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

Zoom TRPA April 26, 2023

Meeting Minutes

CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Ms. Faustinos called the meeting to order at 11:30 a.m. on April 26, 2023.

Members present: Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Mr. Rice, Mr. Settelmeyer and Ms. Williamson.

Members absent: None.

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Regan stated no changes to the agenda.

Chair Faustinos deemed the agenda approved as posted.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Williamson moved approval of the February, 2023 minutes as presented.

Motion carried by voice vote.

III. RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF DRAFT FISCAL YEAR 2023/24 TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY TRANSPORATION PLANNING OVERALL WORK PROGRAM (OWP)

Deputy Director Kim Chevalier introduced the four items on the agenda, focusing on funding and regional transportation planning, with three items requiring action and one for information.

Michelle Glickert presented the Transportation Planning Overall Work Program (OWP) for the fiscal year 2023-24. This OWP serves as the budget and detailed work plan for the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO).

Judy Weber discussed the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP), which documents recently awarded funding for RTP transportation projects, and also covered the projects forward with the Regional Grant Program.

Nick Haven presented a long-term funding strategy for the RTP, aiming to fill a \$20 million annual funding gap through a collaborative partnership between federal, state, and local entities.

Michelle Glickert provided an overview of the OWP, highlighting various work elements. Work element 101 encompassed administration and program management. Work element 102

focused on transit planning support, and work element 103 covered public outreach and collaboration.

Regional and intermodal planning (work element 104) included safety planning, transit planning support, congestion management, and park-and-ride development. Work element 105 addressed regional transportation data collection and modeling efforts.

Work element 106 focused on tracking, financial management, and grant administration, including federal programming and ongoing tasks related to transportation projects. Work element 107 focused on performance-based planning, including performance management processes, transportation reports, and policy development.

Additionally, work element 108 centered on sustainable communities planning, seeking to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles traveled. The plan included initiatives such as an update to the Electric Vehicle Readiness Plan, regional parking management evaluations, and transportation technology advancements.

The presentation received feedback and comments, some requiring minor adjustments related to budget estimates and project design considerations. The schedule involved finalizing the OWP for submission to state and federal partners before the May 15th deadline.

Throughout the presentation, several staff members, including Kim Chevalier, Michelle Glickert, Judy Weber, and Nick Haven, presented or contributed to various aspects of the Transportation Planning Overall Work Program and related planning initiatives.

Committee Member Comments

The committee members expressed appreciation for the comprehensive overview presented by Kim and Michelle. They delved into specific aspects, such as the sustainable communities portion, transit electrification, and the need for clearer budget breakdowns aligning with programmatic objectives, particularly in public outreach. There were inquiries about staff allocations for transportation action plan implementation and the reflection of project changes, such as the South Shore Community Revitalization Project's evolution.

Public Comment

During the public comment, concerns were raised about the proposed hubs by the TTD (Tahoe Transportation District). The speaker mentioned a recent public presentation where 75 people voiced opposition to the hub proposal, particularly against locating it in Incline Village. They highlighted the TTD's purchase of the old elementary school, which has sparked worry, especially considering the potential transfer of ownership within agencies, potentially affecting the local middle school. The concern stemmed from the recent condemnation of the middle school by the Washoe County School District, despite a reported increase in the local youth population. The speaker expressed worry about the possible transfer of the elementary school property, already owned by TTD, to the middle school due to interagency relationships, urging attention to potential negative impacts on Incline Village.

The motion proposed was to request the approval of the draft fiscal year 2023-24 TRPA (Tahoe Regional Planning Agency) TMPO (Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization) Transportation

Planning Overall Work Program. The motion passed with unanimous approval from the committee members present.

