TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
TRANSPORATION PERFORMANCE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency April 3, 2026
Zoom

Meeting Minutes

1. CALL TO ORDER

TRPA Associate Transportation Planner, Rachael Shaw called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Members present in-person or online: Michelle Glickert (TRPA Transportation Planning Manager), Dan Segan (TRPA Chief Science and Policy Advisor), Kira Richardson (TRPA Senior Transportation Planner), Jared Deck (Placer County), Gavin Feiger (League to Save Lake Tahoe), Mohammad Qureshi, aka “Dr. Q” (City of South Lake Tahoe), Phil Ritger (Douglas County), Dave Solaro (Washoe County), Jim Marino (Tahoe Transportation District), Sara Van Siclen (Truckee North Tahoe Transportation Management Association), Steve Teshara (South Shore Transportation Management Association), Alex Fong (Caltrans), Donaldo Palaroan (El Dorado County), Kelly Norman (Carson City MPO), Kevin Verre (Nevada Department of Transportation).

The General Public seat is currently vacant.

3. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS – ON AGENDA ITEMS

Nick Speal provided feedback on the draft biennial report, questioning whether median travel time for auto mode is the best metric for the committee's goals. He raised concerns that the implied goal of reducing median travel time could conflict with traffic safety goals, specifically noting that lowering speed limits for safety would actually increase median travel time. He suggested that the 95th percentile travel time might be a better metric for measuring congestion, as it would allow median travel time to increase slightly while still advancing the committee's overall objectives.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Gavin Feiger made a motion to approve the May 29, 2024 Transportation Performance Technical Advisory Committee minutes as presented.

Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

6. AGENDA ITEMS

A. Committee structure: vacant general public representative (Informational)

Michelle Glickert informed the committee that Carole Black, who previously served as the general public representative, could no longer be reached to continue in that role. She explained that the committee is now seeking to fill the position with another member of the public who is data oriented and familiar with regional transportation policies and issues. She invited suggestions from committee members on how to fill the position, noting it likely would not be resolved before the next meeting.

Gavin Feiger responded by suggesting that Nick Speal, who had commented earlier, has a lot of experience and could be a good candidate.

Michelle acknowledged the suggestion and noted the board has approved the current membership structure and remains committed to filling the general public representative position.

B. Review of draft Transportation and Sustainable Communities Performance and Recommendations Report (For Possible Action)

1. Transit Metrics

Rachael Shaw introduced the next agenda item, the review of the draft Transportation and Sustainable Communities Performance and Recommendations Report. She outlined the structure of the presentation, explaining the committee would cover metric data and progress for transit, active transportation, and auto modes, with discussion of 2024 recommendations for each category. She noted the schedule calls for discussing the draft report at this April meeting, with the option to continue at a May meeting if needed, followed by publication of the final report in June and transmission to the TRPA governing board.

Ms. Shaw provided context on the performance reporting process, explaining the committee was formed to help meet the Transportation and Sustainable Communities threshold established in 2021. She described the committee's three main roles: determining which metrics to track, supporting and reviewing the biennial report, and providing guidance to adaptively manage programs, policies, and projects. She clarified that the biennial reporting alternates between the performance and recommendations report every four years and the regional transportation plan analysis report every four years.

Ms. Shaw reviewed the six main regional transportation goals that organize the planning framework: safety, environment, mobility, prosperity, resiliency, and performance. She then presented the primary metrics established in 2022, noting that with only two years

DRAFT

elapsed, some metrics have just one additional year of data. The metrics include total ridership and population served by transit service for transit, bike and pedestrian mode share and low stress bike lane miles for active transportation, and median travel time and average daily VMT per capita for auto. She then passed the presentation to Kira to cover transit metrics.

Ms. Kira Richardson, senior transportation planner with TRPA, presented the transit metrics portion of the report. She began with total ridership, explaining that the data includes all transit ridership operated by public entities and reported to TRPA, though not private providers like airport shuttles or Heavenly services. She noted that while transit ridership has increased since the pandemic, there was a slight decrease from 2024 to 2025, which she attributed partly to lighter winters in the last two years since winter typically sees the highest ridership.

Ms. Richardson then broke down ridership by operator, covering Lake Link, TART Connect Microtransit, TART fixed route, and TTD fixed route services. She explained that ridership on the South Shore increased overall while ridership on the North Shore decreased. She attributed the North Shore decline to several factors including consistent staffing challenges at TART, fleet issues similar to what TTD experienced previously, and the need to contract out West Shore service temporarily. Additionally, the Incline Village Crystal Bay microtransit zone began charging fares in 2025 and ultimately ceased operations in mid-December, further contributing to ridership loss.

