TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
TRANSPORATION PERFORMANCE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency May 8, 2026
Zoom

1. CALL TO ORDER

TRPA Associate Transportation Planning Analyst, Rachael Shaw called the meeting to order at 1:33 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Members present or online: Rachael Shaw (Associate Transportation Planning Analyst), Michelle Glickert (TRPA Transportation Planning Director), Dan Segan (TRPA Chief Science and Policy Advisor), Josh Schmidt (TRPA Transportation & Analytics Analyst), Kira Richardson (TRPA Senior Transportation Planner), Phillip Ritger (Douglas County), Andy Deinken (Placer County), Mohammad Qureshi, aka "Dr. Q" (City of South Lake Tahoe), Dave Solaro (Washoe County), Jim Marino (Tahoe Transportation District), Caroline Craffey (Truckee North Tahoe Transportation Management Association), Steve Teshara (South Shore Transportation Management Association), Donaldo Palaroan (El Dorado County), Kelly Norman (Carson City), Gavin Feiger (League to Save Lake Tahoe), Daniel Cressy (United States Forest Service)

The general public seat is currently vacant.

Rachael Shaw, TRPA Associate Transportation Planning Analyst, welcomed all attendees to the May 8, 2026, meeting of the Transportation Performance Technical Advisory Committee.

3. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

None.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minor corrections to the minutes, including adding Mohammad Qureshi's (Dr. Q's) full name to the Members Present list.

Gavin Feiger made a motion to approve the April 3, 2026, Transportation Performance Technical Advisory Committee minutes as amended.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

DRAFT

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS ITEMS

A. Discussion and possible recommendation to transmit the 2026 Transportation and Sustainable Communities Performance and Recommendations Report to the TRPA Governing Board.

1) Changes to the Report

Rachael Shaw detailed changes to the report. For the transit section, we added ridership data on the seasonal transit services, airport shuttles, and van pools to that primary, metric of ridership total ridership data, so you'll see that reflected in that chart. In the explanatory section, per the committee's comments, we added more contextual information on some of the upcoming improvements, like the Lake Link expansion plan for the summer. On some of the staffing and safety challenges that don't impact those primary metrics, because without Staffing, and with, turnover, it makes it challenging to provide, increased ridership, and so it does have an impact on those primary metrics, so we added some more data that, TTD provided. They estimated about a $9,000 training cost per driver, and I think it was about 35% turnover rate based on the last 6 months of data. So, we added that in there to add a little bit more context. For the active transportation section, we updated the bicycle level of traffic stress analysis to also include neighborhood and local streets, still keeping the focus on those primary roads, being the main connector routes, but still reflecting what's going on in neighborhoods to make sure we're still tracking progress there as well. So that has been added as additional data. And then, for the automobile section, just a minor change to re-word the 95th percentile to slowest travel times for clarity.

Committee member, Steve Teshara, South Shore Transportation Management Association, asked: There's no actual presentation to the Governing Board, as I understand it. If they approve it, would it be a Consent Calendar item?

Dan Segan: They don't actually need to approve it. But if they don't agree with any of the recommendations or findings, they need to provide written notice to this group, and then we would need to reconvene and consider. So, if any of their recommendations, the governing board disagreed with, they would provide notice to this entity in writing, and then you would have to reconsider them.

Steve Teshara: Did you say they have 90 days?

Rachael Shaw: That's right. It won't be an actual item for them to make a motion on.

Steve Teshara asked: Regionally 72% of the population is served by basic service, which is defined as 60 minutes, and then it says, microtransit wait times typically average around 15-30 for purposes of this analysis it's considered basic service. Since 30 is more than 20, we fall into the basic service category. Is that correct?

DRAFT

Rachael Shaw: That's correct. That's the same with TTD's, like, 30-minute frequency on Route 50. It does fall into the basic service, even though it is kind of in between. It goes above that.

Steve Teshara: It's difficult to work as hard as we do and to be tarred with the basic service label.

Rachael Shaw: I understand that. And to provide a little bit of context, I think, too, on the frequent service definition, that 20-minute definition is not one that we necessarily selected as TRPA, but aligns with the state of California's definition of frequent service, which does have implications with, like, there's CEQA exemptions if you have frequent service, and so that was kind of the reasoning for selecting that as the definition. But I understand Tahoe's a bit different than cities in terms of what is considered frequent.

Daniel Cressy: Do the scooter rentals and things like that play into that?

Rachael Shaw: They don't, I think, play into our current metrics. It's something that we could track in the future. But I think we're limited in how much data we receive from the vendors. We get it from one of the vendors, but not the other. But, that could potentially fall into the explanatory section of the active transportation.

Daniel Cressy: Do the commercial rideshares, Uber, Lyft play in any way?

