

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
OPERATIONS AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

TRPA/Zoom Webinar

October 25, 2023

Meeting Minutes

CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Ms. Aldean called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m.

Members present: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Bowman (for Mr. Aguilar), Ms. Diss, Mr. Hoenigman, Ms. Laine

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda approved.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

September 27, 2023 Operations and Governance Committee Minutes

Minutes approved, as amended.

III. [Recommend Approval of September Financials](#)

TRPA Finance Director, Mr. Keillor, presented the item. Mr. Keillor said there are no major insights or issues to present, just a couple of things that we're watching and tracking. We're one quarter end of the fiscal year with no major liens against the budget. Labor is on track, we're just now completing the annual salary review, and we do have a few vacancies that are in the process of being filled. Contract payments continue to lag, but they'll catch up, and the state funds are all in.

Planning fees is one thing that we are tracking. We're still above the 5-year average, but a little bit below last year. Grant revenues are almost zero, because we bill grants in arrears so we're in the process of billing all those grants right now. Next month, there'll be a big number in there for grant revenues. The only other big thing of note is that we just transferred the funds for a big debt payment due December 1, 2023.

The chart on slide 4 shows performance against budget. And as I said, most of the state funds are in. There's a little bit of state money sitting out there, most of that is TSAC funding which we bill on a cost basis. We are still working with California to get some extra money for salary reviews.

Planning fees for the first quarter are exactly 25% of the budget. That sounds like it's on track, but it is a little seasonal, so we're worried about that. The AIS fees are at 38% of the budget right now. We're in the process of settling up with all the boat ramps so that's normal. Shoreline fees are very low at 15%, but the buoy fees are actually due June 30, 2023, so what you really see this time of year is lagging payments from people who were late in updating their buoy.

OPERATIONS AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

October 25, 2023

Mr. Keillor said he provides quarterly updates on mitigation fees. So far this year we've taken in about \$600,000 and made one disbursement of \$25,000 to the City of South Lake Tahoe. We will distribute another \$60,000 this week, so there is more to come. Mr. Keillor explained that this is not the balance, just the annual revenue and expenses that will wind up getting reported through our financial statements, due to the GASB change that requires us to recognize mitigation funds as revenue and expenses. Before that GASB change, we were just treating them as money held in trust.

Slide 6 shows cash flow with and without mitigation funds. You can see that they're almost on top of each other because we haven't really done much with mitigation funds so far this year. This is the peak of the year when we have a lot of cash. That's because all the state money comes in, and we will drive that down. Over the balance of the year, we will spend far more than we take in cash. The only positive cash of those would be the grant billings and the fees.

Committee Member Comments:

None.

Public Comment:

None.

Motion:

Ms. Laine made a motion to recommend the Governing Board accept the September 2023 Financial Statements.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Bowman (for Mr. Aguilar), Mr. Hoenigman, Ms. Laine, Ms. Diss

Motion carried.

IV.&V. [Possible recommendation for approval of the Inflation Adjustment to TRPA Application Filing Fee Schedule, Mobility Mitigation Fee, & Rental Car Mitigation Fee](#)

TRPA Finance Director, Mr. Keillor, presented the item. Mr. Keillor reminded the committee that the budget for the year did assume that there would be a 3.5% inflation adjustment to planning fees. When we started running the numbers using the August CPI that became 3.9%, so slightly higher. Mr. Keillor said there's a little bit of an anomaly in that two of the mitigation funds that we're talking about today are listed in the Rules of Procedure as having a different index. The Governing Board approved changing those Rules Procedure last month, but the 60-day implementation window is still open, so we have to use the old index for this change. As a result, those two are being inflated based on the San Francisco SSMA inflation rate, which is lower than 3.9%.

Going forward, everything will move over to the Western States to standardize. Mr. Keillor added that an open item is that all the other mitigation fees don't currently have a provision for inflation adjustment, so that's a topic for a future conversation.