Ms. Richardson then covered the population served metrics, noting there are currently no frequent transit services with 20-minute or better headways in the Tahoe Basin. For basic transit services, she reported that approximately 39,000 people, or about 72 percent of the basin population, are now served when including microtransit in the calculation, up from 35,000 in the previous report. She also presented data on microtransit coverage and wait times, highlighting service expansions on the South Shore and service cuts in Incline Village and Crystal Bay, as well as a spike in wait times during the mega winter of 2022-2023.

Steve Teshara shared a concern that when the report is presented to the governing board in June, the data will be out of date. He noted that board members who only meet once a month may not be aware of recent improvements, such as TTD increasing evening frequency on Highway 50 and the South Shore microtransit service moving to zone coverage around July 1st with improved wait times. He requested that staff find a way to communicate this context so board members do not think the presented data reflects the current state of affairs. Ms. Richardson acknowledged the concern and explained that the report includes a transit explanatory section for each mode specifically to provide context that is not reflected in the statistics alone. Mr. Teshara expressed appreciation for this approach.

Ms. Richardson then reviewed the five 2024 transit recommendations. The first recommendation, supporting strategies for securing flexible operating dollars to increase frequency and coverage, has seen significant progress with TTD adding services and the South Shore Transportation Management Association expanding service zones, aided by

DRAFT

an influx of funding. The second recommendation, integrating microtransit and fixed route operations for efficiency and accessibility, is underway with TTD and Lake Link working together and conversations happening on the North Shore. The third recommendation, maximizing limited transit funds through operator support, service promotion, and efficiency improvements, is progressing as both operators adopted new short range transit plans and a region-wide transit study is underway. The fourth recommendation, prioritizing funding for transit operations within the TRPA regional grant program, has been completed through allocation of certain fund sources to transit operations. The fifth recommendation, supporting workforce housing for transit employees, has not yet started despite broader workforce housing initiatives around the basin, and Ms. Richardson invited committee input on this item.

The committee discussion covered several topics related to transit recommendations and challenges.

Jim Marino informed the committee that TTD is currently conducting feasibility studies for their maintenance facility and incorporating a housing component to potentially include employee housing. Ms. Richardson acknowledged this update for inclusion in the status assessment.

Michelle Glickert noted that when the workforce housing recommendation was previously added, there was pushback questioning why it focused only on transit operators rather than teachers and other workers. Steve Teshara questioned the value of such truncated information, and Ms. Richardson suggested this recommendation might be modified for the next report.

Ms. Richardson continued reviewing recommendations, noting that microtransit coverage tracking has been implemented. Regarding ridership data collection, she explained that TTD now collects top-level ridership data and operators are looking at automatic passenger counters for new bus purchases. Gavin Feiger asked about the origin-destination files received monthly from microtransit services and whether anything useful could be done with that data. Ms. Richardson acknowledged they have access but have not yet utilized it. The final recommendation involved reviewing TRPA code for opportunities to further transit goals, with coverage exemptions for transit infrastructure being explored.

Jim Marino raised a significant concern about labor challenges, noting that workforce stability is fundamental to transit operations. He suggested the committee consider training programs, including local CDL training facilities, and offered to prepare internal data on operator turnover rates and associated costs. He noted the expense of training drivers who then leave for better jobs.

Gavin Feiger observed that the committee may have limited ability to address housing but could potentially track metrics like driver retention or number of drivers on payroll. Jim Marino agreed to bring data to a future meeting and mentioned that the CEO is looking at a holistic approach to training.

DRAFT

Michelle Glickert asked about TTD's bonus and incentive programs, and Jim Marino explained their robust pay structure for licensed operators and incentives for obtaining CDLs in a timely manner. He suggested that ideally, legislation removing CDL requirements for public transit could help with recruitment, though he acknowledged this would be a significant federal lift.

Ms. Richardson proposed developing metrics for the next meeting that could track workforce issues without being burdensome on operators. Michelle Glickert suggested exploring a regional training program, and Ms. Richardson noted this topic is being discussed in the ongoing transit study. Gavin Feiger mentioned that the local college has occasionally expressed interest in supporting such training.

Jim Marino also raised concerns about increasing violence and crime on transit, noting more police calls and unruly passengers, particularly on the Route 19 Carson City-Gardnerville line. He offered to provide metrics on this issue and connected it to fare strategy, noting that free fares may be a contributing factor. Michelle Glickert offered to connect TTD with colleagues at the City of Santa Monica who have dealt with similar issues. Gavin Feiger suggested that diversifying rider demographics could help build accountability through increased ridership at different times and seasons.

Gavin Feiger raised a question about seasonal transit service, noting that previously only the Special express was tracked as seasonal service. He observed that while more people visit Tahoe in summer, transit ridership tends to be higher in winter, and seasonal services vary by season—Heavenly operates in winter while most other seasonal services run in summer. He asked whether there was value in examining seasonal service data separately or incorporating it into the overall analysis.

