vision is strong, a transportation system that is sustainable connecting people and places within the region and to all of those popular places outside of the region. This Regional Transportation Plan is oriented to climate action, meeting our greenhouse goals, reducing mobile source emissions, reducing dependency on the automobile, and the associated VMT. This Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy goes beyond the California Air Resources Board (CARB) GHG reduction targets for the Tahoe Region and delivers additional GHG and VMT improvements.

Mostly it creates a full trail system, a robust transit system that serves everyone and maximizes use of the roadway. The RTP is helping us move forward to reaching the goals in collaboration. The plan's 25-year transportation vision stresses connectivity and a focus on reducing auto use and expanding options for residents and visitors. The plan considers all users, where that trip begins and ends, strategically aligning improvements in transit, trail connections, and adaptive management including parking which can incentivize using non-auto options. The plan includes

GOVERNING BOARD

April 28, 2021

travel management focused on recreation hot spots but also works with employers large and small to provide information and incentives for employees to commute car-free.

This time around, the plan is more contemporary. The plan provides a regional approach to mobile source GHG reduction and incorporates new GHG goals of California and Nevada. Climate change is at the forefront and Transportation is part of the solution. There is broad agreement that new Sustainable Transportation funding is needed for transportation and through the coordination among the Bi-State Consultation, the Tahoe Transportation District, and Local governments there is significant momentum toward realizing new funding options. Regional revenue is now in the Regional Transportation Plan with identified funding as a starting point.

The plan includes project priorities that have been identified by the Bi-State Consultation working with implementation partners, private sector, and local governments. The plan's project list incorporates all of these. Technology and service models are leveraged in providing transportation options, including travel apps, on-demand micro transit, and recognizing the private sector who provides transportation services in Tahoe.

Recreation travel is one of the top issues and recreation access were enhanced through corridor planning work and includes new data sources to better understanding behavior incorporated into the forecast for the plan. Parking management that includes pricing, managing the existing use of the roadway more efficiently, and reservation systems.

Goals and Policies: Staff has proposed changes to the policies only as shown in Attachment D of the staff report. The goals and policies for the RTP are the Transportation policies of Chapter 3 of the Regional Plan that are being considering for approval today. The Regional Plan Implementation Committee endorsed these policies this morning as did the Advisory Planning Commission on April 14.

Environment: Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Here they've incorporated a focus on GHG and VMT as well as updates to project impact analysis with a new Policy (1.3). This policy will implement greenhouse gas reduction strategies in alignment with federal, tribal, state, and regional requirements, and goals. They've also revised a policy to fold in the project impact analysis to develop and implement project impact analysis, mitigation strategies, and fee programs to reduce VMT and auto trips.

Connectivity: Enhance and sustain the connectivity and accessibility of the Tahoe transportation system, across and between modes, communities, and neighboring regions. The new policy focuses on collaboration with local partners such as the two transportation management associations and nearby communities that share transportation to and from the Tahoe Basin which includes the Town of Truckee/Resort Triangle, and the Carson/Minden Valley. This policy builds from policy that talks about the coordination needed with our mega region; those partners a little further away like Reno, Sacramento, and the Bay Area. The policies continue to emphasize providing more travel options at key recreation locations. To make the plan relevant they've added a new Policy (2.14) that states "Supporting, where feasible, the implementation of on-demand, dynamically routed transit shuttles. The plan expands several policies and includes new policies around parking. The parking pricing and management are one of the strongest strategies they can employ to make people think twice about taking the car. On a project level, they've expanded a policy to develop standards and guidelines for incorporating multi-modal amenities in new development or redevelopment as part of all plans including but not limited to the local area plans.

GOVERNING BOARD

April 28, 2021

In the safety goal there is a new policy to encourage appropriate agencies to use traffic incident management performance measures. This new policy augments Policy 3.4 which has an emphasis on improving safety data collection; it can take over one year before the data is cleared through the two states which delays their ability to address unsafe conditions.

In operations and congestion management they've made policies relevant with new shared on demand mobility services such as ride share and bike share. They've revised policies for clarity like (4.10) to track and prepare for emerging transportation technology. Building on that policy they added "Coordinate policies across multiple partners to support the use of safe electric assisted, low-speed devices on paths and trails to serve travel needs in Tahoe."

Economic vitality: There's a new policy revolving around access to public transit and how it needs to be compatible with the neighborhood and users it serves. They need to ensure that all of our vulnerable users, those without cars, have access to services. They've updated an existing policy on collaboration with bi-state regional partners regional such as Sacramento and the Bay Area, and inter-regional partners like Minden/Carson and Truckee to establish efficient rail, air, and bus transportation connections to Tahoe.

System preservation focuses new policies on improving winter access. It's not just about keeping those roads plowed, transit shelters and sidewalks cleared. Those are essential to get people using transit in the winter time. Another highlight is the inclusion of mobility hubs in the policy; one size does not fit all but a hub where various transit lines connect and people have shelter are needed.

While the need is obvious for public participation, they did not have a policy about this. Now they have Advancing Transportation Planning through public participation and collaboration.

Ms. Sloan's presentation:

Ms. Sloan said the recommendation of code changes updates the current project impact assessment and mitigation fee processes. This will implement the new VMT per capita threshold at the project level and to advance its goals for reducing greenhouse gases and reliance on the personal automobile as well as changing land use and transportation.