Mr. Keillor handed the presentation over to Principal Planner, Ms. Borawski, to present the inflation adjustments and permitting fees. Ms. Borawski said this was her fifth time presenting the CPI adjustments, which feels like a time of reflection, and showed our commitment to consistency and

OPERATIONS AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

October 25, 2023

to achieving our goal for the Permitting & Compliance department to be able to fund itself. Right now, we're not able to do that with application fees.

In 2018 we implemented a big increase, but in the last 5 years we've just done the CPI adjustments. The proposed annual inflation adjustment to fees as called out in the TRPA Code and Rules of Procedure:

Application Fees	3.9%
Mobility Mitigation Fee	3.4%
Rental Car Mitigation Fee	\$0.25 day

Committee Member Comments:

Ms. Laine asked, when you say that you're not at full recovery, where are you?

Mr. Stockham said it varies year to year, and that he will be presenting in detail to the Governing Board later today, but the short fall is approximately 30% on average.

Ms. Borawski added that right now we're talking only about CPI adjustments, but Mr. Stockham will be talking about other fee adjustments in his Governing Board item later today. She added that the Rental Car Mitigation Fee will go into effect January 1, 2024, and the other fees will go into effect later in January.

Mr. Keillor said if we can get the planning department to be self-funding it will free up general funds, because right now we're subsidizing them with the general fund resources.

Ms. Aldean asked how many rental car agencies are in the basin.

Mr. Keillor estimated 3 or 4, but said there is a subtle change where it now says rental vehicles, which could include motorbikes etc.

Public Comment:

None.

Motion:

Ms. Laine made a motion to recommend approval of the attached resolution 2023-___ as shown on Attachment A, and Exhibit 1 to Attachment A, amending the TRPA fee schedule, including the Mobility Mitigation Fee

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Bowman (for Mr. Aguilar), Mr. Hoenigman, Ms. Laine, Ms. Diss

Motion carried.

Ms. Laine made a motion to recommend approval of the attached resolution as amended in the Errata Sheet received earlier today – which states that there was an omission to the Rental Car Mitigation fee, in the now therefore be it resolved paragraph.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Bowman (for Mr. Aguilar), Mr. Hoenigman, Ms. Laine, Ms. Diss

Motion carried.

VI. [Recommend Approval of the 2023 Federal Transportation Improvement Program Amendment No. 4](#)

Ms. Aldean informed that the Governing Board had received a number of online comments requesting that this item be removed from the consent calendar and dealt with at Governing Board level. She asked that staff specifically address the two most prevalent concerns, firstly, the adequacy of public notification and opportunity to participate in the discussion of the trail, and concern about where people will be parking, and secondly, concern about how disruptive the construction would be.

Ms. Weber, TRPA Transportation Planner, presented the item. Ms. Weber explained the progression of a Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) project, which starts with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The RTP identifies projects and programs necessary to improve Tahoe's transportation system. Once included in the RTP project list, a project can apply for federal funding.

When funding is awarded to a project, it must be programmed into the FTIP through an amendment. Today, there are three projects being amended into the 2023 FTIP. The FTIP serves as the short-term programming document that implements projects in the long-term regional transportation plan. These projects, ranging from preliminary planning to construction, have received federal funding, are regionally significant, or require federal action.

The 2023 FTIP must be financially constrained and covers a four-year period, from federal fiscal years 2023 through 2026. The FTIP is updated every two years, and the 2023 FTIP was adopted by the Governing Board last September.

As the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), our responsibility is to program and maintain the funding in the document. Once a project is programmed, it allows for the allocation of funds and the implementation of the project. Throughout the four-year cycle, there might be revisions to existing projects or new projects that need to be added, requiring amendments to the FTIP. Amendments are major changes to the FTIP and can include updates greater than 50% of a project's cost, as well as adding or deleting projects. These amendments are processed on an as-needed basis and require adoption by the Governing Board, as well as state and federal approval.