Presentation can be found here: <u>https://www.TRPA.gov/wp-content/uploads/EITPO-Agenda-</u> <u>Item-No-4-Briefing-on-Tahoe-Transportation-District-Activities.pdf</u>

IV. RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF 2023 FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (FTIP) AMENDMENT NO. 1

The presentation covered Amendment One to the 2023 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP). Judy Weber, the Transportation Planner, outlined six Nevada projects within the amendment:

SR 28 Projects: These involved pavement rehabilitation, stormwater improvements, and other infrastructure enhancements. Two projects were added, focusing on shoreline preservation and a Spooner mobility hub.

Updates to Existing SR 28 Central Corridor Projects: These included updates in scope, funding, and titles for projects like San Harbor to Thunderbird Cove and Chimney Beach to Secret Harbor.

Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) Projects: Amendments were related to transit fleet and administration facilities, along with the Kale Drive Complete Street project. Weber detailed the amendment process, highlighting the public comment period, which resulted in suggestions and inquiries related to parking reservation systems, the mobility hub, specific project details, and opposition to certain projects.

The next steps involved the governing board's approval, submission to Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) for state approval, and ultimately, submission to the Federal Highway Administration for final approval. Weber requested adoption of the amendment and assured that any comments or questions would be addressed before submission.

The presentation aimed to gain approval for the amendment and incorporate any relevant comments or queries before the final submission.

Committee Member Comments

John Friedrich started the conversation revolved around a proposed allocation of \$2 million for a transportation facility. Some committee members express concerns about locking in the location to Douglas County and raise questions about the suitability of the location concerning ridership distribution and future electric bus needs.

There's a notable discussion on the need for electrification, citing California's mandate for zero-emission purchases starting in 2029. The absence of plans for charging infrastructure raises concerns. Committee members suggest a need for a more flexible approach, considering ongoing planning processes and emphasizing the importance of adequate facilities for maintaining buses, regardless of their fuel source.

There's debate on whether specific language referencing Douglas County is necessary due to existing congressional spending designated for Nevada. Members express concerns about potentially losing federal funding if the location specificity is altered.

The conversation highlights a tension between the need to secure funding and the desire for a more comprehensive planning process to determine the ideal location for servicing buses, especially considering future electrification goals and ridership patterns.

Public Comment

Steve Dolan, representing Friends of Third Creek and Incline Village. First, thank you for listening to a 7-year dialogue about having the Spooner area considered for parking. Coming in a little disturbing related to that is taking the parking or transferring the parking from Sand Harbor, which has been a battle since they decided to enforce no parking on the highway 28. And they moved that parking into Incline, where it has trashed our interior neighborhoods and our exterior neighborhoods regarding the transportation facility, fleet facility, as an organization to protect the lake. I can't imagine that you would want to have all of those vehicles being managed with their grime and their gas and their oil in the basin. So Douglas County sounds reasonable, and Carson City is where half of our workforce fleet comes from. They already drive over the mountain to get to Incline to work both in housing and building and any number of things. So I would say that's really the best place for this fleet hub. Just to protect the lake, if nothing else. You'd rather have everybody going there, and it's fairly close to South Shore, which really needs it. So thank you for that.

Steve Teshara representing his company Sustainable Community Advocates. I appreciate the discussion; however, I think we've gone a little far afield from what the action item is before you today, which is to amend the F-tip to allow projects that have federal funding into the Regional Transportation Plan through the federal process. So we've gotten a little bit far afield from that. Let me put the comments that Executive Director Reagan made in a slightly different context. We have this funding, the 2 million dollars for the facility potentially in Douglas County from Congressman Amodei. And we did work very closely with the Congressman on the issue, and if we start making changes to congressionally designated funds that are delivered to Tahoe, I think we undermine our work with Congress and our delegation to bring those funds to Tahoe. There is a number of other advantages to the Douglas County site which haven't been brought up this morning. I won't go into that now because I don't want to run afoul of the agenda item before you. But I encourage the committee today to unanimously adopt the program that's been presented by staff as presented. Thank you.

