

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
GOVERNING BOARD

GoToWebinar

February 23, 2022

Meeting Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Mr. Bruce called the meeting to order at 11:50 a.m.

Members present: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Hicks, Ms. Hill, Mr. Hoenigman, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Hangeland led the pledge.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Marchetta said Agenda Items VI.C Reconsideration of January 26, 2022 Agenda Item VII.A TCAP Amendment and VI.D TCAP Amendment will be heard first.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES *(January 26, 2022 Governing Board Minutes will be in the March 23, 2022 Packet)*

V. TRPA CONSENT CALENDAR

1. January Financials
2. 2021 Audited Financial Statements
3. Lake Tahoe Community College: Remodel for Efficiency and Science Modernization Project, One College Drive, South Lake Tahoe, California, Assessor's Parcel Number 025-041-010, TRPA File Number ERSP2020-2105

Ms. Aldean said the Operations and Governance Committee recommended approval of items one and two.

Item number three was not heard by any committee.

Board Comments & Questions

None.

Public Comments & Questions

None.

Mrs. Cegavske made a motion to approve the consent calendar.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich,

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Hoenigman, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates

Motion carried.

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. Forest Health Code Amendments Regarding Mechanical Ground-based Equipment on 30-50% Slopes, Chapter 61 Vegetation and Forest Health-Sections 61.1.6.B. through 61.1.6.D

TRPA staff Ms. McIntyre provided the presentation.

Ms. McIntyre said the Angora Fire happened in 2007 in South Lake Tahoe that burned approximately 3,100 acres and 250 plus structures. From this, the Emergency California Nevada Tahoe Basin Fire Commission Report was generated. It was a bi-state report that encompassed recommendations on policy, implementation, and education regarding vulnerability to fire, and forest resilience within the Tahoe Basin.

The Tahoe and Fire Fuels Team has been working diligently over the past few decades to try to implement as many recommendations as possible. One of the last recommendations that still needs to be implemented is Recommendation 17, Subpart J. "The commission recommends the TRPA, the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board, the USDA Forest Service, and other affected agencies amend their plan and ordinances to allow equipment use on slopes greater than 30 percent based on current and future technology and current forest practices to ensure resource protection. In September 2021, the board received a Caldor Fire briefing and heard from Chris Anthony, now retired from Cal Fire who highlighted this recommendation that it is one of the last and most important recommendations that still needs to be put into place within the basin. The California Forest Practice Act, and California Forest Practice Rules which govern forestry within the state of California, currently allows for treatment with ground-based mechanical equipment over 30 percent and up to 65 percent outside of the basin. Additionally, the Nevada forestry regulations allow for treatment of over 30 percent up to 50 percent as long as there is a variance through the fire warden.

(Slide 5) Angora Fire treatment effectiveness: The results show that fuel treatments generally performed as designed and substantially changed fire behavior, and subsequent fire effects to forest vegetation. The two exceptions were areas on steep slopes that hadn't been thinned as needed and with hand thinning due to the regulations in the basin. The treatments did not act as they anticipated.

(Slide 6) Emerald Fire treatment effectiveness: Left photo; to the far left of that photo, there is area where it had not been treated, the fire burns through and consumed almost all vegetation. On the right are areas where there were treatments. Flames dropped down out of the canopy and there are a lot of trees that are alive and left standing versus on the left where it's scorched earth. The Caldor Fire started in August of 2021 and burned about 220,000 acres starting in Grizzly Flats and moving up into the Tahoe basin. It burned approximately 10,000 acres within the basin. Of those 10,000 acres, approximately 6,000, or 60 percent burned on slopes 30 percent and greater. Of those 6,000 acres, 2,723, or about 45 percent burned at moderate to high severity. That was a large piece of the Caldor Fire that burned through the basin on slopes that could have potentially been treated if these code amendments had been in place.

(Slide 8) The 3,100 acre Angora Fire is the small red arm or leg to the left right underneath South Lake Tahoe. Caldor Fire was 220,000, there were 10,000 acres burned in the basin. The blue halo around the lake is the entire basin landmass which is about 200,000 acres. It doesn't take very much for a fire

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

to potentially burn into the basin, let alone, the entire Caldor Fire could have consumed something like the entire landmass of the basin.

Within the Lake Tahoe basin, approximately 6,100 acres, or 27 percent of the total land falls on slopes between 30 to 50 percent. Of these acres, 25,300, or 41 percent fall within the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) defense and threat zones. Those are the zones that are critical for protection of neighborhoods and communities, and benefit from treatments of defensible space. Additionally, the majority of acres that are on 30 to 50 percent are on federal lands of approximately 47,000 acres. The orange and red areas are those WUI defense and threat zones. The gray overlays are those 30 to 50 percent slopes.

These code amendments have ecological and economic benefits. The current code allows for hand treatment on slopes greater than 30 percent. Hand treatments are often more resource intensive and more costly. Limited budgets don't go as far, as if they were allowed to use ground-based mechanical equipment.

Pile burning is known to be less ecologically beneficial than a low and slow broadcast burn where a fire is lit and is allowed to creep underneath the trees. These code amendments will not completely do away with hand treatments and pile burning which will still need to occur on some slopes, but it will reduce the number of piles that are in the basin. Ultimately this has implications for pace and scale of restoration which are more important than ever after what they witnessed with the Caldor Fire.

Based on this, staff engaged with scientists, science partners to assess erosion effects of a variety of restoration treatments on hill slopes, and soil types within the Lake Tahoe West landscape on the West Shore as well as across the Lake Tahoe Basin. Staff works with the Pacific South-West Research Station, which is an arm of the Forest Service, and the University of Idaho. Those science partners came to the Forest Health and Wildfire Committee in July of 2021 and provided a presentation on initial findings.

Some of the report findings were that sediment and phosphorous yields from moderate or high severity fire were significantly more than all thinning scenarios. Even to the max thinning scenario that they would never replicate in the basin, they found that sediment and phosphorus yields were still higher from moderate or high severity fire. Managers would need to apply thinning treatments more than 50 times within 60 years to generate erosion that would eliminate the benefits of reducing wildfire severity from moderate to low. That would almost treating every single year for 60 years. Most sediment yield on slopes between 30 to 50 percent comes from areas covered by shrubs and grasses and not from forested areas. The areas that they're seeing the most sediment yield are areas that are not targeted under these code amendments. Shrubs and grasses are more ripe to be prescribed burns, specifically broadcast and would not be falling under these amendments. Between 30 and 50 percent thinning will increase the risk of erosion, but when thinned hill slopes erode, the sediment yield is no different than compared to an untreated hill slope. The analysis showed that, yes, there can potentially be an increase to the risk of erosion but when thinning is done, the erosion that comes from that is no different than not treating the hill slope at all.

Staff also worked with key Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team members to collaboratively review and craft code language that maintains environmental protection, while allowing for increased use of ground-based mechanical equipment on steeper slopes. They worked with the Forest Service, the California Tahoe Conservancy, the Tahoe Resource Conservation District, the Nevada Division of Forestry, and the Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team to vet these amendments and ensure that they would maintain environmental protection while also allowing implementers to ultimately increase pace and scale.

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

The proposed code amendments fall into two main categories: One is for clarification and standardization, and the other is for expanded treatment opportunities.

Code Amendments for Clarification and Standardization: The first one was inclusion of over frozen ground tree removal. They standardized with previous code updates that the Governing Board/Committees have approved that include the removal of trees for over snow and frozen ground. They find that over frozen ground can often be more environmentally protective than over snow, and as there is shifting climates and might not get as much snow there could still be frozen ground. Therefore, they want to allow implementers to be able to do tree removal in those conditions as well.

Refinement of equipment definitions: They refined equipment definitions to reflect the speed of machinery and technology that's currently available for tree removal. (Slide 18) All in one "process at the stump" has been crossed out. Often implementers need to use multiple machines. They're not just using an all in one processing machine at the stump. Sometimes, they have a machine that comes in and cuts the material, another machine that pulls the material out, and another machine that takes that material away.

Proposed code amendments for expanded treatment: This is the heart of the amendments. First, Table 61.1.6-1 was refined. "Roads" has been crossed out. Implementors felt that using the word road was disingenuous, because these aren't roads but rather trails that the tractors will continuously take to access units. They're not engineered to typical roads standards. On the right of (slide 20), 50 percent has been added. Previously, the maximum grade for tractor, main skid trails, and secondary skid trails was 30 percent. Because with these amendments, it would be expanding the opportunity for ground-based mechanical equipment up to 50 percent. They would still need to skid, which is either dragging a tree completely along the ground or partially suspending it and dragging it. They'll still need to do that to get those trees out of those areas, and therefore, needed to increase the maximum grade to 50 percent.

Refinement of Table 61.1.6-3: Replaced TRPA's water break spacing requirements with California Forest Practice Act water break spacing requirements. The California Forest Practice Act currently allows implementers to go up to 65 percent with ground-based mechanical equipment. They're only looking to go up to 50 percent. Implementors felt that this was a reasonable substitute to allow for water breaks spacing up to 50 percent. (Slide 21) The table on the left had land capability districts in it. That's replaced by estimated hazard rating and they felt comfortable with that because estimated hazard rating includes things like soil type and slope.

Refinement of Table 61.1.6-4: This is to allow the use of ground-based mechanical equipment on land capability districts 1a, 1c, and 2 which are all areas over 30 percent. This is where they're allowing ground-based mechanical equipment. Additional language was added "Use of ground-based equipment and skidding may be use pursuant to 61.1.6.D.1 through 61.1.6.D.5 with approval by TRPA.

(Slide 23) This is where those sections are referencing. This is the language to allow for skidding 30 to 50 percent slopes. "Ground skidding may be permitted on slopes under 30 percent which was already part of the language. Ground skidding on slopes between 30 and 50 percent requires TRPA review and approval to ensure that environmental protective measures (e.g., water breaks, vegetative buffers, slope length limitations, and remaining ground cover post-treatment, erodible soil avoidance) will be in place to minimize slope erosion.

(Slide 24) Language for ground-based mechanical equipment on 30 to 50 percent slopes. Ground-based vehicle systems for removing trees without skidding, such as harvester and forwarder

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

combinations may be used on slopes below 30 percent. On slopes between 30 and 50 percent ground-based vehicle systems for tree removal requires TRPA review and approval to ensure the environmental protective measures (e.g., water breaks, vegetative buffers, slope length limitations, etc. will be place to minimize slope erosion.

The Caldor Fire highlighted the critical importance of forest treatments and defensible space work within the basin. The Forest Health and Wildfire Committee reviewed and approved these code amendments in November 2021. Staff took these amendments to the Regional Plan Implementation Committee in January 2022 and unanimously approved these amendments. The Advisory Planning Commission recommended approval to the Governing Board in February 2022.

The Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team partners are primed to start accomplishing this work and have completed the Forest Action Plan. That plan was released in 2019 and it charts a plan to collaboratively accelerate landscape restoration and wildfire protection within the basin. They are seeing an influx of funding for forest treatments and resilience so having these code amendments in place for when that funding is in hand.

There are already projects that will utilize these code amendments if adopted. The utility resilience corridors, the Nevada Energy, and Liberty Utilities resilience corridors both have areas that could be treated with these code amendments along with state lands and the Homeward Ski area. Caldor Fire hazardous tree removal and fuels reduction, as well as the Caldor Fire long-term restoration projects all have areas that could potentially be treated with ground-based mechanical equipment on the slopes as well as Lake Tahoe West, which really was the impetus to get this going.

The expanded checklist is in the staff packet. There were findings of no significant impacts. Staff found that multiple levels of environmental protection are currently in place for water quality erosion and vegetation management, including the current Code of Ordinances, California and Nevada forestry regulations, and Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit Forest Plan Standards, and Guidelines that were drafted in 2016/17.

Presentation can be viewed at: [Agenda-Item-No.-VI.A-Forest-Health-Code-Amendments.pdf](#)

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Conrad-Saydah said in the presentation it was mentioned that the number of pile burns in the area and during this process will potentially increase pile burns, or potentially not, but there'll be more residue in reaching these higher slopes. Has there been any discussions on how to ensure that all the biomass coming out of the basin has a place to go where it can go into a circular economy process, and bring more revenue into the Basin? In addition, it could potentially create forest and wood products that are useful to people in the basin.

Ms. McIntyre said there's two parts. In terms of piles and pile burns, ideally, allowing ground-based mechanical equipment into these areas, it will be easier to remove the materials. The hand crews will not drag every pile out. Often, there's piles left to be burned. If there's ground-based mechanical equipment there'll be an opportunity to get that material out of the forest and take it to a biomass facility or mill. There's continuing discussions around biomass. The Lake Tahoe Community College is looking at how to build a workforce and how to look at biomass. The California Tahoe Conservancy is interested in that question as well. There are others interested in getting Cabin Creek up and running again. There are discussions about how to utilize this material, where can it go, and what's the best way to handle it.