Amendment 4 includes three projects, two in California and one in Nevada. The first project is the micro transit electric vehicle charging base station in the City of South Lake Tahoe, which was awarded \$275,000 through the TRPA Regional Grant Program and aims to install infrastructure for a charging base station at the City's D Street shop facility.

The second project is the Meeks Creek Bridge, funded through the State Highway Operation and Protection (SHOP) program, includes bridge replacement, creek channel restoration, address fish passage barriers and wildlife crossings, and construction of a bicycle and pedestrian facility. The total cost of this project is \$25 million.

The last project mentioned is the Washoe County led Nevada Stateline to Stateline

OPERATIONS AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

October 25, 2023

bikeway (Crystal Bay to Incline Village). This project was also awarded funding through the TRPA grant program, and is included in the Active Transportation Plan, the Regional Transportation Plan, the SR 28 Corridor Management Plan, and is included in the adopted Washo County Transportation Plan. The project will include the construction of approximately 2.7 miles of shared-use paved trail, and transit improvements along Highway 28. The trail will start in the community of Crystal Bay and extend to Incline Village at the intersection of Highway 28 and 431. The project is in the early planning stages, with funding allocated for community outreach and public engagement to determine the appropriate alignment and necessary amenities for the final construction. The total estimated project cost is 16.2 million dollars. The project has entered the preliminary stages, allowing for public engagement and input to discuss and decide upon the appropriate alignment.

The amendment process requires public noticing and a public hearing. Key dates for public input included a public comment period from September 28th to October 4th, which was later extended to October 16th to accommodate a public hearing at the rescheduled Tahoe Transportation Commission Board Meeting. Noticing was provided through the TRPA website and email notifications, and no comments were received during the posting. During the public hearing held on October 16th, two comments were received regarding parking area plans, which were incorporated into the final amendment.

One comment inquired about the Meek Creek Bridge project's parking area plan, clarifying that the project focuses on the bridge construction and that the Meeks Creek restoration project will address parking area management. The second comment highlighted the need for a significant parking plan for the Stateline to Stateline Incline Village project, due to the anticipated increase in traffic for the planned bike path. The Tahoe Transportation Commission board meeting unanimously recommended approval of the amendment.

Ms. Weber outlined the final steps and approval timeline for the amendment to the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP). Formal amendments typically take about 60 days to become active, allowing for public feedback and state and federal review and approval. After the governing board's adoption of the amendment, it will be submitted to Caltrans and the Department of Transportation (DOT) for their review and approval. Subsequently, the state will submit it to the Federal Highway Administration for final approval and incorporation into the statewide transportation improvement programs. Final approval will activate the projects in the FTIP, enabling the authorization of funds and the commencement of work on the projects.

Committee Member Comments:

Ms. Aldean asked about the allocation of funds specifically for public outreach regarding the Stateline to Stateline trail project.

Ms. Weber said the project was awarded 1.1 million dollars, but the specific allocation for public outreach is not detailed.

Mr. Haven, Metropolitan Planning Organization Director, explained that a portion of the budget will be dedicated to public outreach, but the exact amount is yet to be determined. He added that Washoe County is very well aware of the public comments and community outreach is extremely important. He gave an update on the general timeline, indicating

OPERATIONS AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

October 25, 2023

that the money will be awarded through the current action. Washoe County will then need to establish agreements with NDOT, which typically takes 6 to 9 months. The planning contract award could be 9 to 12 months away. The planning contract precedes any construction contracts and ensures public engagement in the project planning process.

Mr. Hoenigman said that members of the public had requested this item be removed from the consent calendar to be heard by the Governing Board. He said it seems like no decisions are being made right now on what will be built, it's just money for the planning phase of a project, not for the actual construction. He asked if they would be pulling the item from the consent calendar to allow for public comments or to leave it on the consent calendar.

Mr. Marshall said it was at the committee's discretion whether or not to pull the item, but the key decision is whether or not to recommend that the FTIP be amended.

Ms. Aldean reiterated that this was merely allocating money for the planning phase of the project, and she hoped that concerned members of the public saw there will be ample opportunity for public engagement.