In addition to updating the current processes, the recommendation will also align with California jurisdictions in the Tahoe region for updating their project impact assessment with VMT under Senate Bill 743. TRPA's process has always been quite similar to SB 743. The proposal today builds on that existing system and modifies it to align with new California state law so there wouldn't be two separate and possibly conflicting reviews in the region for project development. When implemented the updates will accelerate achievement of the Regional Plan and Regional Transportation Plan goals for more walkable, bikeable, and transit served region through improved land use and transportation solutions. In part, by incentivizing development in and near to town and regional centers.

Currently, project impacts are evaluated using the average daily trips it generates which is out of alignment with VMT per capita threshold. It's out of alignment because it doesn't recognize that location matters for development. Location influences the choices available for people to get around and the distance that they drive by car. Shorter trip lengths occur in and near to town and regional centers where the mix of land uses and transportation options such as transit service and networks of bike paths and sidewalks conversely, more remote areas having longer vehicle trips and little or no alternatives to the car.

GOVERNING BOARD

April 28, 2021

The recommendation sets trip lengths as the foundation for identifying which projects are significant by recognizing that project location matters. As a result the approximately 7 percent of future VMT from development and redevelopment in the region will be reduced through an assessment process that focuses on project location and size, and its mitigations.

The recommendation has three main components: The screening criteria which pinpoints what types of projects are of a size and in a location that require more detailed review and more types of mitigations. Second, standards of significance sound wonky but really have a simple function to define expectations for a project that doesn't meet that screening criteria based on its land use type.

Third, mitigations which ensure projects contribute to VMT reductions and the implementation of the VMT threshold at the project level. Every project mitigates through fees, but those projects that are above the defined expectations (that is the standards of significance) do more at the project level. Within the mitigations is the update to air quality mitigation fee which will be revised to the Mobility Mitigation Fee, and it will also use VMT in its calculation.

The screening criteria term is a little misleading. It suggests that they are exempting projects from additional analysis which is not the case and is a key difference between TRPA's system and the guidance from SB 743 for the California jurisdictions to update their project impact assessment using VMT.

In the recommendation of code changes, every project mitigates its VMT by at least paying a fee. Instead screening here operates for a different purpose. (Slide 47) It draws a line, below which a project pays a fee to mitigate its VMT. Above that line, the project is of a type or in a location that has to do more, while recognizing the location of the project matters because of the availability of transportation options and destinations that can be reached on foot, bike, transit, or short trips in a car when needed.

Staff worked with stakeholders to draw this line more clearly for screening and to more narrowly focus it on VMT and project location. In Tahoe they've always had a standard for this screening that has been based on trips; 200 average daily trips. They recommend retaining that but translating it to VMT for town and regional centers and a one half mile around them. In those locations the screening is 1,300 VMT. Everywhere else the screen would be 715 VMT which represents the VMT equivalent of 110 average daily trips which is a recommendation from California for implementation of Senate Bill 743. The recommended screening criteria, combined with TRPA's land use regulations, will perform more strictly than that California guidance in just about every way.

Standards of Significance, those defined levels, above which, a non-screened project must do more, based on its land use type. Under the recommendation, doing more no longer depends on whether the VMT threshold is or is not in attainment which closes a loophole in the current impact assessment process. The recommendation sets these expectations and standards of significance at the sub-regional or jurisdictional level to promote development in the most efficient areas within each jurisdiction.

The recommendation uses a three-tiered approach to defining these expectations. First, is that smaller less complex projects simply paying the mobility mitigation fee. Second, projects that aren't quite as small or simple will undergo further impact assessment and if they meet the defined expectations of the standard of significance, then they will only need to pay the mobility

GOVERNING BOARD

April 28, 2021

mitigation fee. Third, are those larger and more complex projects that can't screen and don't meet the defined expectations for their land use type. Those projects advance by paying the mobility mitigation fee and do more at the project level through mitigation.

Every project that generates VMT is required to mitigate, some will only pay fees and those not-screened and above the defined expectations pay fees and do more. The "do more" are project level requirements to reduce VMT. In doing more, these projects will perform better than existing similar on-the-ground development.

TRPA staff is developing an online project impact assessment tool for use by TRPA staff, local jurisdictions, and the development community. That tool will be available at any stage of the development project, from idea to application.

For example, if there's a multi-family residential development within a town center in Tahoe Valley. Sixty units of multi-family residential will be below the town center screen of 1,300 VMT. This project calculates and pays its mobility mitigation fee and advances through the application process. The other example is a multi-family residential outside of a town center in an area that's not very connected and doesn't have a connection to a variety of land uses. Because of this even if the project had only 25 units of multi-family residential it would not meet the screen for that location of 715 VMT. This project could advance but it will be required to do more at the project level than only paying its mobility mitigation fee.

If the proposed recommendations are adopted there will be a few post adoption items that will begin immediately. First, staff will finalize the mobility mitigation fee by using the Regional Transportation Plan constrained project list and setting the fee to be completed in consultation with the jurisdictions, stakeholders, and the development community. Staff will complete the development of the project tool in consultation with Placer County as well as input from Fehr & Peers. Once completed it will also be able to evaluate projects for VMT in order for the California jurisdictions to comply with Senate Bill 743. They'll work with the local jurisdictions to train and prepare them for roll out of the updated impact assessment and fee processes. Lastly, using forthcoming research from their partners at the University of California, Davis to develop a project impact assessment mitigation monitoring program.

Presentation can be found at:

[Agenda-Item-No.-VII.A-VMT-Threshold-Update.pdf](#)

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Yeates said the Regional Plan Implementation Committee has been working on this as far back when Clem Shute was the committee chair. There were meetings with staff about three years ago where Mr. Segan explained that we didn't have a nitrate problem, and the way VMT is used in the context of the nitrate threshold was outdated. He appreciated the positive tone of staff's presentation because they've gone far beyond just declaring victory and moving on.

