TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
GOVERNING BOARD

TRPA/Zoom October 22, 2025

Meeting Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Ms. Williamson called the meeting to order at 10:29 a.m.

Members present: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Aguilar, Mr. Bass, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hays, Mr. Hoenigman, Mr. Kieckhefer, Ms. Laine, Ms. Leumer, Mr. Rice, Mr. Settelmeyer, Ms. Williamson

Members absent: Ms. Hill

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS

Gavin Feiger, League to Save Lake Tahoe's comments are on the Cultivating Community, Conserving the Basin agenda item. He thanked staff and the board members that have been through all the meetings for the Tahoe Living Working Group and the community meetings. Staff have done a good listening to all the different local jurisdictions and community members, all of which have different priorities, wants, and desires. The policy proposals in the packet today do a good job reflecting all that and sometimes disparate input. Coverage and development rights give us heartache. Coverage in particular. We have the soils threshold, it's hard to imagine a world in which that threshold could be achieved and maintained without the coverage restrictions staying in place as they are today. There may be some room, as in Phase 2, to look at how stormwater is treated from projects, area-wide stormwater systems. Some enhanced coverage if BMPs are enforced, or on-site treatment and the maintenance of those systems is somehow enforced. As of now, we're not in favor of changing coverage requirements. We don't see how we could continue to achieve and maintain our soils threshold by doing so.

There are some creative solutions for Development Rights. The growth cap has to remain intact. I think that'll come out in the Environmental Impact Statement that's being prepared. We submitted written comments which have our high-level positions bolded.

John Grigsby, 15-year resident of Stateline. I prefer to assume that everyone is acting in good faith and helping us reach solutions that benefit everyone. By extension, the extensive work of the Mountainside Plan is perhaps proof of this, so, I take no pleasure in informing you of the following. The Resolution of Enforcement Action Barton Healthcare System is based on materially and provably false statements by Barton representatives, which the Legal Committee has unfortunately accepted and which could expose the TRPA to future liability. You should not accept them, and Item 4 should be removed from consent.

The narrative in the staff report is that Barton originally complied with their interim BMPs,

approved June 11, 2024, but that the TRPA came to Barton later in the year and asked for additional work which wasn't negotiated or completed in time, causing several smaller muddy discharges and the massive one beginning January 31, 2025. This narrative was repeated explicitly at the committee meeting. This narrative is false. The photographs I submitted with my public comment, which were taken on February 1, 2025, show that Barton performed none of the grading required by the interim BMPs. Specifically, they did not grade to the slopes and contours shown on pages C4 and C5 of the plans. They did not add the retention berms, flood control wattles and this was not an accident or an innocent misunderstanding. They simply refused to do the work.

My photographs show that Barton dug a giant unpermitted drainage pit in summer 2024, drained the site, and then compacted it to 92 percent directly against the approved interim BMPs and with no permits. This compaction and the lack of grading caused the muddy runoff events.

In summary, this was not an innocent misunderstanding. Barton did not do the work required by their interim BMPs, causing the discharges. They did unpermitted work instead that made the discharges worse, and the staff report uncritically accepts materially false statements from Barton representatives. This not only makes a joke of the BMP process showing that we should ignore the TRPA entirely and simply pay a perfunctory fine afterwards that costs a lot less than compliance with the BMPs would have. It also potentially exposes the TRPA to future liability.

Ellie Waller said there is no disrespect for the Legal Committee and how they run their meetings. But I am struggling to understand the definition of "routine issues" on consent. She's requesting that Item No. 4 on the consent calendar be pulled. I agree with most of the comments that Mr. Grigsby made. It's a violation fee of $50,000. There were approximately 120 pages of public comment provided, I don't think that's very routine. I also don't think that the Legal Committee had a very robust discussion with the public. I'm sure there's been plenty of discussion with staff. I also contacted the Douglas County Manager to make sure that I don't misquote, Douglas County takes no position on the $50,000. They welcome any contributions toward the maintenance of the infiltration site. They did not say one way or another if that is enough for that site. I believe if you do a project and we've had issues in the past with maintenance and operational effectiveness, which was in one of my comments. I've taken a lot of time and effort to present issues like fencing. Thank you to Ms. Aldean for bringing up a portion of the fencing, but there's derelict fencing. I provided photographic evidence. Why is it still sitting there? That is not good, best management practice.

I don't think the fine aligns with past issues that have been brought forward through another one of my comments, where there could have been incremental fines, so the $50,000 could have added up to something more significant. Not sure how that will be handled in the future. I would also like to see some breakdown or evidence of the million dollars that was quoted by the attorney of BMP activity that has taken place on the site. Maybe it could be posted on the major project site. I hope this is pulled for further discussion. You can't cover up mistakes of the past—literally.

John Hitchcock, City of South Lake Tahoe expressed the city's support for the policy updates to the TRPA Code of Ordinances through the Cultivating Community process. We hope that staff found our input in the process meaningful and will lead to increased opportunities of housing of all types. Some of the input we provided was directed from our city council and other are real-world examples as the city implements projects on behalf of TRPA in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Most of the barriers that we discovered related primarily to coverage, development rights, development rights transfers, mitigation fees, and design and density standards. For example, we encourage TRPA to re-look at the density standards for mixed-use development. Currently, the way

that it's structured, if you add a residential component to a commercial project, your density is automatically reduced in half. That standard doesn't apply in area plans but does apply outside area plans. Examples that we encourage TRPA to look at are transfer development rights to properties that have legally conforming development on sensitive lands. Under today's TRPA code, you can tear down development on sensitive land and rebuild it "as is" in its current location.

However, if you want to add a new residential use to it, for example, you want to build an accessory dwelling unit (ADU), you're restricted from doing so because you're increasing vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Even though you're not having an impact on coverage, you're not creating new coverage, all you're doing is rebuilding on the existing coverage. For example, the city worked with an individual who had existing one-story garage. She wanted to build a two-story garage and put an ADU on top. However, she was not able to do that because her parcel was identified as a stream environment zone. Or what she could do is an accessory living facility without a kitchen. The city doesn't see any distinction between the two, an accessory living facility and an accessory dwelling unit. We. encourage TRPA to take a look at that. If there's no impact on coverage, you should let an ADU be built.

Another example for us is a Chevy site. That is also identified as a stream environment zone. That parcel has sat vacant for many years. We're trying to get it redeveloped. However, it's been difficult, and most developers have told us it's not feasible to do so, especially if they're interested in redeveloping the site as a mixed-use project. If they were interested in transferring residential units as part of their commercial project, they would be required to retire 1,200 square feet per residential unit that's transferred in. Assuming you can transfer 20 units on that parcel, you basically would have to restore half the site, and it makes the project infeasible.

We would like more coverage for multi-family housing and Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU). This is limiting the number of ADUs and reduces the units in multi-family projects even with all the other levers pulled for free Residential Units of Use (RUU)s, increased height, density, and other incentives. The city provides development rights and coverage for free to multi-family properties and ADUs, even if they are not deed restricted to income levels. The city deed-restricts these properties to not be used as vacation home rentals. This is the only way we have seen any multi-family units developed in the city.

The city would also like more local government control of development standards and zoning. The City is interested in aligning with Senate Bill 9 and allowing more duplexes and multi-family units in more areas. The city includes the largest number of affordable housing in the Tahoe Basin and the largest number of multi-family units in all jurisdictions in the Tahoe Basin. Because of the large amount of affordable units, we believe there should be incentives for the development of market rate and affordable multi-family housing. We need more housing for all income types.

Ted Wendell said I am requesting a re-evaluation of my incorrectly scored lot, based on the factual information documentation, and expert data I have already submitted to TRPA. The information that I've provided, including professional topographic surveys, engineering data, and verifiable records-clearly demonstrates that the original scoring of my property was flawed and does not accurately reflect its true environmental conditions. The fees I have paid to TRPA are not viewed as a loss but as an investment in my property and in the pursuit of a fair and accurate review. However, TRPA's current policies appear structured in a way that removes accountability for previous errors. The agency is not disputing the facts I have presented-only denying my request based on internal policy, which is blatantly unfair and inconsistent with TRPA's mission to ensure equitable and scientifically sound decision-making. During this process, I was informed that my lot

would not be re-evaluated based on TRPA's policy concerning Placer County's "sliver lots." These parcels are located more than 20 miles away from my property in South Lake Tahoe and have no physical, hydrological, or environmental relevance to my site. How can such distant and unrelated lots be used as justification in this equation? This reasoning lacks logic, fairness, and scientific relevance to the specific characteristics of my property.

TRPA's legal counsel publicly stated that the factual information and data I provided were "manufactured." This statement is both false and defamatory. My findings are supported by multiple credentialed experts including surveyors, engineers, and field professionals-whose work and reputations validate the legitimacy of my evidence. If I were to combine my existing parcel numbers, TRPA regulations would permit the construction of a single dwelling unit on the same property. This contradiction further underscores the need for a fair re-evaluation. In light of the substantial evidence and clear errors in the original assessment, I request that TRPA re-score my lot, taking into account all the verified facts, expert testimony, and documented improvements already presented.

Ann Nichols, North Tahoe Preservation Alliance is commenting on the Cultivating Community Policy Package. Renaming Phase 3 as Cultivating Community is confusing and misleading. We've already gone through Phase 1 and 2. Changing the name midstream suggests this is a new initiative when it is the continuation of a single multi-phase housing deregulation effort. The segmentation of these policy changes is inappropriate and warrants a single basin-wide environmental impact statement analyzing the cumulative effects of Phases 1 to 3 together. Phase 2 was sold to us on the guarantee that increased heights, density, and coverage would remain within existing town centers.

Now, TRPA proposes expanding these boundaries and extending the same incentives to non-deed-restricted market-rate projects. That breaks faith with the public. Phases 1 to 3 were all justified on the promise of incentivized, deed-restricted, affordable housing. To now shift those incentives to market-rate multi-family development is hypocrisy. Besides the fact that achievable housing cannot be financed and allows people a 30-hour work week, who is going to verify that?

Meanwhile, key community priorities, especially short-term rental regulation, have been ignored. There are many options to explore sustainable funding sources from a luxury home transfer tax or a targeted transient occupancy tax. Finally, proposals to exempt Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) or certain projects from development rights, land coverage, or environmental review would further erode the integrity of TRPA's growth management system and its credibility to the public. Streamlining reviews while expanding town centers is not environmental protection, it's regulatory abandonment. We have been complaining for years that there’s no cap on the conversions of Commercial Floor Area (CFA) to Tourist Accommodation Units (TAU) or vice versa. And there are millions of square feet of CFA. You say there's a cap on development; how do you do that? TRPA must restore transparency, conduct a single EIS for all housing phases, and return to its mission of protecting the environment and serving Tahoe's year-round residents, not developers.

Alan Miller, Environmental and Civil Engineer with a 25-year regulatory background, including enforcement with the California Regional Water Quality Control Board. Comments are on Item number 4 on the consent calendar. I agree with others that it doesn’t belong on consent and there should be an open public hearing about it. I also don’t agree with certain comments that were made by your general counsel about the manner of enforcement through the courts, that they have to prevent disclosure of information to the public concerning the nature, extent, and magnitude of the potential fines associated with the violations, and the number of violations, etc. Mr. St. Michel said it’s because TRPA doesn’t have the administrative powers to assign fines, so

they have to do these settlements, etc. When I worked for the Water Board, we had to lay all our cards on the table, and we had to be willing to defend our actions before the board, knowing that it ultimately was final and could end up in court. If we weren't prepared to go to court with it, we probably weren't on very justifiable grounds. I'm not suggesting that certain things can't be kept confidential, settlement negotiations being part of that but even the settlements have to come forward publicly, as here. There needs to be a lot more detail and information disclosed. You're the public servants; you're not working on behalf of just the development community here. That's the essence of my comment. I suggest not to do this on consent, or to bring it back at another time. The magnitude of the fines is substantially underestimated. I don't know how far back he went in looking at previous fines that had been issued for similar violations. And if that was under Mr. Marshall and Ms. Marchetta, I don't have any good feeling about that.

Robb Olson expressed his support for Item IX. the proposed policy package, Cultivating Community, Conserving the Basin. As a member of the Tahoe Living Working Group and as the contractor's representative, This package has the potential to significantly increase the number of workforce housing units in our community while improving the environment.

While I support the entire package, we should keep looking at all options. I particularly endorse the following proposals:

Scaling development rights: This approach will allow plan density to reach capacity more efficiently and thoughtfully without increasing overall plan density.