Public Comment:

Steve Teshara, Transportation Activist, said he had heard the public comment at the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) meeting last week and had reviewed the written comments. He emphasized that this is a planning document and urged the committee to move the item forward to the Governing Board with an affirmative recommendation without delay.

Elise Fett, 30 year resident of Crystal Bay and Incline Village, said she sees the dire need for the bike path every day, citing safety concerns for commuters and bike enthusiasts who currently have to share narrow highways. She advocates for a designated bike path with a separated walking path to ensure the safety of the community, particularly for those commuting to work.

Pamela Tsigdinos expressed concern about the lack of sufficient community discussion before allocating funds for the project. She highlighted the already congested area due to ongoing projects at the Waldorf Astoria and other hotels and transportation projects. She said she spent two hours in traffic to move 3 miles this past summer, and putting in place a plan for a trail in a very complicated area requires more community input before dollars are allocated. She said that too often dollars magically appear, and projects begin before people have adequate understanding or what is involved. She urged the TRPA board to consider the safety of residents today, who find they cannot get through that area given the current condition of the roads and projects already in the works, in an area is that a lifeline in the needs of evacuation or snow removal. She asked that this is considered as a bigger picture, not a one-off project, and that the item is removed from the consent calendar until there has been sufficient public discussion.

Ellie Waller agreed with Elise Fett that this does need to be a divided path and emphasized the importance of engaging local law enforcement, proper signage, and more comprehensive public engagement. She added that there will be additional pushback on another segment from the completed Incline piece to Spooner. There's more to this than just one segment, we need to look at the bigger picture and she appreciated the

opportunity for input from the public.

Kathy Julian expressed concern that the planning of this project is not simply allocating a small amount of money to public consultation. This construction of the project will be so complex and potentially dangerous, especially considering wildfire evacuation and traffic issues. She emphasized the need for more upfront discussions and not to rely solely on consultant-led community discussions.

Robert Lober, 34-year resident of North Lake Tahoe, said many people are assuming this would be run right along the highway and that may not be the case. He highlighted the possibility of the bike path serving as an alternative evacuation route, if made wide enough. He suggests considering the path's potential role in emergency evacuations.

Doug Flaherty, TahoeCleanAir.org, criticized the project as another destination project aimed at increasing tourism. He said it will do nothing but increase overcapacity and that the TRPA continues to fail to consider cumulative impacts safety, wildfire evacuation, and environmental issues. Overlooking the hazards that will come with increased destination projects will further complicate evacuation and panic during a wildfire at this chokepoint.

Committee Member Comments:

Ms. Regan, TRPA's Executive Director, thanked the members of the public for their comments. She said that state funding mechanism is such a long process, and the public doesn't often see all the steps. For example, the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (LTRA) has funded scores of projects at the Lake. First, an authorization bill is passed through Congress, but the money then has to be appropriated. Out of the \$415 million authorized under the soon to expire LTRA, we have only seen under \$115 million in direct appropriations, so it's a two-step process. The transportation program follows that model and needs to program funds well in advance of any project being planned, designed, engineered, and implemented. She assured the public that there will be numerous opportunities for public engagement and addressed concerns about safety, law enforcement involvement, and corridor management plans. She also emphasized the TRPA's commitment to providing more information through webinars and other means to address public concerns and questions.

Ms. Laine said that it sounds like the people requesting to remove the item from the consent calendar maybe believe the item wouldn't be discussed by the TMPO.

Ms. Aldean clarified that removing the item from consent doesn't mean it won't be discussed; rather, it allows the concerned public to address the full board.

Motion:

Ms. Laine made a motion to recommend the adoption of the 2023 Federal Transportation Improvement Program Amendment Number 4 as presented and recommends the TMPO pull the item from the Consent Calendar to allow the public a chance to hear the item in its entirety.

Mr. Marshall clarified that the item is for an FTIP amendment that includes three items. So, we need to split out the Stateline to Stateline trail to be heard as a separate agenda item.