They've created a new threshold so we can implement the Regional Transportation Plan and protect Lake Tahoe. These are things that we want to do and starts the process for us to be able to sell why it is important that we have the funding. The flexibility may be in the funding that we can implement the Regional Transportation Plan, fulfill the threshold, and meet that Compact provision that encourages people to get out of their cars. Staff has done a lot of outreach to the stakeholders. There were some stakeholders that were concerned or simply didn't quite believe or

GOVERNING BOARD

April 28, 2021

know why we were changing this threshold. Overtime, with the outreach and listening to what people had to say, responding to that, and coming up with different ways to address concerns without having to drop the ‘hammer’, they came up with a good overall program attached to this threshold and one that will help them in the future. We have a positive way of working together and coming up with solutions that benefit this Basin and Lake. He’s proud of what staff has done and whole-heartedly supports the recommendation.

Ms. Gustafson dittoed the comments and accolades to staff for their hard work and bringing all the partners together to work on this. She said the technical advisory body doesn’t outline private sector partners. As we look towards that general public person, we should look at the private sector. They are instrumental on the north shore for delivering so many of their programs.

Ms. Glickert said they’ve discussed incorporating the Transportation Management Associations (TMA) in that technical advisory body. The TMA’s have that connection to the private sector.

Ms. Gustafson said that could work as long there’s focus on executive directors or business members. The membership calls out environmental and general public and wants to ensure that they know that we’re wanting to bring that private expertise of delivery. For example, the Vail’s Northstar bus fleet is larger than the Tahoe Truckee Area Regional Transportation bus fleet on the north shore.

Mr. Friedrich said he supported the overall framework of this new per capita VMT threshold standard. He commended staff for being responsive to suggestions to strengthen the documents and plans including clarifying the role of the advisory body. We’ll probably see high visitation this summer and, in the years, to come causing impacts including heavy traffic which spurred local resident protest last summer. This is timely and crucial that we implement projects to get people to and around the Basin with alternatives to the private automobile. He would like to see Regional Transportation Plan projects that are assessed to reduce VMT the most given top priority for funding support and implementation. This will become increasingly important if we are not meeting VMT per capita targets and overall VMT is increasing.

Ms. Faustinos thanked everyone involved in producing this report, it’s come a long way since this issue first came up and they started engaging with the impacted communities. She expressed her gratitude that there has been so much done. As an “outsider” of the Basin, having a perspective from that occasional tourist or visitor could be helpful to this process. She tried to use the transit system from the Reno Airport to Lake Tahoe and was only successful once. That’s an important audience to keep in mind because those are the ones who hopefully will be looking for ways to use public transit to get into the Basin.

Mr. Rice said Nevadans aren’t quite as use to fees and taxes as on the California side. He asked who will pay the mobility mitigation fees and how will they be paid.

Ms. Sloan said the mobility mitigation fee is the revision of the current air quality mitigation fee. That fee is currently paid by all projects and development based on the trips they create. The mobility mitigation fee and the rename of it is to more closely link it with the project impact assessment and to align to the VMT threshold. It’s the same fee system only calculated on VMT versus trips.

Mr. Rice said the DMV is now asking for mileage when someone registers a vehicle. There’s been a lot of conversation asking if they are going to be charging by the mile that one drives their car or is

GOVERNING BOARD

April 28, 2021

there going to be a fee to drive to Tahoe? A lot of the folks in the valley will object strenuously to having to pay to visit Lake Tahoe. Something has to be done and this sounds like a good plan. The devils are in the details.

Ms. Sloan said for clarification, it's on project development.

Ms. Novasel thanked staff for the great report and supported these VMT standard changes. El Dorado County only has a small town center and are restricted to around 15 units per acre. The county doesn't have the density and are not in charge of transit in the South Shore so there is no way to hit these new VMT marks. She's concerned about how the county will meet these standards or thresholds. It's a double edge sword for many who are in a rural area of the Basin.

Mr. Marshall said that the proposed threshold is regional, it is not broken down by jurisdiction. El Dorado County will not be measured against any particular performance from a local perspective but the region as a whole will be measured against the threshold.

Ms. Novasel thank you for the clarification, that alleviates a lot of her concern.

Public Comments & Questions

Jesse Patterson, League to Save Lake Tahoe said they encouraged the board to adopt the VMT threshold update package in its entirety. They appreciated being part of the technical groups as well as the Threshold Update Initiative Stakeholders Working Group. They are happy to see the same level of focus from TRPA staff and Governing Board members. They thanked Mr. Segan, Ms. Glickert, Ms. Sloan, and Mr. Marshall for spending so much time with them and other stakeholders to work collaboratively towards this VMT threshold package.

Their goal has always been that it furthers the Regional Plan and Regional Transportation Plan implementation and that any increases resulting from the plan could sufficiently be mitigated with the appropriate accountability. Also, the broader goal of updating all TRPA thresholds to be based on the best available information, measurable, and relevant to the issues and challenges facing the Lake. This updated VMT threshold does that by addressing the greenhouse gas emissions, mobility, and other impacts related to personal vehicle travel, especially moving into that new transportation and sustainable communities category which is very appropriate as well. They're happy to see their remaining concerns from last month be addressed by staff specifically the details provided around the advisory body's composition, role, and types of recommendations and how that will interchange with the Governing Board is a good improvement. In addition, the specificity provided on regional revenue source is good to have that be clear. This VMT threshold update strikes a good balance between adaptive and prescriptive approaches which all need to be included. The VMT target and milestones or triggers result in repercussions if milestones aren't met and is very clear what those are and what will happen. But the complimentary adaptive approach, monitoring, the advisory body recommendations are needed as new information becomes available.