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

Ms. Conrad-Saydah suggested staff do an assessment of the volume of biomass that they might expect to see so they have a sense of the business opportunity and can potentially advocate for funding. There's a new fund of \$10 million to transport wood waste to a biomass facility. If they could advocate for more and for subsidies to open up these businesses in the area and provide local jobs would be great.

Ms. Novasel said she was in intricate part of the Caldor Fire and scary in what a catastrophic fire can do to the environment. It's shocking to see the after effects of that. Are there impediments or issues that we need to bring up? Something to think about is what else is out there that they need to be looking at because this has taken awhile and will take a while as the conversation continues on what will work with climate change. El Dorado County is talking about biomass which has its own impediments. At least they can an inventory what they have and be proactive in looking at that.

Ms. McIntyre said on the horizon is a conversation of how they get more prescribed burning done in the basin, not just pile burning, but broadcast burning of the undergrowth. That would be conversations to be held with the Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team. Another piece would be treatment of riparian areas. There are a lot of protections in place but a lot of the riparian areas essentially become wick's into neighborhoods. Looking at how to maintain those environmental protections but also get more treatment done in those areas to protect those neighborhoods and communities. The partners will all need to be involved with these types of conversations. There's a lot of conversations around the biomass and specifically from Tahoe Douglas Fire Protection District about doing shaded fuel breaks along the ridgelines. Many of the fire partners are in a potential operational delineations workshop looking at the control lines around the basin to determine how to build polygons across the basin. This would help determine what area may be good for treatment versus areas that need much more treatment.

Mr. Hicks thanked Ms. McIntyre for all of the work she's done on this. In addition, Ms. Marchetta, Ms. Caringer, and other staff have been very helpful on this issue. He's been watching this issue now for nine years when he started on the Emergency Fire Commission of the two states. He urged all of his fellow board members to support this. Something they realized back in 2007/08 when they looked at this was TRPA had never been formed with the charge to consider the environmental impacts of catastrophic fire. Since then they've certainly seen those impacts not only on the lake, but on people who are in the area, too. This is a long overdue amendment to the ordinances.

Mr. Yeates thanked Ms. McIntyre, Ms. Caringer, Ms. Marchetta and everyone that worked on this. On the horizon is the Lake Tahoe West program which is critically important for the West Side of the lake. This proposed amendment makes absolute sense, especially after having the wakeup call that we had with the Caldor Fire. He's in support of these amendments.

Ms. Aldean said this has been a long haul but due to the persistence of TRPA staff and Mr. Hicks, they've finally arrived at the point to pass this amendment today. Though, some of these trees will be taken out, it seems to be common practice to leave some of the fallen trees on the steeper slopes to guard against soil loss and nutrient depletion. Is that a technique that's going to be employed on these steeper slopes?

Ms. McIntyre said yes, it could be a technique that can be employed on these steeper slopes and is why they didn't make that list exhaustive in the code language. They want to give the implementers the opportunity to use all the tools in their toolbox to get this work done. If they want to leave logs to stabilize slopes, that's allowed with TRPA approval. Sometimes logs are also left out on a landscape for habitat purposes. It's not always about erosion minimalization.

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

Ms. Faustinos supported this effort and all the committees and staff who worked on this, and the various input received, in particular, on the biological issues, and ensuring that there's good science behind these recommendations. For those who expressed concerns, she believes that most of those have been addressed. She assumed that good metrics will be kept on all of these efforts, ensuring that leaving logs behind really add to biodiversity or does it have some negative impacts? Tracking the progress of this process is going to be important to inform not only what happens in the Tahoe basin but also nationally. Kudos to TRPA for always doing such an excellent job on sharing information. We have an opportunity to be a shining star in this effort.

Mr. Lawrence said this is critically important. As a member of the Forest Health and Wildfire Committee and the Regional Plan Implementation Committee this is his third time hearing this presentation. He was impressed with the amount of science behind the scenes in this recommendation, particularly at the different committee levels whether it's water quality or erosion, impacts. This was very well done. He's supported these proposed amendments. There's a lot of talk about increasing the pace and scale. So much of it's talked about in the context of adding more money to it and is very important. They've been able to get some work done through different programs in Tahoe compared to other parts of the state. But increasing the pace and scale, money can only do so much. There needs to be the proper environmental constraints but not too constraining in order to get the work done as long as it doesn't harm the environment. This goes a long way to achieving the increase in the pace and scale.

Public Comments & Questions

Steve Teshara, Sustainable Community Advocates said he's participated and supported the Agency's refinement of these forest health code amendments through the Forest Health and Wildfire Committee last November, the Regional Plan Implementation Committee in January and the TRPA Advisory Planning Commission earlier this month. As someone who works with the Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team, he understands the purpose, the value, and the importance of this set of amendments. This would bring Lake Tahoe current with the ground-based mechanical treatment practices allowed in California and Nevada. He supported these proposed amendments.

Laura Patton, Senior Science Policy Analyst, League to Save Lake Tahoe said the League is tasked with protecting Lake Tahoe's renowned clarity and water quality, and this code amendment supports their mission. Overall, they support the concept of a basin wide amendment to the code of ordinances to allow for ground-based mechanical equipment, on slopes up to 50 percent but only if erosion is mitigated and water quality protected as presented. The league understands that approximately 20 percent of the Lake Tahoe West project area, for example, consists of slopes of between 30 and 50 percent and that those are going to benefit from ground-based mechanical thinning. Considering one of the goals of Lake Tahoe agencies and their partners is to increase pace and scale of restoration implementing the code changes in line with this goal. As presented in the water erosion prediction project analysis, science demonstrates the basins area narrowly increased sediment and phosphorus yields, a moderate or high severity fire like the Caldor Fire, would have larger implications on water quality and Lake Tahoe's renowned clarity. The League recommended that the Governing Board move forward with adoption of these amendments. They also acknowledge the need for biomass utilization as part of fuels reduction and will continue to be a part of that discussion as it moves forward.

Forest Schafer, Director of the Natural Resources Division, California Tahoe Conservancy is speaking on behalf of the Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team who are in support of these Code of Ordinances Amendments. The Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team is the basins partnership of 21 federal, tribal, state, and local organizations that are focused on managing Tahoe's forests and preparing the communities for wildfire. The team was formed about the same time as the Bi-State Blue Ribbon Commission. Ten

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

years after the Angora Fire the team went through and did a comprehensive review of those recommendations in the Commission's report. They found that of the 90 recommendations that were put forward, 77 of them had been partially completed or completed. Many of these recommendations were implemented directly by TRPA. For example, TRPA streamlined permitting processes for fuel reduction projects, they created multi-agency memorandums of understanding, and also amended vegetation management codes. Each of these have been critical in enabling the team overall to treat over 65,000 acres in the wildland urban interface since the Angora Fire. Of the remaining incomplete recommendations, the team identified the steep slope code amendments as the highest priority for two primary reasons.

First, the code changes will allow for more frequent and complete treatments of shaded fuel breaks that are in proximity to communities, including those that proved to be so critical and suppression operations during the Caldor Fire. It will also be very significant for landscape scale forest restoration projects. For example, when they analyzed 60,000 acres on the west shore of Lake Tahoe, they found that 15,000 acres, or 25 percent are between 30 and 50 percent slopes. Of those over 10,000 acres are not currently resilient to fire due to very high tree densities. Approval of this code amendment as proposed will provide additional tools for land managers as they continue implementing the basins Forest Action Plan to protect communities, to restore forest resilience, and to help bolster the basins economy.

Kacey KC, State Forester Fire Warden, Nevada Division of Forestry she's in support of the proposed amendments. This brings these codes in alignment with the Nevada Revised Statute 528 where treatments are allowed with mechanized equipment on slopes up to 50 percent if the proper erosion control is installed. The Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team has done an excellent job of treatments in the Tahoe basin. The Caldor Fire was a great example of how community and homeowners treatments helped save structures in the Tahoe basin. It did what they thought the fire would do in the Tahoe basin which was move up into untreated area on higher slopes that had largely been untreated. This code amendment will allow them to increase the pace and scale of treatments in the Tahoe Basin, and hopefully reduce the catastrophic loss of fire. Give firefighters a safe place to defend, not only the communities, but the ecosystems and the clarity of the lake.

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Novasel said it was interesting hearing Mr. Schafer talk about the Blue Ribbon Commission that was brought together after the Angora Fire. It took ten years but had some excellent recommendations and they need to continue that kind of dialog. She's hopeful that they can get a blue ribbon commission on the Caldor Fire to bring recommendations forward similar to what has occurred here today.

Mr. Yeates made a motion to approve the Required Findings, as described in Attachment B, including a Finding of No Significant Effect, for adoption of the Code of Ordinance amendments as described in the staff summary.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Hill, Mr. Hoenigman, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates

Absent: Ms. Gustafson,

Motion carried.

Mr. Yeates made a motion to recommend adoption of the Ordinance 2022 - ___, amending Ordinance 87-9, to amend the Code of Ordinances as shown in Attachment A

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Hill, Mr. Hoenigman, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates

Absent: Ms. Gustafson,

Motion carried.

- B. California Department of Parks and Recreation, US Army Corps of Engineers, and TRPA Notice of Preparation for joint Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Statement for the Upper Truckee River Floodplain Restoration and Golf Course Reconfiguration Project. Environmental Improvement Program Number 01.02.01.0010, TRPA file number EIPC2022-0001

TRPA staff Ms. Friedman provided the presentation.

Ms. Friedman said the agenda item stated that it was a joint Environmental Impact Report and Environmental Impact Statement for the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Environmental Impact Statement for TRPA. The project now is going to be a joint California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Environmental Impact Report and TRPA Environmental Impact Statement. This change occurred after this agenda item was put together.

This is an informational item only for the Notice of Preparation to prepare the joint California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and TRPA Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), as well as this as the scoping for that environmental documents.

The Upper Truckee River Golf Course Restoration Project has a long history. California State Parks and partners including TRPA, previously circulated, joint EIR, EIS, EIS, in 2010. That project proposed four alternatives that had varying degrees of river restoration and golf course reconfiguration. The golf course reconfiguration and that document included reconfiguring to make room for the river restoration. Part of that reconfiguration would expand the golf course into the Washoe Meadows State Park. Other alternatives included reducing the golf course from an 18-hole regulation golf course to a nine hole golf course and an alternative that decommissioned the golf course altogether. That environmental document and the alternatives presented in it were opposed from the public at large. Members of the Washoe Meadows Community Group opposed any project that would relocate golf holes into Washoe Meadows State Park and the golfing community opposed any project that would reduce that 18-hole regulation golf course to something less than that.

California State Parks certified the EIR but that was followed by a lawsuit initiated by Washoe Meadows Community Group. State Parks then decertified the EIR and the TRPA Governing Board took no action on their EIS. After that, State Parks reviewed the project and came up with a project that would restore the river while making adjustments to the golf course to keep it within the Lake Valley State Recreation area. Initially, they were going to propose this as an additional alternative to the 2010 document but then decided after public meetings that it would be best for State Parks and the public to start from scratch and complete a new environmental document with new alternatives. In January 2022 two public scoping meetings were held where about 90 members of the public attended. The general comments received were that people appreciated State Parks listening to the comments made in the previous project iterations and were proposing a project that would allow for river restoration and maintenance of that 18-hole golf course within the Lake Valley State Recreation Project area.

Restoration of the entire Upper Truckee River is a high priority Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) project primarily because of the disturbances that have occurred throughout this entire

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

watershed since the 1900s. (Slide 3) On the upper part of the map is the Upper Truckee River Golf Course reach and moving down the Upper Truckee River are the different reaches of the Upper Truckee River based on their ownership and discrete projects. These are all in various stages of planning and implementation. Restoring the Upper Truckee River has been a collaborative approach involving all of the partners that have ownership and interest in restoring the Upper Truckee River. The Upper Truckee River contributes the most amount of sediment of all 63 streams that enter into Lake Tahoe and is another reason why it's a high priority EIP project for the basin.

(Slide 4) The area outlined in red is the area that is owned by California's State Parks. The hatched area in yellow are the limits of the existing Lake Tahoe golf course. The red outline on the right is the Lake Valley State Recreation area. Now, the entire golf course is within that Lake Valley State Recreation area. The area to the left in red outline is the limits of the Washoe Meadows State Park. The golf course was constructed from 1958 to 1962. State Parks acquired this entire project area in 1984 and split it into these two properties putting the golf course on the State Recreation Area separate from the Washoe Meadows State Park. The California State Parks leases the golf course to American Golf. The mission of the California Department Parks and Recreation/California State Parks is to provide for the health, inspiration, and education of the people of California by helping preserve the state's extraordinary biological diversity, protecting its most value, natural, cultural resources, and creating opportunities for high quality recreation. This project is a unique opportunity for State Parks to restore the river to help protect and enhance its unique natural resources as well as providing high quality recreation at the golf course Washoe Meadows State Park.

Restoring stream environment zones and their associated meadows is a high priority EIP project because of the several benefits that a healthy river and meta ecosystem provide. There are water quality benefits by filtering out sediment and nutrients, recharging the groundwater, and providing high quality habitat both in stream and riparian corridors.

