

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

Zoom  
TRPA

February 22, 2023

**Meeting Minutes**

CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Vice Chair Ms. Faustinos called the meeting to order at 11:30 a.m. on February 22, 2023.

Members present: Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Bass, Mr. Rice, Mr. Settlemeyer and Ms. Williamson.

Members absent: None.

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Regan stated no changes to the agenda.

Vice Chair Faustinos deemed the agenda approved as posted.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Williamson moved approval of the January 25, 2023 minutes as presented.

**Motion carried** by voice vote. Commissioner Bass abstained.

III. ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

Ms. Williamson nominated Ms. Faustinos to be Chair and Mr. Rice to be Vice Chair of the Environmental Improvement, Transportation, and Public Outreach Committee

Public Comment

None.

Ms. Faustinos and Mr. Rice accepted their respective nominations. Ms. Conrad-Saydah made a motion to elect Ms. Faustinos as committee chair and Mr. Rice as committee vice chair.

**Motion carried** unanimously.

IV. BRIEFING ON TAHOE TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT ACTIVITIES

TRPA Executive Director Julie Regan began the presentation on this item. She reminds the Committee that a few months ago, Board Member Alexis Hill, who sits on both the TRPA and the Tahoe Transportation District (“TTD”) boards, gave a report to the TRPA board and staff found it

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, TRANSPORTATION, & PUBLIC OUTREACH COMMITTEE

February 22, 2023

was appropriate to bring regular briefings on TTD activities to this committee. Ms. Regan reminds the public that the Highway 50 Corridor Management Plan is not agendaized for this meeting.

Carl Hasty, TTD District Manager, presented on TTD activities. [Slide 1] TTD is a Bistate Compact agency under the same Compact as TRPA and have their authority under Article IX of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact. TRPA has a huge responsibility and a broad mission to make sure transportation is fully integrated with land use and the environmental thresholds. TTD's distinction is they focus entirely on transportation and primarily on implementation of transportation. TTD and TRPA work together as they are the only two entities who have the responsibility to look at the region as a whole. There are at least 18 organizations who have transportation responsibilities in the Tahoe basin alone. TTD rolls all that up to deal with transportation as directed by the Compact and especially with the multi-modal approach to dealing with capacity and congestion. While everyone is familiar with transportation, the business of transportation development and operations is quite arcane; not common knowledge to the public. [Slide 2] This slide shows the responsibility of the Metropolitan Planning Organization ("MPO") who have primary responsibility for Long Range Planning. The reality is that TTD is involved in every step along the way in some shape. TRPA is both the Agency and the MPO, they have the biggest role in things such as the Regional Transportation Plan ("RTP") but all of the partners along with the public are giving input and helping to build those plans. TTD's responsibilities fall on the other end of the spectrum focusing on implementation.

TTD became staffed in 2009 even though it's been around since 1980 through some earmarks that were passed through the MPO for about 5 years. TTD was in agreement with TRPA to take on a series of difficult projects that have been on the books for a long time but tough to deliver on. Among those are the traffic improvements in Tahoe City including the short re-alignment of SR-89 and the roundabouts. That project is nearing completion and should be going back out to bid to complete. TTD planned, did the environmental documentation, brought it to the TRPA Board to get it permitted, and put the funding together. TTD is very flexible as to how they approach implementation of projects. In this case, for Tahoe City, the primary source of Federal funds secured were Federal Lands Access funds. Along with that comes the regional Division of Federal Highways to deliver the projects so the Federal Highways has been the construction lead for that project.

The Nevada Stateline to Stateline bike trail was first completed through a feasibility analysis for the entire stretch and then TTD was charged with getting two demonstration projects up and going. TTD completed the South Shore Demonstration project which goes from Edgewood Golf Course to Round Hill Pines Resort. The second stretch is the 3 miles from Incline Village to Sand Harbor State Park. The Nevada Department of Transportation ("NDOT") was the lead agency of that project and combined it with some erosion control and water quality improvements for that stretch of highway.

Other projects are the US 50 project at Stateline which is in process. SR-28 trail project is planned to be continued for the next 8 miles to Spooner Junction. There are a number of partners involved with that who are addressing getting more parking off of the highway and into designated locations off of the highway. With that project there would be a total of 11 miles of trail from Incline Village to Spooner Junction. In the future, there would be another stretch from Crystal Bay from that Stateline to Incline Village.

