

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
GOVERNING BOARD

TRPA/Zoom

February 22, 2023

Meeting Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Ms. Gustafson called the meeting to order at 1:17 p.m.

Members present: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Bass (for Mr. Friedrich), Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Mr. Di Chiara (for Mr. Aguilar), Ms. Diss, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Hicks, Ms. Hill, Mr. Hoenigman, Ms. Laine, Mr. Rice, Mr. Settelmeyer, Ms. Williamson

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Hicks led the Pledge of Allegiance.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Aldean said members received an errata sheet adding Agenda Item VII.B.1, The Compact's open meeting law requirement, Article III(d) to the agenda.

Ms. Gustafson said the updated agenda was posted and deemed the agenda approved.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (January 25, 2023 Governing Board Minutes will be in the March 22, 2023, Packet)

V. TRPA CONSENT CALENDAR

1. January Financials
2. TRPA Application Filing Fee Schedule
3. Lifting of the prohibition on accepting applications under Code Section 65.1.6(F) for an application for a small on-site biofuel unit at the South Tahoe Refuse site in South Lake Tahoe, California
4. Incline High School Public Service Addition, 499 Village Blvd., Washoe County, Nevada, Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 124-071-51 and 124-071-52, TRPA File Number ERSP2022-1818

Ms. Gustafson said a member of the public asked that the Governing Board pull Item 3, Lifting of the prohibition on accepting applications under Code Section 65.1.6(F) for an application for a small on-site biofuel unit at the South Tahoe Refuse site in South Lake Tahoe, California

Are there any members of the Board that would like to pull this item from the Consent Calendar?
There are no members requesting to pull this item, therefore, we'll take public comment but will not pull the item.

GOVERNING BOARD

February 22, 2023

Ms. Aldean said the Operations and Governance Committee recommended approval of items one and two. For the January Financials, cash flow was a negative \$1.8 million for the month due to the transfer of \$2.7 million of excess coverage mitigation funds to the Nevada Division of State Lands. Without this transfer, the cash would have been a positive \$800,000 plus. TRPA's Balance Sheet remains strong with revenues and expenses remaining on track.

The Filing Fee Schedule was reviewed and approved in October 2022. Unfortunately, there was an error on the spreadsheet in which both the previous base fees and the new base fees were escalated. Refunds of any amount over \$20 will be issued to any effected applicants.

Mr. Hicks said this item required a recommendation to be made by the committee because the current ordinance says that TRPA shall suspend acceptance of applications for biofuel facilities until further research demonstrates the safety and environmental compatibility of such facilities. There's a history to this particular ordinance that was passed in 2012 but there's been a lot of changes since 2012. They found in their discussions that there are at least three California counties, one of which is Placer County. There's also Tuolumne and Plumas County that either have these facilities in place or moving forward in permitting these facilities. Plumas County has an existing facility that is in operation now. They can look at the track record of that particular facility even though there are some variations between the nature of its operation and what's proposed here for the City of South Lake Tahoe. Tuolumne and Placer are in the process, but they've been going through the Federal permitting system. It's impressive that they either completed it or near completion without any problems. The circumstances and technology have changed. Their committee formulated a recommendation to recommend that the Governing Board accept the application for the South Tahoe Refuse on-site biomass project. It's to be noted that this is a test project. By suspending the suspension of this particular ordinance, they've concluded that there is sufficient information at this time, to allow this to suspension to be suspended for this particular project to be taken for a further test to see how it matches under our requirements when placed along side the State of California and Federal requirements. This had a great deal of support from the City and different groups involved in it.

This is not an approval of the project but does allow them to file the application in order for the next step to be taken. This will allow South Tahoe Refuse to file an application for TRPA's review. It doesn't commit the Governing Board to approve the project. Assuming the project continues and satisfies the review there will be a variety of public hearings and comment sessions. The public is not precluded from this process but allows the next step to be taken.

Ms. Gustafson said Item number 4, Incline High School Public Service Addition, 499 Village Blvd., Washoe County, Nevada, Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 124-071-51 and 124-071-52, TRPA File Number ERSP2022-1818 was not heard by any committee.

Board Comments & Questions

None.

Public Comments & Questions

None.

Ms. Hill moved approval.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Bass, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Mr. Di Chiara, Ms. Diss, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Hoenigman, Ms. Laine, Mr. Rice, Mr. Settelmeyer, Ms. Williamson

Motion carried.

VI. WORKSHOP

- A. Transportation Equity Workshop: Briefing on the Transportation Equity Study and review of draft policy concepts and potential actions for the Keeping Tahoe Moving Initiative

TRPA staff Ms. Smith and Ms. Flint, DKS Associates provided the presentation and workshop.

Work on this project was started about one year ago and TRPA as the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Tahoe Basin is responsible for establishing the transportation framework for the Tahoe Region by adopting goals and policies in the Regional Transportation Plan every four years. The last Regional Transportation Plan was adopted by the Board in 2021 and the Transportation Equity Study was a recommendation from that plan.

They know from the last Regional Transportation Plan update that transportation access is increasingly difficult for some of our most vulnerable residents. By conducting this study, they can hopefully identify solutions to improve access and services for those communities. They are also seeing new funding opportunities coming out of Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill and those discretionary funding sources are increasingly tied to equity. If there are a set of policies that address transportation equity, they can set the regional partners up to be more competitive for some of those funding sources. They are also expecting that state regional transportation plan guidelines that they'll update later this year to include stricter guidelines around considering equity in Regional Transportation Plans. For all those reasons, and to improve access for our most vulnerable communities, they're conducting this study.

Staff last came to the Board in August 2022, and back today seeking input on draft policy ideas and proposed actions. Based on the feedback that they hear today and feedback they collect from the public over the next couple of weeks, they'll be developing a list of draft policies and bringing that back to the Board for review in early summer.

Slide 3: Equality is where everyone has access to the same bicycle and equity is where everyone has access to a bicycle in their size. Bicycles on the bottom probably require different resources to manufacture and they probably don't all cost the same, but the point is that everybody in that photo has mobility independence. That's really what the focus of this study is and how they're thinking about transportation equity for Lake Tahoe.

The primary goals for this project are to identify the transportation burdens and barriers facing our community through an extensive public outreach process to incorporate or develop tools to incorporate equity considerations into our planning and project reviews, and to establish targets to measure transportation equity, and to leverage some of those discretionary funding sources. Lastly to provide policy recommendations to improve accessibility and transportation equity for Lake Tahoe. That final objective is the focus of today's presentation and workshop.

Beginning last summer, they did a lot of public outreach to identify the barriers and burdens facing our most vulnerable communities, and they tried to focus a lot of our outreach on these communities because these are the most transportation disadvantaged communities.

GOVERNING BOARD

February 22, 2023

- Persons without private transportation
- Seniors (individuals 65 years and older)
- Persons living below the poverty line
- Individuals with a disability
- Youth (individuals under 18 years old)
- BIPOC (Black, Indigenous, and people of color)

In addition to working with some of our local community based organizations, they also were able to identify neighborhoods in the basin with higher densities of these populations to focus some place-based outreach to understand what the barriers are for these folks. And we were able to identify those areas using census data.