Dan Segan: They're both included in the total trip counts, so if the scooters that are rented go past a bike and pedestrian monitor on the trails, they would be captured most likely as a bike, given the speed of travel. So they're captured there, as well as the Uber and Lyft are captured in the traffic counts, but we don't explicitly segregate them out within the reporting.

Steve Teshara: I'm wondering, because this is basically a reflection of past data, and it goes to the governing board, and they look at it, and there are certain things that it talks about trying to improve. To the extent that we know things will be changing for the next cycle of reporting, could staff do a little context to the governing board saying, you know, since this report was adopted or recommended by this committee. My example would be that, as of the summer of this year, the Lake Link service will go to zones, so that they know there's an effort being made to try to improve the wait times. And there may be other examples that if the staff had a little preface to the report, so that the governing board, particularly those who may not be as familiar as some of the other members, like the local government people, could say, oh, they're making progress, that they're moving forward, it's a good thing. Just, you know, just to let them know that we're not static here.

Rachael Shaw: That seems reasonable. What came to mind first, Steve, was it's just a general recommendation. To the extent we have specific examples to show where progress is being made. I think there's some TDD progress that should be reflected,

DRAFT

in terms of service, right? Some days on 50, that kind of thing. If we know those things, by the time this goes out to the governing board, it would be helpful to show them that, or we can get them in the report if we know also.

Steve Teshara: I just want to make sure they know that we're trying hard as best we can to move forward.

2) Update on DP 5.4 funding milestone

Dan Segan, TRPA Chief Science and Policy Advisor gave an update on the DP 5.4 funding milestone. This committee was formed by a part of our regional plan and given the role of providing guidance to our governing board in the implementation of the transportation program overall, but also in executing transportation strategies to reduce VMT per capita, which is one of our thresholds. The committee has a role both in evaluating the primary metrics that it decided on; those are the metrics that Rachel mentioned earlier, active transportation, auto, and transit. We have milestones for those in DP5 that we evaluated and we've already talked about. DP4 is our funding milestone. We have two milestones that I'll describe, which this committee also has a role in assessing the status relative to non-adopted milestones. When we adopted this, there were two milestones that the governing board established that they asked the committee to weigh in on, and we'll go over each of those individually. But to put you back in time, so this is… we're back in 2020 land, we're in COVID, we are looking at the 2020 RTP and the regional funding line item within the Regional Transportation Plan. So, if you remember, at the time, there was a bi-state transportation consultation on transportation that was charged with closing that funding gap to implement the entire RTP for the constrained list of the RTP. And so, we are writing these milestones in advance of that and setting a deadline first the consultation to develop that funding strategy, that's that first milestone by December 31st, 2021. And then the second one is the 2024 revenue milestone, which is to begin implementation of said plan. So, the question related to the first milestone, Milestone A, is did the consultation arrive at and endorse a funding strategy to close the regional revenue gap. And many of you remember, prior to the 2022 summit, so this is after the deadline established within the regional plan, the bi-state consultation did coalesce around a funding strategy, and you'll see the signatures of the leaders of the bi-state consultation, which is the Secretary of CNRA in California, and the Director of DCNR within Nevada they coalesced on a funding strategy dubbed 777. Which basically followed the existing EIP model, and said all sectors need to come up with an additional $7 million a year to close this $400 million funding gap. That was then submitted and the Nevada legislature endorsed that, California's legislature has not, but it was submitted to vote, after the deadline. So, if you're reading through the assessment, we've assessed it as being completed, but not in the timeline provided within the regional plan. The second one, which is, if you've followed our conversations, has been more controversial is, did that plan start, and is it reasonably expected to achieve the needs set for it

DRAFT

within the RTP? We have now had three years of implementation of this funding strategy, three full cycles. The 2023 fiscal year, 2024 fiscal year, and 2025 fiscal year funding target in each of those years is $21 million, and in each of the years, we have exceeded, we being the partnership at large, has exceeded the revenue target for that year. The accounting for this, and you may be confused, because if you know our transportation spending, that is not the total of transportation spending within each of those years. Again, this was the 777 strategy, to close the funding gap of identified sources within the RTP. Any revenue stream that was already included within the RTP, the revenue forecast of the 2020 RTP is excluded from these calculations. We've had a lot of conversations with both state and local jurisdictions around why is this source not included, or why is this not reflected in it? And the story is, if it's included in the revenue forecast. It can't be included in 777, because it's not additional revenue related to that. So, the funding, what you see here, the summary here, is those are revenue sources outside those already identified, and that each of the first three years, we have exceeded the revenue target for the 777 funding strategy. The assessment based on that success and the continued commitment to implement that strategy, we're suggesting that the second milestone has also been achieved. And this one was achieved prior to the deadline. So, it said it shall commence implementation prior to December 31st, 2023. The bi-state consultation actually accelerated the timeline for implementation of the funding strategy from starting in 2023 to closing the full fiscal gap in the 2023 fiscal year. So that's the year ending September, we're looking at federal fiscal year, sorry, September of 2023. So, by the time it was supposed to start, the full year of funding for that was already in place. And that's a summary of the assessment. The full details are in… let's start again at page 57, and continue for about 3 pages in the packet.