October 25, 2023

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Bowman (for Mr. Aguilar), Mr. Hoenigman, Ms. Laine, Ms. Diss

Motion carried.

VII. [Approval of Amendment No. 1 Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Transportation Planning Overall Work Program FY 23/24](#)

TRPA Transportation Planning Program Manager, Ms. Glickert presented this amendment to the Transportation Planning Overall Work Program (OWP). As the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization, being a recipient of federal funds, we must formally amend the transportation planning overall work program from time to time throughout the fiscal year via resolution from the Governing Board. With preparation for the OWP starting so early, many revenue sources must be estimated and anticipated before June 30th. This is identified as carryover funding in the budget. Once the fiscal year closes out, they receive the final budget, and then must amend these changes back into the Overall Work Program

The proposed amendment (slide 2) involves changes to the budget for the fiscal year, including estimates for revenue sources and adjustments for salary and other costs.

Committee Member Comments:

Ms. Aldean asked about the increase of almost \$77,000 for salaries, and assumed it was for staffing and direct costs.

Ms. Glickert referred to the table on page 130 of the Governing Board packet which detailed the changes. She said they have a complicated grant fund and budget, and every work plan is broken into over 8 work elements. Each of those work elements are assigned several staff from TRPA. Each one of those work elements had to be amended, so it's embedded in the line items on those tables.

Ms. Aldean suggested adding a column to indicate where those increases have been embedded.

Ms. Glickert responded that the redline document identifies the increase or decrease in the change tables.

Public Comment:

Ellie Waller raised a question about the draft amendment attached to the work plan, specifically referring to page 39 where it mentions evaluating regional and community parking management. Ellie inquired if this budget addresses issues related to parking, including the proposed 250-space parking lot at the intersection of State Route 28 and US 50 in Meeks Bay. Is there overarching work being done through this work plan?

Michelle Glickert responded that this is not necessarily the item before them but explained that parking management is a crucial aspect of the regional planning vision, and they understand the need to not only build more, but to manage what they have. She said that Work Element 108 explores the use of technology and other resources to manage existing parking spaces effectively. She emphasized the need to manage current resources before considering new constructions, referring to the corridor management plan for State Route 28, which encompasses various elements like transit, parking management, and trails, all working together to address the region's needs.

October 25, 2023

Motion:

Ms. Laine made a motion to recommend the adoption of the attached Resolution, approving Amendment Number 1 of the FY2024 TMPO Overall Work Program, as contained in Attachment A.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Bowman (for Mr. Aguilar), Mr. Hoenigman, Ms. Laine, Ms. Diss

Motion carried.

VIII. Quarterly Treasurer's Report

TRPA Finance Director, Mr. Keillor, presented the item. He said an annual briefing with investment advisor, Bruce Remington, is being arranged, initially planned for November but potentially rescheduled to January due to scheduling difficulties.

The Treasury is set to release a substantial amount of new debt issues to fund deficits and rebuild cash reserves. He said there are questions in the market about the capacity to buy all this debt up, especially since other outside buyers, such as China, face their own financial challenges. This has caused the yield curve to tilt upwards, which means the 10-year treasury yield recently surpassed 5%, and standard 30-year mortgages are now above 8%. While this results in short-term unrealized losses in the portfolio, these losses will be realized in the future, leading to increased earnings on investments. Mitigation funds and securities are the significant components affected.

Mr. Keillor said they have a huge amount in investment pools, specifically the LAIF account used for cash management, due to recent funds received from the states. These funds will be drawn down over the rest of the year to cover expenses.

Committee Member Comments:

None.

Public Comments:

None.

This item was information only.

IX. Briefing on the Procurement Policies Update

TRPA Finance Director, Mr. Keillor, presented the item, and requested feedback and input. The existing procurement policy has not been updated since 2008, and the proposed changes are inspired by federal procurement rules introduced by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). The changes aim to streamline the procurement process, simplify the guidelines, and ensure compliance with updated federal regulations. Mr. Keillor said the two states have not updated their rules to match the OMB changes so what is being proposed may deviate from the procurement rules of Nevada and California. However, under OMB rules, entities can have more restrictive regulations if needed.