Accessory dwelling units: ADUs, as accessories, should not require residential units of use or development rights, consistent with other accessories in the TRPA code. Additionally, I support decreasing coverage requirements for ADUs.

Lower and deferred fees: Lowering fees and deferring them until final inspection would provide a crucial financial runway for projects. I also suggest immediately deferring fees on all workforce housing projects until this policy package is finalized. This would encourage current projects such as ours, with a 30-unit project ready to break ground next year to move forward during this upcoming building season. Knowing that they could benefit from any fee adjustment made before final inspection would help projects such as this.

Land coverage: Providing the public with more options to protect the environment while allowing for the highest and best use of land is an excellent incentive. Adjusting development standards and town center boundaries: While not suggesting all areas become town centers, expanding these boundaries could create more opportunities for workforce housing.

Securing subsidy funding: I advocate for securing subsidy funding for workforce housing, potentially through a transfer tax or through fees on short term rentals that are currently applied to other commercial projects. Equitable application of these fees could generate substantial funds to support workforce housing construction. Thank you for your efforts in moving these important initiatives forward as quickly as possible.

Laura Patten, League to Save Lake Tahoe comments are on the Thresholds. Environmental thresholds are at the heart of TRPA's mandate under the Bi-State Compact. There are scientific and policy foundations for protecting Lake Tahoe's unique environment and grounding all of the regional decisions. We appreciate the thoughtful, science-based work that TRPA and its partners have put into updating the forest health and water quality thresholds. Standards that really must be achieved and maintained. These updates are essential to ensuring Tahoe's management

framework reflects the realities of today's environmental challenges, from climate change and wildfire to aquatic invasive species impacts.

We encourage TRPA to build on this progress by updating all of the environmental thresholds before the next threshold evaluation. Modern, relevant standards across every resource area are critical for effective adaptive management and for protecting the environmental water quality and resilience of the Tahoe Basin to keep Tahoe blue. We strongly support a comprehensive basin-wide threshold update process that's grounded in the best available science, transparent methods, and community input as well. We'll continue to support this important work as the threshold update process moves forward. Thanks again for your continued leadership in advancing Tahoe's Environmental Protection Framework.

Melissa Soderston, South Lake Tahoe resident comments are on Item IX.B, specifically the Forest Health and Watershed portion. What we're seeing right now is not forest health, and it is certainly not providing any wildfire protection. I encourage all of you to go out and tour these sites on a regular basis and see what they look like as time goes on. In particular, the ones that are occurring on the South Shore. The trees that are being removed are the largest and most fire-resilient of our trees. We are seeing incredible drying of the ecosystems. This BurnBot project that we are seeing currently on the South Shore has left enormous amounts of slash. It left trees and shrubs that were ripped out, a foot high of debris and slash, plenty of places for embers to land.

We do know that the climate is rapidly changing, and the only thing that we can be guaranteed is that it is going to continue to change, and that there is nothing that we can do to stop it. We need to focus on what we can control, which is our built environment. These forest thinning and forest health projects are not doing what they purport. They are giving a false sense of security so people are not doing their proper defensible space work. We hear constantly that they don't need to do the work on their home because it's happening out in the forest to protect them. We need to get all of the funding away from these massive landscape-scale projects and focus on the built environment. We are not seeing any thinning occurring along our evacuation routes, we're not seeing it happen adjacent to our communities. We are just seeing entire ecosystems devastated, at the same time that our bears are being slaughtered for simply trying to find alternative food sources as we are destroying all of theirs. They are not leaving anything left for wildlife to eat at the very time of year that they are trying to forage and store all of their food for winter. It's egregious, and disgusting.

I don't think you are seeing what's happening, I think you're taking the word of what agencies are telling you. See the size of these trees and the amount of slash that's being left behind, and it is not going to stop a wind-driven fire. There is an enormous amount of peer-reviewed evidence out there, not coming from the Forest Service, that shows that none of this works. We saw it in Lahaina, Los Angeles, Texas, and Colorado. We are patting ourselves on the back for the good that we're doing for the environment while we're watching it be destroyed. Stop funding the destruction of our environment and focus on the built environment, which we can control. Do not increase coverage, because allowing people to share coverage elsewhere does nothing to improve the flow of water on my property.

Tobi Tyler, retired environmental engineer, speaking on behalf of the Sierra Club Tahoe Area Group regarding the Cultivating Communities item and the Barton construction site, if I have time. We object to the rebranding of this Phase 3 Tahoe Housing Amendment and remind you that under both National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) piecemealing, the practice of dividing a single project into smaller, separate components to avoid a

comprehensive environmental review is illegal. The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must include all three phases of TRPA's housing amendments. The cumulative nature of these amendments demands a comprehensive basin-wide EIS/EIR evaluating all the various, as well as cumulative impacts, dating back to the 2012 Regional Plan Update. When Phase 2 was approved, TRPA assured the public that any increases in height, density, and coverage would be confined to existing town centers. Now, the proposal is to expand town center boundaries and extend development incentives to projects that are not deed-restricted. This is a clear breach of public trust.

Short-term rentals need to be addressed by requiring STR operators to obtain Tourist Accommodation Units (TAU) and to contribute to mitigation fees to workforce housing programs. Additionally, exempting Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) and other projects from development rights, coverage limits, or environmental review and expanding town centers while reducing oversight does not protect Lake Tahoe. It accelerates its decline. TRPA must restore transparency, prepare a single comprehensive EIS/EIR covering all housing phases, and reaffirm its core mission to protect the Lake Tahoe environment while supporting the people who live and work here year-round, not to serve speculative development interests.

Regarding the Barton construction site which I submitted written comments on and TRPA's lax enforcement, we urge TRPA and the Governing Board to strengthen enforcement actions over Barton and other construction sites in the basin and to commit to genuine accountability and transparency in their reporting.

Finally, I object to the change in your public comment procedures once again. The deletion of public comments during the discussion of a decision item on the agenda is tantamount to censorship. It is clear you have no desire to hear public comments, which further erodes public trust. Without the ability for the public to provide comments after the staff presentation, the public is shut out of the process, and public comments presented much earlier in the meeting are completely ignored. We urge you to reinstate public comments.

Alexis Ollar, Mountain Area Preservation commenting on the draft policy recommendations for Cultivating Community, Conserving the Basin. I appreciate the staff report's commitment to maintaining the growth caps and it is important to continue. While deed-restricted workforce housing and affordable housing has been the goal, that needs to be maintained. Allowing these types of incentive packages to benefit market-rate housing or future luxury housing is counter to the vision and goals of this process. I stress our concern with the concept of increased coverage. That is also counter to the goals of this process. We know that the science shows increased coverage creates more sediment loads into Tahoe, and we need to be maintaining the health, not continuing to degrade the health. There are ways that we can do this and continue to advance workforce housing, deed restricted workforce housing, and affordable housing without increasing environmental degradation. Just as the league stressed, increasing coverage will create that environmental degradation, so we would really appreciate that the item of increased coverage be removed. Additionally, there have been discussions of exemptions, such as accessory dwelling units being exempt, and this pertains back to the concern of the growth cap being maintained. Any new development needs to have an associated bonus unit or tourist accommodation unit tied to this. We need to ensure that the transparency of accounting for these future units, whether they are deed restricted workforce housing or deed-restricted affordable, counts toward that growth cap. That is critical for monitoring and enforcement, not only for TRPA, but as we start to look at future housing being converted.

Lastly, we continue to echo our desire to see programs such as down payment assistance and lease-to-locals be prioritized. Every single workshop this has been brought up; it's the low-hanging fruit, and there are great examples to look at. We will continue to ask TRPA to prioritize this. While TRPA is prioritizing everyone changing their codes to advance housing, it can also prioritize programs that create current deed-restricted housing with our current inventory.

Niobe Burden, Conservation photographer, Tahoe advocate from Tahoe Vista, and part of the Sierra Club Tahoe Area Group comments are on Agenda Item IX.B. I'd like to commend TRPA staff for their progress in developing a new framework to update the environmental threshold standards. The proposed goals, objective strategies and tactics structure, and the effort to align objectives with SMART criteria (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, and Time-framed) is an important step toward improving transparency and accountability. That said, I have a concern that the foundation of this framework relies solely on the 2018 Tahoe Science Advisory Council Work Order Memorandum and earlier referenced materials. In the seven years since that document was prepared, our understanding of the basin's environment and recreation dynamics has advanced dramatically. The scientific community, particularly UC Davis, Tahoe Environmental Research Center (TERC), the Desert Research Institute (DRI), the US Geological Survey USGS), and the Tahoe Science Advisory Council (TSAC) itself, have since developed new measurable indicators that reflect how climate change, population growth, and increased recreation pressure are impacting Lake Tahoe. These advances include real-time water quality monitoring, remote sensing of shoreline and vegetation change, and visitor use data that better capture recreation impacts in both access and experience.

To ensure the updated threshold framework is credible and effective, these new indicators and technologies must be fully integrated, not just referenced or summarized from past studies, because the framework is only as strong as the data supporting it. I encourage the board to consult directly with the scientific institutions collecting this data, UC Davis, TERC, DRI, USGS, and TSAC before finalizing SMART objectives or measurable indicators. The threshold system must reflect current science, not just administrative structure. In addition, I urge the governing board to initiate and fund a basin-wide carrying capacity study. This study should include subcategories for recreation facilities, trailheads, parking infrastructure, and shoreline access. A comprehensive analysis like this would provide the quantitative basis needed to set measurable objectives for the recreation threshold, and it would also inform wildfire evacuation planning, transportation modeling, and future updates to the Regional Plan. This is a rare opportunity to modernize TRPA's approach in a way that aligns data, science, and policy for the long-term protection of the Lake Tahoe Basin. Let's make sure the foundation we build today reflects the realities of 2025 and beyond, not the essentials of 2018.

Kristina Hill said I’ve spent over four decades in Lake Tahoe as an environmental planner. I worked at TRPA and served on the Washoe County Board of Adjustments and was also on Truckee North Tahoe Transportation Management Association, the TRPA Advisory Board, and have been a professional environmental consultant for the past 30 years. I believe the proposed amendments regarding the Cultivating Community pose a serious threat to the integrity of our region. This proposal is another major Regional Plan amendment allowing for more development in the form of housing. Housing will accommodate a larger population of retirees and second homeowners, but it is not going to solve Lake Tahoe’s problems. The plan will result in more land coverage and high-density development, creating decreased water quality, increased traffic, worsened air quality, and greater risk during wildfire evacuations.

There has been no evaluation of impacts on existing infrastructure, road levels of service, scenic

impacts, etc. The plan reeks of community degradation, not cultivation. And what about our spectacular lake? These housing models exist in places like Aspen, Park City, and Ketchum, Idaho, having visited these locations, there is no national treasure there comparable to ours. The quality and health of our lake are declining year after year, with more algae, more microplastics, more invasive species, and less clarity. This is what TRPA was founded to protect, not pave over, as currently proposed. Please keep these concerns in mind when reviewing TRPA's latest plan, which will forever change the character of our mountain communities.

IV. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Regan said there were no changes to the agenda.
Ms. Williamson deemed the agenda approved as posted.

V. Approval of September 24, 2025 Governing Board Minutes

Ms. Aldean moved approval of the September 24, 2025 minutes as presented.
Motion carried-voice vote.

VI. TRPA CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Amendment to Rule 16.2 of the TRPA Rules of Procedure regarding the basis by which fees are adjusted annually
2. Inflation Adjustments to TRPA Application Filing Fee Schedule, Mobility Mitigation Fees, and the Rental Vehicle Mitigation Fees
3. September Financials
4. Resolution of Enforcement Action: Barton Healthcare System, Failure of Required BMPs Resulting in Discharge of Sediment, 168 US Highway 50, Stateline, NV Assessor Parcel Number (APN) 1318-22-002-114, 1318-22-002-115, 1318-22-002-116, and 1318-22-002-117, TRPA File No. ERSP2024-0572
5. Fiscal Year 2025-2026 Transportation Committee Work Plan
6. National Community Planning Month Resolution
7. Consent to Proceed with Judicial Action if Necessary Depending on the Outcome of Ongoing Settlement Discussions; Unauthorized Tree Removal and Additional Code Violations; 614 and 618 North Ridge Road, Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs) 091-230-007 & 008, Placer County, CA

Ms. Laine said the Operations and Governance Committee recommended approval of items one, two, and three. The first item is an amendment to the Rules of Procedure, 16.2 regarding the basis for annual fee adjustments. Currently, TRPA uses the Western States CPI, which has been standard practice for years. The proposed amendment would continue using the CPI but also allow for a minimum fee adjustment in the rare circumstance where the CPI indicator is negative. TRPA notes that salaries, insurance, and benefits increase every year, so a negative CPI is unlikely. This amendment safeguards the agency by permitting minimal fee adjustments even if the CPI decreases. At present, fees collected offset approximately 75 percent of departmental costs. The remaining costs, about one million dollars annually, are covered by the general fund.