As part of this project, they also purchased a census based data platform called “My Sidewalk” that displays census data for the basin with a particular focus on equity metrics. This platform is available on our project website. In addition to aiding them with some of our demographic analysis for this project, they are hoping that this will be a valuable resource for some of our local jurisdictions when they're applying for funding and assessing projects.

In the 2020 Regional Transportation Plan, our environmental justice analysis included identifying neighborhoods with higher densities of those transportation disadvantaged communities. In the 2020 RTP, they identified these five neighborhoods as the community priority zones: Kings Beach, Incline Village, Bijou/Ski Run, Sierra Tract, and Tahoe Valley.

Ultimately with the goal of increasing our transportation investments in these neighborhoods, and for this project in particular, they tried to focus a lot of our community outreach in these neighborhoods so that they were reaching out to the most vulnerable communities and trying to understand what the barriers are to transportation access.

Outreach so far on this project has included two focus group meetings, and targeted outreach in some of those neighborhoods. They've had at least 20 different one on one meetings with stakeholders. They had a community survey that was translated into Spanish and to Tagalog. They organized several pop-ups in neighborhoods, farmers markets, in front of supermarkets, and then also hosted two workshops in Spanish.

Slide 8 shows a list of some of the stakeholders that they've met with throughout this project. It's been interesting to meet with all of these folks because they each provide a unique perspective on transportation equity. Through this outreach and all of these meetings, they were able to understand and identify what the barriers are to transportation for our communities.

Through all of that outreach they heard about a lot of different transportation barriers. Some of what they heard from a lot of different people, multiple times were first, availability of public transit has been a concern for a lot of people. Accessibility and safety of our transportation network, particularly in the winter and at night. The cost of transportation can be a challenge for a lot of people. Data from the US Department of Housing and Urban Transportation indicates that on average Tahoe residents are spending 28 percent of their income on transportation. And for low-income households that figure is even higher. The distance and time spent traveling can be an issue, especially for people who are commuting from outside of the basin because they can't afford to live in the basin. The adequacy of transportation conditions is a concern. One example, when sidewalks aren't cleared of snow or swept, those sidewalks can deteriorate rapidly. They are also hearing from

a lot of people about climate and weather related events that impact the transportation network. Some examples are major winter weather events or evacuation scenarios.

They took all of that feedback that they heard from the community and worked with our consultants over the past several months to develop this list of policy ideas which will review with you today.

There are six categories of policy ideas that they have developed for the workshop and will provide a couple of examples that they heard from the community directly about some of the barriers that they're facing.

Engagement: From the analysis they know that about 7 percent of the basin population does not speak English, and they know through their outreach that those populations really do want to be engaged. They want to provide feedback, but they feel like they don't have the opportunities to do that currently. A lot of the policy ideas under the engagement section are centered around increasing those opportunities.

Access: They focus on understanding what barriers limit mobility. They heard from a lot of different people about challenges, navigating sidewalks in the winter. People can feel unsafe when they have to walk in the street because the sidewalk hasn't been cleared of snow, or because there wasn't a sidewalk in that location at all. For people with disabilities, this can be especially challenging, and oftentimes impossible. A lot of the policy ideas under access are centered around increasing access and addressing some of those challenges.

Infrastructure: There are a lot of different policy ideas under infrastructure, and one thing that they heard from the community is that there is a need for increased access to broadband and the community is definitely supportive of seeing advancements in transportation infrastructure technologies like electric vehicle charging infrastructure. But there are also concerns about installing an electric vehicle charging station in a low-income neighborhood, and who that would actually serve, for example.

Services: They heard about the need for prioritized lifeline services which are services that people depend on to get to work school, access health care and groceries. One example they heard from the Lake Tahoe Community College is that their English, as a second language classes typically occur at night, and this is usually after the Tahoe Transportation District bus services end for the day. The students in those ESL classes don't have their own car after class they have to find their own way home by walking, biking, or in some cases taking a taxi. It can be challenging, and sometimes dangerous if it's dark, and may be cost prohibitive. They also heard from a couple of stakeholders, particularly that the homeless coalitions and live violence free, that bus drivers are often on the front lines when people are experiencing mental health crises, and that by providing tools for those bus drivers to handle those situations when they arise could improve safety on buses, improve the perception of safety on transit, and mitigate some transportation risks.

Environment related transportation barriers: They heard a lot about concerns stemming from climate change. The number one concern they heard from almost every stakeholder they talked to was about concerns around evacuation scenarios. They had the chance to communicate with a lot of community members about their experiences evacuating from the Caldor Fire. They heard there were some instances where families have 10 or more family members and share one car amongst all of them, and in some cases they chose not to evacuate because they couldn't fit all 10 people in

their car, and they didn't feel like they had other options. They also heard from the homeless coalitions and the senior centers whose residents depend almost entirely on public transit. They don't have access to their own vehicles, and those agencies felt like in the Caldor Fire evacuation they were successful in evacuating because they had a lot of time to prepare but they worry about situations in which they would have as much time.

Technology: The community is supportive of deploying more transportation technologies but there are also concerns about ensuring that technology-based transportation improvements are still accessible. They heard from a couple community members without phones that they are dependent on the bus schedules. Sometimes they'll show up to a bus stop, and if the bus isn't there when it's scheduled, they'll start walking so, ensuring that they have accessible real-time information.

Slide 17 is the draft of the Equity Index Scorecard which is in the packet as Attachment. B on page 205. The scorecard was developed for TRPA staff to consider these seven areas when reviewing proposed projects, programs, and transportation investments.

Presentation can be found at: <https://www.trpa.gov/wp-content/uploads/Agenda-Item-VI.-A.-Transportation-Equity-Study-Policy-Workshop.pdf>

Board Comments & Questions

None.

Ms. Regan said they've had a lot of discussion today around transportation and intersects TRPA's Metropolitan Planning Organization role with their land use authority but really highlighting the beauty of the Compact language that ties those two together in land use planning. They have a unique authority in the country to make meaningful differences around those two topics.

Ms. Conrad-Saydah asked a question on some of the statistics shared, for example, on the percentage of non-English speakers, was that Census provided information or additional information? Also, regarding homeless access, she feels like some of those numbers can be under counts, where did the data come from so they have a sense of what the error might be in those demand numbers.

Ms. Smith said the 7 percent figure comes from their latest Title VI and limited English proficiency plan updates, which was about two years ago, and that data is from the Census.

Ms. Faustinos said funding is an incentive a lot of times when it has dedicated resources for disadvantaged communities and such. She hopes that this does not become just a flash in the pan, and that it is something that TRPA consistently incorporates in all of their policy decision making is how to be more inclusive. Making sure that in particular those people in the community that don't have access to Broadband and frankly don't know government and how they can participate. One of the parts that she read in the report was maybe having leadership type academies, basically Civics 101 for community members, that that don't usually participate in these kinds of discussions. She voiced her strong support for that approach. It really does change the whole paradigm of how the broader community feels like they can participate in this process and feels welcome.

Ms. Ortiz provided instructions on how the members would be split into the three groups. Members

will stay in the assigned room for the duration of the workshop. The public can make comments via Mentimeter online platform.

