TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

GOVERNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

July 22, 2026

TRPA/Zoom

1. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Ms. Williamson called the meeting to order at 9:09 a.m.

Members present: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Rodriquez (for Mr. Aguilar), Mr. Bass, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Guthreau, Ms. Hill, Mr. Hoenigman, Mr. Kieckhefer, Ms. Laine, Ms. Leumer, Ms. Williamson

Members absent: Ms. Hays, Mr. Tolbert (for Mr. Rice)

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Regan made the following announcements after the Pledge of Allegiance.

A warm welcome to Aaron Gagnon who is the Acting Forest Supervisor of the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit of the U.S. Forest Service. The Forest Service is one of our integral partners here in the Basin. TRPA and the Forest Service co-chair the Tahoe Interagency Executive Steering Committee, which is the advisory body overseeing the Environmental Improvement Program. He'll be here for four months, and he's coming from the Umatilla National Forest in Oregon, where he was the Deputy Forest Supervisor. He has a great deal of experience working throughout the United States with the Forest Service, and he also served in the U.S. Navy in both active-duty and reserve capacities. He has a B.S. in Forest Management from UC Berkeley and an M.S. in Forest Resources from Oregon State.

Aaron Gagnon said I'll be here through about mid-October. Hopefully, during that time frame, they'll fly the permanent position, and by the end of the year, or maybe the beginning of next year, there will be a permanent person in this position. I arrived a couple of weeks ago, right before the Fourth of July, and I did not know that the Fourth of July was such a thing in the Lake Tahoe Basin. People just said, "Get ready. This is going to be it."

The Forest Service, our partners, the community, the counties, the local sheriffs, and everyone else helped out and made it a pretty good success. I know there were probably a couple of incidents and things that happened, but overall, compared to other years, I think it was a good one. It was also a good introduction to Lake Tahoe, what it has to offer, what some of the Forest Service facilities are like, and just getting a chance to go around the lake and see how many people are interested in this place. It's quite incredible and beautiful.

Over the next couple of months, when I look at what we're focusing on in the Basin and across the Forest Service overall, it's working with you all and with our partners to make sure we get these projects going during the summer and make sure the work is getting done. We have our people out in the field, and we're representing the Forest Service.

But also, it's fire season. Here in the Basin, you may not notice it or see it because things seem relatively calm. If you look around the nation right now, it's game on for fire season. Especially up in Region 6 of Oregon and Washington.

I'm learning a lot with new acronyms, new agencies, partners, and programs. I'm here to keep those things going and to represent the forest well as we keep things like the EIP and all of those efforts moving forward.

Ms. Regan also introduced Mr. Nielsen, TRPA's new Deputy Director and Chief Planning Officer, replacing Mr. Hester. Paul has been at the agency for 30 years, but he came to us from Lake County after completing his education at Humboldt State with a Bachelor of Science in Geology and Water Resource Policy. Paul been a fire captain with Eastern Alpine Fire and Rescue. Leadership is in Paul's DNA. We are very pleased and proud to welcome him to the executive team and to have him here at the dais with our executive team and the Governing Board.

3. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS – ON AGENDA ITEMS

Gavin Feiger, Policy Director, Keep Tahoe Blue made comments on Agenda Item No. 7.D, VMT. We strongly support the significance of the progress the region has made through the 7-7-7 framework. We have been part of that effort from the beginning through the Bi-State consultation process. We have advocated for and directly invested in microtransit, transit operations, active transportation, and regional funding, working alongside all of the partners in this room and many others to help move these efforts forward. The progress is real, and it is worth celebrating.

However, that is not the question before you today. The question is not whether we are making progress. The question is whether the specific funding milestone, DP 5.4.B, has been met—specifically, whether there is an ongoing regional funding source dedicated to transportation that can reasonably be expected to meet the needs identified in our Regional Transportation Plan.

Based on the record before the Board, we do not believe that standard has been met. The region has secured important funding through grants, project-level funding commitments, appropriations, and investments totaling more than $20 million per year. However, that is not the same as the durable, ongoing funding envisioned when the Regional Plan policy was created.

Without a permanent funding source, priorities can change. Right now, there is significant momentum and strong support for transportation funding, but there are many competing priorities throughout the Basin. If that momentum diminishes, it would be easy for our political capital to shift to the next issue. This is important because the discussion is not just about transportation funding. Transportation funding and the Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) threshold are directly linked. Vehicle miles traveled affect Lake clarity, and our transportation system is one of the largest contributors to declining water quality.

Our position has been consistent since the VMT threshold was adopted in 2021, and even during the negotiations that led to its adoption. We supported the overall package because it was thoughtfully developed, with each component designed to work together. You cannot simply separate those pieces. The framework created a careful balance between flexibility and accountability. We supported the shift to a per-capita VMT standard instead of a flat VMT cap

because it included clear funding milestones, along with what we understood to be automatic consequences if those milestones were not achieved.

We also argued in 2023 and have reiterated multiple times each year since that while one-time funding is valuable, it is not the same as the ongoing funding envisioned by the policy. What we are asking today is that you recognize the success of the 7-7-7 Framework while also finding that funding milestone DP 5.4.B has not yet been attained. The conclusions are not inconsistent. They reflect the reality that Tahoe has made important progress, while also recognizing that there is still significant work to do.

Therefore, we respectfully urge you to take formal action acknowledging the success of the 7-7-7 strategy while also finding that funding milestone DP 5.4.B has not yet been met.

Supervising Deputy Attorney General Jessica Tucker Mole said our office submitted a letter yesterday afternoon regarding Agenda Item No. 7. D. We wanted to make certain that the letter was received and had an opportunity to be considered.

Tobi Tyler, speaking on behalf of the Sierra Club's Tahoe Area Group regarding Agenda Item No. 7.D. We urge you to reject the staff's recommendation on this item. This issue is not whether transportation funding has improved. The issue is whether TRPA is complying with its own binding Regional Plan and the threshold standards adopted in 2021.

When the absolute VMT threshold was replaced with a VMT-per-capita metric, the public relied on a crucial commitment: that adaptive management requirements, mandatory funding milestones under Policy DP 5.4, and automatic safeguards under Policy DP 5.6 would ensure continued environmental protection. Those safeguards are now being ignored. A series of one-time grants and political commitments under the 7-7-7 Initiative does not constitute an ongoing, dedicated regional funding source. Progress is not compliance.

Furthermore, staff's argument that no action is required because an advisory committee did not declare a failure misrepresents the Compact. The compliance determination belongs exclusively to the Governing Board. If TRPA can bypass mandatory safeguards whenever milestones are missed, then adaptive management ceases to exist, and the legal rationale supporting the 2021 VMT threshold update collapses.