(Slide 5) The left shows healthy stream and meadow habitat. The river is long and has meanders, overtops its bank providing for a green meadow and it provides high quality habitat both in the stream and floodplain. The illustration on the right shows an unhealthy meadow and stream. The river has been straightened, varied in size, and deep. Therefore, the river is rarely able to overtop its bank and filter out those sediments and has such high velocity going down the straightened channel that it can erode its banks contributing a lot of sediment. The illustration on the right is what they see in large sections of the Upper Truckee River that have not been restored including this reach along the golf course.

The purpose of this project is to restore the river to its natural conditions. (Slide 6) The picture on the left is a picture of the Upper Truckee River as it goes through the golf course and has such high velocity that it continues to erode its banks and into the golf course. Every year they put out log structures to try to mitigate that but the river just continues to erode its banks and contributes sediment into the system. There's also a need to improve recreation access into Washoe Meadows State Park. Right now, the only way to access that state park is through a neighborhood which is not ideal. There is also a need to update the golf course independent of relocating some of the holes to accommodate the project. There is a need to update some of the infrastructure that is associated with the golf course to be brought up to best management practices for golf course operation's. The project goals include restoring the river and habitat to natural and functional condition, Improve Lake Tahoe's clarity, revitalize the Lake Tahoe Golf Course, increase recreational access and connectivity, and support the local economy.

The Notice of Preparation proposes three alternatives. There is the proposed project, which will restore the river and riparian habitat. This alternative will require the reconfiguration of the Lake Tahoe Golf Course within the limits of the Lake Valley State Recreation Area. There is a second

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

alternative that will stabilize the river in its current configuration. That alternative will not require any relocation of the golf course holes. Lastly, there is No Action Alternative. These alternatives could be amended or another alternative could be added as a result of this public scoping process.

The proposed project will restore the Upper Truckee River by lengthening the channel allowing room for the channel to meander, connecting it to its floodplain so it inundates that floodplain more, and it's able to filter out sediment and nutrients. It will restore the natural geomorphic function of the river and improve and stream and riparian habitat.

(Slide 8) The illustration on the left is the current condition that even at floodplain level flows in this section of the river it never over tops and goes into the floodplain. The desired condition is shown on the image to the right that shows the river overtopping its banks and inundating the floodplain on a much more frequent basis.

There is a need to relocate and reconfigure some of the golf course holes. The proposed project will reconfigure the golf course while maintaining an 18-hole regulation golf course all within the limits of the Lake Valley State Recreation Area. The project is able to take advantage of the construction that will take place during that golf course reconfiguration into other improvements to the golf course including replacing outdated irrigation, improving water efficiency, and replacing turf greens with drought resistance varieties. It will also provide new restrooms and upgrade bridges that are currently undersized. The proposed project will also improve recreational access to Washoe Meadows State Park. This includes a new trailhead and parking, and an ADA accessible trail from the highway to the river. It will also open up a one half a mile section of the river that is currently not open to the public because it is confined by the golf course on both sides.

(Slide 11) Shows the current configuration of the golf course and the Upper Truckee River. The heavy blue line is the Upper Truckee River and goes right through the golf course.

(Slide 12) The proposed project configuration. The yellow line on the outside is the project area for both the golf course and river restoration. The pink line is the limits of the Lake Valley State Recreation area and that's the area that the reconfigured golf course will stay in. This is a conceptual layout of the golf course and the details of the holes may change slightly but will remain within the limits of the Lake Valley State Recreation Area and an 18-hole regulation golf course. The blue line is the realigned Upper Truckee River. There are more meanders and this hatch line over it is the area where there will be a floodplain and meadow restoration providing that high quality habitat of a river restoration project. To the north of the golf course is the existing parking lot and golf course clubhouse. North of that is the heavy orange line that is going to be the ADA accessible trail, taking people from the highway to the river. That section is that one half mile that will be open to the general public as well that is currently is not open because the golf course.

The second action alternative is stabilizing the river in its current configuration. This includes engineered stabilization of the bed and banks with things like heavy rock, log jams, things to stabilize that bank to prevent erosion and sediment yield, but the river will stay in its current alignment. This alternative does not require any reconfiguration of the golf course holes. There will be minor modifications to the golf course in this alternative, including replacing they undersized bridges and new restrooms. Some of those access improvements will not be able to be accommodated in this alternative because of the golf course not being reconfigured. There is also the No Action Alternative. All alternatives that move forward in the environmental document will be analyzed at an equal level, including the no project. It is important to note that there is an impact to doing nothing, particularly to water quality and habitat.

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

This is currently in the public scoping period that will conclude on March 15, 2022. The public draft EIR/EIS is scheduled to be released in the fall of 2022 with the final EIR/EIS being released in the winter of 2023 and then proposed certification in the spring of 2023. They'll be taking this Notice of Preparation and scoping to the Advisory Planning Commission in March. This project will go to the Advisory Planning Commission and Governing Board during the public draft of the EIR/EIS and during certification.

Presentation can be viewed at: [Agenda-Item-No.-VI.B-Upper-Truckee-River-Restoration-Project-1.pdf](#)

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Lawrence said two of the alternatives talk about stabilizing the river. How far down or upstream do they go when reviewing hydromorphology conditions? Sometimes there can be something done on one parcel that stabilizes things for that parcel but creates a worse situation downriver.

Ms. Friedman said the limits of this restoration project are the limits that California State Parks owns within Washoe Meadows State Park and the Lake Valley State Recreation area. They want to ensure that what they do in this stretch of the river is going to translate to the next section of the river. This is why the Upper Truckee River Restoration as a whole while it's being implemented in these phases based on different reaches and land ownership is a collaborative approach. When one section of river is being planned for restoration, all of the other property owners and implementers are part of the public meetings and review process to make sure that what is planned for restoration in one reach will lend itself well to the next reach. The Upper Truckee River Working Group meets regularly and reviews these projects as well. There's coordination amongst the landowner's who implement the project, regulators, and funders to ensure that when all phases of reaches are implemented, it's a seamless restoration project that restores the entire Upper Truckee River.

Mr. Lawrence said that's the answer he was hoping to hear. If the project moves forward, regardless of the alternative, he'd be interested to hear how it may or may not impact downriver, how it enhances the restoration and fits together with the different phases.

Ms. Aldean asked for additional information on the mechanics of stream restoration. She presumed that a meander is created and the water is diverted away from the straight channel, and then restore that portion of the channel that's being abandoned. Is it a progressive incremental approach to reduce sedimentation created by working within the stream environmental zone?

Ms. Friedman said that is correct. The proposed project would create some segments of a completely new channel, to provide legs and sinuosity in that channel. There's a methodology to constructing it that allows them to work within a stream environments zone having minimal impacts. Then the old channel will be abandoned and either fully filled or partially filled. The level of detail will be further developed as to where those meanders are in how it is constructed.

Ms. Aldean said it might be useful to include that information for the public to have a general idea of how it works from a mechanical standpoint.

Ms. Aldean said in reviewing the Upper Truckee River Restoration Golf Course Reconfiguration website it appears that State Parks has funding earmarked for design and are anticipating funding the restoration by future grants, and then funding the golf course reconfiguration is yet to be determined. How long of a project is this likely to be? Once the project is approved, the processes kick in and typically a permit expires in three years. Is State Parks reasonably confident that once the project is approved, that they can execute on that project in a timely manner?

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

Ms. Friedman said the anticipated cost for the entire project is \$9.5 million and \$800,000 has been secured for the environmental document phase. There's still a lot of funding that needs to be secured to implement the project. The EIP partnership works together each year to request Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (LTRA) priority funding for projects. This one is at the top of the list and are confident that there will be some funding allocated through that. Like other EIP projects, the implementation will probably be a combination of federal, state, and other sources. There's still funding to be had but it is at the top of the list of EIP projects for the partnership.

Ms. Novasel said she's been a part of this conversation through the old process and appreciated all the work that was done in the past to get them here today. She worked at this golf course in 1978 and has personal knowledge of every piece of that golf course. The river is in dire need of restoration and they need to do something. She's all for getting the environmental improvements that need to happen there and is overdue. That golf course is a gem for all of Lake Tahoe and is the most affordable and used golf course in all of the lake with an incredible recreational resource for our communities. It's one of the most difficult courses to get on, because of the affordability and the popularity.

She appreciated the effort to keep it going as a prime recreational area. There'll be some substantial changes to the golf course but it needs to happen and wants to ensure that it remains an 18-hole recreational golf course. Some of the most interesting comments she heard reminded her of some of the issues that were brought up in the past to make sure that it's not just about golf. There's also a lot of mountain biking back there and is the gateway into Washoe Meadows. She hopes that there's the ability to use mountain bikes but also a pedestrians walkway and equestrian area. These paths need to be multi-use paths and there also needs to be restroom facilities. She's concerned about sharing of parking with the golf course and recreational hub is going to be difficult. They need to address some parking areas that would provide a new hub for recreation that would have an area for the boats because that's a popular day rafting area. If they're going to have to close the golf course for a while, make sure that there's as little impact as possible. Funding was an issue before because they were kind of depending on the permittee to bring in some funding and is going to be difficult. They'll probably get some private funding but hopes that they're adequately funding this through the public funding where they can. Lastly, there should be some consideration for a transit stop. It would be a great connector for the City of South Lake Tahoe and Meyers.

Ms. Conrad-Saydah asked with all the alternatives will they be looking at the impacts of projected changes in precipitation timing and amount over the lifetime of the project. There are stream flows that have varied dramatically as a result of climate change and am wondering if the alternatives will take that into account in the analysis.

Ms. Friedman said yes, the analysis will take that into consideration. A goal of all stream restoration projects is designing a project that is sustainable over the long term and responsive to these extreme fluctuations that they are already seeing in the weather. That will be analyzed and kept in mind when designing the project.

Mr. Yeates hopes this Agency reaches out to the Washoe Tribe. He believes there's some sensitive habitats in and around that restoration area. It's a special area with hiking, biking, and birding.

Public Comments & Questions

Lynne Paulson, Chair of Washoe Meadows Community, a grassroots non-profit organization and a coalition of conservation groups, volunteer activists, and supporters from across the state. They formed in 2006 to protect the natural, cultural and recreational resources of Washoe Meadows State Park. They thanked State Parks for outlining a conceptual plan that was presented today for the

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

project of the river restoration and golf course redesign that complies with the direction of California Park and Recreation Commission to not move golf course holes into the park. They count on this Agency to provide guidance to State Parks so that there is compliance with environmental procedures and that there will be suitable adequate studies and analysis to be in compliance with TRPA thresholds. This will ensure that the project recommended by State Parks is fully explained and transparent so that the public can support it. They do have thoughts on topics that they believe deserve analysis in the California Environmental Quality Act document as represented by these questions.

How have the biological resources in the project area been freshly reviewed and how will negative impacts be avoided? With the recent concerns about fire danger, how will fire risks be minimized during and after project implementation? What access points will be used for construction and what analysis has been done on traffic impacts? What project activities, like road construction, hauling, stockpiling, or staging will take place in Washoe Meadows State Park, related to the project, including locations, duration, and impacts? Was there a suitable range of alternatives considered so as to determine how best to avoid significant impacts? How is recreation in Washoe Meadows impacted during and after the project? And will the process for monitoring water quality be robust in order to ensure that pollutants are kept from the Upper Truckee River and groundwater? They appreciated hearing more about the project and process today, after considering that and other requested information, they'll be submitting some written comments, including some ideas on maybe an expanded alternative. Contrary to what was indicated on the project website, there is access to the park from Lake Tahoe Boulevard. However, this has not been adequately publicized which they've tried to publicize it when they've held hikes and cleanup events.

Lisa O'Daly said she's grateful to State Parks for modifying its project proposal such that golf activities are located only within the boundaries of Lake Valley State Recreation Area. Since the first community workshop for this project on June 3, 2004 when State Parks disclosed the possibility of moving portions of the golf course into the Washoe Meadows State Park. Commenter's requested a project alternative that provided for river restoration while keeping golf within the boundaries of the Lake Valley State Recreation Area in order to protect Washoe Meadows. TRPA has always played a large role as State Parks partner in this project. She still has Julie Regan's letter to valued commenter's from December 2006. The Notice of Preparation project description is noticeably less detailed than other NOP's TRPA has made available for review this month. This vagueness makes it more difficult to provide meaningful response. She's hopeful that the revised project will be one that the community can embrace once the totality of the project is made known in the EIR/EIS. They are now 18 years past the original project meeting in 2004 and the project is receiving a fresh start.