[Slide 3] In 2010, shortly after getting staffed, TTD took on the transit system on the South Shore when the non-profit previously running it could no longer sustain itself and no other public

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, TRANSPORTATION, & PUBLIC OUTREACH COMMITTEE

February 22, 2023

entity was able to step up at the time. TTD has been running the transit service on the South Shore and doing it inter-regionally by connecting to Minden-Gardnerville and Carson City. TTD has put together a variety of funding sources to do this. The map on the slide is an update to the Short Range Transit Plan which TTD is engaged in right now. This concept is discussions right now with a Technical Advisory Committee TTD has convened on the South Shore including the City of South Lake Tahoe, the South Shore Transportation Management Association, TRPA, Douglas County, and consultants. The solid line on the map is a fixed route, here along highway 50. The areas with different colors are micro-transit zones in order to get folks to the buses, called in transit lingo the “first/last mile”. Zone 1 on the map is the existing Lake Link area that is associated with mitigation for the Event Center. The City of South Lake Tahoe is interested in expanding that service to the rest of the City and Douglas County would like to expand it to Zones 3 and 4. This map is a draft and in discussions now with the Technical Advisory Group to look at how this could be accomplished in a short period of time to get some efficiencies and integrate the two systems so that they’re working together. On the dashed line on the Lake is the existing private water taxi service which TTD is also working to integrate into this short range transit plan.

[Slide 4] This slide shows the potential longer-term vision, beyond 5 years, assuming there’s interest on the part of partners. This is a more expansive look at fixed-route service and additional zones for micro-transit. The marked zones 5, 6, and 7 is looking at the unincorporated portions of El Dorado County. TTD hasn’t had dialogue with El Dorado County yet but they’re contemplating the possibilities. The map shows a route from Zone 2, the intersection of US 50 and 89 (“the Y”) following 89 to go to Emerald Bay and a more expansive Lake service with a passenger ferry and more expansive water taxi service to get to Emerald Bay and other locations on the North Shore.

[Slide 5] This slide illustrates the bigger picture. This map is representative of the application that TTD and co-applicants including the town of Truckee and Placer County, just submitted to the California State Transportation Agency (“CalSTA”) under their Transit Intercity Rail Capital Program (“TIRCP”). This is the first time TTD or anyone up in the Sierras has made application to this program. In Mr. Hasty’s opinion, after dealing with grants for a number of years, this program understands systemic approaches, therefore they’re willing to look at support over multiple years. They understand that for transit programs, it’s about building a network, and that’s missing at Lake Tahoe; the comprehensive network that ties together the North and South Shores and starts to tie beyond the Basin; reaching Truckee, Minden-Gardnerville, Carson City and getting to the Reno area, Sacramento, Central Valley, Bay Area.

The proposal in this application is a series of seven projects, the first of which is looking for planning money to finish planning some of these projects. The dark round circles on the map are mobility hubs; on the South shore, out in Meyers, at the Y intersection, and at Ski Run Marina. On the right side [of the map] that is a location that TTD and Douglas County are looking at where there could be a larger and more modern transit facility. On the North Shore, Kings Beach transit up at the intersection of 267 and 89 and the resort triangle tie-in. Placer County is interested in looking at a dedicated transit lane on each of those two state routes to help with the congestion and enhance transit mobility options as alternatives to the automobile. TTD is also working with the town of Truckee for some additional mobility hub locations to capture visitors but also to provide commuting options for the workforce coming up from Reno.

The Town of Truckee is also looking at new maintenance facilities. The Placer County Transportation Planning Agency is working in partnership and are expecting to see a third passenger rail line coming from the Bay Area into Roseville. Therefore, TTD proposes a

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, TRANSPORTATION, & PUBLIC OUTREACH COMMITTEE

February 22, 2023

motorcoach service to complete the trip for folks until we can actually see train [service] up the 80 and 50 corridors to address and create a different transit option.

This is obviously California biased since it's a California funding option but Nevada is not being left out in thought or in pursuit to match the other side [of the basin] with transit services and other mobility hubs both in and out of the Basin to complete the type of systemic network that is needed to address travel at Lake Tahoe.

The two boards of TRPA and TTD have a critical partnership role to play to achieve the transportation system that's needed for Tahoe and the Resort Triangle and to provide an alternative method to arrive, travel around, and return home from this recreation destination. The staffs of TRPA, TTD, and all of the partner agencies, are also technical support and delivery staff to get a multi-modal network on the ground and operating.