Andy Chapman, President CEO of Travel North Tahoe, Nevada, and the TTD Board Representative for the Tahoe North Tracking North Tahoe Transportation Management Association. It's been a great conversation regarding this. We had a very similar conversation at the TTD board as well, and it was recognized, and I heard a few comments that multiple facilities are going to be needed around this lake as we look to deal with the transportation issues and the opportunities that will be with us. This site could and would service both south shore and the Tahoe East Shore, which includes the East Shore Express facilities that the TTD operates, and the Tahoe Washoe area. I do encourage the committee to recommend this amended F-tip for full approval and appreciate the time. Thank you.

Final Committee Member Comments

The motion put forward was to approve the 2023 Federal Transportation Improvement Program Amendment Number One, as presented. There were concerns about the alignment of plans and the allocation of funds before finalizing a comprehensive plan. Members discussed whether this facility should be the singular hub or one of multiple facilities considering charging, fueling, and servicing needs for buses around the region.

Wes Rice made the motion, clarifying that it was a recommendation to the TMPO Governing board, not an immediate approval by the committee. Some members expressed concerns about committing to a specific direction before completing planning processes and felt that this approach seemed like putting the cart before the horse. However, staff recommended moving forward to secure funding, suggesting the opportunity to amend the project later to reflect the outcomes of the planning process.

Despite reservations from some members, the motion was passed with a majority vote, leading to the approval of the amendment.

Presentation can be found here: <u>https://www.TRPA.gov/wp-content/uploads/EITPO-Item-No-5-</u> <u>Vision-Zero-Strategy-Safety-Plan-Update.pdf</u>

V. RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF 2023 REGIONAL GRANT PROGRAM BRIEFING AND ADOPTION OF THE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION PROGRAM OF PROJECTS

Judy Weber led the presentation, focusing on the 2023 Regional Grant Program and the Active Transportation Program (ATP) project recommendations. This program handles the allocation of Federal and State funds for transportation projects through a competitive process, emphasizing regional goals.

The Regional Grant Program, initiated in 2017, has evolved to efficiently administer funds by aligning with various funding sources instead of using separate funding cycles. Over time, it has awarded \$43 million to date, showcasing its effectiveness in streamlining and optimizing project implementation.

During the 2023 call for projects, 14 applications were received, requesting \$38.7 million in funding. A thorough evaluation was conducted by a cross-department review team, assessing applications based on criteria aligned with regional transportation plan goals. Seven projects, totaling \$11.1 million, were recommended for funding, focusing on pedestrian safety, shared-use paths, roundabouts, and micro-transit infrastructure.

The presentation highlighted specific projects recommended for funding in California, including pedestrian safety improvements in various locations, shared-use paths, and micro-transit charging infrastructure. Notably, Nevada projects were pending, and their funding recommendations would be addressed later.

Following the recommendation, the next steps were outlined, including updating the transportation tracker, programming projects into the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP), and obtaining final approvals from the California

Transportation Commission. Judy mentioned that some projects, particularly those receiving ATP funds, required board resolutions and final approvals from the commission, scheduled for their June meeting.

The presentation offered a detailed overview of the selection process, highlighted the recommended projects, and delineated the subsequent steps for approval and eventual implementation, ensuring alignment with regional transportation goals.

Committee Member Comments

The committee members expressed positive sentiments about the funding's impact on the basin's improvement and commended the presentation's comprehensive view of the projects. Member Ashley Conrad-Saydah appreciated seeing the collective impact of the projects, emphasizing their contribution to a cleaner, more livable basin and enhanced mobility without cars.

TRPA Executive Director Julie Regan clarified the scope of the resolution, noting that the action was limited to the active transportation projects and not the broader project selection. She highlighted the significance of securing funds as a larger Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) instead of a small rural one, thanks to the efforts of the partnership and stakeholders.

Director Regan emphasized the transition from mere planning to implementation due to increased Federal funding resulting from the region's reclassification. She stressed that while this was a step forward, there's still a considerable distance to cover in terms of meeting transportation needs in the area. Regan contextualized the significance of the funding and the ongoing advocacy for transportation improvements.