For the first time, she did not directly receive a copy of the Notice of Preparation. For today's project, she learned about the Notice of Preparation from local news article. It was a surprise to read the article as she hadn't been notified that the past project had been officially withdrawn. She presumed the project is considered a major erosion control project requiring notice to affected property owners pursuant to Article 12 of the Rules of Procedure. If not, she requested that pursuant to Section 12.5, this project be considered one that may substantially affect property owners, such that noticing is required. The Notice of Preparation states that the project includes "Portions of WMSP" yet, the conceptual project layout map doesn't display a hard project area boundary. The EIP map that Ms. Friedman showed today is the identical project boundary from the 2010 EIS where she received direct project notification. Please clarify how the public lands noticing requirements of Section 12.5.1 of the Rules of Procedure will be defined and applied to this project. The project area should be clearly mapped and defined and inclusive of all project access roads and activities, including staging, stockpile, disposal, and the like. If other landownerships are included, they too should be properly identified.

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

There may indeed be a viable third action alternative that includes segments of true geomorphic river restoration combined with sections of engineered stabilization. She recalls that when the Highway 50 bridges, above and below the stake park reaches, the Upper Truckee River were replaced and installed in a manner that did not span the floodplain. She hopes that TRPA will consider the physical and biological potential of restoration activities located between undersized highway bridge river constrictions. This consideration is important to understanding the sweet spot of restoration expenditure and project efficacy, especially given the funding needs related to the multiple Upper Truckee River restoration projects located along the rivers length. With several completed UTR restoration projects under TRPA's belt, please ensure consistency between the environmental significance criteria used in the environmental analysis and cumulative impact assessments between the projects particularly as related to lessons learned regarding high flow events immediately post construction.

Steve Teshara speaking on behalf the of Tahoe Chamber the area's largest and most active business organization. They see the river restoration and Lake Tahoe Golf Course renovation project as two components woven together, each for the mutual benefit of the other. They are a long standing active advocate for EIP programming and the funding necessary to implement EIP projects. In regard to hydrology and water quality, the segment of the Upper Truckee River that is the target of this project must be restored to a functional condition, reversing historic activities that straightened the channel, and disconnected it from the floodplain. They encouraged and expected detailed analysis of the proposed river restoration elements, and how they will meet the project goals to restore natural function, reduce erosion, raise the groundwater table to support riparian vegetation and habitat, and improve water quality. The Environmental Report should include information as to how this section of the Upper Truckee River, when restored, will merge and blend with the downriver sections already restored. Ms. O'Daly made that comment, as did board member Lawrence. On the recreation front, Lake Tahoe is renowned for its diversity of outdoor recreation and as Supervisor Novasel indicated the Lake Tahoe golf course is an important recreational asset.

In addition to its history and popularity as an affordable 18-hole golf option with a driving range and a winter snowmobile course, it also serves as a gathering place for family, community and cultural events. These include but are not limited to social gatherings, family reunions, birthday celebrations, business meetings, and theatrical presentations. It derives revenue from green fees, merchandise sales, facility use fees, and food and beverage services. It employs a significant number of local residents and generates positive economic activity for the South Shore area for both locals and visitors. It's an important driver of revenue for the California Department of Parks and Recreation and specifically for the other parks within the department's Sierra District. The recreation, economic, and community impacts of Lake Tahoe Golf Course should be thoroughly detailed within the scope of the environmental document. Integrating hydrology, water quality, and recreation is important to the project.

The environmental report should identify what they foresee will be significant benefits of redesigning and renovating the golf course and upgrading its infrastructure. The artistry of golf course design and the functionality of course infrastructure has advanced significantly over the years since the course was built many years ago. The new course design should incorporate a return nine and ensure that it remains an affordable championship level 18-hole course. The existing turf and greens should be replaced with modern drought tolerant and disease resistant varieties and the irrigation and drainage infrastructure needs a comprehensive contemporary upgrade. The environmental analysis should identify how the renovation will result in more efficient course operation and maintenance, increase sustainability, and playability, reduce erosion, and improve the course as a compatible partner with the river restoration. The environmental report should also study the possibility of keeping Lake Tahoe Golf Course, the clubhouse, and other facilities open safely as much as possible during project construction. As they've heard Washoe Meadows State Park is accessible only through a

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

neighborhood where it's not easy to locate. This is a very unique state and local asset and has very unique cultural features. The environmental analysis should identify how proposed project improvements will create environmentally compatible public access to Washoe Meadows and the appropriate bike and multi-use trails and related connectivity through the project area along with directional interpretive signage incorporated.

They encouraged that a preferred alternative be identified in the final report. One that addresses project goals, the purpose and need for both river restoration, Lake Tahoe Golf Course reconfiguration and renovation, and the access improvements at Washoe Meadows State Park.

Laura Patton, Senior Science Policy Analyst, League to Save Lake Tahoe said after reviewing the Notice of Preparation and the latest conceptual design and proposed project configuration, the League is overall supportive of this project moving forward, especially as was pointed out the climate change is taken into consideration in that impacts analysis. The Upper Truckee River is Lake Tahoe's the largest tributary, and thus the largest natural source of fine sediment into Lake Tahoe. Over the past 200 years, the Upper Truckee has been impacted by logging, fire suppression, grazing, channelization, and other myriad of human uses as well.

The League is involved with Upper Truckee River Watershed Advisory Group and they're supportive of projects such as this that have the potential to restore the natural function of the Upper Truckee River while reducing sediment loading into Lake Tahoe. They'd like to ensure, as indicated, by board member comments as well, that this project is part of the larger Upper Truckee watershed river restoration. This project has the potential to be one of the final pieces of restoration in the lower nine miles of the Upper Truckee River. Restoring a river system has been altered and degraded for the past century. The project has the potential to return more natural meanders to the river, restore a natural hydrologic function, and reduce fine sediment loading to Lake Tahoe, protecting the lakes legendary clarity. They look forward to continuing to work with State Parks, and other stakeholders on ensuring that this project keeps restoration and access at the forefront moving forward. They'll also be providing written comments.

Dyane Osorio, Mother Lode Chapter Director for the Sierra Club representing over 19,000 members and supporters in 24 counties in Northeastern California. The Sierra Club motto is to explore, enjoy, and protect the planet. Consequently, they place high value on California's unequal state park systems. All Californians are truly fortunate that the system has been put into place. They applaud the Sierra District for addressing their concerns raised for the placement of the golf course within the boundaries within the Washoe Meadows State Park. The project conceptual plan accompanying this Notice of Preparation gives hope that there is a path forward towards restoring the river, while keeping the golf course vibrant in the state recreational area footprint. They embrace the possibility of a recreational gateway for a low impact recreational connecting Lake Valley State Recreational area and Washoe Meadows State Park.

They look forward to reviewing new wildlife and botanical surveys of the protected area. Further analysis of potential air and water quality impacts during and after construction will provide information that is needed to demonstrate and confirm a successful project. They seek clear information on temporary and permanent roads proposed for use during and after construction. Given the type of equipment that will be used, how and when will they be decommissioned and what will be the impacts of this use? More details are requested regarding the location sizes and uses of the bridges to be removed and constructed. When combined with the new San Bernardino Bike Bridge being pursued by El Dorado County, each new crossing of the Upper Truckee River should be assessed. An important analytic challenge could document the minimum number and type of bridges required to meet project purposes and their impacts. It is critical that new non-essential bridges not become a problem for future fluvial, geomorphologist or correct if the river is not mending well.

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

David Ziegler said in October 2018, he presented an 18-hole redesign of Lake Tahoe Golf Course to the State Parks Commission which was entirely in the recreation area. That plan along with the conceptual routings from Edward R. helped to convince the State not to expand the course into Washoe Meadows State Park. The conceptual plan shown today, only retains the routing of three holes from the current course. He described this as a new course being built with little regard for the original design by William F. Bell. It would almost certainly be the most expensive to build and requiring the course to be closed for up to two years, resulting in lost revenue and would be difficult in terms of staging construction.

The only other option being proposed today would retain the current course with rivers stabilization work, or no option. He proposed that they study an alternative that keeps the routing of nine or more holes from the original course, combined with new holes entirely within the recreation area, which will help to control cost and provide more options for doing the work. The conceptual plan shown today is not entirely within the recreation area. The tee shot for the 14th hole has a shot line that crosses the state park boundary twice. In this case, state park property is being used as a hazard for forest carry shot off of the 14th tee. Other shot lines that are not shown to cut the corner of the dogleg, which is almost certain in this case, and to drive the green, etc. but also cross farther to the west into the state park. There's absolutely no precedent for a hole like this, they can't use any out of bounds property in this way. He recommend that this be changed immediately. It makes no sense to continue with a hole that's not legal. The map that's being posted at <https://restoreuppertruckee.net/> has been altered. It's the 14th hole again that shows an incorrect shot line that's been moved to the east. This kind of thing should never be tolerated. Any map should only show what is being proposed by the architect and no changes made and should be changed immediately.

Andy Chapman resident of the South Lake Tahoe Region for 30 years. He's a recreationist, golfer, community member, and proponent for fixing the river issues. Items he would like to see included in the EIR analysis and project alternatives:

First, the golf courses is an economic engine to South Shore driving overnight visitor revenue and jobs. An economic analysis is needed and if it isn't planned in this EIR, please refer to the previous studies had noted two thirds of the golf play is made up of visitors who generate significant lodging, dining, and restaurant revenue. Many locals, including the youth, depend on the golf course for employment. It provides 75 plus jobs in these challenging times.

Second, park access. It is important that the analysis includes a thorough examination on how to connect to the area mountain biking and hiking trails will improve the overall access to Washoe Meadows State Park from several different points while reducing conflict between user groups. How will this project ensure equitable access for visitors and locals? Please include analysis in the EIR to offer as much public access as possible. Currently, the park is only accessible through a neighborhood and most people cannot find it.

Third, golf. The EIR alternatives need to ensure the golf course remains a championship 18-hole golf course, and it remains affordable. The EIR should outline what would be improved at the golf course. Currently, the golf course is often waterlogged, with irrigation pipes breaking, which requires a lot of labor on a continuous basis, contributes to driving range closers, and variable playing conditions throughout the course. Lastly, regarding the EIR, will there be a study of the impacts to Lake Tahoe that have taken place in the last decade, due to lawsuits holding up this project? It's unfathomable that sediment continues to dump the Lake Tahoe and could have been avoided, if not for a small group of individuals, that don't want to share what they consider to be their private park with anyone else. This groups obstructions have been a detriment to the health of the lake.

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Friedrich thanked to all the commenters. He echoed those who have noted the history of this and a long time coming. All involved are to be commended and finding a win-win solution. The scoping document has a mention of meadow restoration and improvement of aquatic habitat. To the extent this can be a model of an environmentally sensitive golf course (bio islands) with places for habitat and features woven into the golf course that in addition to the river restoration model the best environmental practices. Again, this was once a meadow system. To the extent that that can be incorporated, it makes sense for Lake Tahoe, for a premier meadow in Tahoe, perhaps while introducing some interesting features for golfers at the same time.

- C. Reconsideration of Agenda Item No. VII.A from the TRPA January 26, 2022 Governing Board Meeting for the Tourist Core Area Plan (TCAP) Amendment: Artisan small scale manufacturing and industrial use in the City of South Lake Tahoe Gateway district

Ms. Burch said this will happen in two steps. This initial item will be the question of whether or not to reconsider Agenda Item No. VII.A from the January 26, 2022 Governing Board meeting. This item requires four votes from each state. If this motion passes, then we'll move on to the next item, which is the reconsideration.

Mr. Friedrich made a motion to reconsider the motion to approve the required findings and proposed amendments to the Tourist Core Area Plan as presented under Agenda Item No. VII.A from the January 26, 2022 TRPA Governing Board meeting.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Hoenigman, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates

Nays: Mr. Rice,
Motion carried.

- D. Tourist Core Area Plan (TCAP) Amendment: Artisan small scale manufacturing and industrial use in the City of South Lake Tahoe Gateway district

TRPA staff Ms. Self and Mr. Hitchcock, City of South Lake Tahoe provided the presentation.

Ms. Self said these amendments were heard by the Governing Board at the January 26, 2022 meeting. Board members, Ms. Hill, and Ms. Williamson were unable to attend the January meeting, but TRPA staff did provide all materials and recording of the meeting to those members. The city is here today seeking reconsideration to adopt amendments to the Tourist Core Area Plan as provided in the packet. This review and adoption considers conforming to the Regional Plan of these area plan amendments.

An errata was provided yesterday for pages 374 and 427 of the staff packet. These amendments are being brought forward by the City of South Lake Tahoe Planning staff and were initiated by the Tahoe Wellness Center, and existing private development within that subject district. The City Council approved these amendments in November 2021. TRPA's Regional Plan Implementation Committee in the Advisory Planning Commission unanimously recommended approval of the proposed amendments to the Governing Board on December 14, 2021, and January 18, 2022.

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

Mr. Hitchcock said this amendment itself would apply to the Gateway District, Special Area #1 which is the entrance into the Tourist Core traveling eastward along Lake Tahoe Boulevard and US 50. The purpose of the amendment is to facilitate implementation of the Tourist Core Area Plan objectives to encourage tourists related retail, commercial uses, an on-site product development of community to made goods and also the set opportunities to enhance retail experience through demonstrations and education opportunities.