We respectfully request that the Board 1) Formally determine non-compliance with Policy DP 5.4.B; 2) Find that the record does not demonstrate an ongoing, dedicated funding source; 3) Acknowledge that Policy DP 5.6 adaptive management measures are triggered; 4) Direct staff to prepare a comprehensive compliance report on the entire 2021 VMT threshold update; 5) Reaffirm that mandatory environmental safeguards cannot be waived through administrative inaction.

Environmental thresholds are only meaningful if their implementation measures are strictly enforced. Show the public that the Regional Plan is a binding commitment, not an optional suggestion. Please see our more extensive written comments submitted yesterday evening.

Laurie (Iphone) expressed concern about using glyphosate in the Caldor burn area. I believe that we should ban all synthetic herbicides and crew thinning in the Caldor burn area. I'm concerned

about this because it's harmful to the soil, the wildlife health and the carcinogenic factors regarding glyphosate. She suggested reevaluating using glyphosate in the burn area.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Regan stated that there were no changes to the agenda.
Ms. Williamson deemed the agenda approved as posted.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
June 24, 2026 Governing Board Minutes

Ms. Aldean said she submitted a couple of minor edits to Ms. Ambler and moved to approve the June 24, 2026 Governing Board Minutes as amended.

Motion carried-voice vote.

6. **TRPA CONSENT CALENDAR**

A. Release of City of South Lake Tahoe Stream Environment Zone (SEZ) Mitigation Funds ($31,779), Water Quality Interest (WQI) Mitigation Funds ($11,092), and Water Quality (WQ) Mitigation Funds ($53,369) for the Upper Bijou Park Creek Restoration Project
B. Release of Douglas County Air Quality (AQ) Mitigation Funds ($120,000), and Mobility Mitigation Funds (MMF) ($40,000) towards the Kahle Complete Street Project
C. Release of Placer County Air Quality Interest (AQI) Mitigation Funds ($38,000) for the Tahoe Transportation District for the 2026/2027 Emerald Bay Shuttle and Parking Management Project

Ms. Laine said the Operations and Governance Committee recommended approval of items A, B, and C which include the City of South Lake Tahoe for a total of $96,240 in various mitigation fees for the Upper Bijou Park Creek restoration project. We're also recommending approval of Douglas County's request for $160,000 for the Kahle Complete Street Project, and Placer County's request for $38,000 to help support the Emerald Bay shuttle and parking management projects.

Board Comments & Questions

None.

Motion:

Ms. Gustafson made a motion to approve the Consent Calendar.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Rodriquez (for Mr. Aguilar), Mr. Bass, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Guthreau, Ms. Hill, Mr. Hoenigman, Mr. Kieckhefer, Ms. Laine, Ms. Leumer, Ms. Williamson

Absent: Mr. Tolbert (for Mr. Rice)
Motion carried.

7. PLANNING MATTERS

A. Cultivating Community, Conserving the Basin Environmental Impact Statement Project Alternatives

TRPA staff Mr. Stock, Senior Planner provided the presentation.

Today's presentation will cover the policy alternatives for Cultivating Community, Conserving the Basin. This is the final phase of the Tahoe Living Strategic Priority. It is focused on adapting policies and regulations to support workforce housing, meeting our region's housing needs, and maintain and improve our environmental protections.

At the heart of this project is the idea that housing our local workforce and protecting the environment go hand in hand. Through this project, we are also supporting key goals of the Regional Plan, including walkability, sustainable communities, and land use patterns that help us meet our air quality, water quality, and greenhouse gas reduction goals.

We have been working on this current phase of the project for nearly two years now. In January, the Governing Board recommended moving forward with our policy proposal, and we are now working on the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the project.

Today, I'll cover some key scoping comments that helped shape the Environmental Impact Statement and the project alternatives within the EIS. The focus will be specifically on the project alternatives today.

A brief overview of the TRPA EIS process, discussion the policy alternatives included in the EIS, and explain what they are and why they are important will also be discussed.

The policy alternatives will be useful tools for understanding the potential impacts and effectiveness of a major policy change, such as what we are proposing here with Cultivating Community. My hope is that understanding these alternatives will help you make a confident and informed decision when we bring these amendments forward next year.

An EIS is TRPA's most rigorous level of environmental study. The environmental document we are preparing for Cultivating Community is a TRPA-only EIS. You have reviewed other documents that have been joint California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) or joint National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents, and sometimes all three.

We begin our review with our thresholds, which serve as the basis for our standards of significance. The EIS will identify potential environmental impacts, determine whether those impacts are significant, and identify mitigation measures where needed.

One of the ways we do this is by comparing the potential impacts of different policy alternatives to existing conditions or to each other. That is essentially what a policy alternative is. Alternatives help us understand the impacts of a proposed action relative to other solutions or non-solutions and relative to the existing conditions on the ground.

We always study a No Project Alternative. This is important because the impact of doing nothing is not nothing. There are impacts associated with maintaining the status quo, and we need to understand those environmental impacts in order to fully understand the impacts of the proposed project.

We are analyzing all of the alternatives. However, staff will make a recommendation when this comes forward for approval. Staff are also preparing a separate memorandum that evaluates each alternative and how each one addresses the project objectives. That memo will be separate from the EIS but will also serve as a useful tool as the project moves forward for consideration and adoption.

TRPA rules require a No Project Alternative in an EIS which examines the impacts of TRPA's existing policies without the changes proposed through Cultivating Community. We will evaluate the environmental and housing cost impacts of existing policy conditions, including the Regional Plan, the Code of Ordinances, and any amendments that have been adopted to date. That includes the Tahoe Living Phase 2 amendments, since those are existing policies that were adopted by the Board.

However, during the public scoping period for the EIS, we received several comments from the public emphasizing the importance of studying a No Project Alternative. To evaluate this alternative, we are looking at current commute patterns, among other factors. Current commute patterns reflect conditions where a significant portion of our workforce is housed outside of the Basin. Approximately 50 percent of our workforce currently lives outside the Basin, and those are the existing conditions that will serve as the basis for evaluating the traffic and air quality components of this alternative.

The next alternative is called the Housing Forward Alternative. This alternative focuses on adapting TRPA policies to meet regional housing needs, primarily through incentives for new workforce housing. The policy recommendations included in this alternative came out of the Cultivating Community public outreach process that we have conducted over the past few years. You saw these recommendations in Attachment A to the packet that you advanced in January. This alternative is studying the policies from Attachment A that you directed us to analyze in the EIS.

The Housing Forward Alternative prioritizes policy and code amendments that support a range of housing types, including affordable apartments, townhomes, duplexes, fourplexes, and accessory dwelling units.

This alternative seeks to accomplish those goals through changes to the development review process, fees, development rights, coverage requirements, and use definitions, all while remaining within the population and growth projections established in the 2012 EIS. That is particularly important because we are trying to direct the remaining growth capacity from the 2012 Regional Plan toward smaller, more affordable housing options through this alternative.

The final alternative, Housing Preservation Alternative, focuses on utilizing existing housing stock to meet Tahoe's housing needs. This alternative evaluates meeting housing needs by unlocking underutilized homes or vacant housing stock through local programs such as Leased to Locals, down payment assistance programs, or increased restrictions on short-term rentals.