The second item applies Rule 16.2 to adjust fees for this year. The Western States CPI is currently 3.2 percent. Staff and the Operations and Governance Committee recommend a 3.2 percent increase in fees, which aligns with the budgeted 2 to 3 percent increase anticipated during the current budget cycle. A 20-cent rental car fee increase is also included. Its effective date differs from the CPI-based fee increase, so the committee approved two separate motions.

The September financials were reviewed in light of the potential federal government shutdown. At present, the impact on TRPA's financials is minimal. Staff will continue to monitor the situation and raise flags if needed. State and fee revenues are on track, and agency expenses remain within expectations.

Board Comments & Questions on Item 1, 2, & 3

None.

Ms. Williamson said I'll take Item numbers four and seven in reverse order. Item seven is the consent to proceed with judicial action, if necessary, depending on the outcome of ongoing settlement discussions for unauthorized tree removal and additional code violations, 614 and 618 Northridge Road, Assessor Parcel Numbers 091-230, 007, and 008 in Placer County and Item number four is the Resolution of Enforcement Action: Barton Healthcare System, Failure of Required BMPs Resulting in Discharge of Sediment, 168 US Highway 50, Stateline, NV Assessor Parcel Number (APN) 1318-22-002-114, 1318-22-002-115, 1318-22-002-116, and 1318-22-002-117, TRPA File No. ERSP2024-0572. The Legal Committee provided recommendation to proceed with settlement to our General Counsel. We did speak about that in closed session and not sure how much more information should be provided.

Mr. St. Michel said we can leave it there and include it on the consent calendar. Just in case our negotiations fall through, our deadline for bringing action would be before the next Governing Board action.

Ms. Williamson said the Legal Committee recommended to the General Counsel and Legal staff some settlement options which staff will report back to us.

The Legal Committee discussed Item Number four, heard from members of the public, representatives of Barton, staff, and our general counsel. We discussed the timeline of the BMPs, the failures, and the actions Barton took. We discussed the settlement and the history of settlements, and how this number aligns with other previous settlements. The Legal Committee unanimously recommended approving the settlement. To give others on the Governing Board a little bit more information, I've asked our general counsel to repeat some of his presentation that was made to the committee. We spoke at our board retreat about having committees, hear projects and then at the board level having the committee report out, and then if we still had questions, we could pull it off consent. We did get the benefit at the committee meeting and felt it was worth repeating today.

Mr. St. Michel said the item did receive a public hearing. We had comments at the committee level, and then also today at the Governing Board. The fact this item is on consent, it's really about an efficiency tool, recognition that the board has delegated, consideration of enforcement matters to be heard in public at the committee level. It's not a cause of a loss of public opportunity to participate. We want to recognize the community's interest and concern for protecting Lake Tahoe, and the level of attention that this matter reflects. It reflects how strongly people care about the lake and accountability for those who impact it. We bring in enforcement matters, it seems, every few months. We do not normally receive this level of engagement, and we do appreciate it. The fact that we've received this engagement is an opportunity for me to provide more clarification about the framework we operate under and how this settlement fits within it.

It's important to remember that the context and the limits of TRPA's enforcement authority. Under

the Compact, it constrains our penalty authority not to exceed $5,000 per day for each violation on which a violation persists. More importantly, we do not have unilateral authority, like other agencies do, to issue unilateral civil penalty orders. The level of review for those types of penalty orders is very deferential to the agency. We don't have that authority for civil penalty orders, and if we can't reach a negotiated settlement agreement, our alternative is to file a federal lawsuit and have to litigate the facts and the liability and the penalty amount in court.

It means that every enforcement action needs to balance the strength of our legal case, the disputed facts, our evidence that we have, and the need for timely resolution. Litigation can take years. In this case, there are genuine disputes about both the causes and the extent of the runoff, as well as the adequacy of the BMP plan that was originally approved. Those issues would be vigorously contested if this matter went to litigation. Given that reality, settlements are, by design, a compromise.

In this case, we are satisfied that the $50,000 settlement meets our enforcement objectives. It's fully consistent with past settlements involving comparable facts and environmental impacts. All of these approved settlement agreements over the past 28 years can be seen on the TRPA website. You can look at other items that received a penalty assessment and a settlement agreement. This particular settlement also ensures a tangible on-the-ground benefit. The funds are going to be used to enhance the stormwater detention basin in the same watershed, which we believe provides a measurable corrective action for this incident.

From a deterrent standpoint, we believe Barton has taken the matter seriously. The site has been stabilized. BMPs have been re-engineered to a much higher standard, and we believe the site is now far better equipped today to handle winter conditions than it was last year.

While I understand and appreciate the public's interest in the dollar amount of the penalty, from a legal and practical standpoint, this settlement represents a strong, defensible, or proportionate resolution. The very fact that TRPA initiated an enforcement case here and conducted multiple inspections. Steve Sweet, TRPA Compliance Program Manager, worked diligently last fall and over the winter. There's an art to how we do this, to try to bring a site into compliance. We work with the site owner to get additional BMPs, you have to do that in a certain way that isn't just guns blazing. And that's what we did last fall, and it was diligent work, and we're here bringing a settlement in public before the Governing Board. I think that demonstrates that we are actively enforcing our code and not looking the other way when it comes to this sort of thing.

<u>Board Comments & Questions on Item Numbers 4 & 7</u>

Mr. Hoenigman said we have limits to the penalties, and I do feel like they're out of scale. If the penalty isn't greater than the action that we wanted them to take but they didn't or the benefit they get then it's not much of a deterrent. For example, if someone cuts down a tree and that increases their property value by $50,000, but we charge them only $3,000, it just becomes an investment for them. It sounds like we don't really have much control over that, but I'd like to understand better how we might ensure we're aligned so that people are discouraged from doing these things.

Mr. St. Michel said we do look at deterrents when we negotiate settlements and penalties and consider what kind of benefit someone gained from their action. However, we're constrained by what the Compact allows of $5,000 per day. In the case of something like cutting down a tree, that's not really a situation we can easily address without getting too far into the details that

involve more privileged or internal assessments aren't really appropriate to discuss in an open session but we can review those methods in a closed session or one-on-one if needed.

At the end of the day, we're constrained by what the Compact allows and the history of our 28 years and beyond. We have to stay within a range; we can't single out one case and go wildly different from precedent, as that could lead to something we can't defend. If we reach the point of litigation, we always push our authority to the maximum amount possible. But settlements like this represent a compromise where we are not doing that.

Ms. Williamson said what the settlement brings is fast environmental compliance, which is what we achieved here. In this case, it also resulted in roughly one million dollars' worth of BMP improvements from Barton, who redid their BMPs and brought them into compliance within weeks. So, while deterrence is one goal, the quick compliance we achieve through the settlement.

Ms. Aldean said there's also going to be increased on-site supervision, so it will not just be a member of TRPA's enforcement staff out there looking at the site periodically to confirm compliance. There will be somebody paid by the permittee to ensure that compliance continues.

Mr. Bass asked if we could team up with our local jurisdictions to create local ordinances that would allow us to use our authorities to do things for tree removals that go beyond this 5,000 a day, and possibly use civil authorities?

Ms. Regan said that's an excellent point. For example, we have had violations in the past, and we have pending matters that we're looking at where violations have occurred on state lands. In the state of Nevada, state of California, under the Conservancy's ownership, the Forest Service, and that is where the power of the unified enforcement is so important. We are working on that, and there are opportunities to strengthen that, and potentially going beyond with local governments as well. I appreciate the opportunity to have this discussion because it has generated such extensive public comment. It's a great educational opportunity for all of us to be reminded that the Compact is different. We are not a state agency. We do not have the same enforcement powers as the Lahontan Water Quality Control Board or the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection. The Compact is where we take our marching orders for enforcement.

We're such a unique entity in that we have planning and enforcement authority. Most regional planning entities do not have enforcement authority, so it's a wonderful combination that we think is a deterrent for future violations. It's something that we have direction as staff to work closely with other jurisdictions and with other partners to do some joint enforcement, and to make sure that it also sends a message to future applicants who may have violations going forward.

Mr. Bass said the Transportation Committee heard an update from Ms. Glickert on where we're at with our Regional Transportation Plan process and the funding as that's coming through. Mr. Marino with the Tahoe Transportation District provided an update on the plans that are in place along mainly the State Route 28 corridor, and the timeframes for the different projects and where the funding is with some of them.

<u>Board Comments & Questions on Item Number 5</u>

None.

Ms. Williamson said Item Number six was not heard by any committee.

Board Comments & Questions on Item Number 6

None.

Ms. Gustafson made a motion to approve the TRPA Consent Calendar.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Aguilar, Mr. Bass, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Hoenigman, Mr. Kieckhefer, Ms. Laine, Ms. Leumer, Mr. Rice, Mr. Settelmeyer, Ms. Williamson

Absent: Ms. Hill
Motion carried.

Mr. Hoenigman made a motion to adjourn as the TRPA and convene as the TMPO.

Motion carried-voice vote.

VII. TAHOE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION CONSENT CALENDAR

1. FY 2025-2026 Lake Tahoe Transportation Overall Work Program Amendment No. 1

Mr. Bass said to correct the record on his previous report out for the TRPA Consent Calendar, it was actually the Tahoe Transportation Overall Work Program that we heard, and the committee took action to recommend approval. The Overall Work Program is the program that shows the projects that have been approved and funded, as well as some that still are in phases that need to have funding put forward.

Ms. Aldean made a motion to approve the TMPO Consent Calendar.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Aguilar, Mr. Bass, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Hoenigman, Mr. Kieckhefer, Ms. Laine, Ms. Leumer, Mr. Rice, Mr. Settelmeyer, Ms. Williamson

Absent: Ms. Hill, US Forest Service Representative

Motion carried.

Ms. Aldean made a motion to adjourn as the TMPO and reconvene as the TRPA.

Motion carried-voice vote.

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

A. Lake Spirit Awards

TRPA staff Ms. Schwartz provided the presentation.

Lake Spirit Awards were established in 2011 and honor individuals who go above and beyond the call of duty for Lake Tahoe. Since that time, we've honored over 40 individuals who embody that spirit. Nominated by their peers, each winner inspires and leads in environmental stewardship often behind the scenes.

Today, we are celebrating five individuals for their extraordinary commitment to protecting Lake Tahoe.

Agency Representative Category:

Kirstin Guinn, Director of Marketing for the North Tahoe Community Alliance. Kirstin Guinn has led innovative campaigns that champion stewardship, support local businesses, and protect the Lake Tahoe environment. She also drives communications for the Destination Stewardship Council, guiding efforts that educate visitors on how to be good neighbors and responsible guests. Beyond her professional work, Kirstin is deeply involved in the North Lake Tahoe community, volunteering with youth sports and local initiatives. Her passion for her people and the lake reflects a steadfast commitment to balancing visitation, community well-being, and environmental preservation.

Tom Berndt was recognized by his peers as a dedicated Tahoe steward, Tom Berndt has been instrumental in advancing the Roving Inspector Program within the Lake Tahoe Aquatic Invasive Species Program. Implemented in partnership between the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and the Tahoe Resource Conservation District, the program places friendly inspectors around Tahoe's shoreline to raise awareness about the serious threat aquatic invasive species pose to Lake Tahoe's ecosystem. By educating beachgoers and non-motorized paddlers on how to Clean, Drain, and Dry their watercraft and equipment, Tom is helping promote the most effective way to prevent the spread of invasives, like the recently discovered golden mussel. As Lead Roving Inspector, his expertise, enthusiasm, and ability to connect with the community have strengthened public trust and inspired collective action to protect Tahoe's watershed.