Mr. Keillor said there were three things that are doing differently. The first is a conceptual change.

October 25, 2023

Currently they have a 70-page procurement manual with excruciating detail and duplicate rules. Mr. Keillor said they want to divide this manual into two documents:

- Policy Document - a high-level document, approved by the board, outlining the overarching rules and principles governing procurement.
- How-To Manual – a manual, for internal staff use, would provide detailed instructions on specific procedures, forms, advertising requirements, and other administrative aspects of the procurement process.

Mr. Keillor outlined three changes proposed in the updated procurement policy:

Dollar Levels for Different Types of Procurement: The policy will define specific dollar thresholds for different types of procurement. These thresholds will determine the procurement method to be used for contracts. The speaker plans to explain these thresholds in more detail shortly.

Implementation of a New Credit Card Program: A new purchasing card program will be introduced, allowing for small purchases. This program is designed to streamline the procurement process for smaller transactions.

Negotiated Procurement in Certain Situations: The policy will include a list of situations where a full competition with Request for Proposals (RFPs) doesn't make sense. Instead, a negotiated procurement approach will be used.

Mr. Keillor emphasized that most of the existing rules remain unchanged. The focus is on these new aspects, which will enhance the efficiency and flexibility of the procurement process. The next steps involve detailing the specific dollar thresholds and elaborating on the situations where negotiated procurement would be applied. Mr. Keillor highlighted the current role of the Executive Director, Ms. Regan, as the purchasing agent for TRPA, for context.

In the approval ratings for the current procurement policy, the first level is Micro Procurement, where you can just go buy it. The second is an Intermediate Level for small purchases, where you call around and get quotes, check websites, and try to get at least three competitive quotes before purchasing the items. For larger purchases, a formal Request for Proposals (RFP) Process is required. This involves issuing an RFP, inviting bids, and reaching out to potential vendors.

Mr. Keillor outlined the proposed changes to the procurement thresholds:

- Micro Procurement: Currently \$5,000, we would like to increase that to \$10,000. The state level is \$5,000 and the federal level is \$35,000.
- Intermediate Level (Informal Procurement): The proposal is to increase the limit from between \$5,000-\$25,000 to between \$10,000-\$50,000, making it easier to handle these contracts informally.
- Formal Request for Proposals (RFP) Process: Contracts above \$50,000. These contracts would follow the formal RFP process, similar to the current policy.

Mr. Keillor pointed out that this change would impact 37 contracts in the budget, making them eligible for informal handling under the proposed \$10,000 to \$50,000 range. The goal is to improve efficiency while still adhering to federal guidelines. The floor is open for questions or feedback from

the committee members.

Mr. Keillor highlighted that these proposed changes are less than the OMB, but more than California and Nevada. He added that there are some exceptions, the biggest example is the partnership with Tahoe Resource Conservation District (TRCD) for the AIS prevention program. This is one of our largest contracts at over \$1 million, where specialized services are required (e.g., hiring and supervising seasonal staff for all the inspection stations). TRCD has established a long-term strategic relationship, making it efficient to negotiate contracts without going through the traditional RFP process.

Ms. Caringer, TRPA Deputy Director said she would refer to this type of agreement as an interagency agreement, where one government agency collaborates with another to carry out specific services or programs. The Forest Service has interagency agreements with TRPA and other partners, where they can give funding to implement EIP elements. It would help the EIP if we could do a similar type of contracting as our partners.

Ms. Aldean asked if this would be a Memorandum of Understanding or a contract.

Ms. Caringer said we need to determine what the best mechanism is. She sees it as an interagency agreement more of an MOU than a contract.

Mr. Keillor said it's currently a contract and would like to keep it that way. There are a number of other non-financial issues that need to be covered in terms of liabilities.

Ms. Aldean asked how legally binding an MOU is.