We chose to study this alternative in part because several public comments requested that we focus on utilizing existing housing in this project or exclude incentives for new workforce housing.

The EIS Review Draft and the proposed amendments to the Regional Plan and Code of Ordinances will be released for public review in fall 2026. We will provide a minimum 60-day public review period for those documents and will use the comments we receive from the public to prepare the Final EIS and proposed amendments.

We hope to bring those amendments forward for your consideration in spring 2027.

Board Comments & Questions:

Ms. Aldean said in my mind, the housing preservation alternative and the housing forward alternative are not mutually exclusive. My assumption is that depending upon the results of the environmental document, they could be combined. I believe that they're both useful in order to achieve our goals of increasing workforce housing.

Mr. Stock said that's correct. When this comes forward the Governing Board will have an opportunity to take a look at all of the studies we've done through the evaluation of the policies against the project goals and make a decision about advancing one package or a combination of packages.

Ms. Faustinos said based on many of the policies TRPA has implemented over the last several years regarding public outreach, particularly to communities that might not normally participate in these types of hearings. I want to be reassured that this kind of engagement will take place again, specifically, to non-traditional groups to ensure that the people most impacted by these issues are included in the conversation.

Many of those individuals are workers commuting from outside the Basin, particularly those employed in the service industry. That may not be the correct assumption, but I would expect that a significant number are. One of the challenges is that many of these workers who commute from outside the Basin are supporting families. As a result, housing designed for families, rather than individuals, may better meet their needs. That has been my experience, but I think we need to collect data to validate whether that is actually the case.

Perhaps that analysis has already been done, but are we creating housing that will truly meet the needs of the workers we are trying to attract into the Basin? For example, if we significantly increase the supply of studio apartments but receive little interest because those units do not meet the needs of employees with families, then we may be doing ourselves a disservice. I recognize that this may not be a specific request for this process, but I believe it is an issue we need to address. I wanted to raise it as another consideration for how this effort moves forward. Overall, I think this is a great outline and a thoughtful approach to the issue. My concern is whether we are truly addressing the housing needs of the workforce in a way that will encourage people to live in the Basin rather than remain in their current communities outside the Basin.

Mr. Stock said normally we'd include a few slides highlighting our public outreach process because we're proud of the outreach we've done for this project. It's been a key part of the amazing grant

we received from the State of California. That grant has allowed us to significantly expand our public outreach efforts and rethink how we engage with the community.

A few highlights include hosting mini workshops, conducting Spanish-language workshops, and going directly to service organizations to meet with both the organizations and the people they serve. Through those efforts, we've received a great deal of input about the need for family-sized housing and we've incorporated that feedback into our policy proposal.

Mr. Hoenigman said I think we're always going to be promoting the reuse of existing housing for workforce and our existing buildings as well. That those weren't exclusive, that they can be implemented together.

Mr. Bass said as we look through all of this and consider approving development that creates more workforce which isn't a bad thing, and I'm cautious about this because I know how difficult it is to get a business open, and I don't want to make that process harder. However, some of these developments should come with permit requirements that require developers to create workforce housing as they're developing businesses that will need employees. I know some developers already do that simply because they're committed to being good developer.

Are we doing anything in our policy to require that and look at what that could do as we're seeing so much redevelopment and making it the responsibility be on the developer? For example, if you're creating 25 new jobs, should you also be required to create 12 new affordable housing units? Is that a policy consideration we're looking at?

Mr. Stock said we explored a requirement like that and ultimately decided not to pursue it. We do have an existing policy that requires a certain percentage of housing to be dedicated to the workforce. For example, when a new condominium building is constructed, ten percent of the building's square footage must be dedicated to deed-restricted housing. We're looking at making some adjustments to that policy to make it more effective at creating workforce housing. However, we have not recommended a policy that would require employers or new businesses to build housing as part of their development.

Mr. Bass is very reluctant to make it harder to open a business in town. It's challenging for small businesses already. Would it be worth exploring a requirement like that for larger developments. Why did we ultimately decided not to go in that direction?

Mr. Hester said that is something that at least one local government, Placer County, already does. It's not that we have prohibited that approach; rather, some local governments have taken the initiative to implement those types of requirements themselves. It is something we could discuss pursuing if a local government does not already have a policy or requirement in place. However, we would not want to preempt or override something that is already established and working effectively at the local level.

Mr. Bass said it’s worth exploring.

Ms. Gustafson said we're proud of our employee workforce housing requirements, although we haven't had any major projects move forward yet that would demonstrate how well it is working.

Other than Palisades, which is one great example of those commitments incorporated into new projects, including new business and commercial development.

Mr. Rodriguez said in terms of identifying housing that is underutilized or vacant, what method are you using to capture those numbers? The second piece is related to policy: Is childcare part of the issue we're looking at as well? I know childcare is a significant component of costs and expenditures for new families, and while it may not directly address the housing need, it is an important factor in addressing the overall financial burden that many Nevadans are facing and the financial hardship they experience. I'm curious whether childcare is part of the strategy as well.

Mr. Stock said we're still working through the details of Alternative 3, including how to implement the utilization of underutilized housing. For example, we're looking at ways for jurisdictions to demonstrate an effort toward ensuring that a percentage of their housing is accessible to the workforce. That alternative is focused on the tools available to local jurisdictions. We're working to craft policy that accomplishes that goal while also looking at ways we can use our authority to help leverage the outcomes we want to see. We are focusing on local tools because those are the tools that are best positioned to accomplish the goal of utilizing vacant and underutilized housing.

As far as childcare is concerned, that is not within the scope of this project, so we have not specifically looked at it. However, the point is very well taken that childcare is part of the overall cost-of-living calculation.

Ms. Hill said It's very difficult to establish regulations or requirements for local governments related to the utilization of existing housing because California and Nevada state laws are extremely different. Additionally, local jurisdictions in Nevada have different allowances on what they can do without state authorization.

It would be helpful if we could potentially get a memo from Legal outlining those differences, including what authority the Compact has.

Mr. St. Michel said those policies for that alternative, which we've been calling "unlocking existing housing," are still under review. That's part of the process, and those policies will be included in the Draft EIS.

As part of that development process, we're looking at the distinction between TRPA authority, areas outside of TRPA authority, and the role of local governments. We are evaluating those considerations now.

I appreciate the suggestion regarding a legal memo, and we'll take that into consideration. Whether it's in the form of a formal memo or something else, there will be additional input from staff, including Legal, as we develop and bring forward those policies and proposals.

Ms. Aldean doesn’t believe this alternative contemplates condemning homes in order to make them available for workforce housing. Hopefully, this would be a voluntary program, and that we would be relying on incentives rather than arbitrary rules that would be outside of our jurisdiction as an agency. I don't know if that directly addresses Ms. Hill’s question, but I suspect it may be related.