Ms. Richardson responded that tracking ridership on all seasonal services is something TRPA can and should do, suggesting they start there. She acknowledged the challenge of getting a comprehensive handle on ridership data given the many different operators but confirmed this is already a goal they are working toward.

2. Active Transportation
   Ms. Shaw presented the active transportation section of the report, covering two primary metrics: bike and pedestrian mode share, and low-stress bike lane miles.

   Regarding mode share data, Ms. Shaw explained that TRPA recently began using Streetlight data to estimate mode share, though data is only available through 2023. The Streetlight estimates are significantly higher than previous sources, showing 16-22% for pedestrians and 5-8% for bicyclists, compared to earlier estimates of 8-12% for all non-auto modes combined. She noted that while having another data source with bike and pedestrian separation is valuable, it underscores the need for more robust data. TRPA will conduct a detailed travel survey this summer and fall, with proposals currently under review and a potential status update at the May meeting.

   Ms. Shaw then described the bicycle level of traffic stress analysis, which evaluates cycling comfort using roadway infrastructure data including speed limits, traffic volume,

DRAFT

road width, and bike lane presence. Scores range from 1 (lowest stress) to 4.5 (exceptionally stressful). The updated analysis showed an increase in Level 1 low-stress miles, partly from new projects like the San Bernardino bike path and Apache Avenue, but largely from correcting data omissions of Class 1 paths from the previous analysis. She noted a slight decrease in Level 3 and increase in Level 4 stress levels, attributed to Caltrans speed limit increases on State Route 89 in Placer County. Ms. Shaw explained that the complementary Pedestrian Experience Index incorporates broader data including economic activity, community activity, and street design. Due to its data-intensive nature, TRPA proposes updating this index every four years rather than annually.

Ms. Shaw also presented supplementary information showing miles of pedestrian and bicycle routes improved or constructed annually, noting an increase in 2025 largely due to Caltrans green paint bike lanes on US 50 and the TCP repaving project. Permanent counter data from locations installed in 2018 or earlier showed relatively steady usage since 2018, with a Covid-related spike in 2020 and a dip in 2021 attributed to wildfire smoke and evacuations. Ms. Shaw concluded that while steady usage is preferable to decline, increases would be needed to demonstrate meaningful mode shift to active transportation.

Gavin Feiger raised the importance of collecting before-and-after data for active transportation projects, noting that this opportunity was missed with the Greenway and expressing concern about capturing this data for new sections being constructed.

Michelle Glickert asked whether before-and-after data collection is a requirement of grant funding for implementing agencies like cities and counties.

Jim Marino responded that while not required, such data helps demonstrate project value. He explained that TTD has requested temporary monitors for recent projects, including a six-month monitoring period prior to the Johnson Meadow section of the Greenway planned for next year. However, he noted limitations with the data—trail cameras capture total users without distinguishing between pedestrians and cyclists. For the Apache Avenue project, TTD used bike-specific counters, but because no facilities previously existed along Apache, the pre-project data did not meaningfully represent the potential increase from a new Class 1 path. He acknowledged that estimating pre-project usage is often guesswork based on vehicle counts and assumptions about mode shift. Mr. Marino also asked whether any metrics are tracked for micromobility devices like scooters and bikes.

Ms. Richardson responded that TRPA currently only has access to Lime's data and has consistently requested data from Bird without success. She noted that the City of South Lake Tahoe could require data sharing through their ordinance, which TRPA has advocated for, as the data is detailed and valuable.

DRAFT

Ms. Shaw added that the Smart grant program with traffic cameras may help fill data gaps, particularly for vulnerable road user counts and safety events. She noted that the mobile trailer has been deployed at pre-project locations, allowing for post-project comparisons in future reports.

Mr. Marino mentioned that TTD is applying for TIRCP funding to build out monitoring capacity on the California side.

Kelly Norman asked Ms. Shaw to clarify the counter locations shown in Figure 2.1, inquiring whether they were permanent or temporary and what types of counters are used. Ms. Shaw explained that the map includes both permanent year-round counters and temporary counters on rotating or project-specific bases.

Ms. Richardson added that TRPA has begun requiring counters at specific locations as part of the permit process for Class 1 bike path construction, which has been helpful for both TRPA and local jurisdictions.

Ms. Norman followed up asking about counter types. Ms. Richardson explained that temporary counters include both tube counters and infrared counters, while permanent counters are primarily Eco-Counter units.

Kevin Verre asked whether TRPA parses the Streetlight and travel survey data by jurisdiction and known activity nodes throughout the basin. He suggested that understanding where bike and pedestrian activity is concentrated would help prioritize investments and make a stronger case to partners for facility construction. He noted that basin-wide data showing general increases does not allow for targeted efforts or compelling storytelling about specific needs.