This amendment was submitted by the Tahoe Wellness Center who operates retail cannabis use within the City of South Lake Tahoe. The addition of small scale manufacturing and industrial services and wholesale distribution would allow manufacturing of products onsite for retail and distribution but wouldn't be limited to cannabis, any commercial retail use could apply these uses and produce products on sites such as brewing coffee, making cheese, baking bread, etc. The city had concern when this amendment was submitted because industrial and wholesale distribution uses are usually found in industrial zones. However, through their process, working with the applicant and TRPA staff they revised the definitions for these uses, so that will be applicable to retail commercial uses within the Tourist Core Area Plan.

These uses are going to be in conjunction with the primary retail commercial use, there couldn't be a standalone industrial service use or standalone wholesale distribution use. It has to be tied to a primary, retail commercial use. The space dedicated to the manufacturing of these products will usually be limited to 30 percent of the primary retail commercial space. A special use permit the approved by the city and TRPA. This will ensure that if there's any potential impacts such as traffic, noise and odor, that those impacts are mitigated to a less insignificant level. There are no changes to design and development standards, only changes to the use itself and specific policies limiting these type of uses to retail commercial.

Presentation can be viewed at: [Agenda-Item-No.-VI.D-Tourist-Core-Area-Plan-Amendments.pdf](#)

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Friedrich encouraged the support of this measure supporting small local businesses, 100 percent in accordance with city ordinances, and business plans. It was supported at all levels prior to last month; the City Council, the Advisory Planning Commission, and the Regional Plan Implementation Committee, all unanimously recommended approval. This has no regional impacts, no impacts to the lake, to traffic, and all thresholds were met. It has positive environmental benefits in as much as the idea is to have manufacturing artisan goods, close to where they are purchased reducing vehicle miles traveled and associated greenhouse gasses and no impact to businesses. He feels the support throughout represents this support from the community.

He also likes the sustainable education element that is attached to this and sets a good precedent for other similar initiatives in the future. It's a triple bottom line type projects it's small, locally owned, business support. It has positive environmental benefits for reducing the vehicle miles traveled and social benefits are helping to anchor community center the Bijou neighborhood.

Mr. Rice said he voted against the reconsideration and the approval of the amendment at the January meeting. His issue with this is allowing of a grow so close to Nevada. Douglas County voted overwhelmingly not to have cannabis in Douglas County. He can't in good conscience vote for this as long as the application is for a grow here in the in the basin.

Ms. Aldean has her own personal opinion about cannabis but in her jurisdiction of Carson City, they did allow two distribution centers for cannabis. What benefits the Wellness Center is that fact that it's going to be a conforming use. It will allow for marijuana to be grown onsite and consumed, is this

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

going to be subject to a special use permit? And is this a defacto cannabis lounge in addition to a growing facility?

Mr. Hitchcock, City of South Lake Tahoe said it's a microbusiness, they cultivate, manufacture, and distribute marijuana. Currently, the City Code prohibits consumption marijuana on site. Yes, they made this a special use, so that they can ensure that any potential impacts are fully mitigated. The application was submitted by Tahoe Wellness. This concept here is to expand the retail experience and they feel that this concept can apply to many other retail uses and is why they moved forward with this application because they feel it will help enhance the visitor experience in the Tourist Core Gateway District.

Mrs. Cegavske said she agreed with Mr. Rice in that she can't support cannabis stores. Therefore, she'll be voting no. She agreed with increasing the retail but if they want to put cannabis in, that's the wrong way to go.

Mr. Rice said he'd be willing to vote yes if they'd remove cannabis from the issue.

Mrs. Cegavske agreed with her colleague.

Ms. Aldean asked where the Wellness Center is located now.

Mr. Hitchcock, City of South Lake Tahoe said on Lake Tahoe Boulevard next door to the CVS Center across the street from Fairway Avenue next to the Beach retreat.

Ms. Aldean was under the impression that they are already located within this Gateway District but was a non-conforming use because it was established prior to date when the Gateway District was established and certain types of uses were restricted. But that's not the case, they're not operating on site today, is that correct?

Mr. Hitchcock, City of South Lake Tahoe asked if the question was are they manufacturing and cultivating on site.

Ms. Aldean said it's the Tourist Core area that is affected by this amendment, they are not currently located in this Gateway District.

Mr. Hitchcock, City of South Lake Tahoe said yes, they are.

Ms. Aldean said then if they're already located in the Gateway District, this amendment would legitimize them from a land planning standpoint or use standpoint.

Mr. Hitchcock, City of South Lake Tahoe said correct. The amendment would allow the Tahoe Wellness Center to pursue a cannabis use permit from the city.

Ms. Aldean asked is it correct that the Tourist Core Area Plan, Tourist Center, Gateway District, Special Area #1 are not currently doing business in this area.

Mr. Hitchcock, City of South Lake Tahoe said yes, they are. They have an established business there.

Ms. Aldean asked what the amendment accomplishes from their perspective.

Mr. Hitchcock, City of South Lake Tahoe said it would allow them to bring a non-conforming use into compliance with the city cannabis permit ordinance.

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

Ms. Aldean asked what the city would do if this didn't happen. Would the city force them to relocate at some point?

Mr. Hitchcock, City of South Lake Tahoe said he would have to defer that question to their legal counsel. They're currently operating under a city permit.

Ms. Aldean said Mr. Rice was insinuating that if they were not there, he would be fully supportive of moving forward with this amendment, but they are there, and the likelihood of them relocating isn't great. As long as they're permitted to operate there, they will continue to operate there. They're currently selling but they're not growing on site. Is that correct?

Mr. Hitchcock, City of South Lake Tahoe said no, the Tahoe Wellness Center right now has cultivation (grow) and manufactures marijuana on-site.

Ms. Aldean said then those are already established activities.

Mr. Hitchcock, City of South Lake Tahoe said correct.

Ms. Aldean said then the only additional thing they could do, but it's not permitted by ordinance, is, establish a cannabis lounge for consumption.

Mr. Hitchcock, City of South Lake Tahoe said no, this ordinance would not allow them to establish on-site consumption. That would require an amendment to the city code in order to have on-site consumption.

Ms. Aldean said they're already there, it's an existing use, and they're doing what they would be entitled to do, even without this amendment, so, it's basically maintaining status quo.

Mr. Bruce said it's a non-conforming use right now, but, because it's non-conforming, it's allowed. Is it correct that this would make conforming?

Ms. Aldean said that their activities wouldn't change significantly from what those activities are today, as a result of this amendment, unless the city decided to relocate them because they're non-conforming.

Mr. Hitchcock, City of South Lake Tahoe said the only change that would be required as part of this amendment, is, the Tahoe Wellness Center would have to provide some sort of educational or demonstration component which they currently do not have.

Ms. Aldean asked would that be required, or would it be obligatory and not optional.

Mr. Hitchcock, City of South Lake said it would be required as part of this amendment. It's built into the definition that if they are going to manufacture and distribute products on site as part of a retail, commercial use, they're required to have a demonstration or educational component as part of the business activities.

Ms. Aldean asked what they would be doing as part of this demonstration.

Mr. Hitchcock, City of South Lake Tahoe said it could be a demonstration on how it's grown, sustainability. It will be up to Tahoe Wellness to figure out how they're going to meet that particular requirement of the amendment. For example, a coffee shop that wants to grow, brew, and manufacture coffee beans on site, they could show how that process is done.

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

Ms. Aldean asked if they could also explain how CBD is removed from marijuana and used as a non-hallucinogenic.

Mr. Hitchcock, City of South Lake Tahoe said yes, that that could be an option. That would be something that the applicant would have to provide to staff during the project view process.

Ms. Aldean asked how much discretion staff has to deny a certain type of activity.

Mr. Hitchcock, City of South Lake Tahoe said if they can't make the special use findings then they have the option to recommend denial to the Planning Commission.

Ms. Faustinos asked if there would be certain types of education that could be required as part of the approval which might include, for example, showing some of the potential negative consequences due to the utilization of these products from an educational perspective. Also, understanding the impacts of why maybe more controlled manufacturing growth is better for our watersheds than growing it in your backyard, for example. It just seems like there could be some good social education that could happen as a result of that educational element. To the extent that they have the capacity to make those kinds of recommendations, she would like to see that. The education should be balanced, both pros and cons. Again, what Ms. Aldean pointed out, the differences between marijuana and the removal of the oils, and then how that changes the properties of the product as another example.

Mr. Bruce asked what the scope of the Governing Board review and approval is for purposes of this matter. Do they have any ability to condition the education parameters as being balanced? It seems that it may or may not be within the scope.

Ms. Burch said in amending the area plan, that is the scope of what the board would be doing, which is amending the plan, and there is not the ability to put conditions on that, the way you would for a permit. It is not something that she believes they could do to add a condition in addition to the amendment to the plan.

Mr. Bruce said there is the area plan amendment and it's allowing for certain uses, but those uses are conditioned. These are mandatory conditions on uses. To him it's hard to separate the approval of a plan that actually has requirements in it from the requirements themselves. He's trying to understand how it can be a requirement of the amendment to the area plan but not be within their purview.

Ms. Burch said if the requirement is part of the amendment to the plan, it is within their purview. It's within their purview to approve that amendment including any requirements that are part of that amendment.

Mr. Bruce said if that requirement includes required education with respect to the actual use. Is that the requirement?

Ms. Burch said yes, and that requirement could be part of the amendment to the area plan.

Ms. Gustafson said similar to Commissioner Rice, Placer County has decided differently about cannabis than maybe the city has. The board's role on TRPA isn't about anything other than the environmental impacts of these sorts of decisions. She would be looking at increased traffic, which sounds like it wouldn't be the case. Air quality, and water quality. Discharge might be an area that could have something but would look to the water treatment facility for that. Philosophically, whether she agreed or not with this use as long as it meets the criteria they're talking about in our

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

mission, she would defer to the local agency on how they're dealing with all the conditions that go along with this. The only item she came up with is the discharge from the manufacturing and assume they have to disclose that to the water treatment facility at South Shore.

Mr. Hitchcock, City of South Lake Tahoe said industrial uses and wholesale distribution uses are considered potential contaminating uses and is part of the special use permit. The project would be required to prepare a source water protection plan per TRPA code.

Ms. Marchetta said when an amendment like this is being brought forward, TRPA has authority over uses and change in uses. This is in an application event of that authority that is objectionable to some, but the limitation on TRPA's authority tend to defer to the local jurisdiction, but that doesn't mean that Governing Board members need to look past their own jurisdictions or own personal points of view on how our authority gets applied.

Mr. Lawrence recognizes that there's different opinions on cannabis and the use of it. From his TRPA board perspective, he tends to agree with Ms. Gustafson. He's uncomfortable as a TRPA board member telling local jurisdictions which retail establishments they can and cannot have in their community. But these are some good questions raised. He tries to stick to the environmental issues that are under TRPA's purview. The other finding that they usually have to make is compatibility findings with the neighborhood. Discharge would be taken care of through retrofits or permits, and it sounds like there's no traffic issue. Has there been any nuisance complaints to the city regarding, perhaps the odor? Those types of issues don't necessarily fall under TRPA but it's also a compatibility question.

Mr. Hitchcock, City of South Lake Tahoe said he's not aware of any complaints. The city's cannabis ordinance requires using appropriate technology to essentially scrub the odors so it doesn't create an impact on to the surrounding properties and neighborhoods.

Ms. Novasel regardless of how she feels personally, it's important to understand that in the State of California, Prop 64 allows for this kind of use. Within El Dorado County, they had two measures that came out, because they wanted to decide whether their county could agree with it. There was 65 percent of the county agreed with the use, sale, and manufacture of cannabis. She sat on the Ad Hoc Committee for cannabis, went through years and years of discussion about this, and it has an overwhelming approval in their county. They could be going down a rabbit hole when this group or organization can oversee local and state level type of ordinances. This subject has run its course and they as a jurisdiction, have to realize that they need to allow for what the public has told them loud and clear. She'll be voting yes for this. That operation is in what she would consider a proper use area.

Mr. Hicks said the manufacture, growth, and distribution of marijuana is illegal under federal statutes. They exist pursuant to a Compact that is approved and endorsed by Congress. He recognizes the authorities of the local jurisdictions and the states, but there is an inherent conflict here. Has anyone looked at this question?

Mrs. Cegavske still has a lot of concern and believes Mr. Hicks' is right. It is a federal issue. Banks cannot take the money, there's problems with extortion in their county's and feels it would only bring it up to Lake Tahoe. She feels that they do have a right and are not trading on bad water and are doing the correct thing.

Ms. Hill agreed with Ms. Novasel and Ms. Gustafson. Their role at TRPA is to review environmental issues. For example, this would be like Story County telling Washoe County what to do over some sort of a loophole in legislation. They need to tread very carefully on this because their role at TRPA is

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

very sacred. She doesn't want it to look like TRPA is going further in what they're permitted to do and review. She would like to see a future staff report discussing this. Local jurisdictions have a role to allow for these uses and TRPA needs to be careful in what they tell the local jurisdictions to do. She also will be supporting this item today.