Mr. St. Michel has not heard that proposal floated about condemning homes, so that is not something being considered. Of course, that would be something we would need to look at very carefully in terms of our authority.

Ms. Hill was talking about requiring Placemate or requiring down payment assistance. Those were the types of things I was referring to as requirements for local governments.

Mr. Bass thought that when we created the bi-state compact to make Tahoe have its own development rights. I think that's part of why you're asking for a legal memo. It seems like that is part of the reason we have the TRPA Governing Board to make these types of decisions. I understand that California Regional Housing Needs Allocations (RHNA) and some of those things that don't apply to us because of the bi-state compact, but this has been an interesting discussion. I would also be very interested in reviewing the legal memo.

B. 2026 Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) Project Implementation Update

TRPA staff Ms. Friedman, Environmental Improvement Program Manager provided the presentation.

Today's presentation will be an update on Environmental Improvement Program projects that are currently being updated and implemented, as well as an update on projects that the Governing Board has approved over recent years. For newer members, a brief history of the Environmental Improvement Program will be provided. Lake Tahoe is known for its famed water clarity, at one point reaching depths of up to 100 feet. However, development and disturbance led to a decline in that clarity. As a result, the Environmental Improvement Program was developed in 1997. The goal of the Environmental Improvement Program was to restore Lake Tahoe's clarity while also improving forest health, watersheds, and habitat, as well as implementing TRPA environmental thresholds.

The Environmental Improvement Program is a partnership made up of more than 80 partners, including federal, state, and local agencies; nonprofit organizations; the private sector; and the Washoe Tribe of California and Nevada. Together, this partnership plans, advocates for, and implements Environmental Improvement Program projects.

Since its inception, the partnership has implemented more than 900 projects, with up to 100 projects being implemented each year. Together, these investments deliver measurable improvements for the environment.

Today, I'll highlight a selection of projects that will be implemented this year. I won't be able to touch on all of them, or even all the projects identified in the staff report, because there simply is not enough time. However, all the information can be found on the EIP Tracker.

Forest Health Projects:
Forest health projects restore our forests to protect them from catastrophic wildfire, improve habitat, and make forests and communities more resilient in the face of a changing climate.

Glenbrook Utility Underground Project:
The Glenbrook Homeowners Association is currently implementing the Glenbrook Utility Underground Project. Glenbrook is located in Douglas County on the east shore of Lake Tahoe, and

the project will underground five and a half miles of utilities. This year, they will underground the final mile, and the project will be complete.

The primary goal of this project is to reduce the threat of wildfire. However, undergrounding utilities also provides scenic improvements and increases the reliability of services.

Slide 4 shows the work taking place in Glenbrook. The picture on the left is the Glenbrook Cemetery, which is located within the community. It provides a good example of the conditions before the project, where above-ground utilities and overgrown vegetation were present. The after photo shows the utilities undergrounded and vegetation cleared to implement defensible space. This area is now less susceptible to wildfire and improves the scenic quality of the area. There is also an image of an overhead utility line in Glenbrook that is visible not only from the Glenbrook community but also from Lake Tahoe. Undergrounding that utility will improve fire safety and aesthetics from Glenbrook, as well as from the shores of Lake Tahoe, which improves the scenic threshold of Lake Tahoe.

Burton Forest Restoration Project:
California State Parks is implementing the Burton Forest Restoration Project at Burton Creek State Park. The park is located on the north shore of Lake Tahoe between Tahoe City and Lake Forest. This project will treat 132 acres within the state park, which is located in a very high fire hazard severity zone. It will build upon existing treatments by creating a contiguous area of reduced fuel loading and protecting at-risk communities. This year, they will burn 53 acres of piles within the state park.

Slide 5 shows a good example of before-and-after treatment. The image on the left is before treatment, the middle image shows the area during treatment as crews are preparing to burn the piles, and the image on the right shows the area after treatment.

Van Sickle Hazardous Fuels Reduction Project:
Nevada State Parks is currently implementing the Van Sickle Hazardous Fuels Reduction Project at Van Sickle Bi-State Park. This project is located in Stateline, Nevada, directly adjacent to the tourist casino core on the Nevada side of the park. This area is a very popular recreation park with many trails, and the State of Nevada also has other improvements planned, including a visitor center and employee housing.

The State of Nevada will treat 40 acres through hand thinning, chipping, and pile burning, focusing primarily on areas adjacent to recreation trails and planned improvements. Slide 6 shows treatment along a trail where crews focused on removing dead, diseased, and dying trees, making the trail safer for users.

South Shore Treatment Project:
The USDA Forest Service Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit is continuing to implement the South Shore Treatment Project. The areas shown in yellow on the map on Slide 7 represent locations where forest thinning treatments are occurring. Since the project started in 2022, they have treated more than 523 acres, and this year they plan to treat an additional 500 acres.

Watersheds and Water Quality Projects:
Watershed and water quality projects improve lake clarity while also improving habitat. They do this by treating stormwater runoff from urban development, restoring stream environment zones and floodplains, and protecting Lake Tahoe from the threat of aquatic invasive species.

Third Creek Fish Management Structure:
The Nevada Department of Wildlife is implementing the Third Creek Fish Management Structure in Third Creek in Incline Village, Nevada. This project is part of the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout feasibility study. The goal is to determine whether Lahontan Cutthroat Trout can thrive in Lake Tahoe and spawn in its tributaries. This is a priority because Lahontan Cutthroat Trout is the only native trout species in Lake Tahoe. It is also an important species for the Washoe Tribe of California and Nevada. The species' habitat has declined due to habitat disturbance, as well as competition from other species, such as rainbow trout. A temporary fish management structure was installed to capture fish and allow Lahontan Cutthroat Trout to be moved upstream in the watershed so they can continue to spawn. The temporary fish management structure has proven successful, so a permanent fish management structure is now being implemented on Third Creek.

Multi-Benefit Tahoe Valley Stormwater and Greenbelt Improvement Project:
The City of South Lake Tahoe is implementing the Multi-Benefit Tahoe Valley Stormwater and Greenbelt Improvement Project. This project is located at the Y in the City of South Lake Tahoe. The project treats stormwater runoff from roadways and development areas, improves the stream environment zone, and constructs new bike trails.

The project will treat 12.8 miles of roadway, restore 1.5 miles of stream environment zone, and construct 0.5 miles of new trail. The project will be complete this year. Slide 10 show examples of flooding and erosion of roadside shoulders that the project will address.

Third and Rosewood Creek Water Quality Improvement Project:
The Third and Rosewood Creek Water Quality Improvement Project is being implemented by Washoe County in the watershed area of Incline Village, Nevada. Third and Rosewood Creeks are priority watersheds due to high sediment loads. This project will treat stormwater runoff from roadways and upland development by stabilizing roadside shoulders, improving drainage facilities, and installing infiltration basins. This project began this year and will take multiple years to construct.