Michelle Glickert acknowledged this was a challenge in the 2024 report as well and expressed openness to parsing data by jurisdiction where counter coverage allows. She asked staff whether this would be feasible.

Ms. Shaw confirmed TRPA could do this and suggested incorporating jurisdiction-level analysis into the upcoming travel survey this summer and fall, calling it a great recommendation.

Ms. Shaw presented the active transportation recommendations from the 2024 report and their current status. The first recommendation—prioritizing active transportation projects in the RTP and regional grant program that increase safety, decrease level of traffic stress, and improve the pedestrian experience index—was marked as complete. She explained that TRPA updated the regional grant program guidelines in the 2025 cycle to include questions about whether projects would decrease bicycle level of traffic stress, increase the pedestrian experience index, and address safety concerns including

DRAFT

severe and fatal injuries within a mile of the project, segments on the high injury network, and incorporation of proven safety countermeasures.

The second recommendation focused on supporting funding for local jurisdictions to perform maintenance, year-round clearing, and improved wayfinding. Ms. Shaw noted progress through the 777 funding initiative but suggested broadening the language beyond funding support, citing TRPA's work with Douglas County on code updates requiring snow clearing enforcement for sidewalks in the Tahoe Basin.

The third recommendation—continuing to seek better data sources for mode share and commute trips and restarting recurrent surveys—was marked as in progress, with the upcoming travel survey addressing this need.

The fourth and fifth recommendations both involved updating TRPA's code of ordinances: one to further active transportation plan goals and the other to expand the effectiveness of the trip reduction ordinance for single-occupancy work trips. Ms. Shaw reported that both were approved last summer alongside the Regional Transportation Plan, including exemptions for sidewalks from land coverage calculations and updates focusing the trip reduction ordinance on large employers with greater flexibility.

The sixth recommendation—monitoring travel time for pedestrians and bicyclists along corridors connecting popular destinations—remained not started due to data unavailability. Ms. Shaw posed this as a question for the committee regarding whether it should remain a priority for TRPA to continue exploring data sources.

Ms. Shaw concluded by asking the committee to consider whether they agreed with the progress assessments, whether agencies had taken additional actions toward these recommendations, whether these remained the right priorities to carry forward into the 2026 report, and whether any changes or additions should be made.

Steve Teshara questioned why vanpooling was not included in the recommendations, noting that the trip reduction ordinance has never really worked and suggesting vanpools represent a more active form of transportation that deserves tracking. Ms. Shaw responded that these were the recommendations the committee agreed upon previously but welcomed Mr. Teshara's suggestion to add vanpooling for the next report.

Michelle Glickert asked if Mr. Teshara was referring to TDM ordinance credits for vanpooling. Mr. Teshara clarified he wanted vanpooling explicitly called out since it is becoming a bigger part of transportation efforts.

Jim Marino suggested tracking overall vanpool ridership, and both he and Ms. Richardson agreed this would likely fit better in the transit section of the report.

DRAFT

Gavin Feiger expanded on the discussion, noting that vanpools and Commute Tahoe do not fit neatly into any single category since they touch transit, active transportation, and auto modes. He suggested that participation or compliance metrics for the trip reduction ordinance—such as the number of businesses or employees—would be valuable to track and could highlight to the Governing Board that implementation has lagged since the 1990s.

Michelle Glickert noted that TRPA has worked with the TMAs to identify participating businesses and has solid lists for the North Shore.

Mr. Teshara shared that at a recent meeting, the North Tahoe Community Alliance discussed hopes for small businesses to collectively combine employees for vanpools, though this has been challenging. He noted that South Shore primarily sees major employers participating, and suggested that tracking vanpools as a metric might encourage broader participation among smaller businesses.

Sara Van Siclen added that the North Shore TMA has struggled to bring small employers together, partly due to limitations in the Commute with Enterprise platform, though improvements may be forthcoming.

Mr. Teshara noted that while TRPA only tracks VMT savings within the basin, there are additional savings from trips originating outside the basin, and the current 24 vanpools do accumulate meaningful data. Michelle Glickert asked whether zip code data could be provided to understand where vanpool participants originate. Mr. Teshara confirmed that participants come from Carson Valley, Carson City, and Reno, with trips typically calculated based on where they enter and exit the basin.

Ms. Shaw then asked whether the committee wanted to retain the recommendation about monitoring travel time for pedestrians and bicyclists. Gavin Feiger supported keeping it, noting that travel time data exists for autos and partially for transit through headways, making it valuable for discussing multimodal level of service.

Michelle Glickert suggested Google might have relevant data through their travel time estimates, and Ms. Richardson noted that network analysis could work but would require a better street network dataset.

