

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

GoToWebinar

February 23, 2022

**Meeting Minutes**

CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Mr. Lawrence called the meeting to order at 9:31 a.m. on February 23, 2022.

Members present: Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates

Members absent: None.

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Regan stated no changes to the agenda.

Chair Lawrence deemed the agenda approved as posted.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Yeates moved approval of the December 15, 2021 minutes as presented.

**Motion carried** by voice vote.

III. TRANSPORTATION FUNDING INITIATIVE BRIEFING AND POSSIBLE DIRECTION TO STAFF (ACTION)

Julie Regan introduced the item to the committee. There was a bi-state consultation transportation meeting on January 31, 2022 and this is the first [TRPA Environmental Improvement, Transportation, and Public Outreach] committee meeting held since that date. Josh Metz from RGS will present to update the committee on the last developments.

Josh Metz presents from Regional Government Services. Josh will be updating the committee with developments since the January 31, 2022 Bi-state meeting as well as provide some background for newer members on the Transportation Funding Initiative since RGS began working with TRPA in July 2021. (Slide 1) RGS has been working with TRPA to navigate the complex jurisdictional landscape to arrive at sustainable funding for meeting key transportation needs. The imperative for doing this is (Slide 2) the need for Tahoe's world-class transportation system to address congestion at peak, reduce climate impacts, and increase public safety. There's been extensive work done in this area on the planning side for many years. What RGS has found through evaluating many funding possibilities is that there are few that are both legally viable and politically palatable. One thing that has come up productively in the last few months is recognition that the Environmental Improvement Program which has been in place for 50 years in Tahoe is a good model for a shared sector approach to meeting this significant transportation funding need.

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, TRANSPORTATION, & PUBLIC OUTREACH COMMITTEE

February 23, 2022

(Slide 3) There is a program encapsulated by the Regional Transportation Plan that amounts to around \$80 million a year over 20 years. There's about a \$20 million piece of that funding that needs to be generated through these new mechanisms. That's shown on the purple piece of the pie chart on the slide. RGS's effort has been focused on trying to solve for that piece. (Slide 4) This slide shows the concept of the "shared sectors" approach that RGS has arrived to and had the most heads nodding at the latest bi-state consultation. In the Bi-State, RGS discussed this concept [of shared sector funding] and its relative success in the Tahoe Basin with regards to the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) and generally agree that this is a good model for moving ahead on Transportation. (Slide 5) The Federal sector is where a lot of people have hopes in the form of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) which was recently passed and includes increases in existing formula funding for transportation as well as new programs. The work then becomes focusing on the details of the Act and how those funding programs could bring new money to Tahoe.

Since January, (Slide 6) a few actions have happened regarding focusing in on these Federal funding opportunities. The first is a recently submitted grant proposal through the Tahoe Transportation District called a "Tribal Land Access Grant". There hasn't been a decision on that grant yet. The RAISE Grant is an existing program with new dollars within the IIJA is now in focus and has just opened up and is being read by the transportation district, a bundle of projects around the Nevada side, South Lake Tahoe are being contemplated to go into a proposal there. The maximum for this one is about \$25 million so the intent would be to bundle as many capital projects into that proposal as would be competitive and viable. The process is being led by TTD Staff with coordination with Tahoe Transportation Improvement (TTIC). The committee will be hearing from TTIC as they focus on the priority projects in each of the jurisdictions and how they might align with this proposal that TTD is putting together. Finally, RGS is generally tracking the [IIJA] programs and aligning those regional priorities to do as much as possible to get projects in Tahoe into the pipeline for funding. One of the things that was discussed at the Bistate previously was the imperative for doing this sustainable revenue generation is to have a match funds to match federal and state grant programs like those listed on the slide. So local dollars need to be generated to match against federal programs.