Aquatic Invasive Species Program:
The Aquatic Invasive Species Program protects Lake Tahoe from the threats of non-native species. The program includes both a prevention component, through our boat inspection programs and the Tahoe Keepers Program, as well as a control component, which focuses on eradicating and controlling populations of existing non-native species in Lake Tahoe.

Motorized boat inspection stations have proven to be very effective at stopping the introduction of new invasive species. However, there is growing concern about non-motorized watercraft spreading invasive species because these types of watercraft are much harder to regulate and can be launched from almost anywhere. As a result, there is a significant effort to educate the public and make it easier for people to clean, drain, and dry their watercraft to prevent the spread of invasive species.

TRPA has purchased three non-motorized aquatic invasive species cleaning stations, known as CD3 machines shown on Slide 13. These machines allow users to easily clean, drain, and dry their boats either before or after entering Lake Tahoe. TRPA owns three of these machines. One is permanently located at Meeks Bay in partnership with the Washoe Tribe. One is permanently located at Sand Harbor, and one rotates throughout the Basin and is currently located at Kiva Beach in South Lake Tahoe.

In June alone, there were 495 uses at Meeks Bay and 318 uses at Kiva Beach, for a total of 813 unique uses of the machines. This demonstrates that people are using these resources and that they are effective tools in preventing the spread of aquatic invasive species into Lake Tahoe. Control of existing invasive species populations is also a priority of the program. This is done through a variety of methods, including installing bottom barriers, hand pulling, and diver-assisted suction.

Some priority projects occurring this year include the Tahoe Keys Fragmentation Containment Project, hand pulling of aquatic invasive plants in Pope Marsh in South Lake Tahoe, and aquatic invasive species surveillance and plant removal in Emerald Bay.

Surveillance of Lake Tahoe's waters is also ongoing this year. This allows staff to identify any new invasive species populations and rapidly treat them, which helps keep populations under control and reduces the cost of future treatment efforts.

Sustainable Recreation Projects:
Sustainable recreation projects include new bike trails, maintenance of existing bike trails, improvements to trailheads, construction of new trailheads, and improvements to recreation sites. I'm not going to discuss transportation projects today because Mr. Haven provided a very thorough update on transportation projects at the May Governing Board meeting. Instead, we will focus on recreation projects.

Recreation projects help people enjoy all that Tahoe has to offer while protecting natural resources.

Spooner Mobility Hub and Watercraft Inspection Station:
The Nevada Department of Transportation and Tahoe Transportation District are currently implementing the Spooner Mobility Hub and Watercraft Inspection Station.

This multi-benefit project is located off State Route 28 in Douglas County, directly across from Spooner State Park. It is a key project identified in the State Route 28 Corridor Management Plan that will improve safety along the corridor, protect natural resources, and encourage alternative modes of transportation, including transit, biking, and walking.

The project will construct a 250-space parking lot to replace parking that currently occurs along the roadside shoulder. It will also include a transit stop and a permanent watercraft inspection station.

Dianne Feinstein West Shore Trail Rehabilitation Project:
The project implementer is the Tahoe City Public Utility District. This project will rehabilitate 13.1 miles of existing trail along the west shore of Lake Tahoe, from Tahoma north to Carnelian Bay. While it is important to invest in constructing new trails, it is equally important to maintain and improve the investments that have already been made by rehabilitating existing trails.

This segment will extend from Sunnyside to the Idlewild neighborhood on the west shore. Slide 17 show examples of existing trail conditions, including eroding edges and cracking caused by tree roots. The improved trail will include resurfacing, improved signage, and illuminated stop signs to enhance safety.

Tunnel Creek Alternative Trail:
The Nevada Division of State Parks is continuing to implement the Tunnel Creek Alternative Trail in Incline Village, Nevada. This 2.28-mile single-track trail will connect the East Shore Trail and the Incline Flume Trail. Currently, the only connection between these two trails is through Tunnel Creek

Road, which is a busy road that is steep, sandy, and highly erosive. This new single-track trail will provide a more sustainable alternative while reducing user conflicts.

Construction began in 2023, and the project will be completed this year. A ribbon-cutting ceremony is being scheduled later this year.

Environmental Improvement Program Accountability and Stewardship:
Investment in the Environmental Improvement Program is based on the most recent science. It also includes tracking and accountability measures to ensure transparency with the public, as well as a stewardship program that encourages visitors and residents to participate in restoring Lake Tahoe. We have found that visitors and residents truly want to be involved in restoring Lake Tahoe.

TRPA has ten environmental thresholds that were developed in the 1980s, and TRPA is currently in the process of updating those thresholds so that we are measuring what matters. This year, we will be updating the biodiversity and recreation thresholds. We are also improving water quality monitoring in Lake Tahoe.

The University of Nevada, Reno will increase monitoring of the lake's ecology, including greater analysis of particles suspended in the lake that contribute to reduced clarity. This is important because Lake Tahoe is a complex system, and the more we understand the causes of clarity decline, the better we can adapt management actions to directly address those issues.

Stewardship is also an important component of the Environmental Improvement Program. The League to Save Lake Tahoe, also known as Keep Tahoe Blue, has been an incredible partner in this area. They host volunteer events, including Tahoe Yellowcress volunteer planting days. Tahoe Yellowcress is an endemic species that only grows along the shores of Lake Tahoe, making its protection and restoration especially important. Another planting event is currently taking place at Baldwin and Kiva Beach in South Lake Tahoe.

Keep Tahoe Blue also facilitates Tahoe Blue Cruises, which allows groups and organizations to adopt a beach for cleanup efforts. These events not only remove litter but also categorize and weigh collected materials to better understand what types of trash are entering the environment. This information helps inform outreach and education efforts.

One of the most popular beach cleanup days occurs on July 5, following the Fourth of July holiday. In recent years, participation has been so high that there has sometimes not been enough trash for all of the volunteers to collect. It has become a hugely successful program.

Finally, we want to remain accountable and transparent to the public. This year, we launched new Lake Tahoe branding and a new Environmental Improvement Program website, RestoreTahoe.org This website links directly to the EIP Tracker and serves as a valuable resource for information on all Environmental Improvement Program projects. The website provides a clear and concise explanation of the Environmental Improvement Program.

Environmental Improvement Program Projects Approved by the Governing Board:
Slide 21 shows a list of Environmental Improvement Program projects that have been approved by this Board over the last several years. Most of these projects have either started construction or will begin construction this year or next year and will take multiple years to complete.

The one exception is the Kings Beach State Recreation Area Pier and Recreation Improvement Project. The Governing Board approved this project in January 2019, and construction has not yet started. The project has been delayed for several reasons, including funding challenges. The project

team is also continuing geotechnical investigations to ensure that the location of the new pier is the best possible location and will minimize environmental impacts. The permit approved by the Board has expired. When the project comes forward again, depending on the scope of the project, we can revise the permit and determine at that time whether the project needs to return to the Board for additional approval.