They supported approval and asked that the Regional Plan Implementation Committee and Governing Board remain diligent after approval and continuously look for ways to ensure implementation of the Regional Transportation Plan and Regional Plan. The League will remain committed and looks forward to continuing work with staff and partners as they apply the new threshold.

GOVERNING BOARD

April 28, 2021

Sophie Wenzlau, California Attorney General's office commenting at a staff level. Their office has worked closely with staff over the past year to discuss their concerns regarding the proposed VMT threshold amendment. They thanked staff, particularly Mr. Marshall, Mr. Segan, Ms. Sloan, and Ms. Glickert for continuously making time to meet with them and ensuring that their questions and concerns were heard and responded to. Most of their core concerns have been addressed and are generally comfortable with the proposed amendments. They are particularly pleased with the changes made in the past month that clarified the regional revenue milestone, the interim targets, the function of the performance reports, and the adaptive management measures.

The remaining concerns are rooted in the fact that the proposed VMT threshold is only as strong as the Regional Transportation Plan it is based on. The proposed VMT threshold is tied to the level of VMT reduction that TRPA expects will occur with the full implementation of the Draft 2020 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. The Draft RTP/SCS on which the threshold is based could target a higher level of per capita VMT reduction without changing expected investment and while continuing to prioritize equitable transportation solutions that work for everyone in the Basin. They continue to wish that the RTP/SCS and by extension the threshold was more ambitious. They also remain concerned about the \$1 billion dollar funding gap for RTP implementation which would persist even if regional revenue is fully secured. If the RTP is fully funded and implemented, TRPA projects that total VMT in the Basin will increase above current levels. If the RTP is not fully implemented due to the funding gap, total VMT could rise more than projected which could adversely impact water quality including TRPA's ability to attain the Total Maximum Daily Load target. Increases in VMT are also related to increased congestion and deterioration in the balance between the man made and natural environment.

Going forward, it will be important to keep an eye on these issues especially as we face more population growth pressure and greater wildfire risk. Notwithstanding these concerns, they are pleased that the Agency is holding itself to the high bar of full RTP/SCS implementation and committing itself to develop a badly needed revenue source for transportation improvements. They hope and expect that the new VMT threshold, its implementation and adaptive management framework will lead to creative and constructive action between now and 2045. Achieving the proposed threshold will require ongoing attention, effort, creativity, and ambition by TRPA. If implemented correctly, the framework proposed today, could ultimately serve as a model for other metropolitan planning organizations in California and establish TRPA as a leader in this state. They encouraged staff and the board to view attainment of the threshold not as an aspiration but as an imperative.

Russ Wigart, El Dorado County said they've been working on a pavement study for years that looks at the contributions of fine sediment particles going to the Lake from the condition of the road itself. What is being seen is that in the Pavement Condition Index rating from 0 to 100, a road in very poor condition, a rating of 20 for example, has much more fine sediment particles associated with it than a pavement condition index of 100. From their research they're seeing that they can get about a 90 percent reduction in fine sediment particles which ultimately affects Lake Tahoe's clarity by simply improving the pavement condition alone. By doing that, they can also improve their sweeper effectiveness and how the sweepers recover that material off road surface. Also, durability comes into play when you run heavy equipment in the winter time. For example, if there's a pavement in reasonable condition, it's more durable. There's less down pressure on the road, better snow removal, and less degradation which leads to less fine sediment particles going to the Lake. When a road in poor condition is repaved, there is less fine sediment particle transport, improved durability on the road, more sweeper effectiveness, and there's a better traveling experience driving around the Basin and better fuel economy. They hope that this is

GOVERNING BOARD

April 28, 2021

something that can be incorporated more into this program. Getting people out of their cars is important. The existing transportation infrastructure is imperiled, and there are huge deficits on what exists.

Mr. Yeates made a motion to approve the required findings, including a finding of no significant effect, for amendments to Thresholds, Regional Plan, and Code of Ordinances, as provided in Attachments K and L.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates
Motion carried.

Mr. Yeates made a motion to adopt Ordinance 2021-___, amending Ordinance 2019-03, as previously amended, to amend Air Quality Threshold Standard 14 as set forth in Attachment M1 of the staff report.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates
Motion carried.

Mr. Yeates made a motion to adopt Ordinance 2021-___, amending Ordinances 87-9, as previously amended, to amend the Regional Plan Goals and Policies as set forth in Attachment M2 of the staff report and the April 28, 2021 errata sheet.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates
Motion carried.

Mr. Yeates made a motion to adopt Ordinance 2021-___, amending Ordinance 2019-03, as previously amended, to amend the Code of Ordinances as set forth in Attachment M3 and the April 28, 2021 errata sheet.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates
Motion carried.

B. 2020 Linking Tahoe: Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy

TRPA staff member Ms. Glickert provided the presentation.