Dr. Q expressed skepticism about obtaining reliable data, explaining that travel time for autos relies on anonymous cell data tracking vehicles through networks. Without similar user-level tracking for pedestrians and bicyclists, fabricating numbers would be the only option.

Ms. Richardson responded that network analysis using established average walking and biking speeds could provide estimates, similar to how fire department response times

DRAFT

are calculated. She noted TRPA has been working on updated network data but would need to define what constitutes "popular destinations."

Jim Marino added that any analysis would need to differentiate between commute and recreational travel since speeds vary significantly, and noted that e-bikes add complexity. He mentioned that Streetlight is developing metrics using connected devices but the timeline is unknown.

Donaldo Palaroan suggested Strava data might help, as it tracks travel time and trip frequencies, though he was unsure whether such data could be shared.

Gavin Feiger suggested the metric does not need to be perfectly accurate but should be consistent enough to show benefits from infrastructure improvements like the Greenway extension.

Michelle Glickert agreed, sharing a personal example of saving seven minutes on her bike commute to the dentist after Keys Boulevard was paved, demonstrating the travel time value of smooth pavement.

Ms. Shaw then asked about expanding the second recommendation beyond just funding support for maintenance and year-round clearing. Gavin Feiger asked what additional elements she was considering.

Ms. Shaw cited the example of working with Douglas County on code updates requiring snow clearing enforcement for sidewalks. Ms. Richardson offered another example of the City of South Lake Tahoe taking over the contract for shoveling sidewalks along Highway 50.

Michelle Glickert suggested modifying the language to "support funding or policy changes" to broaden the recommendation's scope.

Kevin Verre asked whether staff reverse-engineer recommendations to identify tracking mechanisms and measures, using the Douglas County snow removal example and asking how progress would be reported—such as whether clearing five sidewalks versus zero would constitute green versus yellow status.

Ms. Shaw explained that recommendations are meant to move the needle on tracked metrics like mode share and low-stress lane miles, rather than having separate metrics tied to each recommendation. The logic is that actions like snow clearing would contribute to mode share by removing barriers to walking.

Michelle Glickert added that the process is cyclical—recommendations help move metrics, and if a recommendation requires deeper metric exploration, staff reevaluates and adjusts as needed rather than strictly reverse-engineering from metrics.

DRAFT

Gavin Feiger noted that the travel time recommendation exemplifies this challenge, recalling discussions about achieving parity where driving is not always dramatically faster than other modes. He acknowledged limited opportunities to significantly cut bike or pedestrian travel time but emphasized the value of showing benefits from projects like the Greenway extension.

Michelle Glickert agreed, noting that demonstrating reduced travel time helps justify expensive Class 1 trail investments.

Ms. Shaw concluded that some recommendations tie directly to data collection while others are more programmatic or policy-focused, and both approaches are valid.

3. Auto Metrics

Mr. Segan presented on auto metrics, covering Vehicle Miles Traveled and travel times in the Lake Tahoe region. The data, detailed on page 28 of the committee report, shows that VMT remained relatively flat pre-pandemic at approximately 1.5 million miles per day. Following the significant drop during the pandemic, VMT has stabilized at a lower level of roughly 1.3 million miles per day. Mr. Segan noted that TRPA uses three-year running averages to smooth out variations caused by seasonal factors such as ski conditions and summer weather patterns.

Mr. Segan explained that TRPA calculates VMT per capita using an "effective population" model rather than just resident population. This model accounts for second-home users, day workers, short-term rental guests, and full-time residents. Data is gathered through traffic pattern analysis, hotel occupancy rates, census information, and Placer.ai cell phone data. All three estimation methods indicate that peak visitation occurred in 2019, with a slight decline since then, though daily population has remained relatively steady overall.

Regarding VMT per capita performance, Mr. Segan reported positive results. The 2024 milestone target was set at below 12.35 miles per person per day, and actual performance came in at approximately 11 miles per person per day, well below the target. However, Mr. Segan noted that the committee had previously expressed caution about celebrating these results too quickly given the uncertainty about whether post-pandemic travel patterns represent a lasting trend.

On travel times, Mr. Segan explained that median travel times across the 100-plus miles of monitored roadways show virtually no change throughout the year or across multiple years. The 95th percentile travel times, representing the worst 5% of trips, show more variability and are primarily influenced by construction and weather. He cited Highway 50 construction during 2017-2019 and the severe winter of 2023 as

examples, noting that the 2023 winter caused delays of up to 20 minutes longer than typical bad travel times on some segments.