{Slide 7) The State Sector topics on the California side has been recognizing the federal Tahoe population (145,000) which would increase the amount of money that Tahoe would be suited for and be able to get through the various grant programs. It's largely population dependent so having a larger population would potentially yield more volume in the grants. Since January on the California side there has been a series of meetings with our teams, TRPA, TTD, and RGS among others, with the Caltrans leadership (slide 8) which focused particularly on this question of the population formula. Through the work of this process we succeeded in getting stronger engagement by Caltrans and California Transportation Agency leadership a better understanding of the dynamic of the population formula and how it affects the monies that Tahoe is eligible for. There was also a focus on this Active Transportation Program (ATP). One of the big outcomes of these meetings was the prioritization of the Fannie Bridge Project in North Lake Tahoe, that that was put forward by the Caltrans leadership as a priority project to be funded in this cycle. Add the word on the street for how that works is you get Caltrans leadership prioritization and your likelihood of funding goes up significantly. Were this funding to come through that would bring in an additional \$3 million to that particular capital project. We think these are all worthy outcomes of this engagement and really have come by way of reactivating the leadership engagement, having the active interest and attention of the leadership at both the transportation agencies and the resource agencies.

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, TRANSPORTATION, & PUBLIC OUTREACH COMMITTEE

February 23, 2022

Moving on to Nevada (Slide 9), there were a number of topics that were discussed as possible funding mechanisms from the Nevada side. There are continuing conversations, both with the Resources Agency and the Department of Transportation in Nevada, as well as Nevada Oversight Committee meetings; one that just happened and one being planned in May. (Slide 10) Chair Lawrence reported for the update from the Nevada sector.

Chair Lawrence presents that on the Nevada side, it's a little bit different with two states. The conversations are going very positively between both with the Nevada Department of Conservation & Natural Resources (DCNR) and California Natural Resources agencies, along with the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT). First of all there were some really good conversations with NDOT regarding revising the funding formula which California's pursuing. It's been mentioned this at previous meetings, but to review, Chair Lawrence learned that NDOT does not have a funding formula, so recognizing the populous nation mix doesn't really solve anything on the Nevada side. However, the conversations are really good to highlight the importance of Tahoe and then to perhaps look at some opportunities for general fund appropriations. That will remain to be seen as Governor Sisolak will be giving the state of the state speech today, so there might be a little bit of insight regarding the budget situation moving forward. And then Executive Branch agencies get the budget instructions around March 9<sup>th</sup>. After that we'll know more about whether there's room in there for general fund appropriations.

Chair Lawrence reports on positive conversations regarding bonds. There's been talks with the legislatures and the Treasurer's Office and the Executive branch. It looks like the bond authority and capacity for Nevada might increase over the next biennium, which would open up some doors to get some bond sales for some of the infrastructure needs on the Nevada side. Chair Lawrence is very mindful of the 777 split and advises caution that all of the funds aren't in one bucket, so to speak. For example, if Nevada came up with \$7 million in bonds, that would be great but general obligation bonds can't be used for things like operating and things like that so we have to be mindful of filling those gaps as well.

Josh Metz continues the presentation. In regard to the report on bonds, Mr. Metz agrees that it'd be nice to have a diverse portfolio, but we'll take whatever we can get to get started and move things along. On to the topic on the Local/Private sector (Slide 11). This is the local jurisdictions and the potential for generating new or leveraging existing sources of funding at the local level to contribute to this 777 match. The other topic that has gotten a lot of hope invested in it is this Zonal congestion management fee which would focus on the recreation traffic in the Northeast and Southwest sides of the Lake. The authorization options being jurisdiction by jurisdiction- a "Business as usual" model – or a basin-wide authorization that would leverage TTDs authorities. These are all topics that have been discussed and are continuing to be discussed. The question is how to move ahead with public outreach and polling on these topics. RGS made a presentation at the South Shore Transportation Management Association (TMA) last week and those were questions that were raised by business representatives there in terms of a proactive public outreach need and value. These are complex topics with lots of nuance and navigating that is the subject of this committee, so RGS looks forward to the committee's feedback on that and it's also being discussed at TTD Regional Partnerships committee.