Ms. Glickert said with a relatively short four year update cycle they've never stopped development of the next Regional Transportation Plan. About 1.5 years ago, staff started updating the public participation plan which was approved by the board. Then they worked with the identified steering committee; the Environmental Improvement, Transportation, & Public Outreach Committee. With their guidance on tough issues they released a public draft of the plan last fall which included hearings at the Tahoe Transportation Commission and the Governing Board. The final draft was released on March 17, 2021 and since then staff has presented the goals and policies to the Regional Plan Implementation Committee, the Advisory Planning Commission, and held another plan briefing at the TRPA Environmental Improvement, Transportation, & Public Outreach Committee in preparation for final Tahoe Transportation Commission Hearing. On April 9, 2021 the Tahoe Transportation Commission provided a recommendation of approval to the Governing Board.

GOVERNING BOARD

April 28, 2021

Earlier this morning staff received a recommendation to approve the goals and policies of the RTP from the Regional Plan Implementation Committee and a full plan recommendation from the Environmental Improvement, Transportation, & Public Outreach Committee.

A little over one year ago, staff began outreach, alerting the public about development of the plan, and shortly thereafter for the Spring and Summer moving everything on line with several successful webinars. This past summer staff distributed flyers about the Draft Plan Release at popular destinations around the lake in addition to running radio adds, in English and Spanish. All of the input, stakeholder meetings, and public comments have made this a community's plan. They reached over 5,000 participants including 77 percent who reside here and 23 percent who do not. The RTP elevates public desires and needs and triangulates that public input with a coordinated implementation strategy that's been developed with project implementors. The plan is not just a wish list.

Over 55 comments have been received and incorporated into the final draft. Since the release they've made changes in the following sections:

Chapter 3: Details were added about day visitation and expanding details on mobility hubs to make sure it is clear one size does not fit all of the locations proposed in the plan. They've expanded using roadway adaptive management for not just transit but emergency response. They received comments about the water taxi shown on maps in Incline Village not being feasible with private beaches. It is important to understand just like with mobility hubs and even the Tahoe trail that the map is illustrative, this plan does not include references to use of the private beaches. This plan is the future vision, getting to increasing transportation options for everyone. It's not project approval as you may know, however, there may be opportunity to consider potential public/private partnerships.

Chapter 4: Funding the Plan. They added more details about the development of new transportation funding with the Bi-State Partnership.

Chapter 5: They updated with a new VMT Target of 6.9 percent reduction by 2045 from the 2018 baseline. Adaptive management process set with the new VMT threshold will dovetail nicely with all the existing data collection and tracking in the measuring and managing for success.

Appendix A: Edits to the policies as presented that are in line with the new VMT threshold and project impact analysis.

Appendix B: Project List. Defining and identifying regionally significant projects and making updates to those project costs and implementation timeframes. Because the project list is an essential element of the plan, projects must be in the plan to receive state and federal funding.

Appendix C: Revenue Narrative. They worked with their funding partners and the Environmental Improvement, Transportation, & Public Outreach Committee to provide the most up to date information on revenues which now include new federal relief funding and recent tax measures.

Appendix G: Data and Forecasting. There was a request to develop this further and explain the Trip Reduction Impact Analysis which is a component of the model that allows them to analyze the programs and projects that reduce vehicle trips.

GOVERNING BOARD

April 28, 2021

Appendix I: Performance Measures. This now includes more details on all of their Federal Performance Measures.

The plan is the 25 year vision for transportation in Tahoe providing a broad approach on travel needs and what they are focused on and how they want to achieve it. The elements of the plan are clear and solid. They want to connect the trail around the lake and connect trails to popular destinations whether that be a recreation site or a town center.

Transit: They want to modernize the system to keep it free, frequent, and increase frequency.

Technology: Capitalizing on technology that's tied to travel options to provide details about options for pre planning and adjusting a trip if people know when the next bus or shuttle is nearby or letting someone know that the parking lot at Sand Harbor is full, so people can adjust their plans.

Corridors & Communities: This is where land use and transportation come together for multimodal planning not at just a single problem spot but along an entire corridor. This planning helps to align the priorities and make the corridors "complete streets" with a trail options, transit, and paid/managed parking that all work comprehensively.

Their approach to planning is to understand who is moving around in Tahoe. Tahoe Travel reveals different user behavior and each traveler has a unique pattern and those strategies mentioned need to be designed for each travel type. Part of that approach and Framework for Transportation Planning is looking at all of the users; because we are a recreation-destination we don't have typical weekday commute congestion. They see the congestion during heavy recreation times, ski season and summer months getting to trail heads and the lake.

(Slide 6) Visitors make up the top two tiers. The longer trips are coming in from outside the region; 96 percent of visitors arrive by car. This plan lays out how to increase that 4 percent non auto mode share, not an easy one without the ability to control transportation outside of the Basin. But with committed partnerships they've included regional park n rides, regional bus connections like the pilot project that will connect Reno to Incline Village this summer. Once they are here, the plan includes improving travel by keeping local transit free and frequent.

In the middle there are more Recreation Trips. This is that internal travel to all of the recreation destinations which include residents and visitors. There are over 34 percent getting around by bike/foot and bus. This is also where those corridor management plans come in, adding transit options to recreation destinations, paid parking, and managing the roadway for safety.

At the base of this is the residents, employees of the region. Those trips include work, school, and errands. Ninety percent are completed by car which is a great opportunity for improvements here with better transit, regional commuter routes as well as connecting trails to popular destinations within. This next year's pilot project for Commute Tahoe will be working with the two Transportation Management Associations and Placer County to reach those large and small employers with travel information and incentive ideas for their employees. The approach also incorporates tracking the day user which is the hot topic for revenue discussions they've been having. It's one section they've have expanded in the plan since the plan was released.