While in the breakout groups, members are asked to think of one really important question of “What are the most important policy ideas and actions for staff to focus on.” Think about ideas that you support, any clarifications, questions, or any concerns.

Workshop

Engagement Policy:

Commit to respectfully engaging underserved populations:

Incentives for participation could include financial incentives, gift cards at a local grocery store for people to participate in the stakeholder study.

Meet them where they are. Rather than having folks to come to us and our public meetings, do outreach at community events or go to meetings at these community based organizations.

Ask clearly. About 7 percent of the population here doesn't speak English as their primary language.

Ask once. Often times, there are several public meetings simultaneously that are variations on similar themes or about specific projects.

Ask simultaneously. During the Caldor Fire evacuation there was Spanish translation on some items but unfortunately that didn't happen simultaneously.

Board Feedback:

If 7% of the population as non-native English speakers, is that of a first language?

Is there any data on secondary language?

A lot of these principles make a lot of sense, especially being able to show up on the communities terms instead of them meeting our terms.

Support for all the policy points nested within how to respectfully engage with the underserved populations. Having a respectful reimbursement policy is a very important element so people can have their voices heard. Not mentioned but assuming there was childcare elements at these events and information to children that's relevant to the meeting topic.

The simultaneous translation is important to the extent that it can be done and is not a distraction in the room. It's more expensive in getting that translation equipment for people to hear the translation as it's being given as opposed to having several different types of translation including sign language.

Translators need to be on hand to translate immediately.

Not just summary documents and fact sheets but moving towards live interpretation for public meetings would be a huge help.

Support for interpretive services. It could be an “on request” basis, that other documents and informational items translated on request. It’ll make people feel more engaged and a part of the process.

Want people to get engaged because they want to be engaged. Getting them the service that they feel isn’t being provided. Then how do we get the leaders of these underserved communities involved in our process so they can deliver to us what we as a Board will bring back to make it a more equitable service all around.

Support for “ask once” – a lot of head nods. We have too many meetings.

Support for equity, not equality and spending more time with groups we may not be usually spending time with.

We have a bunch of sub-committees but what if we appointed diverse people to these sub committees who could give input on behalf of our communities.

Difficulties with childcare and meetings starting at 8am. Having meetings in the middle of the workday when people are working means you tend to get self-employed and retired people making comments. Recommendations for meetings in the evening and on the weekends to get participation from that workforce.

North Truckee Tahoe Leadership group – all of the members were sponsored by their employers. Could we involve employers in these leadership academies?

Adding diverse voices to boards is very important. The more we can hear from voices that have fallen prey to misinformation is great. Maybe we can find some champions who can attend regularly and get a regular compensation.

Pushing back on comments from residents who say they are a “20 year resident, a 10 year resident, etc.” Making it clear from the onset of public meetings that we want to hear from everyone, their tenure doesn’t matter. They can have lived here for 6 months or one year, and they contribute and their voice matters.

Do they ever work with community leaders to host these meetings? It may make people more comfortable to get involved and engaged if it was a familiar setting. For example, going to someone’s house in a neighborhood. It’s a way to build community leaders as well, to have them take charge.

Support for removing contract barriers. Pay in portions, rather than paying after delivery in lump sum.

Add diverse voices to influential boards and Committees:

A community academy that trains people on different government processes so, they too, can have a tract to get engaged. Stipends for participation, language can be modified. There’s the idea of hosting roundtables or meet and greets at popular gathering places.

Board Feedback:

Recommended a leadership academy, i.e. understanding acronyms and speaking the “government language.” Importance of compensation, as many of these meetings are during the day and people have day jobs and can’t attend during our hours. Need to figure out a good way, whether it’s stipends or compensation.

There are stipends mentioned for participating in various meetings. The distinctions between incentives and stipends, where stipends are typically a reimbursement which is reasonable, money permitting. Hopefully, they don’t have to use a lot of incentives to get people to participate as long as they are made whole as a result of their participation. It’s like paying people to vote. This is being done to assist people that if they merely agree to provide them with stipends for reimbursement for loss of work time, transportation, etc. Suggest that it be a reimbursement rather than a financial or food incentive because that diminishes the importance of that program.

Targeting a percentage of outreach efforts on these underserved populations:

Right now, they don’t have any targets, nor does everybody track what how much of their time is going towards these underserved populations. They would propose that they could track that and target a specific percentage.

Board Feedback:

The Board doesn’t know what staff’s current percentage of time put forth for underserved outreach and what staff’s workload involves. Asked about existing training (Tahoe Chambers) and making sure it doesn’t overlap. Maybe a community organization can sponsor people for the program.

Support for a percentage target and may need to be higher since it may take more staff time to reach.

The people we’re trying to reach (i.e., transit riders) may make up a larger percentage of target population.

Infrastructure, Access, & Technology:

They’re trying to find ways to make sure that policies and programs take a look at things like the Equity Index Scorecard. It’s not to say that every project and program have to comply with all seven of these things but are criteria that staff should look at as a guidance document to find out whether there are opportunities to make that work.

Infrastructure that improves accessibility for all different types of modalities including wider trails for people who might be using a wheelchair or being able to look at things that have bike racks so people can other places in the basin.

Encourage multi-modal transportation options which is making sure that they do have the ability to use other types of ways of getting around in general.

Making access better for people that are bikes or pedestrians and then looking at intelligent transportation systems and broadband investment. The pieces that are important is that it's not just for people to access the internet and watch Netflix, it's for getting people connected during an emergency and connecting technology that can tie our lights, traffic signals and other things together to move people throughout the basin more efficiently and in a safer manner. Which makes all that intelligent transportation work well.

Board Feedback:

What about gentrifying neighborhoods by installing EV charging infrastructure? Car share with EVs within a multi-family development rather than within the neighborhood could help and is a nice amenity.

A lot of these charging stations are accessible to anyone, why can't they be locked and only available to the occupants of that housing project?

Supported infrastructure for real time information at bus stops and that can function for all languages.

How much of Tahoe is ADA compliant?

In Even though sidewalks may be in the city or county right-of-way, responsibility for removing snow on those sidewalks rest with the adjacent property owner. In a winter like this, that can be difficult to enforce. One would assume that the local jurisdictions are attempting to enforce that as much as possible especially in these priority zones that are being identified.

Enforcement of clearing sidewalks is very important.

A Gondola from the Stateline Transit Center to the mobility hub at the Y. It would have five stops at each one of the Town Centers. Microtransit would be able to use that as a link. A feasibility report could further this idea.

Studying the opportunities for having separate pathways for cyclists and pedestrians is important to have pathways wide enough to accommodate wheelchairs.

Technology:

Board Feedback:

Supported ITS and broad band have as well as real time information at bus shelters; consider that transit can be challenging for families as kids under 10 are often in special seats – this age group is hard to switch from modes, kids move more slowly. Consider this and strollers to ensure these are not a hinderance.

Real time info is a great addition, helps increase ridership; bus stops need better amenities and even adding multimodal options nearby to help complete that last mile.

Draft Service Policy:

Make sure that bus drivers have the opportunity to get front line training. Often, they are first people that will see folks that are in distress. Also, look and prioritize unmet transit needs and create an interregional discussion from the public and private sector about ways to manage that. They are still a lot of gaps and whether it's a time of day or it's an expense gap. Also change some of the transit agencies timing of service and incentivize that.