### Committee Member Comments

Commissioner Bass was excited to hear about the rail projects proposed in California but really wants know if a rail project that goes between Reno and Carson City that could come up Spooner Summit to serve South Shore is in the TTD Long range plan?

Mr. Hasty responds that it's not something currently in the TTD long range plan and he's not aware of any dialogue on the Nevada side for that project but that doesn't mean TTD can't query Washoe RTC or Carson City to see if they're contemplating something like that.

Commissioner Bass thinks this should be in the long range, 25 year plan, knowing that if there's a high speed rail option between San Francisco and Reno it'll be a 2 hour trip. With an additional high speed line between Reno and Carson and then up to the South Shore that could be a 3 hour trip which would transform the way people come to Tahoe. Mr. Hasty laid out TTD's regional role. Commissioner Bass asks for Mr. Hasty's opinion on a different entity providing transportation for the South Shore, if that would help TTD's overall focus for the region.

Mr. Hasty responds that Commissioner Bass is aware, since he sits on TTD's board, that the TTD board is open to that and the City has interest in that. They'll be coming to the TTD Board to adoption of the short-range transit plan for adoption. After they get public comment on these proposals coming forward, they'll make those decisions.

Commissioner Bass continues to let the committee know that the City has unanimously agreed that they [the City of South Lake Tahoe] should be the recipient of transit funds, similar to Placer County, which would come with a commitment to operate transit at a level to meet climate and other goals. If the City Council decides they should be the recipients of transit funds, would TTD oppose that? He believes that would be TRPA Board approval to move that forward.

Mr. Hasty responds that it's not up to him, it's up the board, and they've said that they're open to hearing that proposal.

Commissioner Bass says in terms of the electrification goals, is there a plan to meet not only the City's goals, but also California's mandates for electrification in transit. Mr. Hasty responds that the TTD Board has adopted a goal that's consistent with the State of California goals for compliance. TTD has funds and will be moving into a fleet conversion and infrastructure plan for

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, TRANSPORTATION, & PUBLIC OUTREACH COMMITTEE

February 22, 2023

their service area and hopefully the entire Region dovetailing with what Placer County has done and looking at what else needs to be done. That will be happening over the next year.

Commissioner Bass comments that with the planning for these sites, especially with regards to the transit hubs, to not have included the Y as a major hub for transit when we know the needs for Emerald Bay, the needs for the City, needs to be looked at again and be included. The facility planned to be built at Zephyr Cove, Mr. Bass feels would be better suited "down the hill" to serve Minden and Carson City moving into the electrified fleet.

Mr. Hasty notes that 5 of the 7 projects on the [TIRCP] application were projects that were on the 10-year Bistate consultation list, so this application is a way of moving those forward and TTD is pleased with the support including our resources agencies for the application.

### Public Comment

Phillip Schloss comments as a resident of Stateline. He finds it interesting that so far, and others have not mentioned the cost of these projects over what time period and where the revenue is to either initiate them or to keep them going.

Ellie Waller, Douglas County, Carson Valley Resident. she use the roads in both areas and come up here off often. This morning's ride was a little harrowing; NDOT could do a better job. It's not your problem. But just to let you know. Also Carl mentioned a possible expansion of the Douglas County Mobility Center in the long term. I'm wondering when that will surface to the Board of Commissioners so we have a better idea of funding expectations. Micro transit was funded for the remainder of the fiscal year at 520 from Douglas County, the missing piece, as the applicant stated, to keep it running for the rest of the year. We're looking forward to that service expansion into Douglas County for fair share service into the Douglas County area, and also there wasn't a mention of the Incline Village potential mobility hub at the closed elementary school. That'll be nice to get an update on that. I know there is a future meeting on the agenda for the members of the community there to come out, but it would be nice if it came back to this board as well.