(Slide 12) Focusing on the zonal congestion management fee in the SR28 up by Alexis Hill's district and down in Sue Novasel's area in South Lake and Emerald Bay. The concept is that there would be a mechanism for charging transportation system users who park within these zones. If a user was simply passing through they would not be charged or there would be other

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, TRANSPORTATION, & PUBLIC OUTREACH COMMITTEE

February 23, 2022

mechanisms for equitable access. The goal would be for it to be easy to use and scalable so that if these two pilot projects are successful the system could be expanded to other parts of the Basin. Mr. Metz understands that there is emerging interest in a Basin-wide parking management system. Currently, RGS is engaging an engineering firm in technical studies related to these questions – transportation revenue estimates and mechanism evaluation. This information will be brought back to the committee for vetting and conversation. The goal is to have most of this information gathered by the Nevada Oversight Committee meeting in May.

(Slide 13) Next, focusing on the Private Sector piece. RGS participated in a South Shore TMA meeting where there was an impressive level of engagement with key employers in South Lake Tahoe. There were a number of updates provided at the meeting by attendees about board actions that had put forward funds towards micro transit program which is at about \$800,000 of the million needed to launch it. As the Event Center project is completed and starts generating ticket revenue they'll be able to use that to continue funding but they need this initial seed money and they're getting close to their mark. The interest still remains on addressing the challenge of getting workforce to and from work which had smiles and head nodding in the room. Regarding the capital project funding particularly in the pursuit of these federal grants, there's an opportunity for the private sector to contribute in a fashion with in-kind contributions. Generally there was interest in that as well. The biggest takeaway [from this meeting] other than that this group seems to be well informed and engaged was the importance of public outreach and communication when we're talking about the various potential local revenue generation mechanisms. The community is aware of and interested in being kept in the loop, particularly the lodging folks on the TOT (Transient Occupancy Tax) and generally the business folks on the sales tax.

(Slide 14) Finally, we want to begin tracking progress, and we are setting up to begin tracking progress towards meeting these funding targets. The next step in that area is moving toward a project funding tracker tool that will be worked through the TTIC to align priority projects and funding avenues that may exist in order to bring that back to this committee. There was a big interest in executive engagement and awareness into how this is all progressing and we want to be able to communicate efficiently back and forth.

Presentation can be found here: <https://www.trpa.gov/wp-content/uploads/EITPO-Committee-Item-No.-3-Transportation-Funding-Initiative.pdf>

### Committee Comments & Questions

Ms. Faustinos asks although this is not necessarily directly within TRPA's purview since we don't actually implement projects. But one of the things that we've been paying close attention to here in LA County, is, how these funding mechanisms can really help us with workforce development, making sure that we're creating good living wage jobs, as we know, which is a concern for everyone.

So, how was that embedded, and how can TRPA strengthen its position on this issue, or is that appropriate it? To what extent can we as the TRPA board make sure that is included in the in these projects as they move forward. I know some of the funding sources actually require it like the TCC program, as an example for State of California, has some embedded requirements in that regard.

Mr. Metz responds that discussions to date that I've been part of in this process that has not risen to a high priority of the kind of the items that we're discussing but raising it at the board

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, TRANSPORTATION, & PUBLIC OUTREACH COMMITTEE

February 23, 2022

level and establishing a policy recommendation that touches on that explicitly would be probably the most effective way to ensure that it becomes part of whatever we come out with. Generally, the intention is to, have these significant investments yield, both benefits and the outcome, the delivery of the project, as well as providing good jobs for people.

Ms. Regan adds that that's something we should talk about because it really does get to the overall role of the Compact in our convening and Partnership building role. Because sometimes, as you pointed out, we're not implementing the project, but we're helping shape these projects as they're developed, and we do have permit conditions that you as a board certainly can discuss as a policy matter, where we do find ourselves in project implementation in a few places. One is invasive species, for example, just as a parallel. So because we often facilitate projects as a fiscal agent, we have opportunities to influence how these projects take shape. So I think it's a worthy conversation for this committee and for the board as a whole. And as Josh said, that wasn't identified in our initial principles. When we looked at the principles for this transportation funding initiative, we looked at things like equity, fairness, etc. We didn't talk about that explicitly, but certainly, this is moving and progress, and we can take that up. I do believe that Nick Haven might want to jump in as well. And I'll certainly invite Nick if he has additional thoughts to do so.

Mr. Haven adds that we can dive into deeper. The connections of transportation projects with the economy with the workforce is extremely important and I think the better we can connect our transportation investments with economic development plans and other things that are coming forward from the local governments.