Citizen Category:

Sydney Morrow, Glenbrook HOA Director and FireWise Coordinator, Sydney Morrow has shown exceptional leadership in protecting Lake Tahoe from wildfire risk. She led a large-scale tree-thinning project that has removed roughly 450 hazardous trees on Tahoe's East Shore, reducing wildfire danger and strengthening community resilience. And earlier this year, Sydney helped organize a National Lieutenant Governor's Conference to demonstrate the effectiveness of the BurnBot which utilizes technology for wildfire fuels mitigation. It shined a light on Tahoe as a national model, mobilizing technology and collaboration for effective fire preparedness. Her collaborative spirit, persistence, and foresight have set an example for how local action can protect both neighbors and Tahoe's environment.

Tim Kosier is recognized for his outstanding commitment to Lake Tahoe and its surrounding communities. Through his involvement with the UC Davis Tahoe Environmental Research Center, Sierra Watershed Education Partnerships, and the Tahoe Institute for Natural Science, he has spent over a decade inspiring curiosity and fostering a love of science in the next generation of Tahoe stewards. Peers describe Tim's passion as contagious, his energy as tireless, and his leadership as truly inspiring qualities that make him a deserving recipient of the Lake Spirit Award.

Lifetime Achievement Category:

Jim Baetge's leadership has left an enduring mark on Lake Tahoe. Having served as former Executive Director of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency from 1994-2002, his lifelong dedication is deeply woven into the health of the lake. It was under Jim's leadership that TRPA spearheaded the ban on carbureted two-stroke boat engines, cutting polluting gasoline compounds in the water by 90 percent, a landmark achievement for water quality. And Jim was also the visionary of the Lake

Tahoe Environmental Improvement Program, laying the foundation for decades of collaborative restoration surpassing more than $3 billion in investments to date. The EIP is now heralded as one of the most successful landscape-scale, public-private conservation initiatives in the United States. His vision, integrity, and unwavering dedication will continue to shape the Tahoe Basin far into the future.

Thank you to all who submitted nominations. There were so many wonderful submissions. Which made it very difficult to choose. The next Lake Spirit Awards will take place in 2027. In the spirit of continued celebration, nominations are now open for the Best in Basin Awards.

IX. PLANNING MATTERS

A. Presentation on Draft Policy Recommendations for Cultivating Community, Conserving the Basin Project

Mr. Hester said this is the first of three times you'll hear this. Today is about introducing the information to you; no decisions are being made. There were a number of actions for the 2012 Regional Plan including an environmental impact statement with a number of mitigation measures. I believe Mitigation Measure number 8 said that as a result of the 2012 Regional Plan Amendments, we should do a study on housing and implement that study.

We did conduct a study, which was done by BAE Consulting. Their primary recommendation was that we look at development rights and how they could be changed to maybe help with housing. As we do every few years, we created a strategic initiative called the Development Rights Strategic Initiative with 24 alternatives being looked at. We created some ability to transfer from one type of development to another, with the objective that more housing units could be built if other types of development were reduced.

COVID came along, and we had what's been referred to as the Zoom Town effect, with more people moving here and working remotely. The board rightly said we need to continue working on housing, so the Tahoe Living Initiative was started. A working group was formed, including board members and APC members. The chair role was delegated to the chair of the APC, Brendan Ferry, who still serves in that role.

They recommended three phases of work. The first phase looked at Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU), California law, and conversion ratios between hotel rooms and housing. The second phase addressed high-density coverage and parking. We are now in the third phase, which Ms. Fink will discuss in more detail. We will have three meetings on this before starting the environmental impact statement on an earlier environmental impact statement mitigation measure. We are being very thorough in our environmental analysis and to provide the 13-year context as we move into this.

TRPA staff Ms. Fink provided the presentation.

What is the average size of an accessory dwelling unit that has been built in the Tahoe Basin since we approved our accessory dwelling unit amendments in 2020? It's 694 square feet and that compares favorably to the average size of a new single-family home, which is coming in at over 2,000 square feet. More information on this can be found on the Accessory Dwelling Unit Dashboard: https://trpa.maps.arcgis.com/apps/dashboards/236bdcf3a173441b84d7d4486daaf4e5.

Today's presentation is to tee up the Cultivating Community Conserving the Basin project which is the current phase of the Tahoe Living Strategic Priority that focuses on the housing goals of the Regional Plan. Staff will be coming back in November and then again in January for everyone to have a chance to start familiarizing themselves with the information, which is going to be a large package of information. In November, staff will bring a more detailed packet that'll be related to what we've presented today.

Staff will eventually take all the feedback provided and come back in January with a refined policy proposal that will go into the environmental analysis. Once we start analyzing these policies in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), we'll come back to you eventually after being analyzed for consideration for adoption. At that point, we can always dial the proposal back, but we can't expand it.

The Tahoe Living Strategic Priority is one of four strategic priorities of the agency that you approved in your operations work plan this year. The Tahoe Living Priority focuses on addressing the housing goals that are in the housing chapter of the Regional Plan, while simultaneously achieving our environmental goals. The focus of this is that we have folks who steward and protect Lake Tahoe's environment and our communities and power our economy, and they need a place to live. The main takeaway from where we've been since 2012 and why we're back here now with this most in-depth phase of Tahoe Living is that a lot has changed since 2012. We were coming out of a recession then. We had COVID, the nationwide pandemic that introduced Tahoe as a Zoom town to many people. There are nationwide economic forces pressuring housing markets in many communities. It's time to look at our growth management system and see if the regulations that were put in place in 2012 based on assumptions about the sizes and types of homes that would be built are still functioning the same way. Are they still the best way to achieve our envisioned environmental protection and housing goals for local communities?

Again, emphasis on maintaining and improving the environment and our thresholds. We need to provide access to housing, and we want to engage those most impacted by the housing crisis. That's been a big emphasis in this process. We convened a community partner group with representatives from social service agencies directly working with and serving those most impacted. We also rebranded the project name intentionally to be descriptive and help people understand its goals calling our amendments simply "phases" wasn't helpful. One key assumption in the proposed policy changes is that this effort does not intend to increase the growth potential beyond what's already approved in the current Regional Plan. We're looking at options to simplify the process for people who want to build workforce housing within that growth management system. There's quite a bit of unused development potential that we think can be shifted.

Over the last ten months, we've had four meetings with our Tahoe Living Working Group, five with the community partner group, and six community workshops on both the North and South Shores. We've also had one-on-one briefings with individual groups and board members. Through these meetings, we've reached key milestones: developing consensus around project goals (approved by the Governing Board in March 2026), generating ideas to meet those goals, and now refining the policies for environmental analysis.

In the packet, we provided a high-level description of five key policy areas. In November, we'll bring more details and organize them by the main topics to clearly align what we're doing with project goals. We've heard that small units face disproportionately high costs during the application process, especially in obtaining a development right. Small units must meet the same requirements as large ones, even though their construction and land costs are much lower. There's strong

support for removing as many of these requirements as possible to simplify the process. TRPA would still track development rights to ensure we stay within our growth management system but homeowners wouldn't have to find and purchase them individually.

We also heard support for not requiring deed restrictions on some of these units, or for allowing simple ones that only ensure the unit is a primary residence or not used as a short-term rental. There were also comments about ensuring as much housing as possible serves the local workforce. On housing choice, one policy option is to allow more "missing middle" housing types, duplexes through fourplexes in more areas. We heard considerable support for that. There's some debate about deed restrictions, but overall support for these traditional housing forms that provide much of today's workforce housing.

On zoning standards, we've heard support for giving local governments more flexibility in how they meet housing needs while encouraging environmental redevelopment. Meeting water quality and achieving environmental thresholds remains critical. Coverage continues to be one of the biggest barriers, but maintaining high water quality standards is essential. We're exploring whether projects can have more flexibility in meeting those standards such as allowing multi-family projects with smaller footprints to have more coverage if they treat stormwater to the required standard.

We'll discuss the pros, cons, and concerns in small groups, and then move them into the environmental impact statement for analysis. The goal remains to stay within the current plan's growth potential and to achieve environmental goals with maximum effectiveness and minimal complexity. The material in the packet reflects a thoughtful process midway through the project, subject to ongoing legal review and environmental analysis.

In January, we'll ask for Governing Board action on which policies to analyze in the Environmental Impact Statement. That analysis will take most of 2026, during which we'll continue community workshops and education, hold multiple hearings along with a 60-day review period for the EIS.

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Bass said I haven't been able to make a lot of these workshops, but I know there's been a lot of participation, which is great. One thing that comes up for us in South Lake Tahoe is how we can get the other jurisdictions to participate in addressing the housing crisis at the same level that we are. We understand that Carson City doesn't have the same opportunities as the City of South Lake Tahoe, but is there an effort to look at housing responsibility by some kind of metric? For example, if a county has a certain number of employees in the basin, should it be working to provide a proportional amount of housing? Could we create benchmarks between the five counties and the city that everyone works toward meeting? Some of the sentiment we hear is that projects like Sugar Pine Village are great, but they can't just serve South Lake Tahoe residents and we don't want. We'd like to see similar opportunities exist basin-wide, so we're not the only ones building housing for everyone, but rather, the entire basin is sharing that effort. I'm curious whether that kind of coordinated approach or shared responsibility is being considered.

Ms. Fink said that issue came up during our discussion with the Tahoe Living Working Group when we were talking about giving local jurisdictions more flexibility to decide what kinds of development they want. There was concern that some jurisdictions might not offer as many incentives as others.

There isn't a specific policy addressing that yet but that's feedback we can add. We might want to workshop the idea further in November. As part of the Environmental Impact Statement process,

we're conducting an updated regional housing needs assessment that will examine housing needs by jurisdiction and compare them to the number of jobs in each jurisdiction. That will give us a clearer picture of the proportions we may want to consider, and the document will be available for review to help inform the discussion.

Mr. Hester said there is a distinction between California and Nevada jurisdictions. California jurisdictions are required to meet Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers assigned by the state. TRPA works with local staff and the state to align those numbers with growth management, ensuring that jurisdictions aren't being asked to plan for more housing than their development capacity allows. Nevada jurisdictions, however, don't operate under the same RHNA framework, so we'll need to find a way to balance those differences. This likely won't be something we can address unilaterally.

Mr. Bass said we're going to create these benefits, which I support, but we're not requiring that units be deed restricted but it raises a point I've brought up before regarding a decision, I believe in 2011 where a residential unit of use (RUU) was allowed to operate as a short term rental (STR). I'm not suggesting we go back and change that, but if we aren't going to implement deed restrictions, I wonder if there could be a second type of RUU permit that also cannot be an STR.

This wouldn't require undoing past decisions, but if we allow these benefits, the RUU would effectively have a second side: you get these benefits but cannot be an STR. If a unit owner later wanted to convert back to an STR, they would need to go through a new environmental review and pay for the coverage that was originally provided for free, because that wasn't the intention. This situation starts to reopen an issue that the board hasn't necessarily got into the business of and leave it to local jurisdictions. But if we're going to allow these coverages without deed restrictions, I feel we need stronger measures to ensure units don't become STRs. At the same time, there should be a clear pathway back, but it should include all the requirements that would have applied before these benefits were granted. I want to make sure we don't leave a potential loophole open.

Ms. Fink said that's a great input, and it reflects what we heard from the public as well. To the point that we want to cast a wide net in this analysis, the proposal does, in most cases, talk about these incentives that could go to some market rate. There's a whole section in here on scaling development and scaling of fees. What we're trying to analyze is whether there is an environmental and community impact based on size. Should our fees and potentially our development rights be scaled differently to incentivize smaller units? It doesn't mean the smaller unit won't be used as a short-term rental, but they are more likely to be used as local housing, which is what we found. We are proposing to analyze quite a few options that allow market-rate units because we want to make sure we're evaluating the full potential package. That doesn't mean in November or January, we can't scale that back if we're concerned now, or when we receive the environmental analysis and come back with policies.

We'll have a chance to reconsider whether we want to require more of these units to be deed restricted. That concern has come up repeatedly: how do we make this as simple as possible? Deed restrictions add complexity. But deed restrictions are also the protection for ensuring the units don't feed into the second-home market, which is the most difficult aspect to manage in this process. The deed restriction that only applied to short-term rentals came up multiple times in the process.

Ms. Faustinos said this is helpful in terms of having a "through" line to where we need to end up, and I appreciate all the documentation. I agree with Mr. Bass' comment that we need to establish

benchmarks, but those benchmarks need to be based on data that's well-researched. I appreciate hearing that you're going through a needs assessment process, because you can't establish those benchmarks until you have the data to demonstrate what the need is. I like the fact that an academy was established as part of this process to educate the public so they could meaningfully participate. Instead of going into a meeting where there's a jumble of acronyms thrown around. Providing education for the general public to meaningfully participate is awesome.