My name is Scott Robbins. I'm a member of the South Lake Tahoe City Council, but my comments here are in my individual capacity as a member of that Council. I'm not speaking on behalf of the city as a whole, nor of the South Lake City Council as a whole. I thought Mr. Hasty's presentation was very interesting. It showed real ambition at what an integrated transit plan would look like, particularly around the South Shore area and expanding it to areas like Emerald Bay. And I think ambition is good, I think having a vision is good. What I think the presentation significantly lacked was any acknowledgement of the reality of the current execution of that plan. At the moment bus service in the south shore, which used to be every half hour in November, was cut to every hour. Not only are we not heading towards this ambitious future transportation plan, we are headed away from it. Service is not getting expanded, or better, it's getting worse. That is the actual lived reality of the people who might whom are my constituents. The lift operators, the ski instructors, the snow groomers. They are hitchhiking to work in the morning, and if you drive along Highway 50, you can see them hitchhiking to work in the morning because the buses are not running. So, I admire the ambition. I think it's the right kind of vision that we need, but we are not actually executing on the real current fundamental needs of transit in the south shore. I am very concerned by the fact that there was no acknowledgement at any point in Mr. Hasty's presentation about this current reality, and there was no effort to address the these problems and to demonstrate what actions are going to be

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, TRANSPORTATION, & PUBLIC OUTREACH COMMITTEE

February 22, 2023

taken by the TTD to address this critical transit shortfall that we have now. So ambition is good, plans are good, vision is good, all that's excellent. But we're not executing on the reality is in the present, and I think before we spend a lot of time and a lot of effort thinking about a grand vision for the future, I think we also need to have pragmatic execution in the presence. And we're not doing that. And this is a failure of the TTD that severely impacts the people who are at the foundation of the South Shore's economic vitality. Thank you very much.

Elizabeth Lernhardt, Zephyr Cove. I also would like to really applaud what the previous commenter said. I have seen it on social media. I've experienced it in myself. We are going backwards, not forward. I would like to leave the road diet for today, since you got a little tired about hearing me talk about it, and I would like to talk about TTD's One Tahoe plan. I have studied it as it is available to the public. It's a little dated and stale in its numbers, so I think the numbers will come out much higher when it's actually being executed. So when Congress granted TTD and TRPA the compact, it was concerned about preserving the Lake Tahoe natural environment. It seems that 54 years later, the focus of this agency is to study how to maximize revenue and implement up unproven ideologies rather than finding custom-fitted solution to this unique place. It applies the cookie cutter approach like the road diets. The main creativity I see in this plan, as I read it on the Internet, is directed towards improving revenue by taxation or fees, whatever you call it. So problem might be unique but I can assure you it is not as unique to find solutions to it. If you, the members ever traveled to the Alps in Europe, you would have seen what is possible and has been for the last 50 years. Swiss engineers, Austrian and German engineers have tackled much more challenging solutions, and have come up with unique long-term solutions to it that do not encroach on the local residents, as you are proposing here. There's still hurdles ahead for you the legislator of both States has to be so persuaded to agree this taxation. In Nevada the agency lobbied the 81<sup>st</sup> Assembly to waive this requirement, the assessment was that that it was a fatal flaw to ask California and Nevada for statewide vote to approve these monies with a two-thirds majority as mandated by your Congressional Compact. So the consultants went on to a phishing expedition for acceptable ideas how to fund this project. The first one was to call the tax a fee and comparator utility Fees. This begs the question of whether looking at the lake was the benefit the user was charged for. 28 methods were identified, and 5 determined to have the potential to be accepted by the public and you came up with a user fee of \$84 per property tax collected by property tax, \$4.10 per day per visitor as well as \$852 per year per business, and \$1.06 per day commuter fee for employees living outside the basin, no fees for bikes.

Nick Speal from South Lake Tahoe. Thank you for this report on some of the exciting transportation projects around the lake. There's lots to dream up here, but local transit needs more attention. I appreciate Mr. Bass's questions to focus attention on the local transit system, and would like to encourage the TRPA to consider a restructuring of who is responsible for local transit operations so that a focus on the needs for transit on the South Shore can be achieved thank you.

Doug Flaherty. In Mister Hasty's delivery and explanation of this very far-reaching proposals set of proposals, he mentioned that it's going to help with congestion. I want to reiterate that you guys, you know, the planners continue to hold on to the half-truth that these projects are going to reduce congestion. Those comments are arbitrary, capricious, subjective, controversial, and the outcomes of their reasons are highly subjective. Second of all the TRPA and governing partners are destroying our east shores. The last thing left of the what appears to be wild and scenic of the Lake Tahoe Basin; you guys are destroying it. We need to move that east shore trail to the to the east side of Highway 28. We need to get rid of those bridges. There's erosion underneath those bridges, there's algae. This is opened up the lake to an unbelievable number

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, TRANSPORTATION, & PUBLIC OUTREACH COMMITTEE

February 22, 2023

of people that basically subject the east shore to overcapacity. The urinate, they defecate their dogs defecate, there's trash, and there's plastic. We need to move that section to the east side of Highway 28, and for the rest of the trail to Spooner Summit everything should be on the uphill, east side of 2. Other than that, I like this whole idea of going local. We've got these grandiose plans, but it really comes down to the environmental impacts locally on not only the communities, but also the Lake Tahoe Basin on a whole. These are all symptoms of your current pro-development, pro-contractor approach, which continue to add to the tyranny of incremental projects that result in negative impacts on accumulated basis.