Board Feedback:

There's a need to have service demands that meet the workforce needs and there needs to be better transit service on the South Shore main line. Need to look at a new service model which may mean going to the private sector to provide the main line for the workforce by creating service metrics.

Supported crisis training for transit drivers.

Smaller transit vehicles make sense for late night, Seniors – great idea.

Consensus for extending hours and training for drivers.

Draft Environmental Policies:

Trying to get greater use of transit and supporting education and regional evacuation and emergency planning. First responders would like coordination basin wide. This might not be something for TRPA to lead but to support and encourage. The other piece was encouraging greater use of transit. One of the policies may be to incentivize carpooling or taking buses to resorts or major attractions. The Gondola would be a great way to get people onto public transit. Most people said they didn't take transit because it didn't go where they wanted and took too long.

Board Feedback:

Evacuation was difficult during the fire because some people didn't have a car. In addition to developing these government related plans there needs to be a greater effort to develop neighborhood support groups. In the event of a fire and evacuation, have neighborhood support groups who can pre-identify people who need transportation and assign them families to help them evacuate in the event of an emergency. This approach not only needs to focus on government service but focus on services that other people can render to others.

Transit in high demand areas, need parking management and the fees are needed to push people to use transit, same as ski resorts. Mentioned need for timing entry to help with access and congestion.

The number one issue is emergency evacuation. We depend on our Sheriffs and Cal Fire to manage evacuations – TRPA doesn't need to take the lead.

Evacuation planning is already happening in Washoe. There is also GPS data available to assist us with that.

TRPA has the boating app. Could this be expanded to include emergencies off the lake? It could be beneficial in neighborhoods where evacuation mandates are different (crosses jurisdictions)

People can't always access broadband as easily during emergencies.

Emergency preparedness, volunteer-based programs where they get paired up with people who have room in their car to assist other people.

TRPA could do a modal analysis to determine where there are safe places (schools, civic centers, etc.) to stop along transit routes. Highly encourages TRPA to apply for a CRC.

Services & Environment:

Services:

Services that people depend on to get to work, school, or access health care. Facilitate Megaregion transit or a specialized transit roundtable to support interregional transit options. Interregional transit options are critical for people who are accessing healthcare in the valley because it's not readily available in the basin. Or people who are traveling to Carson to buy groceries because they're less expensive than in the basin. They're encountering challenges identifying funding to provide a lot of those sources. One of the issues that they are seeing is that the funding that's currently used to operate those services in between the South Shore and Carson City for example, is rural funding. Because the basin is designated as an urbanized area that would limit them from using urban formula funding that they receive for transit services to operate transit services. All of the money that's used is discretionary and limits them in what they can do. They're considering potential policy options that they could adopt in the next Regional Transportation Plan to ease some of those burdens.

Continue unmet needs for transit ridership.

Board Feedback:

Need to provide transit options between the Valley and Tahoe – there are a lot of workers that commute. Look at funding from a regional perspective rather than South Lake money going to only South Lake services, Placer money going to Placer services, etc.

Developing public/private partnerships is important. Could large employers like Costco provide a dedicated van that shuttles shoppers from the Lake to the valley? Employers may be excited to help subsidize the cost of a van?

Partnerships are important to get buses/shuttles to transport people to the stores.

The main audience are already transit users but encourages us to get outside of our normal outreach.

Reach out to community groups and larger employers that might have lower wage workers.

Main hospital is outside of the basin so communication with healthcare service providers is important.

Vanpool is finally getting traction in Incline Village. Make sure that information is available to the public. The vans are free, so this is a great deal.

These services are really important but doesn't want them to cause sprawl as an unintended consequence.

If the bike paths were plowed, would people use them?

There are no sidewalks except in the Casino core. Private businesses clear snow in that area.

Snow removal is the responsibility of the business owner. The issue is that not all businesses owners do it.

Bike Coalition helps contribute to snow plowing but more funding is needed.

Different locations have different usages. There should be an assessment based on the business frontage. A business may pay more for 40 ft of frontage versus everyone having to clear snow on their own.

There was a measure that was passed 20 years ago in the City of South Lake Tahoe that provides funding for bike trail maintenance. If they can't create an assessment, they would ask the public for a new bond when that expires.

Promote quality of service for transportation options:

Work closer with the transit agencies.

Washoe County for the first time investing in snow removal for bike/ped infrastructure. If TRPA can provide data on what is being maintained and what should be maintained.

Agreed that getting to transit (i.e. sidewalks) is very important and currently difficult.

How do you enforce rules on snow removal? Hard to get staff for plows.

Everyone appreciates the ability to walk everywhere.

Service industry folks should be considered.

Poll people that are actually using the services – Reno airporter for example.

Sidewalk Clearing:

Sidewalk clearing has been raised as an issue by community members. When TRPA permits a lot of these projects with sidewalk infrastructure, they require the local jurisdictions to submit information to TRPA on who is responsible for the maintenance of those investments. There could be opportunities for TRPA to be stricter in what they're requiring before they permit a project. Maybe agreements between the responsible maintenance party and the local jurisdiction. There could also be opportunities for TRPA to support by providing snow clearing routes or data.

Board Feedback:

City hasn't been actively enforcing ordinance requiring business owners to remove their snow. They are starting to do compliance and are seeing success with it. There are challenges with tenants that are renting and who is responsible for that.

Lots of businesses clear their snow then the plows comes through and cover those sidewalks again when plowing the street adjacent to the sidewalks. This is a burden to the property owner. This is a local jurisdiction issue with how it's handled with the business owners.

TRPA can't be everything to everyone. Suggests that snow removal efforts should be left to the local jurisdictions.

Emergency Evacuation:

Where do you see TRPA playing a role in evacuation planning?

Board Feedback:

TRPA should be the convener. They should be involved in regional ingress/egress points but only to facilitate and support the discussion. It needs to be approached from a regional perspective but only as a convener to facilitate the conversation. When projects are approved, they should be required to show how they will evacuate. Important to get the private side involved in emergency evacs.

First responders need to coordinate between jurisdictions and makes sense that TRPA could help facilitate.

TRPA needs to work with local jurisdictions to have programs at the ready that would help disadvantaged communities.

Engagement Summary:

Ample support for translation services, particularly live translation at public meetings.

Support for community academies and finding ways to add diverse voices to the Governing Board.

Encourage corporate sponsorship for employers in the region to try and support some of those leaders that are already here in the community to engage.

Compensation or incentives to participate. They should clarify whether it's stipends or reimbursement. Not paying people to "vote." Possible compensation for childcare. This was important barrier from being able to participate in public meetings.

There's a larger percentage of target populations that might be using transit services. Let's make sure that when they are targeting a percentage of outreach efforts, they are including staff on how that recommendation comes forward. Recognizing that these populations might take more resources in order to reach them.

Support for removing contracting barriers.

Services and Environment Summary:

Transit:

Support for strengthening public/private partnerships.

Providing better transit, especially to the valley and Reno for work commute, healthcare, and shopping services.