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Faustinos said as the chair of that committee, the work being done is truly phenomenal. It's a testament to the way this agency and its partnerships produce such outstanding coordination. Being from Los Angeles, I talk about TRPA and the EIP process wherever I go, including in many policy committee meetings, because it is such a shining example of what integrated partnership planning can accomplish. It demonstrates how effective it can be when partners regardless of their political orientation or other differences come together, agree on a common set of goals, develop projects to implement those goals, and prioritize them for funding each year. That kind of collaboration is remarkable. At the same time, we have failed to develop the kinds of partnerships and relationships that generate good integrated projects. Kudos to all of the staff.

Mr. Bass said I am also very impressed with the work that's happening, and I think it's a testament to the good work being done here. One of the things that comes to mind is our discussions about synthetic herbicides. When we think about the Lahontan cutthroat trout and some of the restoration efforts we are trying to advance, it raises the question: if synthetic herbicides were applied in those areas, what would the potential impacts be?

I understand that this may not necessarily be within our wheelhouse, but we are looking at policies from the U.S. Forest Service that could potentially be applied here within the Basin. What would the implications of those policies be? As we consider restoration and improvement efforts, we also need to take into account whether those practices align with and support our overall environmental goals.

Again, I'm not suggesting that we need to get into the business of determining the specifics of that issue, but I do think it is something we should consider. When we are talking about restoring Lahontan cutthroat trout and similar efforts, we should ask what the use of synthetic herbicides in these areas could mean for our broader goals and objectives. It's something worth thinking about. But again, I am very proud of the work being done, and I appreciate the efforts everyone has put into this.

Mr. Nielsen said for those who have been traveling on Pioneer Trail recently, the work you are seeing out there by the Forest Service represents a significant amount of effort. It is transforming not only the appearance of the forest but also its resiliency to wildfire. It demonstrates how overstocked many of our forests are. When you look at the sections of Pioneer Trail that have already been treated and compare them with the areas that are still scheduled for treatment you can clearly see the difference. It provides a great opportunity to compare where we are today with the desired future conditions we are working toward for our forests.

Ms. Regan pointed out that example because it demonstrates prescribed burning within an evacuation corridor. It's important to recognize the multiple benefits of these projects. Shannon did a great job on the presentation.

As indicated in the presentation, we have ten threshold categories, and these forest health projects provide benefits across many of them. We're also gaining important benefits for public health and safety. You can see the broadcast burn occurring right up to the roadway, along with the thinning treatments taking place. These projects provide wildlife and habitat benefits, as well as watershed benefits.

I just wanted to address the comment by Mayor Bass. Our EIP Committee Chair, Member Faustinos, has kindly agreed to have the EIP Committee take up the issue of herbicides and glyphosate within the scope of that committee's work. Since the question arose from a forest health EIP project, the Caldor Restoration Project we will agendize a discussion for the EIP Committee meeting in August. We've been coordinating with the Forest Service on that discussion and will bring forward an agenda item. For those members who do not serve on that committee, you are welcome to participate and join the discussion. We will also make sure the public is aware of the opportunity to engage.

C. Update on 30th Annual Lake Tahoe Summit

TRPA staff, Mr. Middlebrook Government Affairs Manager provided the presentation.

The 30th Annual Lake Tahoe Summit will be celebrated on the shores of Lake Tahoe at Sand Harbor State Park in Nevada on Wednesday, August 19th. The main program will take place from 10:00 a.m. to noon, and our esteemed host this year is U.S. Senator Jacky Rosen of Nevada. All summit information, including the program and event details, will be posted at TahoeSummit.org.

Back in the 1990s, Tahoe's waters were losing their famed clarity at an average rate of nearly a foot per year. In addition, urban centers were deteriorating, and overstocked forests posed a profound wildfire threat. Many worried that the landmark national treasure of Lake Tahoe was approaching a critical tipping point.

In 1997, U.S. Senators Harry Reid of Nevada and Dianne Feinstein of California brought President Bill Clinton, Vice President Al Gore, and top Cabinet officials to Tahoe for the inaugural Lake Tahoe Summit, then known as the 1997 Presidential Forum. At that summit, federal, state, and local leaders unveiled a multi-jurisdictional, collaborative plan to save Lake Tahoe: the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP). As you just heard in the previous presentation, we are seeing tremendous success through that program.

Nearly 30 years later, the EIP remains one of the greatest landscape conservation partnerships in the nation, with more than 80 partners representing all levels of government, jurisdictions, the private sector, the scientific community, and the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California. Today, the Tahoe Summit continues to play a critical role in fostering bipartisan collaboration around the current priorities of the EIP and securing funding for projects that protect the lake's ecosystem and ensure the region's long-term sustainability.

We have been doing a lot of history and research, and I want to recognize the distinguished list of guests who joined us at that first summit. We had Washoe Tribe Chairman Brian Wallace; President Clinton; Vice President Al Gore; U.S. Secretary of Transportation Rodney Slater and Deputy Secretary Mort Downey; U.S. EPA Administrator Carol Browner; U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Dan Glickman and Deputy Secretary Rich Rominger; U.S. Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt and Deputy Secretary John Garamendi; Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works John Zirschky; Chair of the Council on Environmental Quality Katie McGinty; U.S. Senators Harry Reid and Richard

Bryan from Nevada; California Senators Dianne Feinstein and Barbara Boxer; Nevada Congressmen Jim Gibbons and John Ensign; U.S. Representative John Doolittle; Representatives Dick Fazio and George Miller; Nevada Governor Bob Miller; California Governor Pete Wilson; California Lieutenant Governor Gray Davis; and Nevada Attorney General Frankie Sue Del Papa.

This was not just an event or a photo opportunity where we said, "Great job, we brought the President here, and now we move on." The key outcome of that first summit in 1997 was the signing of multiple implementation agreements and memorandums of understanding among federal agencies, state agencies, TRPA, the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California, and local governments. Those implementation agreements created the framework and foundation for the Lake Tahoe Environmental Improvement Program. The EIP was born out of that 1997 summit.

In 2000, the first Lake Tahoe Restoration Act was passed, authorizing $300 million in federal investment in Lake Tahoe. That federal investment in the EIP and protecting Tahoe's clarity has been matched many times over by state, local, private, and nonprofit funding. Most importantly, it led to the creation of Team Tahoe, and you heard about all the great work Team Tahoe is doing on the ground in the previous presentation.

Slide 5 is the partnership of Team Tahoe. The full spectrum of federal, state, local, regional, Washoe Tribe, and private entities is represented because everyone plays a role in protecting Tahoe. As Governing Board members and members of the community who care about Tahoe, you are all members of Team Tahoe.

We have had tremendous demand for the event. Public tickets are already sold out. Each of you Board members have been registered for the event.