Mr. Settelmeyer said there were comments on the size of being in the realm of 620 to 630 square feet or something of that nature. Did you do any research on who is living in those units? Are we talking single occupancy, or a married couple with no kids? What type of information do you have on that? I ask that question based on my knowledge from knocking on doors way back in the Northwood-Southwood area and realized that 6 to 7 people were living in a motel room.

Ms. Fink said the housing needs assessment, the ones we already have and the one we're currently doing, does look at household size. That assessment includes an estimate of how many units are needed, such as studios, one-bedroom, and three-bedroom units. One of the things we've heard from the community partner group in particular is that many working families are large and need bigger homes. That is something we don't have a great answer for in this process, and we may want to keep thinking about how to address that. The traditional way to provide larger homes for low-income households is to subsidize that housing, as we've seen with Sugar Pine Village and other projects. As for getting the market to provide those larger units, that's still a topic we need to continue discussing. This concern has come up.

Mr. Settelmeyer asked if we had any information about what we know within the Tahoe Basin area, which could help us as we make some of these types of decisions. It was amazing to me that there are working families up here who, in essence, are hot-bunking. One family had an AM schedule, another family had a PM schedule, and I found that very shocking.

Ms. Gustafson said I, too, haven't been able to attend the meetings because of conflicts but appreciate the work and the discussion on scaling. It's critical. We have quite a few, growing number of trophy homes and far less investment in trying to help our communities and workforce. I would love to extend it to utilities, fees, and all kinds of other obstacles we see in getting housing built, including sewer hookups, water, and other infrastructure, because even with work done by other agencies, I don't think we've reached that goal. I hear this all the time that coverage is considered more important than water quality. When I say that, I mean the science shows we can treat water quality on a site very effectively, but the concept of coverage often gets in our way. What steps are we taking to address the science behind how we treat water quality to ensure we're doing everything we can, help the public understand that, and work with environmental organizations and groups? It's important for people to understand that it can be done, and it can be done effectively, as opposed to relying on coverage, which in many of these larger homes becomes parking areas and other uses that are not effective, but do meet the coverage requirements of their property. Assure me that we're working to study this, and that we bring in our interest groups.

Mr. Hester said the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL), has the whole basin divided into catchments. Each catchment has a loading of pollutants into the lake, and some are high priority because they load more than others. The idea of coverage, which came about roughly 40 years ago, was because much of the development in Tahoe had already occurred. Anytime a subdivision is done, you build in storm drains. Streets work as a collection system. You build storm drains that take water to retention and detention basins that filter out pollutants. We don't have that in a lot of the existing development around here.

The coverage idea came out of a way to manage forest lands, but it was also applied in urban areas. If we limit the impervious development on a parcel based on its slope, soil, and geomorphology, we can try to get the same effects through BMPs as if we had stormwater systems and utilities. There are some challenges with the BMP process, including inconsistent maintenance and incomplete compliance.

Regarding catchments: There's a model or analysis tool called the Pollutant Load Reduction Model. Every catchment has a pollutant load reduction amount they're supposed to meet. When evaluating alternatives, such as using a stormwater collection system or utility to reduce erosion as much or more than limiting coverage alone, we run that pollutant load reduction model. It's very quantitative, and you can identify specific parts of the system that need to be added.

We are working in South Lake Tahoe and have funding to work on a couple of catchments in Placer County to analyze, using the pollutant load reduction model, whether a stormwater system can achieve better water quality than BMPs on a parcel-by-parcel basis. This demonstrates how rigorously we assess whether switching approaches make a difference. If the model shows no improvement in a certain catchment, we conclude there's no reason to invest in a system. It's not one-size-fits-all, but it is a very rigorous process.

Ms. Gustafson said I know from various projects that Placer County implemented, the mechanical systems and the filtration can be checked and monitored. BMPs are much more difficult to monitor. For some of the smaller projects, it may not be feasible to invest in mechanical systems because they are very expensive. However, mechanical systems are incredibly effective, and for larger projects, being able to evaluate them in addition to traditional BMPs is valuable. Any day, someone can inspect the filter and confirm that it's in place, effective, and working, whereas BMPs can be more challenging to assess.

Mr. Hester said some may wonder how you get from a parcel to an area-wide system. In the Code of Ordinances and what we're proposing, you could, as a bridge technology, install BMPs on a project if the local government takes responsibility for monitoring and maintaining them. Then, once you have enough coverage, you could convert over to an area-wide system. We're looking at all those options.

Mr. Hoenigman said as chair of the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) and a member of the Tahoe Living Working Group, I wanted to comment on some things that people covered in public comments that I didn't hear addressed. One comment was "we aren't listening." We do listen, and there's been a lot of listening over these 10 months. The comment about millions of square feet that could be converted into housing was probably an exaggeration. The number of available housing units that we're showing already includes conversions, depending on where you're talking about. With conversions, there are about 6,000 units remaining, and some of these numbers are in a briefing book on https://www.trpa.gov/housing/#tahoeliving.

Many of the proposals we're putting forward are things that counties or the city have requested and could do additionally, but we're not imposing them. This includes potentially expanding town centers or providing extra incentives for market-rate development. Many of us have been frustrated with some of the buildings that have come before us. We've approved them because they meet our codes, but they aren't what we want. From my experience with development in Southern California, every property requires figuring out the best "mousetrap" the most profitable use under the law otherwise someone else will do it.

Currently, our codes produce what we wouldn't prefer, large luxury units. With low density, they tend to be bigger units. Our codes effectively conspire to create that outcome. What we are trying to do is make the highest and best use for the land what we actually want is small multi-family homes in town centers that are walkable and serviced by transit. Right now, luxury housing is the easiest to build in the basin.

We are trying to revise the codes to provide more housing for local workers and people of lower incomes, particularly in town centers, and to reuse existing buildings. Incentives could be provided for that reuse as well since locals have expressed interest. I encourage the public to get involved in all public meetings because policy is shaped there, not just at board meetings. I also encourage the board to review policy recommendations carefully because there is a lot of complexity. Thank you to everyone who has participated in public sessions and on the board. It's been a lot of time, but there are some great ideas that will change things in the basin.

Ms. Aldean said when we're talking about Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) and the potential of allowing them to be built without a development right, as long as TRPA accounts for them. Every vacant lot in this basin has an inherent residential unit of use. How is that going to affect the undeveloped lots that are developable but have not been developed for whatever reason? For example, lots that were passed down through generations, and the family doesn't have the wherewithal to develop them right now. If you're accounting for them internally, that means you're reducing the availability of not only allocations, which is a development right. It seems like if you're accounting for them internally to maintain our growth caps, then somebody who hasn't developed their lot is going to be denied the right to build. I don't want this agency to find itself being sued because their right to develop, which was inherent, has now been eliminated or diminished.

Ms. Fink said the current proposal, which isn't detailed in the October packet but will be shown in November, is to explore whether we can convert some of our unused commercial floor area and Tourist Accommodation Units (TAU)s and potentially even Persons At One Time (PAOTS) into the bonus unit pool. The goal is to determine what types of development we want to incentivize that may or may not be deed-restricted, and TRPA would then draw from the bonus unit pool rather than from allocations or individual parcels. Someone could still sell off their residential unit of use from their parcel which is what the proposal currently is.

Ms. Aldean said I just want us to be in a position when we're pursued for a taking.

Ms. Aldean said I don't know if it necessarily needs to be analyzed in the environmental analysis, but what is the current vacancy rate at the Stateline casinos?

Mr. Bass said please don't quote me on this, I don't want to be incorrect on the record. I sit on Lake Tahoe Visitors Authority (LTVA), and we see it from Zartico. Ballpark is 70 percent in the summertime, and it goes back to 40 to 50 percent around October in the shoulder season.

Ms. Aldean said I think we're missing an opportunity. I understand that they have to comply with local zoning requirements, but I'm wondering if some of those zoning laws could allow some of these rooms to be equipped with cooking facilities and used for seasonal workers. Then they could go from being used as motel or hotel rooms into extended-stay units, which may require some adjustments to local code requirements and potentially TRPA's Code of Ordinances.

For example, large employers such as Palisades outside the basin, who have acquired units inside the basin don't reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), because people are commuting to Palisades

from other places within the basin. People who employ the most workers should have some obligation to provide on-site housing if the land and coverage are available. That way, people could live where they work, walk to work, and not have to drive. It seems like low-hanging fruit. Also, the casinos, even though they've gone through difficult times, could charge a marginal rent by converting some of their hotel rooms to accommodate their own workers. I'm not sure it needs to be analyzed in an environmental document, but I think it's worth being explored.

Ms. Conrad-Saydah had a couple of questions about the scale of fiscal demand to meet the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) assessments or just general housing requirements. If the region provided enough housing for everyone who needed it, what's that fiscal demand based on what we know about average per-square-foot building or conversion costs? Because California has put billions of dollars of its cap-and-trade funding into affordable housing. There's a way to meet a portion of that demand, and it would be useful to get a sense of where that opportunity lies, where the demand is, and put together a package of potential funding sources.

With the reauthorization of NowCap and Cap-and Invest in California, there's more of that opportunity. If we can get ahead of affordable housing allocations and say, "This is the demand, we've calculated it, this is the portion that, if it could come from California, would provide X, Y, or Z units or conversions in the state." We could show something commensurate for Nevada as well to potentially encourage regulations that bring in those affordable housing and community transformation dollars.

Ms. Fink said that it is not in the package yet, but we are planning to bring some cost estimates such as multiplying the subsidy needed by the housing need, and what the fiscal need would be. Hopefully, we'll have that by November; if not, by January.

Ms. Faustinos referred to the comment made by Mr. Settelmeyer about large families. The other thing that I've recognized is that, in particular with seasonal housing, you have ten service industry employees living in one small studio apartment. How we track that ties into Ms. Aldean's comment about how we can use vacant hotel space in casinos to meet that need. It's a big issue, and yes, large families are part of it. I know someone who comes here every winter and bunks up with six people, and not even in a one-bedroom unit. So, that's a critical need we have to figure out how to address in this whole process.

Ms. Fink made a clarification to say that I misspoke about none of the policies addressing that. Some of the policies do address it. Still, there are ways to look at relieving burdens for deed-restricted homes of a variety of sizes. It's not all related to scaling and just trying to incentivize smaller units. We also heard a lot of support for trying to incentivize co-housing, dorms, or boarding house types of development.

Mr. Bass referred back to the Residential Unit of Use (RUU) discussion. Going back a few years, looking at short term rentals, and having to not force a deed restriction on someone, but adding an RUU-Short Term Rental (STR). When we looked at it before, there was also the thought that, similar to short-term rental permits in the city that expire annually and have to be renewed with fees, TRPA could have a mitigation fee tied to transportation and the impact these units put on our transportation system. If we look at this and add the RUU-STR, where the STR part has to be renewed annually and this mitigation fee for transportation would need to be paid. Even if it's $500 per STR unit times 7,000 units, that's $3.5 million for transit funding, a local match. This is a good opportunity to see if that's possible, and if this is passed, it could be amended and added into the RUU code.

Ms. Fink said staff can look at that in the package that we bring in November.

Mr. Bass said I'm in the Bijou area, and we had the Bijou Water Erosion Project. I believe that if I join that, I must pay the assessment per parcel and it certifies my BMPs on my commercial property. Has the science already been done with that particular water management project to show that as long as you're a member of it and the drains go to that project, it effectively does more than the BMPs? Has that been determined, or is it just on a project-by-project basis?

Mr. Hester asked when you say project, do you mean development project.

Mr. Bass said joining this is going to do more for the water quality than the BMPs would have in that situation.

Mr. Hester said that's done by catchments. The current one in the City of South Lake Tahoe is called Mountain to Marina.

Ms. Regan said the Bijou Pump and Treat and Erosion Control project by John's Cleaners, including all the underground vaults, was an Environmental Improvement Program (EIP), similar to Harrison Avenue. There are a couple of area-wide projects that we've been able to do at that scale, where you pay in and it satisfies your parcel BMPs. But that is very specific to those investments in that EIP project. Mountain to Marina would be the next big one in that same general region, going up into the neighborhoods.

Regarding your question about vacation home rentals, to clarify, because this comes up often in public comment. In 2004, this board took action to change the Code of Ordinances definition to allow vacation home rentals for residential homes. That had always been the practice there was never historically a requirement to have a Tourist Accommodation Unit (TAU) or anything different to rent your house out, because the majority of properties in Tahoe, for as long as I've been here (30-plus years), have always been part-time residences more than 50 percent in the basin. In some areas, particularly the North Shore, it has exceeded that significantly. The 2004 action simply formalized that vacation home rentals are part of a residential unit in the code. It wasn't a major change but clarified and codified the practice.