Committee member questions and comments

Gavin Feiger asked does this count as, like, governing board finding that the funding milestone was met, and then this policy is, like, done in the regional plan? What's going to be the outcome of this report being transmitted to the governing board?

Dan Segan responded the governing board would have the option of rejecting the assessment. This committee initially needs to say, do we want to transmit this?, Or do we want to modify this? Then the governing board would have ninety days, just like any other recommendation within the report, they would have ninety days to say, no, we don't think this is correct. Or this group should go back and look at it again, or if they don't object, they can just accept.

Jim Marino asked Is there a breakdown for the local private?

Dan Segan said there is.

Gavin Feiger asked I'm kind of curious, what percentage is South Shore, what percentage is North Shore? What percentage is city, county, vice versa, right?

DRAFT

Dan Segan said that's something I can follow up, but we've got that full breakdown. And we actually have… we have a full breakdown by the individual funding sources that we can share with the group. We can share the slides as well at the end of the meeting.

Jim Marino asked 777 is theoretically covering the cost of the base program, right? The base RTP? It's not expansion, it's not furthering anything above what $20 million is going for?

Michelle Glickert said back in 2020, the RTP, that line item, was a little different. That's where we have to go, I keep saying, kind of taking you back, versus this RTP was different. Back then, we had a little bit more robust of a transit vision and plan. Versus now, we did definitely, working with all of you, scale that back. But we also then assessed that we're going to continue this work, this 777. I don't know if that answers it, Jim. It's kind of hard to go back to 2020. So, it's now baked in: as we say, in the 2025 RTP, and that only gets us the basic services.

Jim Marino asked you're looking at least 17% cost increase in services and projects between 2021 and now, right? So, 777 is not worth what it was.

Gavin Feiger said it was kind of targeted at a specific set of 10 projects or something. Even though the money didn't have to go to them, that was kind of the idea.

Michelle Glickert said you're getting to a good point, which I think you're familiar with, is, while this was sort of the vision and the accounting, it's really challenging, right? This is accounting for a one-time project. That's why you see a big fiscal year 24, versus this, because it's about also those funds coming in, and some years are smaller than others. So, that's the challenge with the accounting, is that it's going to vary.

Dan Segan said I think to acknowledge the difficulty in evaluating this from the committee standpoint is that when the regional plan measure was written, many people envisioned a single funding source that we could clearly point to, and it would say, it'd be like a base and entry type fee, and it would be a very easy role for this committee. There'd be none of this type of accounting, because you could just see, like, how much was raised by the toll. And then we'd say, you know, to Jim's point, is that enough or is that not enough? And where we landed through the bi-state consultation is a very different type of plan from what was originally envisioned. I think the type of plan that was to be put forward wasn't pre-baked within the regional plan. So we're left with both, do we think they fulfilled their job in coming up with that plan, and then do we think it can be long-term executed? I think it is more challenging from our seat to produce the assessment than we'd originally imagined, 6 years ago when this was written. To Jim's point, and to try to

DRAFT

capture part of the committee's recommendations could be to look at the increasing costs and how to continue to support that level of service, given those costs. We can consider that as we go to the next item, in terms of the recommendations.

Gavin Feiger said my thought on it is keep tracking it. The funding gap, that $20 million, is a little bit of a moving point now, because it's been wrapped up into the 2025 regional transportation plan forecast, but I still think it's valuable to track in finer detail where funding is coming from, which you guys were doing for a few years under the 777, so I think continuing to track that is valuable. To Jim's point, especially local jurisdictions, how they're doing, whether it's sustainable money, $20 million is coming in every year, and again, it's accounting, who knows? At least continue to track it going forward. I think it's a good idea.

Rachael Shaw asked do you see that as TRPA's role outside of this report, or being tied to this report, having that tracked in it?

Gavin Feiger said I don't know if it matters how or where it's tracked, because it'll come out through this group, through Regional Transportation Plan, through the Transportation Committee, the Governing Board, through TTD.

3) 2026 Recommendations

Rachael Shaw presented 2026 Recommendations.