Mr. Segan then reviewed the recommendations from the previous report. The first recommendation, to continue implementing regional plan policies that reduce reliance on the automobile, was marked as in progress and supported by the recently adopted Regional Transportation Plan. Some discussion followed about whether this recommendation should be more specific, though it was noted that the general nature of the recommendation makes it broadly defensible. The second recommendation, to replace average travel time with median travel time as the primary metric, was marked as complete. Discussion ensued about potentially elevating the 95th percentile travel time to become the primary metric, as this would better align with delay reduction goals rather than implying a desire to increase speed limits. Mr. Segan noted this change would be straightforward since both metrics are already being measured.

Dr. Q raised a concern about the use of "95th percentile" terminology when discussing travel times. He explained that the ranking system can be confusing because it runs from longest to shortest travel time, which is counterintuitive to how people typically think about speed-related metrics. Dr. Q noted that when most people hear "95th percentile," they instinctively think of the top or fastest performers, when in this context it actually refers to the slowest 5% of trips. While he agreed that measuring the slowest travel times could be a valuable metric, he cautioned that the percentile terminology is difficult to explain to the general public.

Mr. Segan acknowledged the validity of this concern and suggested that the metric could simply be labeled "slowest travel times" rather than using percentile terminology. Dr. Q agreed, suggesting alternative phrasing such as "the slowest fifth percentile" to make the concept clearer. He emphasized that if committee members with technical expertise need to spend time doing mental math to understand the metric, it is likely not the best way to present the information to a broader audience. Mr. Segan concurred, noting that if this group struggles to understand the terminology, and the report is intended to be publicly accessible, then using such language could create even more confusion for the people TRPA is trying to communicate with.

Committee Discussion on VMT and Travel Time Metrics

Mr. Feiger noted that the committee's general goal appears to be targeting the worst travel times rather than trying to make everyone travel faster all the time. Mr. Marino reiterated his priority for traffic signal synchronization, stating that he believes it needs to be done and that transit agencies should implement it. When Mr. Feiger asked whether signal synchronization would help more with median or slowest travel times, Mr. Marino initially thought median because drivers encounter signals daily, though Ms. Glickert pointed out that people also experience delays during those worst-case scenarios, leading Mr. Feiger to suggest median might be the better measure.

DRAFT

Dr. Q inquired about the source of travel time data, and Mr. Segan confirmed it comes from the Inrix data platform, which aggregates GPS and cell phone data. Mr. Segan noted this is similar to the data they wish they had for pedestrians. Mr. Feiger asked if TRPA was already collecting both median and 95th percentile data, and Mr. Segan confirmed they were, suggesting the committee could continue tracking both metrics without additional work.

Mr. Segan then moved to the recommendation regarding better coordination and dissemination of real-time travel information. Mr. Teshara asked what progress had been made, and Ms. Shaw explained that previous discussions had focused on the role of TMAs in coordinating with Caltrans and NDOT, and that TRPA had recently begun a transportation systems management and operations plan for the basin. Mr. Teshara referenced previous meeting minutes about manipulating construction areas, which he found unrealistic. Ms. Glickert clarified that the systems management plan addresses using technology to inform travelers about alternatives, such as routing around construction. She suggested that contracts could require construction crews to communicate with regional real-time information systems. Dr. Q noted that technology in this area has advanced significantly. Ms. Shaw recommended keeping this item for the next report since progress has been made but the work is not yet complete.

Mr. Segan discussed recommendations related to the effective population model. He explained that TRPA had been exploring Placer.ai as an alternative data source, but that the vendor revised their methodology, resulting in a significant drop in their population estimates. While the new estimates were closer to TRPA's own calculations built from census data and room rentals, Placer.ai would not apply the new methodology retroactively to 2018 baseline data. This highlighted challenges with using big data platforms for long-term regulatory tracking, as these platforms frequently revise their methods. Mr. Teshara acknowledged this is a common struggle but questioned what alternatives exist.

Mr. Marino suggested that installing counting infrastructure on both sides of the lake would reduce reliance on big data, noting that physical counts can provide trending data even if they do not capture origin information. Mr. Feiger asked whether the committee could track progress toward installing such infrastructure as a recommendation or metric. Mr. Marino noted this effort is tied to other subcomponents like fiber broadband. Mr. Feiger observed that even without knowing exactly which policies affect VMT, the committee knows certain actions should reduce VMT and can track progress toward those goals. Ms. Glickert suggested prioritizing data sources that provide reliable trending information.

Mr. Marino asked about the cost of big data services. Mr. Segan and Ms. Glickert confirmed that Placer.ai costs approximately $15,000 annually, Streetlight data costs around $65,000, and Inrix delay data is provided free to MPOs.

DRAFT

Ms. Norman from Carson City joined the discussion remotely, suggesting the development of propensity indexes for transit, pedestrian, bicycle, and automobile use. She explained that Carson Area MPO had recently measured transit propensity in their coordinated human services plan, which helped identify populations likely to need transit but not currently using it. She suggested that similar propensity indexes could help TRPA target populations already inclined toward non-automobile modes and reduce barriers to adoption. Mr. Segan requested that Ms. Norman share her transit propensity calculation methodology offline, and she agreed to follow up with staff.