Presentation can be found here: <https://www.TRPA.gov/wp-content/uploads/EITPO-Agenda-Item-No-4-Briefing-on-Tahoe-Transportation-District-Activities.pdf>

### V. LAKE TAHOE VISION ZERO STRATEGY SAFETY PLAN UPDATE

Rachael Shaw, Assistant Transportation Planner, presented an informational update on the Lake Tahoe Region Vision Zero Strategy. This plan ties directly into the next Regional Transportation Plan, helping to improve safety and implement policies. It also ties into Michelle Glickert's presentation about the Transportation Performance and Recommendations Report. As the committee will hear, safety is one of the many metrics tracked to assess progress.

Vision Zero is a strategy improve safety for all modes of transportation on roadways with a focus on reducing fatal and severe crashes. Implementing this strategy will bring us in conformance with both states, which have adopted Vision Zero goals and also aligns TRPA at the Federal level as the Department of Transportation has a National Roadway Safety Strategy inline with Vision Zero Elements and just launched a Call to Action campaign asking stakeholders to commit to specific actions in 2023 to reduce serious injuries and deaths on roadways.

[Slide 2] Ms. Shaw outlined the presentation to start with a brief background on the previous strategy and TRPA's role in general in safety and then go more specifically into this strategy update and the Vision Zero elements. [Slide 3] This is not a new plan, but rather an update to the 2019 Safety Strategy but with the focus on Vision Zero. The presentation will be revisiting some of the recommendations and MOUs (Memoranda of Understanding) that came out of that previous strategy. This update is going to support the Regional Transportation Plan ("RTP") both the existing one and the update in 2025, and it aligns with the strategic initiative, Keeping Tahoe Moving. [Slide 4] TRPA has a few different roles when it comes to safety. First as the MPO, TRPA is required to establish and report on annual safety targets to both States. Next, TRPA also establishes safety policies in the RTP. TRPA also provides that regional coordination role to have a systemic approach which is especially important for safety. And then, lastly, TRPA provides funding for safety projects such as through the regional grant program and support local eligibility for funding opportunities. [Slide 5] Why does Tahoe need a Vision Zero strategy? One of the main reasons is the number of crashes that we're seeing on Tahoe roadways. The last Safety Strategy was based on crash data from 2012 to 2016, and since then there have been 19 fatalities and 109 severe injuries on Tahoe's roadways, an average of 4 fatalities in 22 severe injuries each year. This is with the caveat that 2021 data is still coming in, and these numbers may change. This is being called a preventable health crisis on the national level, and we have our role to address our portion of this crisis in Tahoe. I want to acknowledge when I mention this data that these are not just numbers, but family members, friends, colleagues, and community members that have been greatly impacted by these crashes.

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, TRANSPORTATION, & PUBLIC OUTREACH COMMITTEE

February 22, 2023

[Slide 6] The second main need for a Vision Zero [strategy] is eligibility for new and existing funding sources. We know that in order to make significant impacts on crashes, we need infrastructure. And in order for local jurisdictions to implement infrastructure, they need more funding. And so TRPA is designing this plan with funding in mind. One of the new funding sources is Safe Streets and Roads for All or SS4A. This was established by the bipartisan infrastructure law, making 5 billion available over 5 years. One of the requirements to apply for this grant is to have an existing Vision Zero Action plan that covers your area. Therefore, TRPA's Vision Zero strategy makes not only TRPA, but the locals [jurisdictions] eligible to apply for \$5 to \$30 million in implementation grants. We just saw the average implementation award for the cycle recently awarded was \$16 million, and these were comprehensive projects covering multiple safety improvements across cities and counties and this could have a big impact on Tahoe. [Slide 7] Staff is also considering other State and Federal funding and using this strategy to make agencies more eligible for not just SS4A, but other funding sources, and part of that is including equity considerations. Equity is becoming an increasingly important consideration, and sometimes a requirement for transportation grant sources. So TRPA is going to be looking at some of the recommendations that come out of the transportation equity study which you're going to hear about later today from Kira Smith, and incorporating that into this strategy.