Ms. Faustino asks one other question on the low fare. one of the efforts I've seen used successfully, is, in particular, when it comes to fares are free or lower fares that would apply to local community members, such as school aged children and some kind of a variant fee structure for local residents to encourage them to use this system. Clearly, we want to hit the tourist element here but I think that encouraging local communities to start to rely on public transit and active transportation, as opposed to all driving individual cars is so critically important, and driver to that is also economics. So, if we can have some kind of a fee structure, which has low rates for local residents that live in the area. That would motivate me to use public transit more often than I do now. Even for middle-income people, if it's convenient and it makes sense from an economic perspective and a sustainability perspective you sell it as hey, you're not only, saving your pocketbook, you're also helping the environment, and congestion relief. It seems like a great PR tool.

Chair Lawrence responds that this committee and probably the full board will wrestle through your comments more as we get into implementation. I think a couple of things you said, resonated with me as one, is that during project construction our bonds have certain requirements and fair wage requirements in our capital improvements, but that doesn't get to the end user. When I reflect back, I think I used public transit the most, when I was a college student at Santa Cruz because my student fees paid for the transit, and so I took transit all over the place. This is going to warrant more discussion particularly with the transportation experts, because our user groups is one of the things that Tahoe has a big challenge with. We've got the workforce down in South Lake and across the basin, but then we also have a huge recreation demand as well. Ms. Gustafson follows up on Ms. Faustino's questions that all transit in the basin right now is free to the user. I think there are real challenges in having the longer extended hours and the frequency needed to encourage more ridership. We've been working with Bob and Josh [from RGS] on one of the issues that I see is the \$20 million commitment was an annual commitment. And my concern is, and I'll just pick on Caltrans a bit. I'm glad they're

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, TRANSPORTATION, & PUBLIC OUTREACH COMMITTEE

February 23, 2022

stepping forward on a Fannie Bridge replacement project, But Fannie Bridge is an 80 year old bridge that should have been in the Caltrans seismic retrofit program already. To me, that's not new money helping us run better transit solutions. It's part of their current obligations. And if we start looking at all the money we invest in our roads and infrastructure, we far exceed the \$20 million. So, really, if we want to make a change in transportation patterns and behaviors, we need that free and frequent transit system that is universal. And that, alone, requires \$20 million a year. That's the challenge with the state and federal funding, is some of those pots are capital, now, there's certainly capital infrastructure; you need to maintain busses, to have pullouts, to have bus stops there. But we've still got to get to that, not operating dollars. When we look at the local dollars, I do think, and I don't mean to pick on Caltrans, because I'm so glad they've picked up that project, and are taking the lead on it, if you put \$3 million into the state share for that project on your thermometer, Josh, it's got to be replenished with that commitment every year. I don't know, that replacing Fannie Bridge in and of itself is going to create any incentive for people to get out of their vehicles and reduce greenhouse gasses. That aside, we're very excited to have that project. It's been on them books for a number of years and because of federal contracting issues, it didn't get incorporated in the first set of roundabout projects. The locals have put in a significant amount of money, Placer County has to that project too.

I think our what we've been talking about for the rest of the committee and I urge Sue and Alexis to chime in is that there's no doubt that the zonal fees seem to have the most support at the state and federal level in our discussions. They are primarily summer congestion zones, and we want to be aware that a significant portion of our traffic congestion also includes the ski season and will zonal fees spinoff money for solutions that can be activated in the winter months or peak weekend months and throughout the basin. And so we had talked as the local elected about getting our public works director is engaged through the TTIC to talk about what is a fair share to the seven million, based on the projects and services because each of the jurisdictions already has differing levels and uses of sales tax, TOT, and other revenue streams, we weren't sure we could land on one regional funding source but potentially a regional strategy where we each use different funds to potentially contribute. Some might be existing dollars that we can free up through or general funds or others might be new funding sources in general are all supportive of parking fees. But, we know that parking revenues typically are just kind of self-sustaining to maintain that. They're not going to really generate shuttles services. The zonal fee may or may not. The analysis needs to be pretty thorough on that. And the piecemeal approach of that, of the zonal when it is in two particular areas of the basin and not comprehensive was a concern as well, but we definitely are interested in a fair share approach. What is Placer County's share of the seven million? Is it based on no vehicles driving through our jurisdiction? Is it based on our commercial revenues? What is the road miles? How are we going to distribute that seven million and say, here's the fair share for each jurisdiction to contribute.