GOVERNING BOARD

April 28, 2021

This time around they're making the plan more contemporary and focused on Implementation: The plan provides a regional approach to mobile source greenhouse gas reduction and incorporates new GHG goals of California and supports the Nevada State Climate Strategy because transportation is part of the solution.

There is broad agreement, new funding is needed for transportation and through the coordination among Bi-State Consultation, the Tahoe Transportation District, and local government there is significant momentum toward realizing new funding options. The plan includes this as a starting point for the funding initiative underway.

The plan includes project priorities that have been identified by the Bi-State Collaboration, working with implementation partners, the private sector and local governments. Many of those priority projects are already moving forward including the second phase of the State Route 28 Corridor Management Plan which parking management is a big component of this plan. There's been a trail feasibility study started as well.

They continue to leverage new technology and service models in providing transportation options, including travel apps and on-demand micro transit. Along those implementation lines the new transit pilot project commencing this summer connecting Reno to Incline Village utilizing a reservation system and micro shuttle pilot project coming for Incline Village.

The Regional Transportation Plan sets out to increase our private sector partnerships and the role they play. This isn't just on the transit side of the house; they are currently working with the South and North Shore Transportation Management Associations to work with employers.

The Regional Transportation Plan enhanced details on recreation travel and access through "Corridor Planning." The plan includes new data sources to better understanding behavior, this is built within the analysis and forecast for the plan, parking management that includes pricing, managing the existing use of the roadway more efficiently, and with reservation systems. Pricing strategies at the Tunnel Creak Parking area are underway. The Resort Triangle Transportation Plan (adopted 10/27/20) is preparing for a parking pilot project to better utilize existing parking that's focused on their town centers. Placer County staff will be providing a briefing to the board on the Resort Triangle in June. US Highway 50 East is gearing up for a Corridor Management Plan that will include parking management. The Tahoe Backcountry Alliance are hopeful to pick up a pilot they previously started which is a smaller scaled van that will connect trail heads on the west shore.

Moving Forward will require continued collaboration with all of the stakeholders, from partner agencies and the public for all those that live, work and play here.

Presentation can be found at:

[Agenda-Item-Nos.-VII.B-VIII.A-IX.A-2020-Linking-Tahoe.pdf](#)

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Lawrence said the Regional Transportation Plan was heard this morning at the Environmental Improvement, Transportation, & Public Outreach Committee and there it was unanimous recommendation for Governing Board approval.

Ms. Novasel thanked Ms. Glickert and staff for the presentation. This is the cornerstone of our transportation and the ability to work together on what we've been discussing for the past couple of hours. It's the data behind what we are doing.

Public Comments & Questions

Sophie Wenzlau, California Attorney General's office commenting at a staff level. They have provided detailed feedback to staff on the Draft 2020 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy over the past several months. They continue to think the Draft 2020 RTP/SCS could target a higher level of per capita VMT reduction without changing expected investment, while continuing to prioritize equitable transportation solutions that work for everyone in the Basin. They continue to wish that the RTP/SCS and by extension the new per capita VMT threshold were more ambitious.

As noted, in their October 2020 letter on the Draft Environmental Analysis for the Draft 2020 RTP/SCS they are skeptical that full implementation of the RTP/SCS would lead to the level of VMT reduction claimed in that analysis. Their review of the available data indicates that full implementation of the RTP/SCS is more likely to hold per capita VMT steady between now and 2045. They expect that future RTP/SCS's will need to scale up the level of ambition. They are concerned about the \$1 billion dollar funding gap for RTP implementation which would persist even if regional revenue is fully secured. Given the existence of this funding gap, it is imperative that every dollar invested in RTP implementation be directed towards projects that are expected to significantly reduce VMT or otherwise provide a significant return on investment. Strategic implementation of the RTP will be essential if TRPA is to achieve the new VMT threshold. Notwithstanding these concerns, they are pleased that TRPA is holding itself to the high bar of full RTP/SCS implementation and committing itself to develop a badly needed regional revenue source to fund transportation improvements. They look forward to continued engagement on this issue.

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Friedrich said he strongly supported the bulk of the transportation projects proposed in the proposed 2020 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy including the South Tahoe Greenway, micro transit, waterborne transit, the Tahoe Trail, regional buses, parking management, etc.

The one problem in the RTP from the City of South Lake Tahoe's perspective is the proposed Loop Road diversion of Highway 50 through the Rocky Point residential neighborhood as part of the South Shore Community Revitalization Project. Rocky Point is a low and moderate income, walkable workforce neighborhood home to hundreds of Latino and Filipino families who would either be displaced by the demolition of their homes for the proposed highway right-of-way or experience degradation of their neighborhood by having Highway 50 physically divide their community with new noise, air, and light pollution impacts. The majority of the \$156 million dollar project budget would be spent on buying, demolishing, and replacing increasingly scarce affordable housing, paving the new highway, and not reducing per capita VMT or greenhouse gas emissions.

The Biden Administration, American Jobs Plan infrastructure proposal includes \$20 billion to remove highways that have historically divided low income people of color and neighborhoods like Rocky Point. A related reconnecting communities act has been introduced in the US Senate. In that spirit, the City of South Lake Tahoe passed a resolution on February 2, 2021 that strongly

GOVERNING BOARD

April 28, 2021

supports the Main Street Management Plan portion of the South Shore Community Revitalization Project while opposing the rerouting of Highway 50 through Rocky Point. The resolution opposes the use of eminent domain for the proposed highway alignment and instead supports protecting, enhancing, and revitalizing the existing neighborhood including measures to limit cut through traffic and supports creation of deed restricted affordable housing in place. To accomplish both goals, the City's resolution proposed an alternative main street bypass using existing roads namely Lake Parkway east and west which is essentially an existing loop road around the Highway 50 Stateline corridor.