Our keynote speaker is still to be announced. Thea Schwartz from our TRPA team is organizing the Environmental Booth Fair, which will feature more than 50 Team Tahoe members, organizations, and nonprofits sharing the great work they do year-round throughout the Tahoe Basin. The booth fair will take place before the main program and continue until 2:00 p.m., allowing attendees to stay, enjoy the beautiful weather at Tahoe, and continue the post-summit conversations.

As part of the 30th Anniversary Campaign, we are doing a lot of exciting work to promote the event. Yesterday, we launched the "30 Years of the Tahoe Summit" social media campaign. Follow along on your favorite social media platform using the hashtag #30YearsoftheTahoeSummit or through the TRPA accounts. Each day, we will highlight a different year in our 30-year history and showcase an EIP project, program, or major accomplishment that helped shape the Tahoe Summit and our partnership today. A special edition of Tahoe In Depth will be released before the summit that will take a deeper look at the history of the partnership, the event, and what it has accomplished over the years.

Ahead of the summit each year, we host a virtual briefing for our delegation staff and partners at the federal and state levels so they are informed about what is happening in Tahoe and can prepare for the event. This year's briefing was titled "Top Five in Tahoe for 2026," and we had 63 participants join the webinar. The briefing was moderated by Kim Carringer and the recording is available online.

As we reviewed the archives related to the Tahoe Summit and looked through the materials from 1997, we found this historic proclamation from the City of South Lake Tahoe welcoming President Clinton and Vice President Al Gore to Tahoe for the first event and committing the City to being part of the partnership that became the EIP. That inspired us to request 30th Anniversary

resolutions from our various partners as another way to celebrate this milestone. In addition to the resolution being considered by this Board today, we have requested and anticipate receiving resolutions from both states, the governors, the federal congressional record, and our local jurisdiction partners. Representatives on this Board will also be adopting resolutions, along with the Nevada and California governors and both state legislatures.

Ms. Regan said the summit has evolved over 30 years into a one-day event. We have tours and educational tours that lead up to the summit, as well as other events that coincide with the summit. The very first summit, however, was a series of meetings. It was maybe three or four days of working meetings and roundtable discussions that led to those policy outcomes, which was tremendous. The Incline Hyatt, there was a line and you could meet the president and the vice president, was very hard to get into. Being creative at the time, I worked at the South Tahoe Public Utility District, and I went to my media friends with the Tahoe Mountain News and said, "If I cover this as a member of the media, can I get in?" So I got to write a column, and I got to go and experience what has shaped my tenure in the Basin and my commitment to collaboration and leadership with this incredible partnership.

But the challenges are so great. I think what we hope at this summit is to celebrate those 30 years of summits, which in and of itself to maintain that over 30 years is an enormous accomplishment, and to celebrate the outcomes that we're driving from that. But also, we want to recognize the great challenges that we have and that the work is not done, and that we have to re-commit and reinvest.

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Gustafson said I was on the transportation panel the day before, and my fondest memory is getting Al Gore to laugh when I said we all needed to come in by helicopter and avoid our automobiles, but we didn't have the same opportunity that he had.

Motion:

Ms. Gustafson made a motion to adopt the Tahoe Summit 30th Anniversary Resolution as shown in Attachment A.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Rodriquez (for Mr. Aguilar), Mr. Bass, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Guthreau, Ms. Hill, Mr. Hoenigman, Mr. Kieckhefer, Ms. Laine, Ms. Leumer, Ms. Williamson

Absent: Mr. Tolbert (for Mr. Rice)
Motion carried.

D. 2026 Transportation and Sustainable Communities Performance and Recommendations Report

TRPA staff Mr. Segan provided the presentation.

Many refer to this as the VMT item. That is because the item itself, and the report, are rooted in our Regional Plan and in changes to one of our threshold standards related to Vehicles Miles Traveled (VMT). The agency has a long history of trying to reduce vehicle miles traveled. In 2021, we updated that standard to modernize it and make it a standard focused on reducing the amount

that all of us in our daily lives in Tahoe whether we are visitors, workers, or residents drive each day. We established a new, ambitious goal for ourselves to achieve by 2045.

As part of that, we did not just want to set it and forget it. The Board adopted an adaptive management framework that can be found in DP-5 of our Regional Plan. There are three core parts of that adaptive management framework. The Board wanted independent guidance as we made these decisions. They wanted to establish milestones along the way so that we were not just waking up in 2044 and wondering how we were doing on our progress toward a 2045 goal. And we wanted triggered responses, or things that would go into place, if we started to fall behind on what we were trying to achieve.

The first part of that independent guidance: the Board formed a 15-member committee named the Transportation Performance Technical Advisory Committee, (TPTAC). The Board approved that membership in March 2022, and it approved the committee's charter in September of 2022.

That committee's core responsibility is providing biannual reports. Every two years, it provides this Board with a performance and recommendations report. The key part of that report is to evaluate how we are doing on a series of metrics and asks: Are we doing well, or are we not doing well? If we are not doing well on those metrics, it provides recommendations on how to improve our performance. And if we are doing well, it says, "Hey, we're doing well here."

The 2026 reporting cycle is our second edition here. There are three purposes of this report. We evaluate the status of our metrics, we evaluate progress toward our milestones, and then the group provides recommendations on both. In this reporting cycle, the Technical Advisory Committee held two publicly noticed meetings in April and May of 2026.

The metrics framework that the advisory committee produced and then brought to the Transportation Committee in April 2023 includes three core areas, with metrics within each of those. The committee evaluates the performance of our transit system, our active transportation network, that is biking and walking and our automobile system.

The full report will not be presented on today but is available in the packet and has been transmitted to you separately. Today's presentation will provide a high-level overview of what we are seeing in each of those categories. The first is total ridership within our transit program. This is transit all around our region. What is most notable here is that there was a big dip associated with COVID, followed by the post-COVID recovery and this improved trajectory. What we are seeing is very encouraging. From those COVID lows, we have returned to pre-COVID ridership levels and are now exceeding those.

Bike and pedestrian facilities. There are two parts to Slide 8. On the left-hand side of your screen are the miles of bike path that we have constructed in any given year, and we are making steady progress as we expand the bike and pedestrian pathways of the region. The graph on the right-hand side of the slide is from our count stations along those bike paths. Here, you will see the opposite of transit ridership. The 2020 spike, with extremely high levels of bike and pedestrian activity during that COVID period, has gone down slightly since but have overall remained relatively constant. We continue to see high levels of activity on those facilities.

The third and final metric is traveling times. We currently measure congestion, or travel times, on 12 segments within our region. We measure both the average travel time within each of those segments, as well as the slowest period of travel. the five percent slowest trips. The key to this slide is that green is good. That means you are flying through that little piece of the corridor. Red is bad, and darker red is even worse. What is noticeable on Slide 9 is that 2023 stands out as having just about the worst travel times in our region during the recorded period. In 2023, was the big winter of 2023 and all of the slow travel times are associated with storm slowdowns. Every other red period, on any of the segments, is associated with construction. And 2023 is the one constant. And after the big winter, we generally return to more normal travel times and flow within each of those corridors.