For anyone who wasn't here last time, for some context, we talked about the recommendations that were in the 2024 report, and we talked about a status of progress that you'll see in Chapter 4.1 of assessing what is the status of those 2024 recommendations, what have we done since last time, over the last two years? Being in progress not being a bad thing, since it's only been a couple years. And then, carrying over most of those in-progress recommendations to this report, and removing the ones that weren't completed. Which is kind of what we landed on, and I'll go through that as we go through these updated 2026 recommendations. So first, we have a new category. Normally, the recommendations have been matching the metrics with those three categories of transit, active transportation, and auto. But we've heard from this Committee, from public comment as well, that having multimodal recommendations would be helpful, because there are recommendations that span all of those modes and aren't really in a silo of just one of them. And so, this is the new multimodal recommendations category. You can see a lot ended up landing in this category, which I think is great. It shows just that crossover that we've talked about. And so this first one was a… is a new recommendation that was suggested by a committee member to evaluate methods to measure transit propensity, pedestrian propensity, bicycle propensity, and auto propensity as another tool to, you know, help inform project development, or where you're planning future projects to make them more successful. The second one is to evaluate modal accessibility.
Every 4 years in alignment with the regional transportation plan requirements. I think, given the current administration, we didn't really want to say equity. And

DRAFT

having it aligned with the regional transportation plan requirements allows that flexibility, depending on what the current federal requirements are around equity or accessibility. So that was kind of one of the reasons for this wording, and to help us meet those RTP requirements and align with that. The third one is to evaluate other methods for estimated regional mode share and where possible, report and track mode share by jurisdiction, trip purpose, and traveler type. And so we had Mode Share as a recommendation in the previous report, but this one has been updated to now have, some of the comments we heard of maybe tracking by jurisdiction, or by traveler type would be helpful information. So, that's a change for that third one. And this one was previously in the auto section and now is in this multimodal section. The fourth one is just a carryover of exploring the creation of a multimodal level of service index for the region. Again, this was previous in the auto category, and now let's move to this multimodal category. And then lastly is to incorporate, intelligent transportation system data collection, such as TTD Smart Grant data, into metrics when available as appropriate. And I think given some of these projects, being pilot projects, or just kind of starting off and not knowing all the data that's going to come out of it, decided to keep it a little bit more broad to be able to incorporate it where it makes sense, and as we get data from that project. So any… I'll just pause for any comments or questions on these multimodal recommendations, and any of those newer, revised ones have that little asterisk at the end. And for those who recommended some of these last time does this match what you were thinking? Does this align with why you suggested it? Did we capture that right?

Gavin Feiger said this is good. I'm really happy to see this. I think this would be really, really useful going forward, especially with regional transportation planning, and I hope we're able to get some good data. I'm a little worried because our discussion last meeting, last month was a lot of this is maybe hard to capture. But, I think it's worth it to try, like, so I didn't want to create more work for you guys, and as long as you're up for it, I think it's worth it.

Rachael Shaw continued presenting 2026 recommendations stating for active transportation, again, removed the recommendations last time that had been completed, including those that were in reference to updating the regional grant program and updating the TRPA code ordinances. This might look a little bit lighter, but that's partly because of that new multimodal section that's taken some of the recommendations that were in this category last time.
We did have this recommendation in the last report, but I've updated the wording, so it's to support funding, implementation, and policy strategies for local jurisdictions and other partners to perform maintenance, conduct year-round clearing, and improve wayfinding. This previously was just to support funding, and now just added implementation and policy, just broaden it to other strategies that could help support local jurisdictions. The second one is consider additional resources, staff, and funding to expand the effectiveness of the trip production ordinance to support reductions in VMT and single auto work trips. I think that's one that Steve might be interested in as well, because I know that was one of his comments at the last meeting, but we had a recommendation in the last report that we marked as complete, because we updated the trip reduction ordinance during

the regional transportation plan. And there was a comment, even though we have updated that, to make it more efficient and improve the effectiveness of it, just to make sure that we keep that in here to keep supporting implementation of that ordinance and, not let that fall away. The third one, consider monitoring travel time for pedestrians and bicycles along corridors that connect popular destinations. We discussed last time how this is something we don't necessarily know how we're going to track yet, and might be a little bit challenging, but we still want to work on this and figure out if this is something we could do, so keeping that in here to continue to explore. Any questions on these active transportation recommendations?

Daniel Cressy: The first one talks about funding for maintenance, etc. Is supporting funding for implementation and expansion, is that appropriate in this kind of context? I'm thinking about we're working on the West Shore, we're planning additional expansion of active transportation network. Does it make sense to advocate for implementation?

Michelle Glickert said I'm trying to tease out where some of that comes from is knowing that there are so many grants that allow… give you money to build something, but never to maintain it. Right? And so, a lot of the… this came from this group, and our public works working group, and groups you've been involved in. So, we wanted to make sure that we were tracking that funding, it wasn't just implementing, right? Expansion, I think, maybe we could maybe reword to get to that piece, but I also don't want to forget about that maintenance piece.