Sidewalk Clearing:

There were mixed opinions. Where TRPA could play a role is by providing mapping and route support to the local jurisdictions when they are clearing sidewalks and bike paths.

Environment:

Evacuation planning scenarios. There were mixed opinions about TRPA's involvement. In general, it was agreed that TRPA should play in role in some form in a regional evacuation scenario.

Access/Infrastructure/Technology Summary:

Access:

Discussion was on snow removal and better access to information on the transit shelters. Real time bus routes.

Solar power motion sensor lighting to ensure safety at the shelters.

ADA compliant. There was not a desire to reinvent existing trails but more so to make sure that they have the right modes associated with the right paths on a basin wide effort.

Infrastructure:

Support for broadband. It's already moving forward at TRPA.

Intelligent transportation systems.

Using opportunities to have multi-lingual signage and flashing messaging: Availability for parking and information for evacuation or health.

Technology:

Tie together light signals and making it easier for people to get in and out of areas.

Changing the way, they control movement through the basin.

Coordinating with Caltrans and local jurisdictions to tie those together. Even though they may go across different jurisdictions, the technology would work across all those different paths.

There was general support for the Equity Index Scorecard with the understanding that it is a reference document to guide a review of potential project, program, or initiative but not a specific grade list to hit a certain target for each and everything that they went through.

Public Comments via Mentimeter:

<https://www.trpa.gov/wp-content/uploads/Agenda-Item-VI-A-Transportation-Equity-Study-Policy-Workshop-Mentimeter-Results.pdf>

Engagement Policy:

Members of the public encouraged building trusted relationships with members of the community.

Meeting people where they are.

Engaging with already trusted community leaders.

Supported diverse voices to decision making bodies, City Council, Governing Board, Tahoe Transportation District, etc.

Increasing the frequency to underserved populations.

Access/Infrastructure/Technology:

Increasing or developing communication plans that identifies how people can access transit.

Making dedicated HOV lanes perhaps.

Park and Ride options to get to transit and Gondola access.

Services and Environment:

Mass and microtransit specifically for the workforce to get to the basin for work.

Identifying where there are gaps in evacuation services.

Ms. Smith said today's feedback will be used to develop a list of draft polices. Staff plans to bring this back to the Board in early summer for endorsement. After endorsement, the list of policies will be incorporated in the transportation plan updates over the next couple of years.

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Hill said great work on the community outreach. Her constituents have spoken to her about all of these issues.

Public Comments & Questions

Scott Robbins member of the South Lake Tahoe City Council on behalf of himself and not representative of the Council or the City of South Lake Tahoe as a whole. What he heard today was interesting and showed a lot of vision and understanding of the places they need to go in the future. But he has to bring it back to the present, and at this time they are not moving forward. The reality of our public transit system is that they're moving backwards. Bus service, only this just past November on the South Shore was cut in half. They are not making a connection here between the housing crisis and the inability to hire drivers. This was mentioned at one of the breakout sessions. Even on the North Shore, they are experiencing a severe shortage of commercial drivers.

There is a connection between the housing crisis, and a deeper connection between the fact that the rare residential unit permits are allowed to be used for full-time commercial vacation rentals which has driven up the cost of housing because housing comes off they rental market and goes into the tourist accommodation unit market. That drives up the cost of housing, then housing becomes unavailable. Labor leaves the region. The cost of that labor goes up, and they're no longer able to hire drivers. Heavenly Ski Resort pays their commercial drivers of their buses close to \$30 per hour, and they have bus service every 15 minutes. If that's not in the budget for the various transit agencies, then they have to address the problem at the level of the costs of living. So long as they're not addressing in a meaningful way, the fact that a huge proportion of our housing supply has been diverted for tourist accommodation uses then they're not going to be able to get a handle on the cost of living which means they're not going to be able to get a handle on the labor shortage. Meaning that they're not going to be able to execute on these visions for a grand integrated transit system which requires things like park and ride, and bus infrastructure, all of which requires staff and staff that can be hired at affordable rates.

There's a disconnect here between the vision for the future, which is fantastic but the present reality in which they're operating and the underlying causes of the staffing shortages that are not just

limited to government operations, but to all businesses here in the basin. Everyone is short of staffing because no one can afford to live here. Unless they get a handle on these underlying problems, they're not going to be able to execute on the vision for the future. It's a vision which he loves. He likes where they're going, but they have to address the present shortcomings and that they are currently going backwards, not forwards. If they want to go forward, they have to get the car out of reverse.

Brett Tibbets, Cave Rock resident echoed the Council members comments. He's completely befuddled by the planning, and then what you actually do as the TRPA. How in the world, when you're talking about transportation equity and limiting trips? Does it make sense to move Barton Hospital from the Y to Stateline? It primarily serves South Lake Tahoe. There's 25,000 people there and you're going bring all those people up here for healthcare. The 2,000 people that live in the Douglas County side, mostly use Carson Tahoe Hospital. It just seems totally backwards that you would allow that to happen. Evacuation planning, he was amazed that you act like there's nothing you do. All of your effort is into limiting roadway capacity right now. You want to limit Highway 50 on the east side, you want to limit the North Shore. That's restricting evacuation. He doesn't understand. You've got a complete mess on the North Shore with the traffic calming, traffic circles, and that emergency vehicles and snowplows can't use. Miles of traffic, people can't get to their jobs. All the big projects you've approved lately are for rich people. There's no affordable housing, the site being used for Barton Hospital could have been an amazing site for affordable housing.

One of the few left, yet there's no public discussion. It's just all behind the black curtain. It's amazing. The Tahoe Beach Club and the Latitude 39, absolutely no effort to include affordable housing. People of reasonable means can't live here. Everything you do that he sees, is moving toward making this the Billionaire Boys Club with all the private beaches, all the billionaires that live here. He doesn't see what you're doing, the words are fine, but the actions and what you actually approve back up your words.

Doug Flaherty said this is directly related to comments made by Ms. Aldean on the issue of where TRPA should take a role in convening transportation evacuation. The Bi-State Compact states that an environmental threshold carrying capacity means an environmental standard necessary to maintain a significant scenic, recreational, educational, scientific, or natural value of the region or to maintain public health and safety within the region. The information you currently have in your standards only addresses public facilities. You are totally deficient, you're aware of the issue, you're required to come up with a public safety environmental threshold carrying capacity and you're not doing it and you've avoided this for a very long time. Yes, you are the conveners. In fact, you're required under the Compact that says there's a public interest in protecting, preserving, enhancing the values for the residents and visitors of the region which include public health. Your role is to develop a public safety environmental threshold carrying capacity which includes the elephant in the room; wildfire evacuation for the public, the residents, and the visitors, and understand the difference between an evacuation plan, which is nothing more than a bunch of arrows on a map and an evacuation roadway capacity assessment. There are two different things. You must provide a data driven data public roadway evacuation assessment capability study. The Butte County grand jury did this many years ago. Their Board of Commissioners at that time rejected their suggestions, and a few years later Paradise burnt down, and -we lost many lives. It's time for the Board to say until we do this

assessment, this wildfire evacuation road capacity assessment, we're going to put on hold all this stuff about increased height, density, and coverage. It's just craziness, it's time to get serious about this.