It's easy to be supportive, in general, it's when we get down to, OK, this is how much you owe. And this is how it's going to be used that we need to really be thoughtful. In my 30 years of visiting other areas and learning about other transit systems, free frequent transit, throughout all resort communities, has been in place for many areas for a very long time. It's combined with a parking fee so that you really disincentivize individual vehicles. But, if you start charging the parking fee and there's no alternative, you just create anger and frustration. So, really looking at that systematic approach that allows us to get to both would be most important to those of us who have to answer to our constituents about how is this going to impact workforce? Where can they park? Are we providing separate shuttles? Because right now we don't have enough workforce in the basin to meet those needs and so we are reliant on bringing people in and then how we look at our business community to say we're going to have a comprehensive parking fee

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, TRANSPORTATION, & PUBLIC OUTREACH COMMITTEE

February 23, 2022

but we don't have any shuttles to get people around, so we're going to have to roll those out and really have that visionary approach that I think we can answer those questions when we go out to the voters to say, Hey, do you want a pay more sales tax? We need to be very specific in the projects and the plans, and solutions, that's going to create.

Ms. Conrad-Saydah adds to build a little bit on what Cindy said. First of all, thanks for the presentation. I'm jumping into this obviously, mid-stream and a lot of these conversations but having worked on most of the grant programs that Josh flashed for the State of California, including TCC and the Affordable Housing Programs. I have some perspective on pursuing ephemeral grant programs to fill that \$20 million dollar annual gap and finding some regular revenue that can fill that gap is obviously very, very critical. Also, having a project pipeline, I think that's kind of where Cindy left off with this idea that you have a sense of what you need to do to get to that end result. So, having a vision of where we want to go for the area, and filling in projects to reach that vision, I think you can apply for those grant programs to fill in specific projects. But for that annual \$20 million need, you do need to find that sort of stable source of revenue and I just don't know that ephemeral funding sources like grants and bonds are necessarily the way to go to fill in that gap.

Additionally, there are very, very different cost of implementation for the different proposals that we saw today. When you think about where the cost of implementation falls and where the benefits of implementation fall, you really want the benefits to fall on the Basin. So, if you're thinking about a project where the cost of implementation falls to, you know, a middleman of, say, a state or local agency collecting fees; is that going to drive jobs in the basin? Is that going to create jobs where there are local people who benefit from the program? I think comparing the cost of implementation, what is the infrastructure need? What is the actual annual cost of that? What percentage of the total funds raised goes just to implementation? Comparing that across options is really important, and then comparing benefits across options. Where do they land? Where does the revenue land, and where do those benefits of the cost of the implementation land?

For example, congestion fees versus parking, congestion fees and parking, tax revenue, things like that comparing those across the board I think will be really important to get to the lowest cost of implementation with the highest local benefit. Additionally, comparing local prevailing wage job creation potential to determine what gives us the best option of creating prevailing wage jobs in the Basin area. Thinking about some of the congestion fee pricing, how does that create local prevailing wage jobs in the Basin that I do have a question on that.

Finally, I think really having this vision and creating the project pipeline and then figuring out which of the relevant grant funds could actually satisfy that project pipeline and doggedly going after those would be really important. Transformative climate communities as a great program. But it's a fight in the legislature every year to get it funded. And so, relying on TCC as a funding source over any time horizon, especially for the Tahoe area that is predominantly seen as an area that does not mean TCC funding is not reliable. And same thing with affordable housing, sustainable communities. I think there's one grant in the Truckee area but looking at that for the base and that's going to be a challenge as well. So, you know, it'd be great if we could see that pipeline and see what the vision looks like and start assigning grant fund sources to that over time so that we get a better sense of how that \$20 million will play out over many years. And then, again, if we can see that compared cost of implementation, even a pilot project will be very costly. And so, you know, implementing up pilot project that has greater potential for implementation in the future, I think, would be a wise way of approaching it.