Jim Marino: Is there a target for delivering the active transportation planning recommendations by jurisdiction? So the target for City of South Lake Tahoe, for example, might be, you know, 5%, right? Is there any sort of context for that?

Michelle Glickert said not in this report, but I do recall when I began in 2017, I think we had set five miles a year. There was something in the EIP program, but we don't have that now. Are you guys interested in that? Is that helpful?

Jim Marino said it’s so highly dependent on what grant funding you’re going for.

Rachael Shaw said we could track, instead of setting a target, track what's happening by jurisdiction, maybe? I know we have total miles of improved or constructed bike paths or sidewalks in this report, but it's not broken out by jurisdiction.

Jim Marino: In your previous slide, you mentioned, like, a service index in your multimodal, right? And I'm kind of curious, is that service index taken into consideration? You know, miles built, projects completed? As sort of an element of how the performance of a particular jurisdiction is doing with regard to making progress on your report.

Michelle Glickert said that's a great segue to what Daniel was asking. I think this stems from the Regional Transportation Plan project list. This report is evaluating are we implementing (RTP) projects on that list? So, to advocate for the additional

DRAFT

project you're talking about, that expansion, it was one of those projects in the RTP. It's not so much specific to advocating for more. It's about the regional transportation plan implementation. As that gets updated, then this reflects that kind of cycle.

Dave Solaro said doesn't this also take into account, though, that the ongoing maintenance is a real thing for all of the things we're adding in all the other plans? Just to make sure that local jurisdictions and others realize that, you know, you've built this stuff, now you've got to maintain it. Because if you don't maintain it, it's not used in all those other things.

Michelle Glickert said I looked at a couple regional transportation plans. I do think it's great that we actually have a category for maintenance and operations. I don't remember when I was working in Southern California seeing that, but that was a while ago. Maybe now people are doing that, calling out those specific pieces.

Jim Marino said Dave, I'm not familiar with Washoe County and how you do your CIP program, but at least in TTDs, We have a cost forecast for maintenance and operations post-project, right, that we…specify when we start that project with our board, saying that, you know, if we take this on and we complete it, then you need to add to the annual budget in operation and maintenance X. Whether or not it ever gets added, who knows? But we're forecasting it, right? And we're bringing it as a cost.

Dave Solaro said it's either a forecast with a cost that is going to either, if you add to it, then the service level stays the same, or if you don't add to it, then the service level of the entire network goes down. That's the trade-off.

Jim Marino said do you want to defer it for a long time and then incur, you know, a major headache at some point down the road, or attack it annually? Correct.

Rachael Shaw said let's go back to the transit one, but we can always continue this conversation.

Steve Teshara asked when you say support strategies for securing and maintaining flexible operating dollars to increase? What level of support is TRPA willing to provide?

Rachael Shaw said I think the Tahoe Transit Study is a good example of this in developing, in evaluating a funding strategy, and identifying…

Steve Teshara said specifically, South Shore TMA has been asking the city for some data so that we can explore forming a business improvement district to help fund transit on the South Shore, Lake Link, and maybe to some extent, the TTD service And this has been 2 years, and we still haven't gotten the information we need. So, would TRPA be willing to talk to the city and say, hey, why don't you do this?

Michelle Glickert asked could you elaborate on the data you're seeking?

DRAFT

Steve Teshara said its revenue data associated with business types in the city, so sales tax, principally, and to some extent, maybe TOT. The city has that information through their relationship with HDL, which is a company that does that for a lot of jurisdictions, and We recently did get the list of city businesses and the types of businesses, which is important, but we still don't have the economic data, and we're not asking it in specific business. We're not asking for proprietary information, we're asking for cumulative data. Because if we go to the businesses, we have to know which businesses are we going to? And they're going to say, well, what are you talking to us about? How much money are we talking about? So we don't have any information to share with them. So, it's a circular thing, and if this is a transit recommendation, if the TRPA was willing to have, you know, conversations with city leadership about why, from a transit perspective, and a regional and South Shore perspective, why this is important, that would be helpful.

Kira Richardson said we have been working with locals, federal agencies, state agencies to help secure more dollars for transit. We've introduced legislation to try to secure more money for transit, so I think this recommendation is all-encompassing, and I do think the TBID is a good example of a strategy that we would support. I don't know that we need to drill into, like, very specific details on, like, we need to go talk to the city, like, I don't know that that's an action that fits here, but I think that's a good example, Steve, of something that we could help with, and I think there's a lot that TRPA does to help secure more money for transit.

Steve Teshara asked I see the recommendation, how do you define it?