Mr. Marshall said the zoning and planning issue before the Governing Board is content neutral. Even though it might have been that the applicant has to do with cannabis, the analysis that the City undertook was not directly related to any particular use, or commercial activity, but generically. It is not a direct regulation of cannabis that impinges on any federal directive. If there is a planning reason why this use should not be allowed within this special area then that's the main concern, not whether the particular applicant has the necessary state authority to undertake the activities. For TRPA's purposes in this particular instance to determine whether or not, to approve or not approve by the otherwise, legal use that the applicant is seeking ultimately to do. Because the plan change is generic and is not contingent on any particular type of commercial use.

Mr. Bruce said what's conflated this discussion today is that the applicant is a very specific business, as opposed to this coming before them, just as a plan amendment with general principles, but don't have to attribute to something so specific. This is a learning lesson as to how this type of thing should be framed.

Ms. Conrad-Saydah said they're voting on a proposed amendment, not on the activities of a specific business owner alone. They're having this discussion about activity that's legal in one state and not legal in another that is independent of this discussion. She agreed with some of the comments about the area where TRPA can be making decisions on where they operate versus many, many other areas of discourse and policy discussion that's outside of their purview at this point. We need to focus on this amendment, and what they as TRPA are able to vote on. She'll also be supporting this amendment.

Public Comments & Questions

Molly Armanino said this amendment doesn't have anything to do with cannabis. It has to do with increasing in house manufacturing, decreasing vehicle miles traveled, and creating local goods that are going to benefit tourist, consumers, and the business owners. As a member of the public, she supported environmental regulation like the opportunity to decrease the VMT. She also supported education so the business owners are held accountable for what they produce and what they sell to consumers. This is an initiative could kick start environmental or environmental regulations on commercial businesses and is what this is about.

Nick Exline said collaboration was a part of this application, first were meetings with city staff, and then bringing in TRPA staff as well. With that collaboration, they not only sought to have an amendment that would create diversity in the commercial and retail opportunities, but also allow for environmental education to be upfront and foremost in the business model and approval process. That was important to them from a local standpoint, not all businesses are the same. Businesses that represent the sustainability ethics, and design sustainability and education into their business model are businesses that they want to shop at locally. This support was echoed by the elected City Council members and appointed Planning Commissioners, as well TRPA's Regional Plan Implementation Committee. In addition, there's been a petition signed by many local community members. This area plan amendment is for the use that was primarily discussed today and is altering nothing with that particular use. What will change is the ability for TRPA to represent that environmental improvement is now represented and required within the approval process. That door becomes open today. Another door that becomes open today is the opportunity for businesses to not only reduce

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

their VMT, but then be required to educate how they do it. So people that come to the basin have to see and witness their environmental sustainability ethics. He supported the proposed amendments.

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Friedrich made a motion to approve the required findings, as described in Attachment D and a finding of no significant effect, as provided in Attachment B for adoption of the Tourist Core Area Plan amendments, as described in the staff report.

Ms. Aldean said this is a sensitive issue and would hate to see other businesses that are located in this special area be discouraged by some people's aversion to cannabis industry. It could be a negative, it could be a positive depending upon the audience. One of the objectives in the staff report was to enhance the visitor's experience, not the locals experience. The locals may be fully supported of this use but there's a variety of people coming from other jurisdictions where cannabis is not legal or not permitted. To the extent that the staff can have a discussion with the Wellness Center about providing educational materials about the pros and cons of consuming marijuana would be beneficial.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Bruce, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Hoenigman, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates

Nays: Mrs. Cegavske, Mr. Rice

Motion carried.

Mr. Friedrich made a motion to adopt Ordinance 2022-__ amending Ordinance 2020-06 as previously amended, to amend the Tourist Core Area Plan as shown in Attachment F.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Bruce, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Hoenigman, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates

Nays: Mrs. Cegavske, Mr. Rice

Motion carried.

VII. PLANNING MATTERS

A. Briefing Lake Tahoe Community College on Campus Master Site Plan and Future Projects

Ms. Marchetta said TRPA works with a lot of partners in their overall regional work. Lake Tahoe Community College (LTCC) has been an institutional entity here on the South Shore for many decades. It's one of two institutions of higher learning, the other being the Sierra Nevada College, which houses the Tahoe Environmental Research Center. LTCC is an important partner in the fabric of the community. They're not merely an organization of local interests but they've grown themselves into this highly valuable partner to the region as a whole. The college works with TRPA on the bigger view of Tahoe's regional interests. They've become this extremely valuable partner in implementing the Regional Plan and goals of the Environmental Improvement Program.

This morning on consent, the board approved one of a series of Lake Tahoe Community College projects that you're going to be seeing. This one was on energy efficiency and retrofit is relatively small in scope, but these are important projects in the larger scheme of what they'll see from the college coming forward over the next year or so. Staff felt it would be useful for the board to see the bigger outlines of what the college's campus plan has in mind for projects that they're going to be

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

bringing forward. Themes of today's presentation will be to support the major goals of the Regional Plan; housing, transportation, sustainable energy, design, and water quality improvements, and forest health.

Dr. DeFranco, Lake Tahoe Community College provided the presentation.

Dr. DeFranco said Lake Tahoe Community College has been serving this community for more than 45 years. Although they are based on the California side of the South Shore, they serve students from around the lake. They recently received some legislation passed by the State of California that allows them to serve their Nevada neighbors in the basin at a hybrid in-state tuition rate, which is a unique piece of legislation. They made the case that it is one basin, one geographic environment, one environment for the economy, and one education system.

They share a lot of the same goals with TRPA and have alignment in their mission for the improvement of the lake which everyone will see in today's presentation. They are looking for support for some projects that are currently seeking state and federal funding for which could come to them with tight turnaround times if they are lucky enough to receive those funds. Specifically, it's to provide low-income housing and their Regional Public Safety Training Center.

He thanked TRPA staff who helped shepherd them through multiple projects since 2014 when they passed the local \$55 million general obligation bond.

The college serves about 6,500 students annually. The full-time equivalent students is about 1,800. They do student transfers, improve their workplace standing, English as a second language, lifelong learning, etc. In addition to their classroom facilities, they have a theater that's used by the community. They were the hosting site in the South Shore for Covid testing during the first year of the pandemic. They hosted multiple mass vaccination clinics. They also host the US. Forest Service Supervisors office on part of their nearly 150 acre wooded campus. There's a lot of environmental responsibility for the college because they only have a very small portion of this campus developed and a lot of it is just helping conserve and preserve the natural environment.

(Slide 5) This is not a TRPA approved master plan, rather it's their local master site plan that they're required to have as part of their role as a California community college. It outlines where they are trying to go with facilities as funding becomes available. This plan was originally developed in 2011 and was updated in 2020 and been the basis for their California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) studies, etc. They've been at this location since 1986. The college was originally founded in a repurposed motel.

Today's presentation has themes of sustainability, conservation, public safety, housing, and transportation.

They've tried to do projects that help improve environmental mitigation by allowing snow to melt and filter on campus. Their color scheme is designed to match the natural environment and have setbacks from Pioneer Trail and Al Tahoe Boulevard to meet some of TRPA's goals.

(Slide 7) Synthetic soccer field replacement. Many synthetic soccer fields are filled with those tiny rubber black balls that's made from recycled tires. Great idea from recycling standpoint but bad from an environmental standpoint because they end up in the natural environment. They built this facility with an infill called Corkonut which is cork, rice husk, and coconut. If any of this organic infill leaves the field of play it will disintegrate into the natural environment. They also did a lot of stormwater retention and filtering improvements as part of this. In addition, they added designated walking areas in place to reduce people cutting through some of the wooded areas. The green grass fields were done in partnership with the city.

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

(Slide 8) Renovation of the main parking lot was done to retain and process all the stormwater 100 percent on site. They installed underground infrastructure for future electric vehicle charging stations and are currently seeking funds to bring those units in. They've also moved about 80 percent of their exterior walkways to hydronic heating which eliminates the use of chemical ice melts.

(Slide 9) Lisa Maloff University Center who was a major benefactor in Tahoe region. She gave the college \$6 million to bring four year degrees to the South Shore. This is aligned with TRPA because this building was designed for high efficiency, low impact buildings. Also, many people in the South Shore were driving to Sierra Nevada College in Incline Village, the University of Nevada, Reno, or Sacramento State to get a face-to-face bachelor's degree. Now, they can get those here.

(Slide 10) Their current project is the model for efficiency and modernization. It's predominantly inside but was on TRPA's consent calendar today because there are some exterior elements with the heated sidewalks which will take them from 80 to 100 percent. They're also putting in a fire lane on the west side of the campus which faces out to Trout Creek.

Transportation: About four years ago they entered into a partnership with the Tahoe Transportation District to pay for unlimited bus passes for all students and employees. The Mobility Hub was a partnership with Tahoe Transportation District also. They wanted to become a central hub of public transportation in which they provided covered bike parking and a bus waiting area. The Tahoe Transportation District will be completing the electric vehicle charging units this summer for their busses.

(Slide 13) Lake Tahoe Community College is one of the partners in the Greenway Bicycle Trail. This trail goes through their campus and they provided a significant amount of acreage for this as well as nearly \$700,000 toward the project. In addition to bus and electric vehicle transportation, they also want people to be able to ride their bikes to the campus and community play fields.

Like every other organization, they're also dealing with the housing crisis. (Slide 14) Is an off campus housing unit that they entered into with a master lease in fall of 2019. Each of these units are three bedrooms with six students. It's only 31 students right now but has proven to be valuable.

(Slide 15) Lake Tahoe Community College is pursuing on campus student housing. They currently have a \$40 million grant request into the State of California and are expecting to hear from Department of Finance on their recommendation as early as March and will be addressed with the legislator between now and June when the budget's approved. This would bring 100 low income housing beds to their campus. Their presenting this to the board now because if they are successful in receiving these funds there's an expectation from the Department of Finance for them to move at a lightning pace to bring these units to reality. There not just competing against other California colleges but competing against the places like the California State University, Chico and the University of California, Berkeley. They explained in their application about the TRPA grading season and some of those steps. If and when they receive these funds, there will be an expectation to turnaround this project in a pretty notable time. They're already into their schematic design planning for potential allocation of those funds. Their hope would be that TRPA can look at this similar to like the Sugar Pine low-income housing project. It's a low-income housing project that's not only going to benefit college, but also benefit the community because those 100 students aren't coming from outside of the community, they're already here.

They're stacked into subpar living conditions throughout the town. Many of them are moving from place to place. Students are having their leases terminated because their house got converted to an Airbnb, or got purchased by somebody from the Bay Area. This will also reduce thousands of vehicle trips to and from campus annually.

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

Conservation and Fire Ready: Their campus is pretty heavily wooded and are very mindful of their location. As a part of the solution for the past 15 years or so they've had the Lake Tahoe Basin Fire Academy, which puts out about 20 to 25 graduates each year. The graduating class of June 2021 all fought on the Caldor fire. Not only did every student fight on the Caldor fire, their coordinator, the chief of the program, many of their instructional aides, and teachers also fought in that fire.

They're also currently working for state and federal request to bring a Tahoe Basin Public Safety Training Center to their campus. Currently, their cadets train in Alpine County, the airport in South Lake Tahoe, and in Carson City and this would bring the training facilities to the campus. This is a critical project for the basin. It'll allow them to double the number of Fire Academy cadets to graduate each year as well as double the number of Emergency Medical Technicians. It also has the potential to serve as an incident Command Center for local agencies. They're currently doing Phase one for the equipment storage facility that will store a lot of the fire equipment that's currently spread throughout multiple locations. This will also respond to a long standing issue with TRPA, back when the college was built, there was a lot of vehicles parked on dirt. This would allow them to remediate all those past issues and address these storage elements.

This fall, they're launching a Forestry Education program that's meant to be a feeder to jobs in the Forest Service, defensible space inspectors, forestry aides, technicians. This is funded through Cal Fire and the California Tahoe Conservancy. This will be another program that will feed into supporting not only the local economy, but also taking care of the local community and environment.

They continue to focus on firefighting, forestry, wilderness education, public safety and things that serve the basin. This past year, they expanded a telecommute pilot that allows qualifying employees to work one day, a week remote. Again, reducing those trips to and from campus and less impact on the parking lots.

Presentation can be viewed at: [Agenda-Item-VII.A-LTCC-Presentation.pdf](#)

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Bruce said they're doing amazing work and providing a lot of affordable opportunity and future to a lot of people.

Ms. Novasel said the Lake Tahoe Community College has been the premier of the community for many years. She's excited to hear about the student housing. They need to find a way to help because it is critical to the communities. To be able to keep the students here and give them secure housing is important.

Ms. Aldean said she would assume they've set priorities for their master plan but those will be largely dictated by available funding. What is the next project that you are most interested in pursuing pending adequate funding?