Mr. Marino asked how TRPA tracks progress on infrastructure such as sidewalks, park-and-rides, and connections to mainline routes. Ms. Glickert explained that this RTP cycle included a review of how many projects from the RTP list had been completed, and that infrastructure improvements would be reflected in pedestrian experience and bicycle level of traffic stress metrics. Mr. Marino noted that infrastructure improvements also represent potential vehicle miles reduced when people choose not to drive because safe alternatives exist. Ms. Richardson confirmed that TRPA tracks miles of active transportation facilities improved or constructed, and noted that the 2020 RTP had examined coverage of transit, sidewalks, and bicycle facilities within community priority zones, though this analysis was not repeated for the current RTP due to administrative changes.

Mr. Feiger recalled that the committee had considered using bike score and walk score metrics at one point before deciding to use level of traffic stress instead. Mr. Marino agreed that level of stress effectively measures safety concerns. Ms. Glickert suggested that a travel demand management metric could capture programs, vanpools, and employer initiatives that do not fit neatly into existing categories. Ms. Richardson proposed that the committee could track neighborhood walkshed, bikeshed, and transit shed coverage with targets, noting that community priority zone targets had been set at 100% coverage with walksheds defined as quarter-mile distances.

Mr. Marino expressed interest in a bigger-picture view of neighborhood health that encompasses sidewalks, lighting, and other factors supporting multimodal transportation. Ms. Glickert acknowledged the importance of this perspective but noted that current efforts focus on town centers where needs are known to be greatest, and that expanding analysis to all neighborhoods would require decisions about resource allocation. She noted that neighborhood scores would likely be poor given the lack of pavement, sidewalks, and lighting in many areas. Mr. Feiger cautioned against building sidewalks in every neighborhood due to maintenance challenges in a snow-prone basin. Ms. Glickert referenced the active transportation plan, which concluded that every neighborhood should at least have access to a quality arterial or collector with a Class I path. Ms. Shaw suggested that existing neighborhood data could be included in reports for reference while maintaining the primary focus on town

DRAFT

centers. Mr. Feiger suggested that walkshed analysis could examine whether residents can walk a few blocks to reach a high-quality multi-use path.

Committee Discussion on Next Steps and Timeline

Mr. Teshara asked what changes would be realistic for staff to implement between the current meeting and the May meeting, acknowledging that while committee members had raised good ideas, he was uncertain what could feasibly be added or modified before the June presentation to the governing board.

Ms. Glickert clarified that the report would not go to the board until June, providing time to refine recommendations and incorporate new data sources. She noted that the committee would need time to assess what was possible, but observed that for most suggestions, the data appeared to already exist and the issue was presentation rather than lack of analysis.

Ms. Shaw agreed with Ms. Glickert's assessment. She noted that propensity data analysis would not be feasible to complete in time but could be included as a recommendation for future work. However, she believed many other suggestions could be addressed by the next meeting, such as incorporating additional transit data from TTD if available, and including neighborhood data for bicycle level of traffic stress and pedestrian experience metrics since that data already exists and would only require presenting it differently. Ms. Richardson confirmed that she already had the relevant data available.

Mr. Teshara mentioned he had been reviewing the transit study technical memo on existing conditions, particularly material on page seven, and that Ms. Norman's earlier comments about propensity had prompted further reflection. He noted that one challenge with transit is that some neighborhoods that would benefit from service have residents who say they do not want it, citing Incline Village as an example where an older population and workers who previously relied on Metro Transit ridership nonetheless had residents opposing service.

Ms. Glickert stated that committee members would need to provide comments on the report soon, noting they had already had it for two weeks even if some had only opened it that day. Mr. Teshara acknowledged that sometimes discussion with colleagues is necessary to stimulate ideas and feedback. Ms. Glickert reiterated that staff would need those comments in order to refine the report.

C. Set Date for the Next Committee Meeting (For Possible Action)

Ms. Glickert suggested working backwards from the timeline, noting it was 3:00 p.m. She proposed May 8th as the earliest available date, a Friday five weeks away, emphasizing that a May meeting was necessary given the requirement to go to the board. She asked

DRAFT

committee members to check their calendars and suggested a 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. timeframe, noting she did not anticipate needing two full hours for the next meeting.

Mr. Feiger confirmed that time worked for him. Mr. Marino asked for a moment to check his schedule. Mr. Teshara suggested Friday at noon. Mr. Feiger proposed 1:30 p.m. since another meeting ends at 1:00 p.m. Ms. Glickert confirmed a 1:30 to 3:00 p.m. timeframe, and Mr. Feiger agreed that worked.