Rachael Shaw said that's a good example. My understanding is that Devin Middlebrook from TRPA is helping with the TBID. I would connect with him on the city and see if he might be able to support you on that a bit further. So, just a quick overview. Most of these are carried over from the previous report with some of them having been removed that were already completed. We also omitted the recommendation from the previous report on housing, because we discussed last time how that didn't really feel like it was in the purview of this committee. We added this seventh recommendation to support regional training coordination opportunities for transit operators to try to support a regional training facility, or just coordination to make it lower cost to train new CDL drivers.

Jim Marino said I was just going to say, from our standpoint, we're working on almost every one of these, so we're fine with this list from TTD's standpoint.

Steve Teshara said we discussed if TRPA staff writes a context for providing this report to the governing board, and I can't remember if this is already in there, but Lake Link and Jim with TTD fixed route, we are integrating the services, on an ongoing basis, working on that. So it's number two, and so the governing board should be made aware of the fact that that's already had some beneficial effects and could continue to have some additional beneficial effects as we go along.

Rachael Shaw said in section 4.1, when we talk about progress from the last report, that is definitely one of the things that we highlighted. The effort from Lake Link to

DRAFT

coordinate with TTD, and how you redirect riders to the fixed route if you're within the block shed of Route 50. Feel free to let us know if you want us to bolster that, but I think we kind of captured that in that recommendation.

Steve Teshara said two and three are pretty similar, but I'm good with all these.

Jim Marino said I think they look great. I really do want to start the discussions on this regional training coordination. I really think there's an opportunity there, not only for CDLs for transit, but CDLs for snow removal drivers, and other public works staff. I'd like to really start engaging for our locals.

Daniel Cressy said thinking about some of the work we're doing of limiting the unmanaged highway shoulder parking, limiting that supply could increase demand for transit ridership. Broader actions that are maybe indirect to transit.

Rachael Shaw said they're definitely not in a silo, and that will impact. I think it'll be interesting to track, too, how ridership changes with some of the changes on 28 this summer, and if you see a change in ridership when you're at 28 as a result. I think that's something we should keep track of. Maybe a highlight for the next report.

Jim Marino said we'd like to explore categorized expense programs, like recreation transit, for example, would be categorized and separated from urban transit, and connector transit would be separated from… you see what I'm saying? So we can define the program, right? The sub-program of the transit program, if you will. So we're kind of trying to tweak ways, or figure out how to do that, have clarity to it, right? So it's not so confusing for everybody.

Rachael Shaw asked, and that would be kind of with how TTD tracks your expenses more specifically?

Jim Marino said I also believe it would be beneficial for this entire team, and the RTP, and other things, because I think when you're talking recreation travel, you're talking primarily tourism, right? When you're talking your urban travel, it's your commuters and your housing. Right now, we just lump everything into a program. It's all transit. We'd like to start breaking that out a little bit and seeing what the performance and funding mechanisms are, and the costs, so to speak, to run a particular program, whether it's recreation-based transit or urban transit.

Michelle Glckert said I think we're kind of lucky in one sense that a lot of the trips on 28 route, the summer route to Sand Harbor, those categorize themselves, right? And Emerald Bay, same thing.

Jim Marino said they do, but for us, putting together the future plans to run the rest of SR28, I'd want to have a separate sub-program of transit that focuses on recreation corridor.

Steve Teshara said I think that’s a great idea.

DRAFT

Gavin Fieger said I like the idea, too, but then thinking about how our recreation corridors are eventually going to probably be the link between North-South, Northlake, and Southlake. Something to figure out in the future. That'd be a nice problem to have in the future, is trying to figure that out.

Jim Marino said Santini-Burton, that brings a whole different dynamic in, even though we can't use it for operational things.

Steve Teshara said we were not really even allowed to use the word transportation in Santini-Burton because of that lumping of everything together.

Jim Marino said if we have a sub-program of transit, recreation, then we have a defined category. I'm curious about these transit recommendations, and I'm sorry if I missed it in the rest of the report, but we talk about Park Tahoe, about parking revenue as a subsidiary of funding transit. I think we need to start bringing Park Tahoe, really, to the forefront of boards and committees, now that it's actually expanding, thanks to the Forest Service.

Michelle Glickert said Placer County's a great example, and their parking program right in the town center, keeping those revenues. I think that's what you're talking about when you say Park Tahoe. Keeping the revenues here?

Jim Marino said we talked earlier about deferred maintenance and paying for O&M and everything, and that's really what Park Tahoe is all about, right? To be able to put those dollars back into the asset, and a system that supports that asset, and not impact these other funds that are out there that we could leverage for bigger and better projects.

Michelle Glickert said I know it’s in the Regional Plan.

Jim Marino said I don't really know Park Tahoe, but maybe parking fees. Maybe more holistically parking fees.

Rachael Shaw asked, are you thinking more in tracking it as a data point, or more in the recommendation side?

Steve Teshara said the recommendations for more funding.