Overall, the commentary acknowledged the positive strides made through the funding while acknowledging the continued need for further progress and implementation.

Public Comment

Steve Teshara commented on behalf of Sustainable Community Advocates. I'm familiar with every one of these projects and urge the committee today to take the action recommended or you're considering by staff.

The motion made was to recommend the CMCO (Central Metropolitan Coordination Organization) Governing Board's adoption of the Attachment A Resolution 2023, which approves the active transportation program for the Metropolitan Planning Organization's program of projects.

The vote resulted in Mr. Rice, Mr. Friedrich, and Miss Williamson voting yes, along with Miss Conrad Seda. The motion passed.

Presentation can be found here: <u>https://www.TRPA.gov/wp-content/uploads/EITPO-Item-No-5-</u> <u>Vision-Zero-Strategy-Safety-Plan-Update.pdf</u>

VI. TRANSPORTATION FUNDING UPDATE

The presentation on transportation funding update was a joint effort by Julie Regan, TRPA Executive Director, and Nick Haven, Transportation Manager. They provided a comprehensive overview of the historical context, current initiatives, challenges, and the pathway for securing funding for transportation projects in the Tahoe Basin.

Julie Regan initiated the presentation, highlighting the significance of a shared funding commitment to transportation. She underscored the origins of this commitment, tracing it back to the by-state consultation aimed at aligning both California and Nevada to prioritize transportation at state and federal levels. This process culminated in the publication of a report and evolved into the Transportation Action Plan, focusing on regionally significant projects and sustainable funding mechanisms.

The presentation further delved into the complexities and challenges associated with securing adequate transportation funding. Julie emphasized the longstanding struggle in the region to address transportation needs and highlighted the emerging momentum through the newly established partnership.

Nick Haven took over to detail the collaborative efforts among various committees and boards, showcasing the alignment achieved in defining transportation goals and identifying funding gaps beyond the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). He highlighted the \$20 million annual funding gap and introduced the shared 7-7-7 funding approach, aimed at leveraging federal, state, and local funds.

Nick discussed the importance of tracking and demonstrating progress on new funding sources, stressing the need for sustained efforts to bridge the funding gap. He underscored the significance of the ongoing support for the partnership to attract new grant funding while exploring long-term sustainable funding sources.

Overall, the presentation focused on the region's historical struggle with transportation funding, the emerging momentum through collaborative efforts, and the strategic pathway forward to secure adequate funding for transportation projects in the Tahoe Basin. Both presenters emphasized the need for sustained commitment and highlighted the progress made toward aligning goals, solutions, and funding mechanisms for transportation initiatives.

Committee Member Comments

A committee member asked about the nature of the funding sources and whether they were for one-time projects or sustainable funds. Staff clarified that while the current funding mostly represents one-time allocations; it is new money secured for specific projects.

Another committee member requested a specific slide to be displayed for reference, discussing the alignment of goals and solutions before pursuing funding.

This member emphasized the importance of having alignment on projects before pursuing funding and asked about the benchmark or process for pursuing earmarks.

Staff reiterated the coordination process for funding requests and the need for project planning consistency. They highlighted the timing involved, noting that the lead time for these projects allows for extensive planning activities.

The committee member emphasized the need to avoid putting funding before project planning, urging that planning processes should precede the pursuit of funding to ensure alignment.

Staff provided clarification, mentioning that most of the local and private shared funding is sustainable. They highlighted the ongoing contribution from jurisdictions, almost reaching \$4 million annually for transit and transportation funding.

commended the local jurisdictions for their significant contributions, especially during times of constrained budgets, noting the importance of these contributions in operating the transit system.

These discussions underscored the importance of aligning projects with funding, avoiding premature funding commitments, and recognizing the value of sustainable funding sources provided by local jurisdictions for transportation initiatives in the region.