[Slide 8] Vision Zero isn't a new concept and many of you are familiar with it. But since this is the guiding principle for this strategy, Ms. Shaw gives some background to make sure everyone's, the Board and the public, are grounded and on the same page. It originated in Sweden in the 1990s. It's since spread to several other European countries, and more than 45 communities in the US. Since its inception, Swedish fatalities have decreased by more than 50%, even with traffic volumes increasing. There are similar results in other places that this approach has been adopted. While Vision Zero seems to be more of a buzzword or a slogan, it's more than just a tagline. It's a fundamentally different way to approach traffic safety. So this traditional approach on the bottom left [of the slide] says that traffic deaths are inevitable. We design roadways for perfect human behavior that seeks to prevent collisions and puts responsibility on individuals. Vision Zero seeks to shift away from that narrative to say that while human mistakes are inevitable, we can design roadways to incorporate human mistakes and prevent the most fatal and severe crashes. With taking a system's approach, saving lives does not have to be expensive. Tahoe is not necessarily still in this traditional approach. Tahoe has already taken steps toward to move towards Vision Zero, even if it hasn't been called Vision Zero yet and so Tahoe falls somewhere in the middle. But this strategy will just be one step to move closer towards that approach.

[Slide 9] This strategy seeks to have 4 main objectives. The first one is to achieve significant decline in roadway fatalities and severe injuries with a long-term goal of 0. TRPA is considering a goal of 0 by 2050 as this aligns with both California and Nevada Strategic Highway Safety Plans. Next the strategy will aim to support and accelerate attainment of RTP goals. TRPA is also seeking to establish a way to measure our progress in meeting that Vision Zero goal over time. One of that ways will be in establishing an adaptive management framework and by annual reports, and we can look at safety as one of those metrics in those reports. Another way to measure progress will be our targets that we set and report onto each State. Then, lastly, TRPA wants to enable agencies to be eligible for new and existing funding to get some safety improvements on the ground.

[Slide 10] TRPA intends to include the elements (with asterisks next to them on the slide) in this updated strategy: Vision Zero goal, Equity Considerations, How Progress Will Be Measured, and Funding Opportunities. Those elements are new to this update. Ms. Shaw highlights all the work that went into the last strategy in all of the other aspects, particularly the crash data analysis



## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, TRANSPORTATION, & PUBLIC OUTREACH COMMITTEE

February 22, 2023

and developing a countermeasures toolbox that's specifically for the Tahoe region and this really lays the groundwork and foundation for this strategy.

[Slide 11] This strategy is going to be developed with input from a technical advisory committee ("TAC"). Staff convened the first meeting in January and invited to participate are both State Departments of Transportation, local and State law enforcement, local jurisdictions, and some advocacy groups. Staff will be coordinating with local plans. The committee may know that the City of South Lake Tahoe was just awarded SS4A planning funds to develop their own Vision Zero Action Plan. Staff will be coordinating with them to ensure both plans are cohesive and aligned with each other. [Slide 12] Finally, these are the next steps that the committee can expect as a strategy moves forward. Staff has already hosted the first TAC meeting, and they're aiming to hold at least 2 more. There will be opportunities for public outreach throughout, but particularly from April to the end of June. In August, staff expects to come to the full Board for consideration of a Resolution committing to this goal of Vision Zero. Commitment from leadership or Governing Body or city council, most often in the form of resolution, is a key part in all Vision Zero plans, and we are considering the goal of zero roadway fatalities and severe injuries 2050. The next SS4A cycle is expected in September so staff will wrap up this strategy by September.

### Committee Member Comments

Vice Chair Rice comments to make sure that it's clear that we are not pursuing the original Highway 50 plan of restricting Hwy 50 to one lane in each direction. I believe that we're looking at other goals and other ways of getting to 0 fatalities. That in a way that is more palatable to the people that live here.

Executive Director Regan responds that this is a more holistic strategy. TRPA is waiting for NDOT's revision to the Hwy 50 plan. TRPA is collaborating with NDOT and looking at how they might change their plans. They have a big overlay project that they're looking to do on the highway and before that happens, the need to finalize that Hwy 50 plan. The Vision Zero safety strategy is a Region-wide approach and doesn't get into that level of specificity.

Chair Faustinos comments that the 4-year reporting period is a long time and with the funding structures and active community engagement, it would be great to have more frequent report outs. It's important to get feedback from pedestrians in this development, not just from vehicles and bicycles.