The City recently allocated funds to perform a traffic modeling study to determine the feasibility of this alternative and expect preliminary results in about one month. He's hopeful that all project partners will come together around a win win approach that moves forward with creating a walkable, bikeable, transit oriented community core at Stateline in a way that protects South Lake Tahoe's most vulnerable and disadvantaged residents in accordance with the priority community's equity and environmental justice goals in the RTP. With that caveat, he will vote in support of the 2020 RTP/SCS to accelerate the transformation of transportation for all throughout the Tahoe Basin.

Mr. Lawrence said the presentation gets better every time he hears it! He appreciated the RTP including the work of the Bi-State Consultation on transportation and the priorities that went through a process with multiple stakeholders from private sector, local governments, and state officials. Those priorities were recognized as the highest priority projects to actually make a difference regarding not just VMT but the transportation challenges that we have in the Basin. He also appreciated that the RTP has an eye towards the two states and their climate actions and that the RTP fits in well with the climate strategies for Nevada. Implementing these projects is hard work. He's excited how this RTP blends with the VMT threshold changes particularly with the adaptive management plan. This is a solid package and foundation but it's going to take hard work and collaboration to identify funding sources and to come together for project implementation.

Ms. Faustinos thanked staff for the comprehensive work that was done and is phenomenal that all this has been achieved in such a short period of time yet making sure that all stakeholders were involved. She shared some of the concerns of Mr. Friedrich with the issues of equity and displacement. The impacts on the Latino community in particular and how that project will impact that community. It always seems to be that underserved population that has low resources that have the most impacts in these kinds of situations. She hopes that when there's additional information from the studies that are being conducted by the City that they can take that information with an attitude of wanting to gather new information to make better decisions. While this plan is the way we need to go, adaptive management means when you get new information that might help make better decisions, we take that opportunity. She supports the RTP/SCS but wants to stress those long term concerns about the impacts of people that are sometimes voiceless in this kind of situation.

Mr. Lawrence made a motion to make the findings including a finding of no significant effect, for the 2020 Linking Tahoe: Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, as provided in Attachment D.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates

Motion carried

GOVERNING BOARD

April 28, 2021

Mr. Lawrence made a motion to adopt TRPA Resolution 2021-___, adopting 2020 Linking Tahoe: Regional Transportation Plan/ Sustainable Communities Strategy as provided in Attachment F1.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates

Motion carried

Mr. Yeates moved to adjourn as the TRPA and reconvene as the TMPO.
Motion carried.

Agenda Item VII.C was heard after Agenda Item Nos. VIII.A & IX.A

- C. 2021-2022 release and distribution of residential allocations to El Dorado County, City of South Lake Tahoe, Placer County, Washoe County, and Douglas County

TRPA staff member Ms. McMahan provided the presentation.

Ms. McMahan said a residential allocation is required before building a new market rate residential unit in the Tahoe region. As part of TRPA's growth management program, the Agency releases or meters out residential allocations over time. The release of up to 520 residential allocations is considered by the Governing Board every four years. Residential allocations are considered for distribution to local jurisdictions every two years based on the Performance Review System provided in Chapter 50 of the Code of Ordinances.

The Performance Review System is based on three factors: residential audit performance, Lake Tahoe Total Maximum Daily Load implementation, and Short-Term Rental Neighborhood Compatibility.

The Performance Review Committee, which was made up of staff from each of the local jurisdictions and TRPA, was convened in February and reviewed the Performance Review System results being presented today.

Every year, TRPA audits ten percent of all residential permits issued by local jurisdictions. The Code of Ordinances states that a jurisdiction shall receive its base allocation for an average residential audit score of 90 percent or greater. The Performance Review Committee agreed with staff's finding that all the jurisdictions received a score of 90 percent or greater for the past two years on their audits.

The Lake Tahoe Total Maximum Daily Load is a program that requires local jurisdictions to reduce pollutant loads to restore Lake Tahoe's historic lake clarity. The Code of Ordinances states a jurisdiction shall receive its base allocation for achieving a 90 percent or greater conformance rate with Lake Total Maximum Daily Load Water Clarity Pollutant Load Reduction targets.

TRPA consulted with both the California Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board and the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection and found that all jurisdictions were in substantial compliance with their Total Maximum Daily Load requirements.

In the 2017-2018 timeframe, concerns were being raised by members of the public about local jurisdictions not adequately addressing short-term rental neighborhood compatibility. In response, TRPA's Local Government and Housing Committee convened a Short-Term Rental Neighborhood Compatibility Working Group that developed guidelines and a code amendment to

GOVERNING BOARD

April 28, 2021

make Short-Term Rental neighborhood compatibility a third criterion of the Performance Review System. The guidelines include Operational, Enforcement, and Locational Criteria best management practices. The guidelines were developed to provide local jurisdictions a range of options and flexibility in implementing and achieving Short-Term Rental neighborhood compatibility, while at the same time require local jurisdictions to receive a score of 90 percent or greater to get their full allotment of residential allocations.

In 2019, only three of the five local jurisdictions had Short-Term Rental Ordinances and programs in place. Today, all of the jurisdictions have adopted ordinances that address noise, occupancy, parking, refuse, and public health and safety and have developed enforcement programs.

The location criterion continues to be the most challenging criterion for the local jurisdictions to address. But four of the five local jurisdictions have addressed it or are in the process of addressing it.