In addition, there needs to be an updated supplemental Environmental Impact Statement from the 2012 Regional Plan, taking into account all the changes and conditions in the Tahoe Basin since 2012.

Kathie Julian supported Mr. Flaherty's suggestion for the focus on roadway capacity study. She appreciated one of the members who mentioned that when you look at developments in the region, and especially housing or tourism developments that one should look at the impact that would have on evacuation plans. In particular, she agreed with roadway capacity, because in Incline Village and Crystal Bay area this is the critical factor. She thanked everyone for being so supportive of bilingual translation and those services to our Spanish speaking community.

VII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director Status Report

1) Annual Report

2) Tahoe In Brief – Governing Board Monthly Report

Ms. Regan said the Annual Report documents 2022 and was a 10 year milestone of the Regional Plan update. Included is a timeline that shows some of the progress that not just TRPA has achieved, but the entire partnership of Team Tahoe. As we talk about the challenges as we have today, it's easy to get daunted. There are so many challenges ahead, but it's equally important to note what we have accomplished in the last decade as a partnership with TRPA in its leadership role of the Compact. She thanked the Board for the work that they've done over the years and also a thank you to staff pulling that report together.

The budget was discussed in greater detail this morning at the Operations and Governance Committee. In Nevada, they had their first legislative informational hearing the week before last, and they are working with the Governor's office and with the Legislature with some pretty exciting opportunities in Nevada to come up to our one-third share of the Compact appropriation request.

They also have some requests to pass through to the Tahoe Transportation District in the budget request. Thank you to many of our board members and particularly Ms. Hill and Mr. Settelmeyer, and others that have been helping them move through the Nevada process. It's a biennium and they are in session this year and is a two year budget for Nevada and optimistic that they'll move that through to a successful conclusion in early June.

In California they are working very hard to maintain our baseline funding. They are not in the General Fund in California which is facing a very substantial shortfall of \$20 plus billion. Their funding on the general fund side for TRPA's general fund comes from California through special funds of the Environmental License Plate Fund and the Harbors and Watercraft Fund, which supports the Watercraft Education Program and the Aquatic Invasive Species program. They are working hard to keep those at baseline and will know more when the Governor's budget in

GOVERNING BOARD

February 22, 2023

California comes out in May. They're engaged with the California Natural Resources agency and also our legislative partners in California.

TRPA sent a brief comment letter related to the Palisades Tahoe project, which is out of the basin but there is a revised project going through an environmental process right now with Placer County. The letter states that they're working together to collaborate on solutions around transportation, mitigation, and any potential impacts to the basin.

Next month, Lake Tahoe Community College has a project coming before you on student housing, and many of you heard a briefing from Jeff de Franco and the team at the Lake Tahoe Community College last year. It's a 100 unit student dorm project here in South Lake Tahoe. Very exciting, related to housing as a potential solution to relieve some pressure on housing on the South Shore.

If anyone would like to know more in advance of that meeting, the college team has volunteered March 14 for a site walk of any Board members that didn't have the benefit of that briefing last year. Please let her know if you are interested to go over for a field tour.

Staff will be doing a Climate Code Workshop on March 2nd. Long Range Planning staff are working with graduate students from UC Davis, Environmental Policy and Management program to develop this first phase of work. Anyone is welcome to participate in that.

Last week, they interviewed stellar candidates for a Chief Partnerships Officer and Deputy Director position which was basically her former position. Thank you to the interview panel, Ms. Atchley, Mr. Hester, Mr. Haven, and California Tahoe Conservancy partner Mr. Vasques who served on this interview panel and are pleased to report that Kim Chevalier will be taking that position. Ms. Chevallier brings valuable mediation skills, plenty of relationships in and out of the basin and experience to this role.

Ms. Chevallier is very excited for the opportunity and looking forward to working with all of you in the future.

Kim's position for the Environmental Improvement Program Division Manager will be posted. TRPA also has a new member of Finance, Mirjana Gavric as the Finance and Grants Analyst back filling Melissa Uppendahl's position. Michelle Basta is our new temporary employee at the Front Desk. Our new GIS Analyst, Andy McClary will be working remotely for a couple months while trying to find housing here in the basin.

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Williamson referred to the Regional Plan Performance Measures Report on page 223. It looks like a few of our performance measures, specifically numbers 5 and 6 were not evaluated because there are new performance measures that they're going forth with. What is the process of updating those because they came out of the Regional Plan? So, they know what the performance metrics are, and then the follow up on that, she loves the met, partially met, not met so they can keep themselves honest and accountable. In future meetings, if they could talk more about those eight that are not being met or reported on.

Ms. Regan said the Board adopted these Performance Measures and will be discussing these at the

GOVERNING BOARD

February 22, 2023

retreat in April. Overtime, they've seen improvements that need to be made to those. There's lots of examples noted in this report but it was to satisfy concerns about the direction of the Regional Plan. They wanted to notate, how are we progressing in some of these big policy ideas. A lot of the discussion that they had today and how does that translate on the ground. The question speaks to even a larger discussion around the threshold update initiative. Overall, where do they have a lack of data and how do they work through that? They are working through a results chain process to measuring what matters.

Mr. Hester said there's the Threshold Update Measuring What Matters Initiative but in addition to the thresholds, some of which are out of date, not relevant, and some also didn't have baseline of what you could measure. There are about 400 other items being measured including these Regional Plan Performance Measures and some of them are similar to things they are measuring for other and some are hard to get data on. That's why they had the initiative to go through the 500 plus things including the thresholds that they're measuring that should really get down to about 100.

Mr. Bass said when he went through the Performance Metrics, it's great and it relates to land use policy and the things that are important to affect the change, but it doesn't show where they're. Taking the 500 and simplifying them to 100 seems like a lot of work, he would think that they could get some of these more data points to start from that would be included in these performance reviews.

Mr. Hester said a lot of the things you're asking about are online through Lake Tahoe Info but may not be included in this Regional Plan Performance Measures Report.

B. General Counsel Status Report

Mr. Marshall said they are going to continue the agenda item for the Open Meeting Law because of the time of day and because of the discussions at legal committee regarding teleconferencing.

Another lawsuit was filed against the Agency last Friday, challenging the Ski Run cell tower that is the subject of the Eisenstecken litigation. This litigation is concerning the plan revision that the Governing Board heard an Appeal on that related to the increase in foundational excavation for the tower. That will be represented by our outside council and indemnified by Verizon for defending that plan revision permit.

VIII. GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER REPORTS

None.

IX. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Local Government & Housing Committee

No report.

B. Legal Committee

GOVERNING BOARD

February 22, 2023

Mr. Marshall said the committee discussed TRPA's teleconferencing policy. Both California and Nevada is moving out from the emergency declarations originally put in place for Covid that allowed significantly more latitude and holding public meetings via teleconferencing and remote participation by Board members. The current Rules of Procedure 2.16 which guides teleconferencing for TRPA. It is similar, but a bit different from the California Brown Act, which applies to TRPA like other local jurisdictions, but it differs in a number of potentially meaningful ways. Staff will bring back some general discussion points for how they might amend their existing Rules of Procedure to take advantage of, and may also need to tighten down a bit on some of our practices on the Rules of Procedure 2.16. This is all because starting next month they'll have to be consistent with Rules of Procedure 2.1 6, until its amended. It has significantly tighter restrictions than they are currently operating for teleconferencing. When they bring that back, he'll also present, generally on the open meeting law. They are trying to get as much flexibility to promote a number of the policies in the Brown Act and the Nevada Open Meeting Law at the same time allowing the public to participate remotely. This will not change remote participation for the public.