Daniel Cressy asked do we have a good handle on barriers to transit?

Rachael Shaw asked do you mean barriers to why people aren't using transit, but not to the actual operation of it?

Daniel Cressy said yeah, social barriers.

Rachael Shaw said I think that's one of the reasons we added that propensity idea, maybe trying to measure transit propensity, and that could speak to it a little bit, and

DRAFT

trying to understand who is most likely to want to take transit, and we do surveys that kind of get to that a little bit.

Steve Teshara said the Tahoe Transit Study Existing Conditions Memo was really good, because it showed who takes it and where they live and that's pretty important information.

Rachael Shaw said we do onboard transit surveys about every two years or so, and that has really valuable data, but it's more on who's actually using transit and not the people that aren't taking it, because it's only asking the actual transit riders. It is very valuable data, but not as much of the side that you were referring to, I think, on the barriers of who's not taking it.

Jim Marino: We were kind of kicking around concepts of, like, you know, you have safe routes to school. Like, we were kind of kicking around with safe routes to transit, because In the Safe Routes to School sort of philosophy, you take the location node to school, and you build out from that location to provide a safe access for pedestrians or cyclists or school children and whatnot. But I feel like, kind of like, at least in our system, once you get beyond the first block of Highway 50, There's nothing. I mean, other than some arterial roads, like Ski Run Boulevard and whatnot, there's nothing. There's no sidewalks, there's no lighting, there's absolutely nothing for someone to walk 4 to 6 blocks to a bus stop, safely, at night. So we're kind of figuring out, like, from our own capital delivery plan, should we be talking about a safe routes to transit type concept?

Michelle Glickert said in the active transportation plan, we selected having a Sierra Boulevard for every neighborhood, it was thinking about at the end of that boulevard, whatever street it might be, it's making sure that it's going to connect to the transit hub. It's not going to be just some random street in that neighborhood. When we were considering that and talking about that in the active transportation plan, we were making sure it connects to something. Don't invest in infrastructure like that, like on Sierra. If there's not a bus stop within a few feet. It’s way more valuable if it connects to a bus stop.

Rachael Shaw said I think there's ways that we can use our existing analyses to help provide data. You could take the Pedestrian Experience Index and add a buffer for a certain block shed within the transit stops, and then just evaluate what is the Pedestrian Experience Index, and that's that particular area, if you're a quarter mile of a transit stop, or a half mile of a transit stop, and provide that data, if that's helpful?

Jim Marino said we're exploring some stuff, and I'd love to sit down with your team and talk about how we could move it along.

Rachel Shaw said happy to support that.

Kelly Norman said Listening to all of the recommendations, and then some of the specific comments. The one about should we have a specific 5-mile increase of,

DRAFT

particular bikeways, or walkways. Would it be helpful if, and maybe, maybe you guys are already doing this, is with these transit recommendations, We're trying to set you guys up for success. So, I think being general recommendations is a really good idea. But you guys are also providing a lot of, really good examples of metrics to, quantify a lot of how these recommendations can be tracked. Is it helpful, as we go along, with these recommendations, as we are proposing them, to also, identify the specific metrics that we would like to, to track them? So that we can find out, how we're doing, or if it's providing value in any way.

Rachael Shaw said I think that makes a lot of sense, and those could be either metrics just that we add to the explanatory section, and or, if the committee wants them to rise to the primary metric level, I think that's something we could discuss, too. But I think guidance on what else you want to see us tracking is always helpful to make it more useful.

Kelly Norman said at the same time, every suggestion that I make, I'm also cognizant of the fact that I'm also staff, and I realize that it's more work, but I'm listening to your specific suggestions, and a lot of it is the metrics that we can use to track these recommendations, and so it may be that your team is already thinking about the ways in which you can fulfill these recommendations, and so it may be helpful to identify those along with these recommendations, and it may not have to be in the report, but just something that we're all thinking about, because I hear you guys thinking about all of it.

Rachael Shaw said I we're all thinking about it, and sometimes mentioning it, but not always calling it out, so that might be helpful to include a bit more specifically.

Dan Segan said it's also something you can share offline, and you can review how we evaluated the recommendations to date. Because you'll see some of these ideas considered there when we've said, is it in progress, is it complete, and provide guidance for us as we produce both this report and then the next round of reporting, the things that you think we should consider. You can do so without fear that it’s a ton of extra work for us, because we can communicate back to you and say, we couldn't find that particular metric, so we're just going to use these to evaluate progress. But I think anything you can share is useful and actually lightens our burden, because then we don't have to think through how we would evaluate each of these on our own.

Rachael Shaw said we’re open to any thoughts now or like Dan said, feel free to email us those recommendations.