Public Comment

Doug Flaherty, on behalf of Tahoe clean air.org. I saw something about safety up there on your proposal. I first want to preface this, and I mean no disrespect. You guys have quite a scheme going it's taken me 6 years to figure it out. You interject your ideology projects at a low workshop committee or subcommittee level, under a process called leading small groups, you can look that up on Wikipedia. You work those up through these committees and subcommittees to make changes, socioeconomic changes, and which actually he called degradation of the Lake Tahoe environment. You do this by creating all these grant approvals before the public has really ever voted or figured out a way within the system to approve your spending, and that includes all your EIP projects, all the transportation projects without accumulative impact environmental analysis or cumulative impact environmental impact statement. The 2012 regional plan ais when it comes to private scheming towards, is outdated. It's not relevant. You want a couple of court cases. You've been involved in the past, but is saying ninth circuit. Judge said. He expects the controversy to continue regarding the relevance and the actions of the TRPA. Right now. You're involved in. But things can change so I would encourage you to pause. All major projects until you do a cumulative impact environmental statement which includes a roadway by roadway, wildfire, evacuation, assessment.

Gavin Feiger commented on behalf of the League to Save Lake Tahoe. Thanks for taking this on reminder. A lot of you were on the governing board when the VMT threshold was approved, April of 2021. The League was one of the major stakeholders leading up to that approval, but the stakeholder group, I mean 30 to 35 public and members of the public and local journalists, were involved in kind of the regional transportation plan and vehicle miles travel threshold updates as they went through together for about 2 years, 2019 to 2021. At the end of it, we came up with some automatic triggers and responses to make sure that we can implement the regional

transportation plan, which is fundamentally the mitigation for the regional plan, right? So here we are, 2 years later, the deadline is coming up. We did. Everybody did agree on it. At the end of this year, you know, 20 million annually, so sustainably or forecasted sustainably, is not coming in. All development will be VMT neutral in Tahoe, which is a very high bar. The event center achieved it, or is on track to achieve it, but they could probably talk to you about how difficult it was. So we hope not to get there. It's really exciting to see the locals kicking in, and I think to Cindy's point, there. It's true that money is sustainable, a lot of it's going to micro-transit, but that shows that there are projects out there that people want and that we can get support for so it's encouraging. That said, we're really not on track to meet the goal this year, so just want to encourage everybody to use all your connections as the League and all of our partners are to try to get this money coming in this year, and then we'll continue to work with staff on what the definition of a sustainable funding source is because there are a lot of nuances to it, and kind of thought about it when we were setting up the threshold. But, you know, here we are, so really need to figure it out over these next couple of months, and then hopefully, we can reach it by the end of this year, and if not, we're on a really solid track to reach it cause as a reminder that trigger for VMTneutral development. As soon as the funding source is coming in, that consequence goes away. So it's not like we have to wait another year, another 2 years to do a check as soon as we reach that milestone, development goes back to normal for Tahoe, what we have right now. So again, thanks for the good work and sticking with it. And let's make it happen this year, or as quick as possible.

Ann Nichols commented from Preservation Alliance. What's scary about all this is? You've all decided how this is all going to work, and there's a hundred 20 projects. And the public is going to be responsible for all the transit. But how is the public going to be responsible? How are you going to decide to get this money? Where did you get the 7 million? You say you already have. What are the benchmarks? Who is going to oversee it? Who's going to spend the money? TRPA. I don't know the 7-7-7 Plan is deeply flawed. It's vague. I mean, you know, we've written on this, and you're not doing anything, and you're not being transparent. The 120 projects all attract more people. They do not solve the transportation issues. You know, more trails, more for attractions. How is this going to help? So I really need, we need you guys to be, tell us how you are doing this, have public presentations about this 7-7 Plan. So we could tell you how badly written it is, anyway.