Mr. Bass said what's very different than 2004 is that our local jurisdictions most of them, if not all have developed programs to collect Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) and regulate neighborhoods, which didn't exist in 2004. Now, it's very easy to distinguish between a second homeowner who just uses their home for family and friends versus someone operating it as a business, paying TOT to the city. At that point, This is where an RUU-STR concept comes in, since reopening the TAU system is too complicated. This is a suggestion for a whole new approach rather than revisiting the TAU structure.

Ms. Regan said exactly, and that code change required the local governments to start regulating. That was the beginning, and so you're 100 percent right.

Mr. Hester said there's the development rights issue; you don't want to require two development rights for one type of development. Then there are the use regulations for Short Term Rentals (STR). The Governing Board concluded that regulation and enforcement are more of a local issue. Regarding the fee, if it's a mitigation fee, we can structure it as a one-time payment. An ongoing fee is a bit outside our current scope, but we're working on that internally and will provide a more refined response in November.

Ms. Williamson said what a Herculean effort this has been among TRPA staff, our city and county officials, and the public. It's not easy, but all of you working together is impressive and appreciated. We're digging in and will keep going, thank you, this has been thorough.

Ms. Fink said if you need any more background information, please go to https://www.tahoeliving.org/. Under the Community Academy, there are some short, 3-minute videos that explain development rights and density definitions. There's also a great video on stormwater, as well as other videos and documents that provide additional background information.

B. Briefing on Forest Health and Water Quality Threshold Updates

TRPA staff Mr. Segan and Mr. Bindl provided the presentation.

Mr. Segan said the briefing today is on proposed updates to the water quality and forest health threshold standards, which are just two parts of our system. There are threshold standards in ten categories, and we've heard a lot of discussion throughout the threshold update process about looking at Tahoe as an entire system, and the interrelationship between forest health and the health of our watersheds. What happens on the land makes it to the water and the entire system. We do view it as an entire system. We present it in pieces so it's more manageable both for us and the scientists who support us to update those standards.

Mr. Segan will cover the water quality updates, which fall into the administrative category of threshold updates. Then turn it over to Mason to discuss more substantive updates to the content of our forest health threshold standards. The division between administrative updates and substantive updates dates back to 2017, when we first started this initiative to update the threshold standards. At the time, we engaged the Science Advisory Council to review other natural resource management systems and provide guidance on how we should revise our system to best support our goals, as well as provide information needed to make decisions about achieving progress toward those goals.

The first step was an assessment of our existing standards. At the time, we had a bit over 170 standards. We went through a process using five criteria to rate how well each standard met an idealized version of a standard: specific, measurable, outcome-based, and rooted in the latest science. None of our standards fully met the ideal criteria. We recognized it would be a process to get there; you don't update all threshold standards overnight. These are broad goals for the entire basin. As we bring forward updates, they're the product of numerous conversations with members of the Tahoe Partnership who implement projects driving toward these goals.

After that report, the board adopted those criteria to guide future threshold standards and formulation. Three main things were highlighted: we wanted each standard to be specific, measurable, and outcome-based. Outcome-based means focusing on the goal not the interim action but broad goals like a healthy forest and a clear lake. Specific and measurable relates to the fact that when the initial standards were adopted in 1982, many expressed broad aspirations without numeric targets. This made evaluations subjective. We set specific and measurable targets for all goals so anyone can clearly see where we stand relative to them.

We then reached back out to the Science Advisory Council because, with over 100 standards and less than one quarter meeting the specific and measurable criteria, we needed guidance on next steps. They recommended recasting strategies or tactics as performance measures. They

emphasized that many items included in threshold standards were strategies or tactics, not ultimate goals. The council used the GOST framework: Goals, Objectives, Strategies, and Tactics. Goals explain what you're doing to a layman. Objectives quantify the goal. Strategies are groups of actions to achieve the goal, e.g., reducing pollutant load for water clarity. Tactics are day-to-day actions driving toward the goal, such as requiring BMPs for projects or street sweeping. The council recommended monitoring strategies and tactics but not including them as threshold standards.

At the time, we had 41 water quality standards. Following the council's guidance, 31 would have been removed, a significant change to the system. We considered the proposal through the Threshold Update Initiative Stakeholder Working Group, whose image you see here, taken during the early days of COVID when many of us were still adjusting to Zoom meetings.

The committee broadly endorsed the proposal but requested additional information to ensure nothing is lost by these changes. We've compiled that information, and another meeting of the Stakeholder Working Group will review the detailed proposal on recasting tactics and strategies as non-threshold standards. That meeting is next month, and we hope to bring recommendations from both the group and the Science Council to a future board meeting, targeting January.

(presentation continued)

Mr. Bindl said today we're talking about our work to create new forest health threshold standards, a priority set at the last strategic planning retreat. Forests underpin all aspects of the environment, water quality, soil conservation, scenic values, recreation opportunities, and wildlife habitat. We know Tahoe's forests are changing and are vulnerable to drought, insects, disease outbreaks, and catastrophic wildfire. This effort aims to update the threshold system to align with the actions and goals of our Environmental Improvement Program (EIP), using the best available science to ensure healthy forests for Tahoe's future.

The forests we see today are a product of history. During the Comstock era of the late 1800s, old-growth timber was logged to support mines in Virginia City. The forests that regrew matured during the fire suppression era, when the goal was to extinguish every fire immediately. This reduced fire on the landscape, eliminating the natural thinning and renewal processes that fire played in our fire-adapted ecosystems. Over time, fuel accumulated, forests lost their balance, became overcrowded, less diverse, and more water-stressed, increasing vulnerability to drought, insects, disease, and catastrophic wildfire. Our standards need to evolve from simply preserving forests to building resilience and restoring the natural processes that shape them.
The Angora Fire in 2007 was a turning point. It burned through neighborhoods thought safe, destroying over 200 homes in hours, demonstrating how quickly wildfire can move from forest to community. This changed Tahoe's perspective on fire from a distant threat to a shared responsibility and sparked collective efforts to restore forest health and protect public safety.

Post-Angora, state and local leaders formed the Emergency Bi-State Fire Commission, whose recommendations shaped policy reforms adopted across the basin. TRPA streamlined permitting for fuels reduction, signed memorandums of understanding with major land managers, updated tree removal rules to focus on forest health, and revised codes to allow modern equipment on steep slopes. These steps marked Tahoe's shift from reactive policy to proactive collaboration.

Our current vegetation standards are among the last pieces of the policy framework needing updates. Dating back to 1982 under the vegetation preservation category, these standards were designed to protect what existed at the time a static view of forests rather than managing for

change. The existing standards have been critiqued as incomplete, with little emphasis on forest structure, density, or fire behavior. Meanwhile, EIP partners have modernized fuels reduction, forest restoration, and policy approaches. This update aims to modernize the threshold system, set specific, measurable standards, and leverage recent science and best management practices for forest health.

While updating the code to facilitate best practices, many groups defined what a resilient forest looks like. The 2016 Lake Tahoe Basin Land Management Plan, the 2019 Lake Tahoe West Landscape Restoration Strategy, and the 2021 Pillars of Resilience from the Tahoe Central Sierra Initiative all describe desired conditions for a healthy forest. The new proposed standards will align with this work and engage the Tahoe Science Advisory Council for formal review, focusing on forest structure and potential fire behavior with measurable guidance.

The two main categories of standards are **Forest Structure** and **Fire Dynamics**.

Forest Structure describes forest condition, tree density, canopy cover, and the distribution of size classes. Structure drives growth, vigor, drought and insect resistance, and fire behavior. In 2023, 1.6 million trees died across 60,000 acres on the West Shore due to overstocked stands and drought stress. Proposed standards include serial stage and canopy cover, which describe size class distribution and desired canopy openness, and stand density, which sets the target number of trees per stand by forest type. Together, these provide a framework to track progress toward open, resilient forests.

Fire Dynamics addresses how fire behaves in two management zones:

1. Wildland Urban Interface Defense Zone (around homes and evacuation routes, shown in orange) aims to avoid high-severity wildfire. The Caldor Fire demonstrated that strategic vegetation breaks allow firefighters to manage fire safely around homes.
2. General Forest and Wildland Urban Interface Threat Zone (shown in green) are where fires often initiate. The goal is to avoid large stand-replacing events from catastrophic wildfire, recognizing that fire will occur but aiming to reduce the scale of high-severity burns, as seen in the Caldor Fire where 5,000 acres burned at high severity.

The objective is not fire-free forests, but fire-adapted forests—forests that can withstand fire, regenerate, and persist into the future. This provides a high-level overview of the two categories and the four proposed standards.

Mr. Segan said this month serves as an initial briefing to orient you on the direction we're headed. Mason and colleagues are currently working with the Tahoe Fire and Fuels team, which implements projects on the landscape, to review the targets we're setting and develop overall goals and implementation measures to achieve those targets.

In November, the Tahoe Science Advisory Council will conduct a peer review of the proposed standards, and we will bring that feedback back to you. The Threshold Update Initiative Stakeholder Working Group will also review the standards in detail, receiving an extended two-hour version of the 10-minute briefing you just received, and will dive deeply into the standards as part of their review. Throughout November and December, we will coordinate with EIP partners affected by these standard updates to ensure alignment and confirm that the new standards reflect their goals for the landscape. We will also brief the Advisory Planning Commission, with the goal of returning to the Governing Board for a recommendation to adopt the standards in January 2026.

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Laine said I'm seeing people trying to do something but everyone's doing it differently. From my own experience, the utility company is caring for their lines but not necessarily the land after they drop these trees. They also don't drop them with any kind of knowledge as to what the forest might look like in spring runoff.

Liberty Energy had a contract on Forest Service land and they started dropping everything within 20 feet of a line, in many directions and then left the timber. The standard by which we would hold everyone who touches the forest to the same standard, so we're all doing the same thing, but we're not.

The Caldor Fire was mentioned and that a lot of credit was because the Forest Service did a big forest thinning there, but they haven't been back in 15 years. Nobody's doing anything in lockstep or with similar priorities and goals of what we leave behind. Some of the stuff that's on the ground is dangerous to the power lines as the tree that was standing there. And they're dropping 140- 200-year-old trees. How are we thinking about this? There doesn't seem to be a rhyme or a reason.

Ms. Regan said having worked in this space now for 30 years in Tahoe, we are getting much better. If it feels that way now, imagine what it was before the Angora Fire, in the early days of the Tahoe Regreen project in the 1990s, when we started at that tree mortality issue in the seven-year drought period that broke around, you know, 1993. Ms. McIntyre will talk about the work with the Tahoe Fire and Fuel Team and the Multi-Agency Coordinating (MAC) group is doing. We can strengthen it with the Utility Corridors project, because Ms. McIntyre has personally worked a lot with the utilities.

Ms. McIntyre said there's more work to do on that, but NV Energy has been doing a lot on the Nevada side, the companion piece of that Ms. McIntyre served on the National Forest Task Force.

Ms. McIntyre said you're not the first to bring up issues with the Liberty Resilience Corridor. We're happy to coordinate with the Forest Service about their contractor and what they're doing out there. Under the Resilience Corridor, they are allowed to clear pretty much down, to bare mineral soil for that 20-foot swath. That is not abnormal for them to be clearing all the trees. The concerns being raised are valid.

In terms of the Caldor fire, I do want to just say there is active work occurring in that footprint. We have the Caldor Fire Hazard Tree Removal Project that the Forest Service is doing, which is removing hazard trees within 200 feet of trails, infrastructure, homes, and recreation sites. They also just released the Caldor Fire Restoration EA, so that'll be kicking off in the next season as well. That is focused more on doing watershed restoration, replanting, what you would typically see in a burn scar.

In terms of the larger coordination, the Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team (TFFT) can always be doing more. We coordinate and meet every other month. We are constantly talking about what the priorities are for the group, what are the priorities at the executive level, how do we want to make sure those get down on the ground? Right now, the three key priorities are: Resilient communities, focusing on defensible space, home hardening the built environment. The second one is landscape-scale resilience. That's the projects like Lake Tahoe West or the Caldor Fire EA. The third one is wildfire response, which gets to what Mr. Bindl was talking about with the four-foot flame lengths and wildfire dynamics in the built environment.

We produce an Incident Action Plan (IAP), which is an annual work plan every year, where we document and line out amongst all implementers what work will be done.