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, TRANSPORTATION, & PUBLIC OUTREACH COMMITTEE

February 23, 2022

Ms. Hill comments that she agrees with Member Faustinos' points. We need to fund these public transportation projects or we can't get employment in the Basin, period. We just did a study on affordable housing and right now, it costs folks who are commuting from Reno or Carson, up to Incline Village or Crystal Bay \$500 a month. And so if we can figure out how to cut that cost and make those connections from Carson to Tahoe from Reno to Tahoe as well and work with those RTCs, I think that is an essential part of these projects to ensure that people if they don't want to live at Lake Tahoe, they can still work up there. We're in crisis mode up in my district, and I know that there's other folks who are dealing with that same issue.

Ms. Hill is also concerned with kids accessing Tahoe. I think it's great that we have free public transportation around the basin, but as Cindy said, it's those connections that need to be made. Because I speak to many youth groups in Reno and school groups and there are many kids who live in my district, who live in Washoe County, who have never been to Lake Tahoe even though it is only a half hour drive from them. And it's because of gas costs. It's just inaccessible to so many families. I think this project will be key for that.

In regard to local dollars, I think it's really important that when we meet on how much each local jurisdiction should be spending and being clear on what part of the project that will be funding. It's really important that we understand how much can be spent for operations versus capital because I didn't know that we could do some restricted dollars in there, and I have some park bond funds that I think we could also use for some of these projects but they would be restricted. So I think that's just another part of the discussion we need to have. And I'm sure we'll be having that. I really like that little indicator that can show how far we are with our spending.

And we're doing a parking and traffic study in my district right now. And I think, you know, it's really going to be important. I'm very supportive of figuring out how we can charge for parking and put that towards our local match. On Highway 28, however, I do want to work with our [traffic] study group to ensure that we're figuring out how people won't park in the Incline Village neighborhood and Crystal Bay Neighborhoods and load them up. So I think that goes where Cindy's point of needing to make sure that public transportation is engaged while we're doing these parking programs because we'll have some other issues that will be coming up with these programs.

Ms. Novasel comments she was on the Lake Tahoe Unified School District School Board for 12 years up here, and I will tell you that we offer free bus passes to our children as much as possible. And even to our continuing education children, I shouldn't say children, the ones that are mothers, that have babies. We offer free taxi transportation whatever they need. We try to dig in and help our local community as much as possible. And so, I think there, obviously is always a need for that. There are people that are keeping eyes on for that system. And I'm very, very proud of the fact that TTD is putting in the electric charging stations at LTCC, my Alma Mater. And we're going to be talking about electrifying our fleets and moving forward. It's a process, but we're getting there. And that is our workforce. That is our future workforce, is using LTCC as a conduit, for moving forward with getting kids educated and into the workforce. So, very happy with that, and then get back to what the consultant was saying. Our fair share model, absolutely aware, and we understand that we all need to pitch in for this very much. Yesterday at our Board of Supervisors Meeting I'm asking for access to TOT money to go into a micro transit to help out locally to try to move forward with micro transit, especially to Emerald Bay. We used to have what's called the Nifty 50 Trolley that would go in there would connect up to Tahoma. I want to see that moving back again in a short term. So that's going to be my goal

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, TRANSPORTATION, & PUBLIC OUTREACH COMMITTEE

February 23, 2022

before I term at the end of this year. Is to see if I can get my Nifty 50 moving again because I loved that, and I think that's just a very small, and helpful.

On the Zonal fee system. Yes, it's got a lot of issues, but I think that makes sense for our community, and so I'm a big, big proponent of that and implementing the Pilot program. Because I think we need to prove to our state and the feds that this can work and that it is the way to go. Because using TOT, etc. does not capture in an equal basis our day users, which is it is a huge impact to our Basin. We need to figure out in that equality mix of how do we capture that the users, the end users, and I think that's critically important, is by using zonal fees.

Chair Lawrence comments that certainly I know the consultants are taking notes on and will incorporate. I am generally hearing agreement consensus around those 7, 7, 7, but I'm also hearing questions and concerns about, how is that going to be divided up. What counts what doesn't count? I'm optimistic that we worked through all of this with the EIP. Folks were doing forest health projects and water quality projects well before the EIP came online and we were able to work through the issues of what counted and what didn't fairly easily. So hopefully we can do it in this space as well.