Dr. DeFranco, LTCC said they have funding for the equipment storage facility through their local general obligation bond and is the next project that they hope to move on as early as the summer. The biggest priority right now is the student housing because that's critical to maintaining face-to-face college. They do a lot of work with distance education, incarcerated student program, and are doing great work to serve the State of California. But if they want to serve the students in this community, they need low-income housing. But they're going to need support to get that \$40 million. The good news is that they have a very compelling proposal, but if any of you have contacts at the Department of Finance or the Governor's office, feel free to put in a good word. If they do get the funding, they're going to need TRPA's help to guide them through the most expeditious process

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

that's reasonable because the state has very high expectations for the timelines and the turnaround that they would like to see.

Ms. Conrad-Saydah said she understands their need to get to the Governor's office. She commended them for thinking about workforce training, specifically in Forest Health, and how they can connect that to jobs and transition in the basin. Thinking about a pipeline of housing on campus, education, specifically in the Lake Tahoe area to get a sense of what they need. Workforce training, forest health training and creating that pipeline to keep people living in the area that they know best and make sure that there is an adequate supply of good jobs in the area for contributing to the health of the area. She's glad to see they have some of the California Climate Investment funds and the Cal Fire grants and hope that we can hear more updates on how those projects go and how you can expand that workforce over time.

Dr. DeFranco, LTCC said they always ask the question when starting a program; will this create a living wage job. There's no point of somebody doing all this additional education and time and not get living wage job. These forestry jobs will do that. The other thing that's unique is there are other Northern California B colleges that have forestry programs but they're predominantly focused on the logging industry. Theirs is different in that regard, it's more fire ready, fire prevention, and forest health. They're filling a very important role, not only for the state, but also makes a lot of sense for the basin.

Mr. Hoenigman is excited about the work that a lot of the universities and colleges in the state are doing with providing more housing, because a lot of students are having trouble. If the \$40 million is for 100 students or 100 units because at \$800,000 for a bedroom or \$1.6 million for one of those little pods seems a little rich.

Dr. DeFranco, LTCC said that is only for 100 beds. The gross square footage on that property is about 32,000. As a K4 agency, they operate under the Division of State Architects. Everything they build is about 20 percent above code. It has a lot of additional inspection fees, so they often see projects that square footage cost upwards of \$1,000 per square foot for planning, architect, etc. They also have a Tahoe factor on their projects where a lot of these companies are bringing materials from Reno and Sacramento that creates an additional cost. This is a very modest project. They met with architects earlier today and were asked about the lack of common space and study areas. Their approach is that there's a library across the street and a fitness center across the parking lot and they don't need to recreate that.

These are basically bedrooms; double occupancy, shared bathroom for four individuals with a small kitchenette. The design from the state is for it to be fully funded by the state, to make the cost for the student very minimal for those students who qualify for low-income. It's not a project where they're trying to recapture the capital through charging the students over the next 50 years, rather trying to be paid for 100 percent upfront. That's also the site development, the walkways, the parking spaces, etc. to bring that housing to campus. It's a shocking number but a realistic number based on their past experience. They've asked at times if there is a way for things like housing that they could build to local building code, the same thing that would be appropriate for a Sugar Pine Village as opposed to the DSA, and potentially save 20 to 30 percent on their projects.

Mr. Hoenigman said if they let himself and Ms. Conrad-Saydah know what the asks are then maybe that's something they could bring to the Governor's office.

Mr. Friedrich asked as it relates to TRPA, is there anything that they can help expedite permitting if needed for any projects such as electric vehicle infrastructure or future solar?

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

Dr. DeFranco, LTCC said items such as the housing and the public safety training projects that are a shared benefit if TRPA is able to look at it from that shared benefit. Related to the electrical vehicle charging, at this point, they're just trying to find access to some funding that doesn't have to many strings attached. A lot of the EV charging funding has some unique strings attached to it. They have the underground conduit and the spaces identified and is really ready to go. As an institution, they're careful in what contracts they enter into. They continue to look at the solar which is designed into their Public Safety Training Center because of the orientation in that building. It sets itself up good for solar but the challenge they've had is many of their counterparts in the north like Butte College and Chico have parking lots full of solar panels above their vehicles. Here, there's 80 to 100 year old trees in the parking lot. That's always been the tradeoff.

This Public Safety Training Center is maybe the best shot because of the orientation, the facility, and the design of the roof.

Public Comments & Questions

None.

B. Update on the Measuring What Matters: Thresholds and Monitoring Update Strategic Initiative

TRPA staff Mr. Segan provided the presentation.

Mr. Segan said Measuring What Matters is what they call the initiative to update, not just the goals, but the monitoring programs that support those goals. Threshold standards is a term that's given to TRPA by the Bi-State Compact which establishes threshold standards as the goals for environmental quality for the basin to work towards. The Compact is specific about the role that these standards should play. These standards are what everything else in the region reinforces and aspires to attain. From the Regional Plan, the Code of Ordinances, to the findings that they make when they approve projects all goes back to the threshold standards, because those are the ultimate goals for environmental quality in the region. The vast majority of the standards were adopted in 1982 and often seem a bit dated through the lens of today. There's standards to protect Canada goose in the region, but no standards related to wildfire.

At almost 150 standards, they seem not necessarily focused on the conditions that they want to create on the ground, but really on controlling development. For example, 10 of those 150 standards relate to water discharged from development sites. They're not the only ones in the region to have noticed that the standards seem a bit out of date by modern standards. Every four years they do a threshold evaluation and have had a number of those peer reviewed by external scientists to make sure that they're doing the best possible. In 2015, many of those external reviewers highlighted the shortcomings of the standards themselves.

Some of the comments about the standards not necessarily being grounded in best science, or not necessarily being specific enough to guide management within the region. Numerous reviewers urged them to revisit updating those standards. While they often talk about these deficiencies of the current standards, it's important to view those standards in the context of when they were established, and the role that they were playing at that time. It's useful to think of three phases in Tahoe's conservation history: A protect phase where they're worried about controlling and stopping harmful development in the region. Then they shifted with the birth of the modern Environmental Improvement Program to this restoration phase, where they're trying to restore the impacts from past development or restore something that's been lost. They're now shifting into a new phase where they're not necessarily talking about stopping harmful developments in the past, they feel

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

they've got those controls in place, they have a lot of the restoration projects that continue, but often what they're talking about now is creating something new.

The threshold standards today that were adopted in 1982 reflect this early period. Put yourself in the place of where the basin was at that time and appreciate how fast Tahoe grew. In the 1950s there were less than 3,000 residents in the Tahoe Region. There were 40 people enrolled in the Lake Tahoe Unified School District. Then the development came fast and furious. By the 1970s there were major acts playing in the casinos and high rise casinos built. Traffic doubled between the 1960s and 1970s and went from 40 students in the school district to 4,400 by the mid 1960s.

The rapid pace of development had an environmental impact on the region because it's been clearly documented in the record. They know all about the decline in the Secchi disk. There are numerous papers authored on what all of this development did to the region. It changed the national psyches and everyone's thought of what Tahoe was. Where prior to that Tahoe was this idyllic mountain getaway that just hosted the Olympics. Everything was great to a region that sort of epitomized the struggle between should they develop and should they not develop?

It was during this time that the League to Save Lake Tahoe were born and started to urge the legislatures of both states to more formally address regional planning in the region. The threshold standards also predated the 1987 Regional Plan, which is what many think of as the first effective regional plan for the region. This is the first time that they prevented new subdivisions. They limited overall development of tourist accommodation units, residential units, commercial floor area within the region.

There were all sorts of development controls that went in afterwards and part of what the threshold standards in 1982 were trying to accomplish was to provide guidance in the development of that Regional Plan. They put in a number of controls that they wanted and have since been written into the Regional Plan.

They've long acknowledged that they need to update the standards. In 2015/16, the Governing Board directed staff engage in this initiative to update the threshold standards and ensure that they have the best science, a cost effective and feasible monitoring program, and to ensure that another 40 years wouldn't pass before we updated the standards again.

That's been included in multiple work plans. If you're familiar with the hype cycle, maybe they're at a different phase of this. The hype cycle is something that a large consulting firm coined in order to explain how people react to new ideas and new technology. Initially, when a new technology or something is proposed, people have incredible expectations. It's going to change everything they do and get incredibly lofty expectations. Then those expectations are not necessarily realized immediately, and things start to drag on and people start to become disillusioned with where they are and that's the trough of disillusionment. Then you emerge from that and technologies start to mature and things become more productive and realize the promise.

That's where they are with the Threshold Update Initiative. They've done an incredible amount of groundwork over the past three to four years, they've made more modifications to the standards than they did in the previous 40 years. They've adopted a system for adaptive management and done this with no change to environmental protection within the region. Most of this has been done with the support of the Tahoe Science Advisory Council which started off by surveying the broad landscape for how other large collaboratives establish standards for themselves and measured environmental quality. It was with their support that they adopted the science based management structure that the board adopted last year.

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

This grounds everything that they do in the entire threshold standard management process, in the best sciences captured with conceptual models and it links those to all the things that they as managers do to the policies and goals of the Regional Plan, the Code of Ordinances, and to all the projects of the Environmental Improvement Program. The glue that holds those two things together are results chains. The results chains of this relatively simple tool that's commonly used in international development, public health, large-scale restoration projects. It links the actions taken all the way through to the outcomes that they hope to see. There are these logic changes that clearly explain to anyone why it is they're doing what they're doing, and what they hope to accomplish by doing those things. Results chains are about accountability to you, the funders, and all the members of the partnership. Everyone that's implementing projects is accountable to one another, and they're all tracking things the same way and working towards the same goals. They've not only developed this structure over the last couple of years, but they've also set up a number of initiatives to address the deficiencies that were raised in the last peer review.

One example related to stream environment zone in which they had a peer reviewer say, the only thing you track with regard to SEZ restoration is the area and this is a better approach. With the support of the Environmental Protection Agency and a grant from them, they delved into how they not only measure not just the area restored of SEZ but the overall quality and the benefit that they're deriving from that. On the backbone of that, they have this basis now to establish a new SEZ or wetland and meadow restoration target that's inclusive not just to the area that they restore, but also everything that they do to enhance SEZs that doesn't augment the area. There are numerous other examples such as the work of Lake Tahoe West, the Aquatic Invasive Species Coordinating Committee who have done a lot of work. There's also been a lot of work done on Tahoe Yellow Cress. Throughout the basin they have all these initiatives that have made significant progress on not only what the goals are, but how do they implement towards those goals.

They took a proposal to the Tahoe Interagency Executives Steering Committee (TIE) who implements projects as part of the Environmental Improvement Program. They recognized that it took them two years to do the vehicle miles traveled standard but, in the background, they've done all of this other work and not reconvened a new working group to talk about SEZ restoration or forest health. What if they mined all of these plans and developed an outline for what they think the basins goals are right now. Then work through a process to refine those and come up with threshold standards on the backbone of that. They started with TIE because that's directed from the Compact. The threshold standards are not TRPA standards but rather the basin goals. They're for every partner of the EIP, every dollar that's spent under the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (LTRA) is supposed to be prioritized and programmed in order to achieve these thresholds. They talk a lot about the collective impact model here and the conditions that are necessary for the partnership to achieve their goals. The Measuring What Matters Initiative is about refreshing some of those conditions, the common agenda, and the shared measurement framework.

As they started to put together this outline for a proposal, it became clear that they're entering this new phase of our conservation history. Where the sum total of our goals can no longer be captured, just by saying, they want to stop this development, or they want to restore the impact than something that's been lost from that development. It's about something bigger now. They're trying to create a more resilient Tahoe and the plans and programs are responsive to a much wider range of threats than simply development.

They discussed the Caldor fire and the change in landscape. There's a new scientific paper published frequently that talks more and more about how climate change is impacting the region. A recent article was on the mega drought that they're still in right now in the Western US. There was a paper published in Nature that talked about that in 25 years they may no longer have a snowpack within the region. Those impacts aren't just in the distant future. The work of the Science Advisory Council

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

has told them that these changes to the climate and the physical changes to the lake as the result from its warming, may already be impacting the programs they're implementing today and impacting Lake Clarity. Climate change is just one of those challenges. They're also talking about population growth, increased visitation, and how they as a region addressed that emerging challenge, and not just that, they're seeing synergies between these.

In recent work by the Science Advisory Council, highlighted how they're seeing synergistic effects between warming and the surrounding regions and visitation to Tahoe. The difference between a 65 degree day and 100 degree day in Sacramento is a doubling of traffic over Echo summit. These are the challenges they're facing today. These are what their goals are aligning around today and trying to make a more resilient future for the region.

The outline today is not the sum total of all of the threshold standards. They surveyed where the EIP working groups and where the partnership has made the most progress over the last five years and identified six areas that they thought were most ripe for updating, where they invested the most time and energy to revisiting the plans: Air Quality, Water Quality, Fisheries, Soil Conservation, Wildlife, and Vegetation.