Michelle Glickert said I want to get a little bit of a go-back to see if we want to add (to our) eight recommendations for transit, which could be, like, support agreements, mechanisms to keep parking fees collected at the source, to support maintenance and transit. Something somewhat broad. Like I said, it is a policy in the RTP, but it could very well be here as well, if you feel strongly about it.

DRAFT

Rachael Shaw said it could also go in the multimodal section, because that's the crossover between auto and transit. So, maybe either of those.

Rachael Shaw presented the Auto recommendations category, stating that auto is just three recommendations, with some of the previous ones moved to the multimodal section. These are all carryovers from the last report, but with some changes. The first one, we heard last time just about how important this is, and continues to be, of promoting coordination and dissemination of real-time traveler information on construction projects to minimize travel delay. The second one, consider updating the region's effective population model to use the State Department of Transportation counts rather than streetlight counts to improve the consistency through time of estimates. This just had some language changes to specifically reference using the State Department of Transportation counts instead of streetlight, but we did have a recommendation last time on the effective population model. And then that third one is updating the BMT threshold baseline to reflect Caltrans' revised 2019 BMT estimate, which is in progress.

Daniel Cressy said the first one is really specific to construction impacts, and I'm wondering, what came to mind was, other congestion impacts, or where you're trying to get to, a car is not the way to get there now. There is no parking where you're going, and everybody is looking for parking and clogging up the roads. My question is construction impacts Too narrow, or is the objection… is the objective really tied to construction?

Rachael Shaw said, so, it'd be maybe instead real-time traveler information in general, not just construction projects, but just getting that information out to the public, no matter what the delay or congestion is.

Michelle Glickert said I think where this came from was in the analysis. Are we all in agreement? We can keep this a little bit more general.

Rachael Shaw said I think this ties a little bit to the ITS recommendation, too, of that potentially helping with real-time traveler information through further ITS projects.

Jim Marino said we're still trying to push the synchronization. The signal synchronization on 50.

Rachael Shaw said I met with Caltrans last week, and they said they have plans to coordinate the signals across the whole US-50 corridor this summer.
Any comments or any go backs on any of the recommendations? Anything we discussed? Open it up before the next thing on the agenda is just a motion, and so we have about 15 minutes, if there's anything the committee wants to discuss further, clarify.

Michelle Glickert summarized changes to the report as noted by the committee. One, we'll be adding to multimodal recommendations, support and agreements are mechanisms to keep parking fees collected at the source to support maintenance of parking, trail, and or transit operations. And then the only other change I had was in

DRAFT

auto. I think we'll simplify by removing the words on construction projects, so it'll read, promote coordination, dissemination of real-time traveler information to minimize travel delay.

Daniel Cressy asked I'm wondering, like, are folks really focused on construction, and is there value in actually putting that word in there?

Rachael Shaw said I know Jamie's not on today, but I think the recommendation partly came from Placer County TART at the last committee of some of the travel delays with transit and construction projects, and needing that coordination, between knowing what's happening and shifting, allowing buses through if they're at the front of the queue, so I think there might be value in still including that, but it doesn't need to be limited to it.

Gavin Feiger said you could add some focus on, the busiest time, peak season in construction, or something like that, just so it shows a little bit of prioritization towards those times, or a little bit of focus on those.

Rachael Shaw said the recommendations are meant to narrow us in on what's the priority. Broad is good, but it also can be helpful to know what the top priority would be.

Gavin Feiger said next year, they're going to replace the Meeks Bridge, Caltrans will, so that'll really mess with Emerald Bay, the north route. We have a policy, or we develop some kind of policy that transit should be prioritized, maybe there's something there? I don't know where this goes, where this all heads. Can we do anything to try to get Caltrans and NDOT to prioritize transit? If people are waiting for a half hour, is there any way they can coordinate it so they close it right after the bus goes through? It seems like there's pretty small operational things that can be done to make transit a little more desirable.

Rachael Shaw said it might be good to connect with Placer County, because I think they did have a little bit of success of if the bus is at the front of the line to let them through, before stopping traffic.

Michelle Glikert continued summary of the recommendations. Remote coordination and dissemination of real-time traveler information during busy times and on construction projects, during construction season? During construction season to minimize travel dela and provide priority for transit, with consideration to prioritizing transit. Okay, so we have only two changes. One addition, multimodal, and a little bit of rewording under the auto.

Dave Solaro made a motion to transmit the 2026 Transportation Sustainable Communities Performance and Recommendations Report with the two identified additions during this meeting to the TRPA Governing Board. The motion was seconded Jim Marino.

Motion carried by unanimous vote,

DRAFT

7. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS

No further comments.

8. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS – ON ANY ITEM

None.

9. ADJOURMENT

Rachael Shaw adjourned the meeting at 2:55 p.m.

DRAFT

Respectfully submitted,

Jessica Gillies,
Senior Management Assistant

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