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, TRANSPORTATION, & PUBLIC OUTREACH COMMITTEE

February 22, 2023

### Public Comment

Elizabeth Lernhardt from Zephyr Cove commented. I really appreciate the Vision Zero. The locals have really a great interest in reducing any kind of accidents living close between 2 of these dead men curves, I can only say personally, and my neighbors would appreciate an improvement. In addition, I've blogged on Nextdoor, and since I put the micro transit on in the public transportation, I've had 1,500 people reading the blog so these 2 issues are really catching. And if the engagement with the public would be more in a constructive manner, I'm sure we would come to a better solution. Regarding Vision Zero, I've studied the crash data on the android web page from 2016 to 2019 as it is available at this point. It stated the number one reason for fatalities are impairment. You do not address it with one word in your presentation you need to talk about impairment. When it comes to impairment it is not just alcohol. There is actually a shift which I found very interesting from alcohol to multidrug use. As long as we are allowing marijuana and other drugs to be legalized, we need to look at how that impacts us alcohol the half-life in your body is very short, and for marijuana it's 30 days. These are facts that are not going get improved by reconfiguring roads, not by road diets or anything else. This is another societal issue that needs to be addressed by this committee.

Helen Neff comments as a resident of Incline Village. First of all, I'd like to thank Ms. Shaw for bringing this briefing before the committee. I know that TRPA, and especially Ms. Shaw have safety as a priority in your planning, and I'm so grateful that for that. Unfortunately, I am one of the victims in the headlines that Ms. Shaw showed on one of her slides. I was injured while crossing State Route 28 in a crosswalk, doing everything legally. So the briefing in the board packet for this presentation, said the strategy is in line with the strategic initiative, Keeping Tahoe Moving, which aims to provide transformative changes to Tahoe's transportation system, including complete streets, pedestrian-friendly town centers, and improved safety. TRPA has been encouraging the implementation of complete streets for over a decade now, but in Incline Village, we do not have complete streets. We do not have a pedestrian, friendly town center. We do not have safety along State Route 28. The TRPA regional plan amended in April of 2021, in chapter 3 4.1 one addresses level of service for intersections, and the plan states the lowest level that may be acceptable is level E and then only certain hours, but the intersection of 28 and northward-Southwood, the gateway intersection into Incline village, when approaching from the east shore, has a level of service designation of F. F in failed, and that is before taking into account final approval of the 947 Tahoe Condo project that will bring more construction vehicles. The entire section of State route 28 through Incline Village has a crash rate over the national average, and it's well established that speed is a determining factor in how severe crashes are. So, while I understand that Vision Zero is a holistic approach, please do more than just evaluate Tahoe regional safety performance in 3 to 5 years. Instead, I encourage you to please use your authority to help those of us living around the lake, and especially in Incline village, to require and to make safety changes along 28 to the F-rated intersection, the speed limit within Incline Village, and redesign state route 28, using complete streets. I'm grateful that you're serious about Vision Zero, but for it to be a reality. These changes are necessary. Thank you.

Pam Strayley comments as a resident of Incline Village. If you're looking at zero roadway fatalities, there's been no mention of motorcycles and electric bikes which I equate; especially class 2 and class 3 bikes are throttled just like motorcycles right now. Those classes of e-bikes are allowed on, or ride on, the so-called multi-use paths, and I equate multi-use paths with sidewalks. They are overrun with pedestrians as they should be, pedestrians, dog walkers, people pushing strollers, and as such they are sidewalks and no bicycle of any kind should be allowed on them. I understand that the East Shore path to Sand Harbor was specifically

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, TRANSPORTATION, & PUBLIC OUTREACH COMMITTEE

February 22, 2023

designed to get road bikes off of Highway 28. Well, I guess that design came in before electric bikes, because electric bikes are now a great danger on that path. I personally was seriously injured on a "multi-use" path on the top, along the Truckee River and apparently there is no jurisdiction for the sheriff or CHP in this case to come and when an accident occurs. I was unconscious and bleeding, and both CHP Plaster County sheriff refused to come to the accident. So that's another situation when you consider safety, and those are my main concerns. Do consider e-bikes. I realize they are important alternative to gas guzzling cars, but they also create safety risks.