Ms. Regan said there's a new Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team Coordinator, Annabelle Monti. We have never had that as a partnership. We re-upped the 10-year fuels reduction strategy basin-wide at the summit. And I think there's almost 20 signatories to that. TRPA is a signatory because we helped form this group after Angora, and our leadership has been very instrumental in supporting the fire service and the work. It's fallen on our shoulders. First, there was Mike Vollmer, when he worked at TRPA, and now runs the Tahoe Resource Conservation District that supported a lot of the backbone work with the fire service and Kat. We were able to work together as a partnership to fund a position to coordinate the Tahoe Fire and Fuels team.

We'd like to do a briefing so you can see all the coordination that's happening, because it is not apparent, even to the community. What we're trying to do is get more public education around the kind of coordination that is going on, and the lessons learned from Angora and Caldor. And the fact that we didn't lose a home in Christmas Valley is still considered a miracle. Not because we got lucky, but it was hard work and firefighting that helped move that fire out of the neighborhood, as embers were landing all over the community.

Mr. Lyon, Forest Service, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit is happy to answer any questions regarding the Liberty Resilience Corridor, Liberty Special Use Permitted Activities, the Caldor Hazard Tree, or Caldor restoration proposed activities,

Specifically, we are in close coordination with both Liberty Utilities and NV Energy, for that matter, managing risk to the power lines, or risk coming from the energy infrastructure to the forest and community. Sometimes while there may appear to not be coordination going on behind the scenes, there is. One place I visited on my way home last night, where some residents had contacted us with concerns. After viewing the area, I've reached out to our partners. I recognize that there are some trees that have been felled out there, but there's a plan to remove them, and I wonder if that might be related to Board Member Laine's earlier comments.

Ms. Gustafson agreed that the public would like to do more and doesn't know where to channel their efforts. There's a lot of "I'm doing my property, but the neighbors aren't." On the bigger picture, I feel like it's better than it's ever been in that coordination, and that's just from my working with the various agencies and hearing how we've mapped and what we're looking at.

One of the challenges is the Golden Gate Bridge. We start at one end, we go all the way around, and we're going to keep doing this forever. As Ms. Laine said, 3 to 5 years, maybe 5 years up here versus the other side of the hill. I'm looking at a 3-year maintenance cycle on the west side of Placer County for forest thinning projects, because of the growth, hotter temperatures, and less winter. I had the opportunity in early fall to do a tour of the King Fire burn scar that still doesn't have trees on it going back to 2015. You realize the high-intensity fires are so devastating to our ecology, and so anything we can do. It's overwhelming in the amount of money that we are going to have to spend to take care of our forests, and the need for partners. I have PG&E on the other side of the hill and they're doing the right thing, but it's never to the satisfaction of the homeowner. The homeowner doesn't want to be left with trees, but yet the trees belong to the property.

We're all going to have to come together and realize this is to protect ourselves. If we choose to live in the forest, we're going to have to be part of the solution, and that is going to cost us money individually along with the local jurisdictions, and the broader agency's money. It's great to have a

path forward and to really focus on that public education of what can we do collectively, and then what can we do as property owners?

The Conservancy did a lot of work in our neighborhood just two years ago, which was much thicker then. Nonetheless, it's a fire danger so how can we best adapt?

I like the idea of the public education, and I know this is going to be a hot button when we bring it back, but it's important. The Vibrant Planets, Land Tender maps where we can focus on the highest threat areas, protect our communities, resources and infrastructure, are going to be critical to telling the story of how we address this.

Ms. Aldean asked when you're shifting the focus of the thresholds to structure and fire behavior, does structure include dealing with the homogeneity of the forest and trying to make it more diverse?

Mr. Bindl said yes, the serial staging canopy cover will be a distribution and desired condition of the different stages of forest, and we know we're not going to manage for a 100 percent manicured forest. It's a dynamic system that we are looking to the science to tell us what the desired range of young and old forests should be, and how it should be arranged, and the standard will speak to that.

Ms. Aldean said Ms. Laine, in Carson City, we have a private contractor who's been employed by Nevada Energy, who cuts a swath through the canopy of the tree to provide a certain amount of distance between the leaves of the tree and the wire. In some respects, it would be better if they just cut the tree down.

Ms. Laine said yes, we have that problem too.

Ms. Conrad-Saydah said one thing we could think about in terms of going beyond the threshold is potentially some of those management standards and showing what it looks like to get the forest into a resilient condition. I think it's hard for the public to imagine, having seen so many overstocked forests, what a resilient forest looks like, and what a forest that's been thinned to bring fire to ground looks like. The goal of this treatment is really to take fire out of the understory, bring it to ground where it can be fought successfully, but to maintain forests as forests. No one wants to see us lose forests and have them turn into meadows and wetlands, and then potentially be developed. So the goal is to make sure that we still have these forests for decades to come. Potentially, with the threshold work, we could do some sharing of visualizations of what future-looking healthy forests look like.

Additionally, I think there's an opportunity for the council that coordinates all this work to talk about some best management practices more vocally. This is what we expect to see on the ground.

There’s so much demand for forest work right now that a lot of these folks who are doing the work are competing for it and doing it as quickly as they can to move on to the next project. Part of the reason for that is we don't have a huge amount of personnel who can manage heavy equipment to do the work. The great thing is we're funding training programs all over California right now for folks to do this type of work, but it will take time. The more you can advocate for those types of programs at your community colleges and elsewhere is helpful.

Lastly, funding is an issue. Natural Resources gets pennies on the dollar at the state level and the national level, and we've seen a complete defunding of the Forest Service and Department of Interior in the last several months. The more we can advocate that these pennies on the dollar are not enough for maintaining health is important.

Mr. Bass said in the City of South Lake Tahoe we have many lots that are owned by the Conservancy that are adjacent to other parcels where our residents are living. We're pushing our residents to plant, but the Conservancy isn't necessarily stepping up. What can happen? I know their mission a lot of times is to fully conserve, and sometimes it's said that they're not managing what they have bought to conserve. Is there anything we can do in partnership with them, or what can be done for some of those parcels? Because, in a way, those parcels that are not being managed and thinned at the right level are causing more harm to some of the structures in the city than almost anything else.

Ms. Regan said this comes up a lot. When we had our discussion with the Governing Board on evacuation, we had representatives from the fire service. The community had a wildfire forum with fire chiefs and various representatives. I know elected officials often mention this, so it's a great opportunity to talk about it. The Conservancy, Nevada State Lands, and the U.S. Forest Service are managing their lots. I think most of those lots have been treated within the last five years. There's more to do, it never ends. An important fact that the fire chiefs discussed at the forum, and that I think the public could use some help in getting the word out, is that an empty lot is treated differently than a developed lot. They were very clear that the fire danger isn't necessarily coming from Conservancy, Forest Service, or State Lands parcels. Unless there is a 10-foot wall of pine needles which generally isn't the case, they're sprinkled throughout the community.

They do have more work to do, and if there are issues, people should call the land management agency. There are good neighbor programs where, if you live adjacent to an urban lot of the Forest Service or another land management agency, homeowners can enter into agreements to treat them. There are a lot of options that can go a long way, but funds to maintain those lots are limited, and it is an ongoing battle. It is very expensive to continue that maintenance.

The Conservancy has about 5,500 urban lots on the California side. The state of Nevada has about 500, and the Forest Service has 3,500. So there are roughly 9,000 parcels that would probably have been developed had it not been for the acquisition of those often-sensitive parcels. But I know that those land management agencies are doing a really good job with the resources they have, and they can always do better.

Ms. Caringer said as a part of our work plan, we elevated Forest Health and Wildfire as a strategic priority for TRPA, and we work with the Conservancy, the Forest Service, and many partners through the Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team to do this work. We also recognized that we need to elevate our public communications. The Public Information Team for the Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team-Fire PIO Team has added some horsepower through our staff along with some contracted staff.

There's been a lot or work happening behind the scenes that you haven't seen yet. Mason and the team have been working on a story map that we can share with the public about the forest health threshold update and other related work. We are also thinking about a new website and have some upcoming articles in *Tahoe In Depth*.

To respond to Member Laine's comments about the thresholds and how we're all coordinating: this update is going to help unite all of us around shared goals and targets that we all need to drive

toward. We're achieving that through planning and coordination on our multi-jurisdictional fuel strategy and related efforts. These are the North Star, and since the thresholds have been out of date, this update will really help us communicate with the public and with each other about where we want to be in the coming decades.

Mr. Rice said kudos to Tahoe Douglas. They have been out here thinning our forests for at least 10 years now. They come by with their shredder, and anything you have piled up for them, they shred and remove from your property. When I moved here 30-some years ago, we had a Fire Safe Council. It was federally funded, and they took laypeople and taught us how to fire-safe a property. They showed us how to put different colored ribbons on different parts of the property, and they would come in and clean out all the runs where fire could spread. That program worked well.

Tahoe Douglas is working with homeowners and cleaning up Forest Service land. And if Chief Lindgren has his way, we'll soon have a firefighting helicopter stationed right here in Douglas County, ready to respond to any area within minutes in the basin to put out fires before they spread. That would be a great day. Ms. Williamson said I believe there was a study that came out in September, that sort of piggybacks off something that Ms. Gustafson had said. A CAL FIRE study found that homes with fire-hardening standards were 40 percent less likely to be destroyed and 32 percent less likely to be damaged. Clearing the 5-foot perimeter around your home doubled the number of homes that survive a blaze, and even a single hardening measure implemented by a homeowner can reduce damage by 20 percent. If you do a comprehensive within-5-feet perimeter treatment, you get up to a 74 percent likelihood that your home survives.

Something I keep hearing about in the utility space is that when we think about these wildfires, we have to start thinking more about the urban conflagrations. I know Tahoe's not urban, but it's people's yards and how we work together makes such a difference in whether your home stands or not. Not to mention the health of the forest around people's yards, but this is going to require us to work with homeowners.

Mr. Bass also had comments regarding home hardening, and whether we're looking at it. I don't know if there are benefits to adding something if somebody will home-harden a new project that we give them. Home hardening is such an important key, and when we look at protecting structures in the urban interface, everything that we're building going forward should use the best materials we know. I know there are so many other dynamics of what home hardening is, but I agree that we need to figure out how to create benefits for people to go in that direction.

Ms. Regan said these are great questions and discussion. This is a pretty aggressive timeline, but work has been going on for years and thank you to Kim for mentioning our strategic priorities and the work plan. You tasked us with moving on these thresholds, and so water quality and forest health are two individual highlighted strategic priorities.

These will reflect best science and advance our goals, and I think collectively, as a partnership, this is something we can rally around. There's additional information at Tahoe Living with Fire https://www.tahoelivingwithfire.com/ on what's being done and all that you can do. Firewise communities are just sprouting all throughout the area.

I think we have more per capita in the Tahoe Basin than the two states, because our communities are rallying around this. It is a combination of home hardening, forest health, readiness, all of the evacuation preparations that we've talked about, and there is work going on in the evacuation corridors. The Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team has made that a high priority. If you haven't driven down

Pioneer Trail lately to look at that work in an evacuation corridor. The SR28 and 50 corridors are underway and will provide a couple of examples in my report.

Ms. Aldean said along the lines of repopulating the forest, I understand that Ponderosa pine, which has thrived in western forests for generations, can survive fire because of its bark thickness. Is there any genetic work being done to alter the genetics of some of these trees so they mimic the Ponderosa pine?

Ms. McIntyre said there is work outside the basin that looks at the genetic makeup of different trees, how trees are going to migrate due to climate change, and what we should be putting in place. There is work on selectively choosing traits of certain trees, like rust-resistant Sugar pines and White pines. They identify which cones are rust-resistant, and those are the cones that they propagate and plant, because those trees are more likely to survive. We don't typically have this in the basin, but we do have a subspecies of Ponderosa pine which is the Jeffrey pine. This area is called the Pine Belt. Down on the western slope, the Ponderosa pine will start to struggle as climate changes, and they will continue to march up the mountain until eventually they have nowhere to go. While this work exists, it's not something we are actively pursuing in the basin right now.

X. REPORTS

A. Executive Director Status Report

Ms. Regan started off by showing a gorgeous photograph from Cedar Underhill, son of Sarah Underhill, TRPA Communications Director.