Mr. Marshall said an MOU can operate in multiple different ways including having a binding effect. Contractual obligations are more serious. He would lean towards a contract.

Ms. Aldean agreed that it should be a contract.

Mr. Keillor said this agreement (with TRCD) is currently a contract, and he would want to keep it as a contract because there are a number of other non-financial issues in terms of liabilities that need to be covered.

Committee Member Comments:

Ms. Laine said she is also struggling with this at El Dorado County where they have a billion-dollar annual budget, and lots of contracts coming before them all the time. She said there are ways to sidestep the formal RFP process, for example, sole source. She would want to make sure that if we put this into play, we came back and looked at it in 2-3 years to analyze how it's being used by staff and if it needs tighter controls. She understands how time-consuming this is for staff, and quite frankly, it's sometimes a pain, but it benefits the public in that it makes sure that we get the best prices with the monies that we have, so it's a delicate balance.

Mr. Keillor said this was a reasonable request. He added that they could do an RFP and spend three months processing through it. And at the end of the day, they are going to award the contract to TRCD.

Ms. Aldean asked when we went out for competitive bids, did we get any.

Mr. Keillor said we only did this once about five years ago and got two bids, TRCD and one other.

Ms. Reagan, TRPA Executive Director said they started this program 15 years ago when there really wasn't the capacity to do this, except for the conservation district at the time. It's been 5 years since we did our only bid, at her urging, for the reasons that Member Laine is referencing. We have high visibility with this program, extensive federal dollars, boat inspection fees, a public private partnership, and we wanted to do our due diligence. We really had no other viable options except for the conservation district, so that's playing into this.

Mr. Zabaglo, Aquatic Invasive Species Program Manager, said that when they did the RFP five years ago, they only received one bid. After a round of questions from multiple entities that we publicly responded to, only one bid was received from TRPA.

Ms. Aldean said to be cautious, the policy should perhaps be that they put it out for a competitive bid every five years, because a new more competitive organization may emerge.

Mr. Keillor said that is the current policy, and they are asking for an exemption to not have to do that every five years.

Ms. Caringer added that they do work with TRCD on annual review and budget, so she thinks there are ways to keep them competitive without having to go through the full RFP process.

Ms. Aldean said the question is do we know if there is another organization that comes into view that may be more competitive, especially since aquatic invasive prevention and control is becoming more common. She doesn't know what the compromise is but thinks that every x number of years they need to revisit the RFP.

Mr. Keillor said rather than an RFP they could revisit the relationship at board level every five years.

Ms. Aldean said she's not questioning the relationship; she's questioning our knowledge of organizations that could provide a similar service.

Mr. Zabaglo said the only entity he is aware of is the State of Colorado who have a private entity working in some of their remote locations.

Mr. Keillor said another potential change they would propose is for when they team with other entities. In this case, if they have already submitted a grant request with all the partners laid out, we shouldn't then turn around and do an RFP for the partners that participated. On the other side of it, if we are not the lead, we would want to accept the other partners' procurement policies. For example, we've done an EIS contract with Placer County, who took the lead and issued the contract under their procurement rules. Our current policy says that we have to validate that their rules match ours.

Ms. Aldean asked when this is brought back in final form if staff could elaborate on the current policy requirements.

Mr. Keillor continued that in order for the AIS program to work, they need a contract with every single boat ramp. There's no point in doing an RFP because we're not selecting one, we're going to do a contract with every single one of them. So, these are the exceptions that I'd like to talk about.

OPERATIONS AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

October 25, 2023

This item was information only.

X. Upcoming Topics

Mr. Keillor informed them that they hope to have TRPA's investment advisor, Bruce Remington, present his annual update in November, and in December the Audit will be on the agenda.

XI. Committee Member Comments:

None.

XII. Public Comment:

None.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Laine made a motion to adjourn.

Ayes: [All]

Chair Ms. Aldean adjourned the meeting at 11:05 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tracy Campbell

Tracy Campbell
Executive Assistant

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.