C. Operations & Governance Committee

No report.

D. Environmental Improvement, Transportation, & Public Outreach Committee

Ms. Faustinos said they had an election for Chair and Vice Chair. They also heard two informational items for the Tahoe Transportation District activities and second was the Vision Zero Strategy and Safety Plan Updates. The briefing on Transportation Performance and Recommendations Report Framework was deferred to next month.

E. Forest Health and Wildfire Committee

No report.

F. Regional Plan Implementation Committee

No report.

X. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Dana Tibbets, Cave Rock resident said she thought there was going to be a discussion today on the US Highway 50 Safety Project Corridor. This is one of those issues where the rubber meets the road. Those who live on that side of the Lake are stakeholders in that and have very serious concerns about how that project is proceeding about whether there's been adequate hearing of residents and their positions on this. With respect to the discussion and concern about evacuation, she doesn't know how this project can be on the table to you know strip out two lanes of that highway, especially when they saw the gridlock in town and out Glenbrook and beyond during the Caldor Fire. It was a parking lot for practically 24 hours and a very dangerous situation. There's a lot of ideology that's getting in the way of actual safety and finds that terrifying. She would hope that this body would undertake serious consideration in putting an end to the this proposed replacement of traffic lanes with bike lanes.

Ted Peterson extended his appreciation on behalf of TRPA and the leadership of Ms. Regan and staff

Mr. Cowen, and Mr. Nielsen. He's calling about the Homewood Mountain Resort matter. There was a letter dated February 4 to JMA, Art Chapman. He appreciated TRPA giving this outline and taking it forward and addressing the important issues that surround this project. The West Shore feels betrayed with the bait and switch of this project. The privatization, architecture, and importance of the process being followed, and thinks TRPA is doing the right thing in representing the master plan. There's reference that TRPA needs to find the project is consistent with the approved 2011 Master Plan.

Laura Patton, League to Save Lake Tahoe said their comment is related to the Regional Plan Update, which is referenced in the Executive Report. Thank you to Vice Chair Williamson for the comment and TRPA for the response. The League was heavily involved in the 2012 Regional Plan Update Bi-State Working Group. Like you, they are heavily invested in its successful implementation. They appreciate the opportunity to continue to work with TRPA and the local jurisdictions to implement the RPU. The RPU included benchmarks in the report, and they were a key negotiation point for the League in 2012. The goal of these was to ensure that the massive risks that they were taking in overhauling the Regional Plan had trigger points and safeguards. The benchmarks like thresholds were a way to see if the plan was reaching its goals and to do something about it if it wasn't. Although, the Annual Report is well done and highlights the many successes over 2022 and the first 10 years of the RPU, they see a disconnect between it and the Performance Measures Report. According to the 2022 RPU measures of the 14 measures, 8 are largely not being met or not reported on. Ten years after adoption, it's helpful to look at these benchmarks to get a sense of what the goals were back then for the plan. It seems like today, a lot of these have been forgotten.

They are hoping for more discussion about the Performance Measures Report specifically how the development projects and area plan amendments in the pipeline, including Palisades, will affect performance measures, especially measures that transfer development from sensitive land to Town Centers, affordable housing, BMP certificates and scenic measures. They'd also like to confirm if TRPA is allowed to change performance measures as Number 5 and 6 were not measured in 2022 because TRPA is proposing to replace them with new transportation metrics. They don't think TRPA can or should change or replace these performance measures. They are supposed to measure the long-term effects of the RPU and VMT is still valid. The VMT Threshold Advisory Groups conversations did not address replacing or changing the RPU performance measures. They can understand that the Regional Plan is not meeting measures because there are so many factors influencing it but this can't just be an exercise to check the box. There needs to be a strategy to update the plan to meet these measures, and they hope to continue working with TRPA to make sure that those measures are considered.

Doug Flaherty on behalf of TahoeCleanAir.org said TRPA continues to fill its own mission statement as the Lake Tahoe Basin free falls out of harmony and equilibrium and degrades before our eyes. Despite the glowing progress report, they see it differently. The TRPA Mission statement is the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency leads the cooperative efforts to preserve, restore, and enhance the unique environmental and human environment of the Lake Tahoe region. It is self-evident the TRPA's current policies and project approvals have caused Lake Tahoe Basin to become out of equilibrium and harmony, as the TRPA and its governing partners increasingly create opportunities for more growth, building height, density, and coverage. More human and traffic density, more vehicles miles traveled, more out of control neighborhoods, and regional adverse impacts, more algae, invasive weed and species growth, more degradation of our streams, more microplastics in the Lake and decreased Lake clarity, which unbelievably you didn't even talk about in your in your

2022 report.

Traditionally TRPA's mindset of more, more, more is exponentially contributing to what is already widely recognized as a dire public safety peril, and of course, without repeating that, they're talking about inadequate wildfire evacuation. He hopes you look at your business model, it's not working. You can put it together as many glowing reports as you'd like. A lot of work went into it, but we're in an environmental free fall. We may be actually at the point of no return and what they're getting is a lot of direction from the Board and the staff to work on issues other than purely environmental and it's not working. He hopes that each and every one of the Board members remember that your stewards of Lake Tahoe and your job isn't just a rubber stamp what the staff ask you to do, is to protect Lake Tahoe. We're at a critical point, so, which one of you are going to step up and provide the leadership to protect this Lake and it's clarity.

Ronda Tycer, Incline Village resident said when she learned that TRPA's housing staff members were using the 2021 Tahoe Prosperity Housing study to help guide their current housing policy decisions, she made a public statement in the Incline community forum that she didn't think the data of that housing study justified the author's conclusions. Heidi Hill Drum of the Prosperity Center asked her to explain her statement. She's now critiqued the entire 190 page study. She'll distribute this critique to Heidi and Karen Fink and other housing decision makers at TRPA. Today, she'll address one of the study's most glaring issues. The survey was distributed to Incline and Crystal Bay residents and targeted people who were employed in the community. Most respondents lived in Incline but about 25 percent commuted to work.

The housing study included multiple choice items as well as write in responses. She has many issues with the study conclusions, but the most serious omission was the complete lack of an analysis of the hundreds of write in responses. This seemed like a huge oversight. When she read the comments, she realized why they were stuck in the Appendix without analysis. Because when respondents were given an opportunity to suggest strategies to solve Incline's employee housing problems, of the 226 write in responses, 93 or 41 percent of respondents said to limit or eliminate short term rentals. Only 55 or 24 percent of respondents said to create more affordable housing. So far and away when given the opportunity to say what they thought was most needed, Incline employees said limits were needed on short term rentals. The study's authors reported that 175 respondents were likely forced out of their homes because of owners converted to short term rentals and to their credit, the authors wrote two paragraphs suggesting Washoe County should restrict short term rentals. But for the past four plus years, Washoe County has fought Incline citizens tooth and nail, refusing to put a cap on any real limits on their more than 700 permitted short term rentals, half of which are in missing middle condominiums. That's their real employee housing problem in a nutshell. Thanks to the Prosperity Center for collecting the data.