Doug Flaherty commented Keep Tahoe Moving. Not just on a daily basis, but how about during a wildfire evacuation? It only takes one or two cars, blinded by smoke, to rear end each other, and trap thousands of people to prevent them from safely evacuating. So, any sort of a safety element approach needs to address the impacts of increased height, density, coverage that are being currently proposed in the area plans and regional plans. All those proposals are increasing capacity. We are over capacity. TRPA has not adequately defined a public safety threshold, carrying capacity to safely evacuate visitors and residents from the Tahoe Basin. Yet you guys can continue to push, push, push for more, more, more height, density, and coverage. It defies logic. Not only that you're not addressing any specific substantial evidence to support these increases of height, density, and coverage as they apply to preventing the perils of public safety, wildfire evacuation. This is gone on way too long. You guys need to do an EIS going back supplemental EIS to the 2012 regional plan and include all these public transportation safety issues and take a hard look at this.

Kathie Julian commented that first, any 0 envision safety plan should tackle the critical issue of the interface between pedestrians and E-bikes, especially class 2 and 3 E-Bikes with throttles that are essentially motorcycles so fully support that point made, Secondly, the last speaker spoke of the evacuation plans so any plan on transportation should also factor in transportation during an evacuation due to Wildfire. I believe the Washoe County folks have come up with an overall Washoe County Plan for evacuation that encompasses a segment on the North Tahoe area. But that plan was flawed, at least in its first phase, because it did not factor in tourism or visitors to the to the Basin in terms of its numbers. So, I think any sort of approach you have for transportation needs to factor in the safety aspects of getting people out during an evacuation due to Wildfire. Thank you very much.

### Final Committee Member Comments

Ms. Shaw clarifies that this strategy will be looking at all modes of transportation so that's bicycles, pedestrians, motorcycles, vehicles, everything on Tahoe roadways that's impacted by these crashes. Staff will also be doing an Active Transportation Plan this year, specifically just looking at those active modes of transportation, of biking and walking and rolling, and that will be looking at E-bikes as well. There will be coordination between both of those strategies. Finally, staff is more than happy to come back to the board more frequently to update on the progress with safety.

Commissioner Bass adds that they got unanimous support from the City Council to explore a Gondola project that will stretch between Stateline transit center all the way to the Y with 5 different stops throughout town and the town centers. Caltrans last week thought it was a very interesting project and something that they would like to also look at. City Council will be coming back and meeting support from our partner agencies to look at the feasibility of it. This

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, TRANSPORTATION, & PUBLIC OUTREACH COMMITTEE

February 22, 2023

is something long range, but something that would bring a lot of pedestrians out of vehicles and move them through the most densely populated part of our highway and the Tahoe region.

Presentation can be found here: <https://www.TRPA.gov/wp-content/uploads/EITPO-Item-No-5-Vision-Zero-Strategy-Safety-Plan-Update.pdf>

### VI. INFORMATION BRIEFING ON THE TRANSPORTATION PERFORMANCE AND RECOMMENDATIONS REPORT FRAMEWORK

This item was continued with the opportunity for public comment.

#### Public Comment

None.

### VII. UPCOMING TOPICS

Executive Director Regan reminded the committee that they will not only be hearing about Environmental Improvement Program (“EIP”) projects, restoration initiatives, Forest Health matters, but also Transportation, as it’s one of the biggest EIP projects.

Michelle Glickert informs the committee that next month they’ll hear the Transportation Performance Report and the SR-89 Trail Feasibility study. In April, there are a handful of items related to the topics heard today; the Regional Grant Program recommendations and Nick Haven will give an update on Transportation Funding.

#### Committee Comments & Questions

None.

#### Public Comments

None.

### VIII. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS

Chair Faustinos comments that it’s great to have so many Transportation Policy issues coming forward and to see all of the hard work staff is doing on those. In the near future, she’d like to hear an update on the EIP projects and where those are going in the next quarter. Perhaps the May meeting would be an appropriate time for that.

### IX. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS


ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, TRANSPORTATION, & PUBLIC OUTREACH COMMITTEE  
February 22, 2023

None.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Williamson moved to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned 12:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "K. Huston", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Katherine Huston  
Paralegal, TRPA

*The above meeting was recorded in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the recording may find it at <https://www.TRPA.gov/meeting-materials/>. In addition, written documents submitted at the meeting are available for review. If you require assistance locating this information, please contact the TRPA at (775) 588-4547 or [virtualmeetinghelp@TRPA.gov](mailto:virtualmeetinghelp@TRPA.gov).*