Ms. Shaw asked about participants online. Mr. Verre indicated that May 8th was not a good date for him and asked whether he could provide comments on the report and have a colleague attend in his place, expressing concern about maintaining consistency. Ms. Glickert assured him it was acceptable and mentioned she had encouraged Sondra to attend the next meeting given the focus on recommendations. Mr. Verre confirmed he wanted to ensure proper representation from his agency. Ms. Shaw confirmed that anyone from his agency could attend.

Ms. Glickert confirmed the proposed meeting for May 8th from 1:30 to 3:00 p.m. and asked how that worked for others. Ms. Van Siclen noted she would be on maternity leave but that Caroline, who would serve as interim editor, appeared to be available, and she requested the invite be forwarded to her.

Ms. Glickert confirmed the meeting date and noted staff would reach out to those who could not attend for offline conversations about recommendations. She stated materials would be distributed one week in advance rather than two weeks since committee members had already seen the report, with the new information focused on Chapter 4 containing the recommendations discussed during the meeting.

Mr. Teshara asked whether the report would be presented to the board on June 24th. Ms. Glickert clarified that the requirement is to transmit the report rather than present it. Mr. Feiger noted that the board technically must respond to the committee. Ms. Glickert confirmed that after transmittal, the board has 90 days to respond. Mr. Segan indicated he was uncertain of the exact timeframe. Mr. Feiger added that the board cannot simply acknowledge receipt—if the committee makes requests, the board must either agree with them or explain why not. Ms. Glickert confirmed that was correct.

7. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS

Dr. Q raised a question he had been considering, acknowledging uncertainty about the answer. He observed that the report appeared to be a status-of-the-system document being transmitted with some subsequent action required, and asked whether the recommendations were really focused on improving performance metrics rather than broader concerns.

Ms. Glickert explained that the committee was at a midpoint in the process. She noted that the previous report had aligned with the Regional Transportation Plan, allowing for discussion of status, vision, and needed adjustments. She characterized the current report as a checkpoint to assess progress and determine where adjustments might be needed.

DRAFT

Mr. Teshara asked whether the report was required under the Sustainable Communities Transportation framework. Ms. Glickert clarified that the report represents good planning practice and fulfills MPO performance-based planning requirements, while also supporting development of a strong regional transportation plan with partners.

Dr. Q expressed continued uncertainty about the California-specific purpose of the report, questioning what would happen after the board reviews and accepts it. Mr. Teshara noted that failing to produce the report would create significant problems.

Dr. Q acknowledged understanding the requirement but questioned whether the time and effort invested should have a clearer purpose. Ms. Glickert responded that the report provides direction to TRPA staff, facilitates conversation about how to support transit operators, and identifies barriers the agency could remove—including discussions about code changes. She described it as an ongoing conversation about making progress, acknowledging that might sound "soft and fluffy."

Dr. Q clarified that his concern was about understanding why a reader should engage with the report and care about providing comments—not in a negative sense, but in terms of purpose. He suggested that as a public document, the report should help readers understand its intent.

Ms. Glickert acknowledged this as good feedback and suggested improving the introduction, particularly for someone coming in fresh. Dr. Q agreed there might be an opportunity to clarify the purpose, goal, and intent more explicitly.

Ms. Glickert asked whether Dr. Q, having been with the committee only a few months, had learned something interesting from the report. Dr. Q responded that he was the wrong person to ask because he considers himself a cynic after working with data for many years. He explained that he understands data is only as good as the assumptions behind it, and while he sees value in many efforts, he is cautious about models with built-in assumptions. He noted that consistency allows for trend analysis over time, but when vendors like Placer.ai change their models every two years, comparing snapshots across time becomes difficult.

Ms. Glickert responded that this is precisely why the committee does not rely on a single data source. Dr. Q reiterated his perspective as a longtime cynic. Mr. Teshara acknowledged they were getting that impression. Ms. Glickert thanked Dr. Q for his openness to the conversation.

Ms. Shaw concluded the meeting with a call to consider the progress made on the recommendations. She acknowledged that the recommendations had just been presented without advance distribution for committee members to review, and encouraged members to take time to digest the material. She invited anyone with additional thoughts or recommendations to email her, Mr. Segan, or Ms. Glickert for incorporation into the report.

Ms. Glickert proposed April 15th as a deadline for submitting additional comments, noting that would provide another eight working days. Mr. Teshara remarked about having other obligations

DRAFT

that day. Ms. Glickert expressed hope that members had already completed their taxes, adding that she planned to do hers that weekend.

8. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

None

9. ADJOURNMENT

Rachael Shaw adjourned the meeting at 3:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Katherine Huston,
TRPA Paralegal

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

DRAFT