Theresa McNamara is concerned about the Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan its precedence that this project may have for future development around the Lake Tahoe Basin, and specifically in the Homewood area. Her concerns that the recent updates to the project do not seem to be consistent with TRPA Code of Ordinances. Their plan area statements, and the Ski Area Master Plan approved by the TRPA Governing Board in 2011. Great effort went into the preparation community acceptance, and TRPA approval of those documents. As a full-time Homewood community resident, she wanted to make sure that all development at Homewood adheres to the 2011 approved Ski Area Master Plan. There was a letter directed to TRPA by Arthur Chapman, and this was the first time information regarding the proposed changes to the project had been outlined

GOVERNING BOARD

February 22, 2023

at length, and were released to the general public, not just to a limited number of HOA members. She lives in the HOA directly next door to the Homewood Ski Area, and none of them were contacted about their changes. The proposed changes outlined in that letter have come under local public scrutiny as these changes do not appear to adhere to the development conceptual renderings the community agreed to and TRPA approved in 2011. She's requesting that the Governing Board address the public with a detailed explanation of how the changes fit within the vision and goals of TRPA area plan and the Alpine Village architectural style of the old Tahoe Lodges presented in the 2011 plan. A similar request was outlined and made in the recent letter to JMA Ventures, President Arthur Chapman from the TRPA's Special Project Manager, Paul Nielsen. She's thankful for Paul's letter. She's also requesting that TRPA receive answers to all of Mr. Nielsen's questions prior to allowing any further progress on the development, including giving directions to Placer County's Building Department, Planning Department and Design Review Committees to not issue or approve any permits or permit any changes or modifications for development that do not adhere to the TRPA area plan approved in 2011. Implementation of the originally approved 2011 TRPA Master Plan will revitalize a beloved local ski area and deliver substantial environmental benefits to the Tahoe Basin.

However, the change is being proposed by Mr. Chapman will not provide any of the approved 2011 Master Plan or promised community enhancements and will have a negative impact on the community. As a longtime Homewood resident, she is relying on TRPA Governing Board to ensure that the originally proposed and approved design and scope of the 2011 plan is the only development that will be allowed, because that is what the community agreed to.

Kathleen Anis has concerns regarding the Homewood Mountain Resorts Ski Area Master Plan and the precedent this project will set for future development throughout the Tahoe Basin. JMA Ventures have stated they are not pursuing their original plan. The loophole for developers to present one thing to the public and have a very different thing be permitted by governing agencies should be addressed immediately by TRPA and Placer County. She thanked TRPA Executive Director Ms. Regan and Special Projects Manager, Mr. Nielsen for attempting to do so in the recent letter to JMA Ventures, President Arthur Chapman. The recent updates to the project do not appear to be consistent with the Homewood Mountain Resorts Ski Area Master Plan, approved by the TRPA Governing Board in 2011. With respect to the plan area statements and environmental threshold carrying capacities for this project, the proposed changes do not comply with the environmental impact report, environmental impact statement previously certified for the Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan.

With regard to the newly proposed architectural design changes as found in Phase 1.C and B, these changes do not conform to the TRPA plan area statements and Placer County plan area statements under the adopted West Shore Area General Plan Standards and Guidelines. Her concerns have been further outlined in more detail in a written letter to the Governing Board. She requested they address the public with a detailed explanation of how the changes do or do not fit within the approved plan. Until clarification is received, she requested that TRPA to advise Placer County's Building Department, Planning Department, and Design Review Committee to not approve or issue any permits, permit changes or modifications to development that will not adhere to the approved 2011 Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan and the TRPA West Shore General Area Plan Standards and Guidelines. Great effort went into the preparation and community acceptance of TRPA approval of those documents. As a patron and season pass holder of Homewood Mountain Resort, past resident of Homewood for 20 years, and current North Lake Tahoe homeowner that all development at Homewood Mountain Resort adheres to this Master Plan.

Dan Copenhagen thanked the Board for their ongoing and in-depth work attempting to address all the various challenges in the Lake Tahoe Basin. Speaking on behalf of his extended family and various homeowners in Rubicon Bay, and the West Shore, including Tahoma, and Chambers Landing, and Homewood. He concurred with both of the previous speakers who outlined it well. The Master Plan was specifically outlined and approved as a community enhancement program and it clearly states that throughout the plan. The objectives were clearly stated along those lines and that has obviously changed. Appreciated the efforts by TRPA and requested that the developer JMA not only submit a new master plan, but also an update to the environmental impact report before proceeding with any further construction.

Ann Nichols, North Tahoe Preservation Alliance said Mona Lisa doesn't need a hair extension. Lake Tahoe is beautiful; they don't need more large development to make things better. It really hasn't worked; it was the basis of the 2012 Regional Plan. That large development was going to fix everything, it hasn't worked, it won't work. They need to throw that in the rubbish bin of more bad ideas. What they need is a commitment to less, a commitment to figuring out capacity. What's going on now is not doing the environment any favor, and you say there are development caps, we can't get any more. The poster child of why this is wrong is Boulder Bay. It was 110,000 square feet, the new proposal, with less units is 800,000 square feet. And they are claiming less traffic. This is why they're starting to not believe, but they do know that North Shore is becoming uninhabitable with traffic.

Judith Miller said she agreed with some of the prior speakers about our failure to achieve the mission of TRPA to protect the natural and human environment. She also agreed with the Council member from South Lake Tahoe, Mr. Robbins who lamented about our inability to provide affordable housing for our workforce. They see media reports of over tourism, workforce housing shortages, and traffic backups, and according to the UC Davis State of the Lake Report, despite TRPA's responsibility and actions, Lake Tahoe has been impacted, particularly in areas linked to greater numbers of people. Yet, TRPA seems poised to extend a California tactic to address workforce housing by allowing two additional dwelling units on residential parcels in these rural communities with the push for tourism these are more likely to be to become even more short term rentals, not workforce housing. It's estimated that 12 percent of the dwelling units in her community of Incline Village, that's 1,000 out of the 8,000 here are now STRs. Nearly 75 percent of these STRs are condos, and they used to provide the bulk of housing for our service industry employees. We need to have some balance. TRPA could come up with some kind of a solution to achieve that balance but yet they don't seem to be considering that. It would be great to see our neighborhoods and schools filled once again with full-time residents. Another measure that appears about to be approved will increase the height, density, and allowable coverage in Tahoe Town Centers. Together, these two major changes will bring even greater numbers of people to the basin, severely impacting the Lake clarity, the already crowded roadways. You talked earlier today about evacuation plans; it'll endanger lives and hamper those evacuation routes. Please do address these critical issues, improve roads and transit before making such drastic revisions and give consideration to a basin wide regulation on short term rentals.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Diss moved to adjourn.

Chair Ms. Gustafson adjourned the meeting at 4:11 p.m.

GOVERNING BOARD
February 22, 2023

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Marja Ambler". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

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.