VII. UPCOMING TOPICS

Kim Chevalier provided an overview of the upcoming topics in Agenda Item 7. The focus was on environmental improvement projects scheduled for the upcoming summer. Key points included:

Environmental Improvement Projects Update: An update on various environmental improvement projects set for the summer was highlighted. This would include progress reports on MOU (Memorandum of Understanding) implementation from collaborating partners.

Restoration Projects and Field Visit: Emphasized the intention to engage in restoration projects and potentially organize a field visit in the future to observe and assess these projects firsthand.

Quarterly Updates on 7-7-7 Strategy: There was a commitment to continue providing regular quarterly updates on the 7-7-7 strategy.

Overall, the upcoming discussions and activities were centered around environmental projects, collaborations with partners, potential field visits, and continued reporting on the 7-7-7 strategy.

Julie Regan, the Executive Director of TRPA, expressed gratitude to the committee for the excellent discussion. She acknowledged Judy Weber, a veteran transportation planner at TRPA, who was addressing the committee for the first time. Julie highlighted Judy's extensive knowledge of the F. Tip (likely an internal system or process) and commended her for doing an exceptional job.

Julie wanted to ensure that this acknowledgment was officially recorded. She extended thanks to the staff, recognizing their tremendous efforts and the value they bring to the organization.

Committee Comments

None.

Public Comments

None.

VIII. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS

None.

IX. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Steve Dolan of friends of Third Creek, Incline Village commented. In this discussion this Board has talked a lot about transportation funding, and I participated or spoke in opposition to bills AB 424, and ACR 5 when they were presented. I'm sorry, but I did not do that because of anything wrong with TRPA. What is wrong is that the TRPA, according to a former executive director, emeritus Marchetta, is that there's a MOU, memoranda of understanding, between the TRPA and the Lake Tahoe Basin management of the Unit (LTBMU) of the US Forest Service which prevents the TRPA from enforcing best management practices. I have here the evidence that I mentioned down at the Assembly, and a Powerpoint. If I can get your business cards I'll give it to you via email, if you're interested. I really would like to see the TRPA be able to enforce these things, because just at Incline Village and the Incline Lake Dam Removal project for the USFS, I documented for Director Marchetta unmitigated dust, no filter fencings, no waddles, no ponds to hold when they divert the thing. Then they got a letter based on our information from the NDOT, protesting the siphoning and pumping of water from the creeks and the streams, and the ponds in the meadow up there that has been created by the removal of the dam. So there's a lot going on, and they are the number one violator of best management practices for the basin and TRPA doesn't have the power to go after them for that. I think there are back doors open, possibly, but that's not what you need and so I'm here to inform you that I am trying to get the TRPA the authority to manage the basin with the Federal Forest Service.

Doug Flaherty commented on behalf of TahoeCleanAir.org. Just wondering why the TRPA has not taken one of its main Government partners, which is the USFS, to task on their intentional practice of wildfire growth for forest resource purposes. The Tamarack Fire, the Caldor Fire, the

Dixie Fire, and on and on and on. For the last several years has deposited enormous amounts, of phosphorus, nitrogen, and sediment into the waters of Lake Tahoe, which are impaired under the Clean Water Act. Yet the TRPA sits silently. While our citizens, our wildlife, our air quality, our water is degraded. There are many lawsuits in play right now regarding the USFS' purposeful use of wildfire. Not a word from you guys. Amazing. Do you see the Davis State of the Lake report sites specifically 5 wildfires just in the last 2 years that has significantly degraded Lake Tahoe, and deposited phosphorus, nitrogen, carbon, carbon, and sediment in the Lake, where where's the TRPA been on this? Oh, they're one of our partners. You guys have to take note of this and enforce your own rules along with the lawn water district and put a stop to this.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Williamson moved to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned 12:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Katherine Huston Paralegal, TRPA

The above meeting was recorded in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the recording may find it at <u>https://www.TRPA.gov/meeting-materials/</u>. 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 <u>virtualmeetinghelp@TRPA.gov</u>.