The outline organizes goals in those six thresholds standard categories into four major categories that they're proposing to move forward: Watersheds and Water Quality, Forest Health, Biodiversity, and Air Quality. They don't see those individual categories as separate and distinct. They're no longer talking about managing towards individual silos. These highlight areas where they recognize that a goal is established in one category, but it's serving multiple categories. In 1982 if they thought a goal would serve both forest health and air quality, it was adopted twice. One of the early things the Science Advisory Council said was a goal is a goal. Write it once and then acknowledge that they all operate beyond the system in which they are categorized.

Today's outline doesn't have specific text for every standard. They haven't populated the entire results chain and explained how exactly they're going to measure progress. They feel this draft will serve as the outline for developing the specific text of the standards, as well as the monitoring programs that will back those standards up. It'll allow them to effectively measure progress towards those standards. Between now and the end of the year, they plan to flesh out that outline. They're currently in a comment period where they talking to all the partners that developed those plans. Over the next four to five months, they plan to go back to the same EIP working groups and all of the partners that helped to create this outline to help refine the specific text of the standards, but also identify how they can effectively measure the progress towards achieving those standards, to ensure that they have the accountability for the funders, to you, and to each other.

The next time this is presented it will likely have a full outline of threshold standards that will then build out this entire full text and monitoring system, They'd like to have that to the board by April 2022. The remainder of 2022 will be to work out exactly what those are to ensure that the partners are on board with this process and there's a system that reflects the goals of the entire partnership, and a system that they can monitor and implement. They are getting the information they need to adaptively manage towards those goals. The goal is to have that completed by December 2022 then move towards the formal adoption process by early 2023.

Presentation can be viewed at: [Agenda-Item-No.-VII.B-Thresholds-and-Monitoring-Update.pdf](#)

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Bruce said this is very informative and helps him understand where they're going from a threshold perspective, and how the climate impact in the basin is being viewed.

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

Mr. Yeates said this is exactly what we wanted to do because there are way too many indicators. In the fact that they're breaking it down and showing the interconnectedness and working with partners, s essential because there no longer can be silos. The Caldor fire was a wakeup call. The work on aquatic invasive species, you just name it, and everything that TERC talks about with changes in the lake itself. He commended staff for putting all this together. This is far better than meeting to discuss the issues, thresholds and indicators individually.

Ms. Aldean said well done. She liked the icons, but it might be helpful for example, under watersheds and water quality, he indicates for AIS control, system tags for water quality, forest health, and biodiversity. It's not readily apparent to how forest health intercepts with AIS control. Maybe this was just for illustration purposes, but she feels that spending a little time including an explanation of the points of intersection would be helpful. That also applies to biodiversity under plants, he omitted forest health. Just a couple of minor points that would be helpful to clarify.

Mr. Lawrence said this is critically important. These threshold standards are over 40 years old. The people that put it together in the late 1970s and early 1980s did an admirable job in trying to forecast what the thresholds and the standard should be. Times have changed and science has gotten better and is critical for them as a planning agency to understand what they're measuring, why they are doing it, and then put in the policies of the program and the projects to move the needle. That can't be done when there's thresholds and standards that are outdated. The last slide showed the adoption process being finalized in early 2023. Is this for all of the final standards or the process for finalizing the standards?

Mr. Segan said they hope by the end of the year to have standards in the six categories finalized. The work over the next couple of months is working through those working groups and identifying which of those standards are not ripe for setting. They may refine the proposal as they the dialog with those groups. The goal would be to have a package of complete standards, including modifications to the EIP performance measures. So, the threshold standards would be moving to adoption through the Governing Board and EIP performance measures through the TIE Steering Committee in early 2023.

Mr. Lawrence asked how they envision those inputs that are actually outside of the basin, or outside of their control. They've had some horrific air quality during the summer largely from the wildfires outside the basin with the exception of the Caldor that did touch the basin. How do they envision working through atmospheric deposition, for example, and other things that are out of their control?

Mr. Segan said that's part of the integration between their results chains and the conceptual models that the science community develops for them. The interpretation of their actions, whether or not they're successful depends on what those external drivers are that are also impacting what's happening. Using the atmospheric deposition example, they may be doing everything they can in basin to limit loading. But if you have the number of fires that are increasing loading, they need to have an understanding of that in terms of whether or not their actions are working. It's yet to be resolved how they articulate those linkages. But they have a general framework that allows them to do that and evaluate progress appropriately, depending on what's happening with those.

Mr. Lawrence said that'll be interesting to see how that comes out. Having good, accurate, and appropriate thresholds and standards is critical for planning work, but it's also critical in order to be able to communicate expectations. They need to think about it through both lenses.

Mr. Segan said the earlier work of the Science Advisory Council advocated that they use smart goals. Which means they're not setting goals for things like the temperature of the lake, which is outside of their control. There were a number of those in the early set of threshold standards that were

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

aspirational in nature but dependent on factors outside of their control. This current effort is focused on things that they can control and the outcomes that they hope to eventuate on the ground.

Mr. Yeates said he's keyed on the word "resilient." The lake's going to get smaller and warmer and there's not a lot they can do about it. There's things that they can do, there are things that they have to adapt to but they're going to have to be resilient. Some of the things that they're trying to wrestle with on transportation as a result of the number of visitors they get. Look at the slide that showed the difference between what happens at 65 versus 100 degrees in Sacramento. It is going to require them to recognize that there's going to be change and they aren't necessarily always going to be restoring a resource, they're going to be resilient to that change and adapt to that. That's the difference in the way the thresholds were set up, they were set up to stop something the best way that they could. The classic one that they just done wrestling with is there was a threshold that wanted to stop an air quality problem that was being treated as a transportation problem. It didn't work, especially in the context of vehicle miles traveled. So, they rerouted that to what it is now, to address the issue, which they have some control over but not a whole lot over the visitor use at Lake Tahoe. They're going to have to do this throughout the West, just on water alone.

Public Comments & Questions

None.

VIII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director Status Report

1) 2021 Annual Report

Ms. Marchetta said the Annual Report picks up on some important themes that they've been talking about today. As she said in her opening letter to the Governing Board and community about last year, and really is about the last several years, these years have tested the resilience of everyone. They've tested the resilience of TRPA as an organization in ways that she hasn't seen in her long tenure.

Last year's fires burned all around them and eventually burned into the region. There were moments last year, where they thought that was impossible. She had to evacuate her home 15 years ago during the Angora Fire. So, the Caldor fire was the second experience in 15 years. The South Shore watched this come at us for days and eventually the first responders evacuated 30,000 people across two state lines in a matter of hours. It was amazing that they were able to return to their homes spared from the personal loss and destruction that they thought was virtually assured. The forest lands lost 10,000 acres and could have been so much worse. There is no question that the prior decade of forest treatments that this region has done, and TRPA's early leadership to create the Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team 15 years ago. In 2007, they were the needed actions that led to reducing hazardous fuels as a region. Those actions are what allowed the heroic firefighters during the Caldor Fire to make their stand, and that stand was not possible in the untreated areas just outside Tahoe. And Tahoe's collective preparation contributed to why Tahoe is still standing.

This role that TRPA plays as the backbone organization for the overall collective impact of the Tahoe Partnership, their role as the coordinator, convener, and organizer in bringing together the advocacy to the bipartisan delegation of Congress into two state legislatures, two governors administrations, their role in strategizing for regional funding, leading the overall partnership for Tahoe has proved its worth for Tahoe this last year, and improves its worth every day.

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

There's an ever growing need for the credible regional scale partnership building and convening, and their continued regional revenue organizing. She's been here when Tahoe was highly splintered and they don't get much done when they splinter into factions. Keeping the partnership together to achieve going forward regional needs is TRPA's job one. It's driven by this evolving and highly daunting set of new challenges. The effects of changes in climate are here. In response, TRPA's focus over this next decade is going to have to be on how Tahoe is a region within the larger Sierra Nevada will have to adapt all of their systems to be more climate resilience, as well as, economically, and socially resilient. They are thinking and rethinking again and again about the needed adaptations and resilience work in all of their systems.

This annual report reflects that they have already started. Transportation through the transportation funding work, where they're coordinating this regional approach to transportation funding in recreation management. It's in their work to convene new destination stewardship partnerships. In water quality they're working with the Science Council to look at how climate drivers may be influencing the water quality and clarity work.

In Forestry, they did the work today to update the codes that are going to allow greater pace and scale or forest health treatments.

In aquatic invasive species they're tackling ground zero and invasive plant control and the Tahoe Keys. Along with their nationally recognized boat inspection program, intercepting more and more infested boats with 132 boats this last season carrying invasive species.

In housing, they're making the first progress on delivering affordable and achievable housing supply for the workforce and are doing this with partners to give the workers the fighting chance to be able to live close to where they work without long commutes.

The shoreline plan is well into the implementation of that 2018 plan that they adopted after 30 years. They've issued thousands of shoreline permits for structures and new piers that are bringing those legacy structures into conformance with that metered development framework.

Similarly, they play this role in compliance oversight. They've completed nearly a thousand site inspections. They did 100 audits of projects that were reviewed by partners and over 1,100 hours of watercraft education and enforcement.

In their accountability programs, they may not be implementers, but an odd position to be in, to be accountable to everything that their implementers do. That's what they're accountable so, they're raising the bar on themselves. They're accelerating the update to the regional goals threshold standards. Then there'll be measures and metrics that are in line with the future challenges. Those are a few of the highlights of how they were able to maintain focus on these important regional issues over the last year and did it all in despite of the distractions and disasters.

Lastly, a shout out to staff. She doesn't underestimate the trying effects of all of the distractions of this last year. Their jobs are hugely challenging in the best of times and last year when the world around them piled on fire, smoke, and pandemic, social and economic upheaval, and every other transformational issue, the staff endured and they had courage, backbone, resilience. She respects and loves every one of them. She thanked them for staying the course over this last year. To the board, they'll see in the annual report the steady accomplishment against the mission. Her gratitude and respect goes out to the mighty but small and lean staff as well as to the board for the steady accomplishments toward the mission and all of that good work despite the year that 2021 was for all of us.

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Bruce said thank you for being the beacon of strategy. He's been involved with this organization now for ten years and it never ceases to amaze him how strategically prepared she and the staff are. It's rare to have somebody with that kind of talent and foresight to lead an organization as Ms. Marchetta does.

Mr. Yeates agreed with Mr. Bruce's comments. It's remarkable that throughout all this craziness that everyone went through, she's dealt with her hearing issues and is indeed remarkable. He misses the connections they used to have when they were together in person for board meetings.

B. General Counsel Status Report

Mr. Marshall said on February 14, the Court of Appeals for the State of California issued an opinion in the League to Save Lake Tahoe v. the County of Placer lawsuit regarding the development by Sierra Pacific Industries of a potential 700 unit project adjacent to Northstar and just outside the basin boundary. The Court, like a previous decision in the Sierra Watch v. the County of Placer case regarding the developments that is now Palisades Resort invalidated the EIR on a number of reasons. Most important to them is the connection to a near basin project impacts within the basin. This reflects a notion that development next to them needs to take into consideration impacts within the basin in a way that melds into TRPA's and the basin system on addressing impacts. They'll be working with Placer County proactively to ensure that if these projects come back that they know if any, what impact needs to be mitigated and how to do so. This will particularly be more efficient, given the work that was done on vehicle miles traveled threshold which played front and center on a number of the issues the courts were looking at. He'll send out a more detailed summary in a written form.

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean asked what constitutes a near basin project. This is a discussion that they need to have because it's going to impact all the communities surrounding Lake Tahoe within a certain proximity. It's a question that needs to be answered.

Mr. Marshall said that question has bedeviled them before. They can safely say that projects adjacent to the boundary are near enough so that they'll have potential impacts in the basin and that they should provide the local jurisdiction with guidance as to how that project might mitigate its impacts, if any in the basin.

Ms. Aldean said when they talk about over tourism, in theory, they could extrapolate that to mean that projects in the Sacramento Area have an adverse impact in Tahoe. It's a difficult problem and understands that there's no perfect solution.

IX. GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER REPORTS

None.

X. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Local Government & Housing Committee

No report.

B. Legal Committee

GOVERNING BOARD

February 23, 2022

No report.

C. Operations & Governance Committee

No report.

D. Environmental Improvement, Transportation, & Public Outreach Committee

Mr. Lawrence said the committee met this morning. There was a lot of momentum regarding a strategy to tackle the \$20 million funding gap through an EIP implementation strategy of which the funding gap or the responsibilities are divided up amongst the federal government, the two states, and then a local private share. Good progress was made there and the devil's in the details. What counts towards that share and what types of projects? It can't all be infrastructure funding because they need to operate transit. A lot of good questions came up and they're making progress.

E. Forest Health and Wildfire Committee

No report.

F. Regional Plan Implementation Committee

No report.

XI. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

None.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Novasel made a motion to adjourn.

Chair Mr. Bruce adjourned the meeting at 4:35 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



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.