Therefore, staff is recommending that all the jurisdictions receive their annual base allocations for 2021 and 2022, with the exception of Washoe County. Even though they recently adopted an ordinance that addresses operational and enforcement criteria, they have not yet had the opportunity to address the location criteria.

TRPA received a number of public comment letters expressing the critical importance of residential building allocations to the local community and the need to get them out to the local jurisdictions in a timely manner. In response, the Agency plans to work with the local jurisdictions to ensure there are no permitting delays.

Presentation can be found at:

[Agenda-Item-No.-VII.C-Residential-Allocations.pdf](#)

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Novasel thanked Ms. McMahon and staff for working on this to ensure that the allocations will be released in a timely manner. It's important to the community and appreciated the effort.

Public Comments & Questions

Russ Wigart commenting as a citizen thanked TRPA; Mr. Marshall, Mr. Cowen, and Ms. McMahon for making this happen. On behalf of many contractors, business owners, suppliers, and various people, thank you very much for all of your efforts.

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Novasel made a motion to release 520 residential allocations for the next four years in accordance with TRPA Code, Section 50.4.2.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates,

Absent: Mr. Rice

Motion carried.

GOVERNING BOARD

April 28, 2021

Ms. Novasel made a motion that the proposed distribution of residential allocations for 2021 and 2022 to the local jurisdictions meets the requirements of TRPA Code, Section 50.5: Allocation of Additional Residential Units.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates,

Absent: Mr. Rice

Motion carried.

Ms. Novasel made a motion to adopt the attached Resolution as provided in Attachment A.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates,

Absent: Mr. Rice

Motion carried.

VIII. TMPO PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. 2020 Linking Tahoe: Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy

Mr. Yeates made a motion to adopt the Negative Declaration based on the 2020 Linking Tahoe: Regional Transportation Plan/ Sustainable Communities Strategy Final Environmental Initial Study/ Mitigated Negative Declaration/ Initial Environmental Checklist, as provided in Attachment B.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates, Ms. Noel

Motion carried.

Mr. Lawrence made a motion to approve TMPO Resolution 2021-___, adopting the 2020 Linking Tahoe: Regional Transportation Plan/ Sustainable Communities Strategy in accordance with California Government Code Section 65080 et seq., Title 23 CFR Part 450 of the federal regulations, and all other applicable federal and state regulations, as provided in Attachment C.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates, Ms. Noel

Motion carried.

Mr. Yeates made a motion to adjourn as the TMPO and convene as the RTPA.
Motion carried.

IX. RTPA PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. 2020 Linking Tahoe: Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy

GOVERNING BOARD

April 28, 2021

Mr. Yeates made a motion to adopt the Negative Declaration based on an Initial Study prepared under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the 2020 Linking Tahoe: Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, as provided in Attachment B.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates,
Motion carried.

Mr. Yeates made a motion to approve the RTPA Resolution 2021-___, adopting 2020 Linking Tahoe: Regional Transportation Plan/ Sustainable Communities Strategy acting as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency for the Lake Tahoe Region as provided in Attachment F2.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates,
Motion carried.

Mr. Yeates moved to adjourn as the RTPA and reconvene as the TRPA.
Motion carried.

X. REPORTS

A. Executive Director Status Report

Ms. Marchetta thanked the Governing Board for their endurance today. We took some very important actions for the future of Lake Tahoe and hopes it can set the stage for new ways of thinking about how we'll be working together in the future.

1) Quarterly Report: January – March 2021

No further report.

B. General Counsel Status Report

Mr. Marshall said his report today has to do with the status of caseloads in the Eastern District of California, Federal District Court. TRPA currently has two cases pending there; the Eisenstecken challenge to TRPA's activities regarding a cell tower and the Mountain Addiction enforcement action. Most recently in the Eisenstecken case, the plaintiff's voluntarily dismissed the Tahoe Prosperity Center and will be seeking to add another plaintiff with more claims. They've heard from the clerk of the court that procedural motions like motions to dismiss are going to take up to one year to decide because of the work load in the District. That will slow down TRPA's work on those cases because principally they'll be taking either opposing or moving for certain types of preliminary motions which will have the effect of drawing out the litigation. Even if you're trying to get to a merits hearing, it's still going to be one year plus just to get a District Court decision. The work load in the district is at the mercy of Congress to allocate monies for sufficient judge positions.

XI. GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER REPORTS

No reports.

GOVERNING BOARD

April 28, 2021

XII. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Local Government & Housing Committee

No report.

B. Legal Committee

No report.

C. Operations & Governance Committee

No report.

D. Environmental Improvement, Transportation, & Public Outreach Committee

Mr. Lawrence said the committee met today and took two actions; the committee unanimously recommended approval to the Governing Board. The committee also received presentations from staff on different state and federal funding opportunities that Agency is working on. Lastly, the committee unanimously voted to direct staff to do more vetting but supported Senator Masto's TRAVEL Act which looks at federal transportation funding and lining it up for destinations that are tourist destinations. TRPA Transportation staff and others in the Tahoe Basin worked with Senator and her staff and there's things in the TRAVEL Act that takes into account some of the challenges that we have at Lake Tahoe. The act has not been introduced yet but the committee unanimously supported sending a support letter once it's introduced.

E. Forest Health and Wildfire Committee

No report.

F. Regional Plan Implementation Committee

No report.

XIII. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

None.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Yeates moved to adjourn.

Chair Mr. Bruce adjourned the meeting at 3:36 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Marja Ambler

Clerk to the Board