We recently published our TRPA opinion column around the student housing project of the Lake Tahoe Community College. A huge shout out to the college, many members of Team Tahoe, the City of South Lake Tahoe, on and on. TRPA staff, Brandy McMahon, moved heaven and earth to partner with the college because they had a big infusion of state funds to move ahead with a 100-bed housing project. To do it in two construction seasons in Tahoe was a miracle. The dorms are beautiful and the view is incredible. It's part of a whole strategy to make housing more affordable, and that's 100 people that won't be looking for housing in the community. They are income-qualified students in California, a big accomplishment for our community.

To wrap-up from the last presentation, one thing we didn't get into too much detail is Lake Tahoe West. Some of you who have been on the board for a while will remember, there's been a very big science policy coordination initiative around thinning the 60,000 acres of forest on the West Shore, and we know right now that there are about 50 percent mortality of those trees. So, right before the government shutdown, the Forest Service signed the decision to move ahead with the federal lands, which is about 45,000 acres. It's an important project that we'll be able to get underway under some provisions from legislation that allow them to just move forward in an expedited way. That is done in coordination with TRPA, our partners, the Conservancy, and the community. It's high priority, and we have funding to move ahead to do that. And the benefit of our partnership and Team Tahoe is that we have put hundreds of millions of dollars of federal and state and local and private funds into forest health projects, and this will be a high priority of that Tahoe Fire and Fuels team going forward.

A big thank you to Kat McIntyre, Kim Caringer, Mason Bindl, Shannon Friedman, Beth Vollmer, and our communications team. This is critical forest health and ecosystem restoration work. It's a priority for us to make some progress on the West Shore. Because if Caldor had turned and gone up

the side of the West Shore to the North Shore, we may have had a very different outcome than what we did in losing no homes, and no lives.

The Fire Aside defensible space software is automating defensible space inspections. After the Angora Fire, we developed Memorandum's of Understanding (MOU) agreements, with the fire districts to mark trees. With this new software that all the fire districts are using ties in with our tree removal, so we can track that. We count that as a performance measure for the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) so we're not having to manually enter all of that. The easier we can make it for the homeowner to do, the more chances that they will.

Ms. Caringer also mentioned, amping up our education around tree removal, because we have had a lot of new homeowners coming into the basin in the last five years post-COVID, and people aren't familiar with the rules around trees, and how it can be easy for them to do defensible space on their properties and achieve that 5-foot perimeter around their house. A lot of work is underway to get out the word in social media and in Tahoe in Depth. We have new opinion columns going out, and a whole new communications platform that's going to be launching soon. Elevating that work and building in the update of our standards as part of the notification to the community to make sure that they are heard in this process over the next couple of months.

We have officially wrapped up the boating season. Cave Rock and Lake Forest on the North Shore are launch sites open in the winter. Looking at the stats, the takeaway is that our education campaign worked. We only intercepted one golden mussel, which is the new invasive that we're keeping out of here, even though they are moving rapidly around the West. We intercepted some other invasives, and we had a major uptick in decontaminations, because we moved ahead with a very aggressive policy to decontaminate every visiting boat, so we feel like that education effort is working with our partners, the Tahoe Fund, the League to Save Lake Tahoe, and the New Roving Inspectors, one who we honored today in the Lake Spirit Awards. Since 2008, 123,000 watercrafts have been inspected. The partnership with the Tahoe Resource Conservation District is essential to that Team Tahoe Gold, to protect the lake. We know we'll have more threats as the warming temperatures increase in the lake. That makes it more hospitable to invasive species, so we have to remain very vigilant on that.

I've had a lot of questions about the shutdown. About 80 percent of the local Forest Service staff are still working and getting paid. Because this is happening more frequently, and they've been able to make some provisions to deal with these short-term situations. Not ideal, because everything is slowing down. Even though they're 80 percent staffed, they have a lot of staff that are administrative and that aren't working.

An agreement that we need to do for the new EIP project is the trail that's from Meeks Bay to D.L. Bliss, which is the next Tahoe Trail segment. We're ready to get going on that, and we have Restoration Act funds to do it, but they don't have the staff to execute the paperwork. So, there are some effects, but we're working through it. Most of the recreation sites have been closed for the season, so that didn't have as much of an impact to us as it might have to other areas, weather-wise.

We have a new Nevada Oversight Legislative Committee in the interim that's being chartered and will most likely start in the first of the year. We have a couple new members. Our chair this year is Assemblymember Goulding from Reno. Senator Daly, who was the chair last interim, is going to be our vice chair, and we have Senators Titus and Scheible joining the committee, Assemblymembers Watts, DeLong, and Zermeño Moore. We have a couple more members than usual. The charter

changed, and we'll be gearing up to educate that committee. That committee is key in shepherding policies through the legislature or just helping us fight for our budget in Carson City.

There's new legislation in California passed and the governor signed Assembly Bill 149 at the end of the session, which allocated $20 million to the Golden Mussel Response statewide, and we are making sure our programs are competitive, because education is expensive. Historically, agencies are under-resourced for public engagement education, things like billboards that are expensive. We're hoping that we can fight for more dollars to up the game on the education front as well, to combat that threat of Golden Mussels.

Recently, we had a taco truck in the back parking lot and invited our building neighbors here at TRPA. We lease space to an electrician, the Tahoe Rim Trail, the GSA, the Tahoe Transportation District, Design Workshop, and other tenants that help support this building. Everyone appreciated that opportunity to network and meet each other.

When we send our staff to conferences, we come back and ask for a learning opportunity. We have something called the Learning Lab every month, where we pick a topic to learn and grow, and go through lessons learned. This week, we had reports from the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations conference in Rhode Island that Kira Richardson and Rebecca Cremeen attended. Nick Haven is on the National Board of those Metropolitan Planning Organizations. There's more than 400 MPOs in the country. We have a special dispensation, even though our population isn't large enough to be one. It was great to hear all the challenges in transportation in other places in the country. Importantly, that group is going to be very influential for the authorization, the new reauthorization of the Federal Highway Bill. That is kicking off in Congress next year.

Kim Caringer, Devin Middlebrook, Alyssa Bettinger, and Kat McIntyre attended the Mountain Planners Summit, in Whistler, British Columbia. Resort planners from around the country and Canada gathered and talked a lot about affordable housing. They'd had a large fire in Jasper, and how a third of the community burned down in one fire. All kinds of trails and learnings around interpretive signage, working with your Indigenous communities to educate around your trail network, and infrastructure. They had a plan and a vision, and when the Olympics came, they leveraged all of that to get this infrastructure. Their average home sales price is $3.5 million. but they are very bullish on having workforce housing in their community, and they gave us some ideas of things that we could do differently here.

In November, the Regional Planning Committee we'll discuss the Placer County Individual Parcel Evaluation Score (IPES). Placer's the only county that hasn't gone down to the score of 1 for building to get qualifying for an allocation for building. In December, it will be our financial audit, executive director and general counsel performance reviews, shoreline amendments, and a Phase 2 project at Van Sickle Bi-State Park. We'll also have our annual holiday lunch along with the Nevada Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (NTRPA) meeting.

B. General Counsel Status Report

Mr. St. Michel said TRPA was named in a slip and fall case at the Hard Rock Casino which is now the Golden Nugget. TRPA was named last year in that lawsuit, probably because we issued the permit related to where this individual fell and hurt herself. A personal injury firm down in Las Vegas was suing the agency. We were successfully dismissed from that case due to improper service. I was proud of the work that Jack Mensick did in our office to help put together the arguments and get the case dismissed.

XI. GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER REPORTS

No reports.

XII. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Local Government Committee

No report.

B. Legal Committee

No report.

C. Operations & Governance Committee

No report.

D. Environmental Improvement Program Committee

No report.

E. Transportation Committee

No report.

F. Regional Planning Committee

No report.

G. Tahoe Living Working Group

No report.

XIII. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Alan Miller, Civil and environmental engineer, and an advocate for the law, with extensive regulatory background submitted written comments calling for the City of South Lake Tahoe Council members and senior city officials to resign. I spoke before the City Council last night. Others also called for resignations because of a crisis of mistrust of the public officials in our community. Their right not to trust anyone in government, especially any agency associated with TRPA, the greatest fraud of any. I testified because of criminal conspiracies, misuse of city funds, resources, and property to subsidize your permit activity. There is tremendous fraud associated with TRPA's Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the City for Area Plans, through which TRPA has violated the Compact, state law, and the California and federal constitutions, and stolen my civil rights and those of others in collusion with the City.

Theft has been a big topic on the South Shore in recent weeks, but this has been going on for years to the detriment of Lake Tahoe. TRPA has turned my city into a cheap hoe with the permit appeal

set up in the MOU, and making my city planning commission your hearings officer for TRPA permits. There are too many violations of law with that to even go into here. The TRPA regulations are coercive and have stolen my city's autonomy and self-determination, and I do not consent. Since the City Council has chosen to support the criminal agreement with TRPA over city code and their oaths, I figure they're of no use to the people in the city. If they can't or won't follow the law, they have no business being in government and should resign. The same goes for all of you criminal conspirators behind these illegal agreements can also resign.

I spoke about this last April and May, this issue with the California MOUs and area plans is not going away. I'll keep pushing the matter until people finally understand the corruption of state and local government you have achieved in the region with your MOUs for implementing area plan requirements. It's an illegal charade, the city pretending to be TRPA. That must end, because it's also destroying Lake Tahoe and its water quality with deficient environmental reviews, even worse than what TRPA does. Permitting efficiencies to efficiently destroy the region and Lake Tahoe water quality is what the MOU program has wrought.

TRPA must do its own work, and the city can't legally do it for you. Stop turning my city into your subservient hoe and the public officials into criminal conspirators against the people. Junk the illegal MOUs in California and that Nevada doesn't use. That makes almost all of this illegal, unconstitutional nonsense go away. The solution is simple; it takes a committed criminal not to see it. I reiterate my petition to you of last March and April to comply with the Compact and junk the horrible, sovereignty-stealing Marchetta and Marshall MOUs.

Ann Nichols, North Tahoe Preservation Alliance said I received an email from Ken Kasman at TRPA regarding the cumulative accounting report, and there's 6.4 million square feet of existing Commercial Floor Area (CFA). You can convert that to Tourist Accommodation Units (TAU) at 300 square feet per CFA, that's thousands of units that could be converted. In theory, you would have to remove, restore, and bank the existing uses, but the great failure in this and I wish you would fix this first before you start creating additive development, is the conversion rate, because one TAU often becomes a 6,000 square foot condo or penthouse. It isn’t equivalent, and you don't need a development right. There are a thousand or so that could be converted right now without a development right. When you talk about having this cap on development, let's see the real numbers.

Melissa Soderston, South Lake Tahoe said it's disappointing that we're not given an opportunity for proper engagement during the presentations of these issues. We should be able to comment after the issue is presented, before you, as the board, respond. I urge you to reject entirely this notion of forest health and resilience. To even infer that you can define what a healthy forest is, is nonsense. Forests are constantly in flux and constantly changing. We have heard numerous times how logging and fire suppression is what got our forests into this state that they are in, and yet those are the only solutions that you seem willing to offer. We need to reject this notion of forest health and stop thinning the forest. It is not improving forest health.

There is no way to tell which trees are going to survive climate change, are going to be most resilient to drought, fire, beetle infestations, and fungal infections. We cannot determine that, and it is egregious to be logging any tree at this point. Extreme fire, stand-replacing, and bark beetles are a natural part of an ecosystem. Dead trees are the life-building blocks of the forest. They are essential to the health of the forest. If we remove dead trees, we are removing all the nutrients, all the homes, all the habitat from the forest.

Please go out and tour these sites. It is disgusting and is not providing the safety. We need to bury the utility lines. We need to take all the funding that you hand back and forth among the agencies that are so in bed with each other in this basin and invest it into our community infrastructure. We cannot afford to do the work and live here. We cannot afford our insurance rates. Frank Frievalt, who has worked in this basin in fire management for many decades, said at a fire event in Reno last year, that we need a paradigm shift. We need to change the way we think about our forests. These are urban conflagrations. This is structure-to-structure ignition. If you go back and you look at the incident reports from the daily briefings during the Caldor fire, they state that yes, our firefighters worked very hard, they did immense and beautiful work. But if the wind and the weather had not shifted that day, our town would have been lost, no matter how much thinning had been conducted in the forest. All the newest science says that thinned forests burn hotter, faster, more extreme than healthy, intact, dense forest.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Hoenigman made a motion to adjourn.

Ms. Williamson adjourned the meeting at 2:21 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Marja Ambler

Marja Ambler
Clerk to the Board

The above meeting was recorded in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to 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.