I liked what Ashley mentioned with sort of a project pipeline. I do think that would be useful. I think we've got a lot of airspace between the ambition of the RTP, which is a large, ambitious program, and then this smaller list of project priorities. But seeing that phasing over a 20-year time period of this comes first and then this will come next, I think that would help educate people on the RTP.

In regard to Ms. Hill's comment about folks down here in the valley that don't go to Tahoe, Chair Lawrence agrees that's an important issue. I know that my street on Reno and when I lived here in Carson City, I knew a lot of folks that ever went to trial because they didn't have the time or it was sort of a resource choice, as far as where they wanted to put their money. I knew a lot of folks that were in that situation.

Ms. Regan adds a couple of takeaways to wrap up. I'm glad you mentioned the EIP as the model. I think that's a key takeaway from the last several months of work. Really shifting this funding initiative for transportation to embrace that partnership model of sector commitments, which we've done successfully for 25 plus years of the EIP. I think it's the way to address a lot of what I just heard in terms of the concerns raised by the committee. The project pipeline is something we have refined and mastered through the EIP prioritization, our five-year Capital list. We have working groups that vet those projects. We've been able to do that successfully looking forward with matching up to funding sources. We've never really had a strong Transportation working group of the EIP now we're getting that underway, working with that implementation committee so-called TTIC if you heard that acronym, working with TTD, working with the implementers, and using our role as the MPO to convene all those necessary conversation. To member Gustafson's point, we're trying to build a seamless system that matches up all of these moving parts of parking, whether we go zonal congestion, transit, and a very complicated what our Director Marchetta has often said, is a Vulcanized approach of multiple jurisdictions that it gets really complicated.

So that is the vision of having this seamless approach. In terms of the corridor, and focusing there, if you just look at the numbers, like six million cars are in those two corridors of 28 and 89 in both states. And that's over the majority of the vehicles of the 10 million annual cars we've got in the Basin. So if we could start with that, there is a lot of technical work to do. One thing that wasn't mentioned that the technical team that's going to be investigating that work is CDM

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, TRANSPORTATION, & PUBLIC OUTREACH COMMITTEE

February 23, 2022

Smith. And they are a global consulting firm that's really quite the expert on, things like rotors you're charging and congestion pricing globally. So they're going to dig in and try to get good answers to the questions that we've heard raised today. So that more to come on those points but really appreciate the discussion. That's exactly what we're hoping to get today.

Public Comments & Questions

Steve Tesha comments as a transportation activist. Among my involvements these days, I continue to serve as the chair of South Shore Transportation Management Association and I'm honored to represent SS TMA on the TTIC that you've heard about. I really appreciate many of the comments that were made today, particularly those by Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Supervisor Gustafson, Commissioner Hill, and Supervisor Novasel. And overall, I think it's really important and I appreciate the increasing sophistication and level of detail that these conversations are now generating. This is where we need to go to get into the level of detail. Details such as the reality of grants and at the federal and state level and how that doesn't really get us where we need to go in an ongoing manner and the cautions about the fact that TOT=T and sales tax sources do not address the day use impacts. The way the conversation is going, we're getting into the level of detail we really need to if we're going to deal effectively with this issue. So, I encourage these ongoing conversations and getting feedback to our consulting team, RGS. Glad to hear that CDM Smith is going to get involved. If we want a world-class transportation system, we have to think in terms of world-class ideas, solutions, and approaches. As Josh mentioned as was brought up at the TMA meeting the importance of public outreach; please contemplate that strategy. There's some people that are getting bits and pieces of this out in the community. And if they don't have a full understanding of what's at stake and what we're trying to do, there can be problems in terms of people's willingness to support some of these things. So anyway, thank you for the discussion today. I know you need to move on to other meetings. Appreciate the time. Thanks.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Hill moved to adjourn.

The meeting was adjourned 10:33 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Katherine Hangeland  
Paralegal, TRPA

*The above meeting was recorded in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the recording 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](mailto:virtualmeetinghelp@trpa.gov).*