The second part of this report is the assessment of milestones, the progress mileposts that we established for ourselves in 2021. There were three milestones to be assessed by the Technical Advisory Committee within this report. The first two related to regional revenue as part of DP-5.4, and the third related to VMT per capita. The structure of these milestones follows a framework that reflects our concerns when we established this new goal. We were worried about funding it, so we established funding goals. But ultimately, what we care about is reducing VMT per capita. So, there are milestones for the actual reduction of VMT per capita which is what we care about most at the end of the day.

The first assessment was DP-5.4.A, and the text states that by the end of 2021, we will have a proposal for dedicated sources of transportation funding endorsed and supported by the Bi-State Transportation Consultation and then submitted to the legislatures of the two states, Nevada and California. Back in early 2021 or 2020, when we were writing this policy, there was a $20 million annual gap in our Regional Transportation Plan. The two states, California Natural Resources Agency and the Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, stepped up to lead this bi-state consultation to find collaborative solutions and develop a proposal to fill that gap and fully fund the Regional Transportation Plan.

The first milestone here was did they establish that plan? They did establish that plan in 2022. It was signed from the director and the secretary and presented at the Summit in 2022 and subsequently transmitted to the two legislatures. The committee found that the milestone had been achieved, but after the deadline that was established within the Regional Plan policy.

The first part of the revenue milestone was that we needed to develop this proposal or plan. The second part is that we needed to implement that plan and start collecting additional revenue. The 7-7-7 funding framework required that each of the different entities; federal, state, local, and private-sector partners need to contribute an additional $7 million. It fundamentally divided up the responsibility for filling this funding gap and asked each of the partners to bring a little bit more to the table. We have completed three years of implementation of 7-7-7 and have exceeded the revenue target in each of those three years. The total goal for the three years would be $63 million in revenue. To date, we have collected $82 million in revenue above and beyond the forecasts of the Regional Transportation Plan. The Technical Advisory Committee suggested that the revenue commencement part of this milestone had also been achieved.

The third and final milestones were the first of our VMT per capita reduction milestones. It is referred to as the 2024 milestone, although it captures VMT between 2020 and 2022. That is because of a reporting lag from the state agencies that provide us the VMT data. We specifically

established these milestones so that they align with when VMT numbers from the two states are released. VMT per capita within that period was 10.95, relative to our target for that period. That means every person within our region produces about 11 miles of VMT a day. Our target was that they would produce 12.38. We are well ahead of that target. Although, in committee discussion, we have talked about the fact that that period still includes the COVID impact and reduced vehicle volumes during COVID. It's with cautious optimism that we should be looking at that. But the committee did assess that we had achieved the milestone.

The third and final part of the report is providing recommendations to this body and to the Tahoe Transportation District. The recommendations in the report are divided into four different sections, one for each mode of transportation. A mode is walking, using transit, and biking. Some of the recommendations are related to multimodal transportation, meaning they apply to all of our modes or would help us improve all modes. One of the recommendations was to evaluate propensity which is the likelihood to use transit or bike and pedestrian facilities. We should do a better job of figuring out who the people are that are most likely to use these services and what types of services would best encourage people to use the services that we are offering. In transit, there continues to be a focus on securing flexible operating dollars for operators and on better integration between our fixed routes and our microtransit routes so that the two support each other rather than compete with each other.

In the active transportation space and the auto space, the recommendations largely follow the recommendations from the prior year report. We should continue to perform maintenance on our bike paths and make sure that our bike paths are cleared in the winter so that people who rely on them to get to work and carry out their activities can get where they need to go. We should improve wayfinding so that it is easier to navigate and understand how to move between modes.

For the auto mode, there is a continued focus on providing travelers with information so that they can make better decisions. When parking lots are full, we want them to know in advance so that they are not making trips that frustrate them and cause congestion on our roadways.

Slide 16: If you are all familiar with elephant culture, you know that elephants are incredible in the way they communicate with each other and pass down knowledge from generation to generation. They have complex rituals through which they mourn their dead. They can find food and water during times of drought, even though they have never visited those areas, because that knowledge has been passed down from generation to generation. I am not an elephant, and I do not remember all of the discussions we had in 2020 and 2021 when we developed this. But I do know that we documented all of that, and a prior Board documented all of that and provided the specific way in which we are supposed to handle many of the challenging questions that you are being asked to wrestle with today, and that were brought up by our partners in their letters and comments. Included in today's presentation is about the process by which we have brought this forward and how that aligns with the words in our Regional Plan that guides us how we approach these types of issues.

DP-5.2 specifically says that the advisory body will provide an assessment of status relative to these milestones in 5.4 and 5.5. The Board did not abdicate the responsibility to make that decision, but it asked an advisory body to provide independent guidance while reserving the ability to make a different decision if it chooses. DP-5.2 goes on to say that the Board will review the report within 90 days of issuance. That is part of the reason why we are here today. The report was issued and

transmitted to you at the last meeting. Members expressed interest in discussing it in greater detail, and so we are having that discussion here today. It goes on to say that if, after discussion, the Board disagrees with the findings of the report, it can provide a written justification for why it is doing something else or why it disagrees. We have this formal process that we are following today, which is given to us within the Regional Plan.

Finally, we have been asked about the structure and why no motion is required if there is no disagreement with the findings of the report. That relates to DP-5.6. Slide 18- supplemental compliance measures is a Regional Plan term of art for basically changes in policy that would be implemented if we were not on track. DP-5.6 lists those supplemental compliance measures changes in how our land use policy works and says they shall automatically go into effect if it is found that the milestones in 5.6 and 5.4 have not been attained. There is not a requirement for an affirmative vote that they have been attained. Rather, the Regional Plan suggests that if the Board believes the milestones have not been attained, we need a vote that they have not been attained, and then the supplemental compliance measures automatically go into effect. There is no additional action required by this Board to make those supplemental compliance measures go into effect. They simply go into effect if and when the Board finds that the milestones established here have not been attained.

The first is a no-action option, which is consistent with staff recommendations and the recommendation of the Independent Advisory Council. No action is required if the Board agrees with the findings and recommendations of the report.

The second option is that, if the Board does not agree and wants to pursue an alternative policy relative to any of the recommendations or findings in the report, the Board has the opportunity to direct staff to prepare a written justification for why it does not agree with the findings of the report.

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean said there seems to be a disagreement about the meaning of the word “ongoing.” It can be interpreted to mean “per year”, as the years progress, we meet the funding obligation of the 7-7-7 Regional Funding Framework. Or it can be interpreted to mean that “ongoing” implies the funding will be indefinite, in perpetuity. Which in our current fiscal climate would be, in my estimation, an unreasonable interpretation of that word. I haven't gone back and read the minutes or reviewed all of the conversations that preceded the adoption of this. What is staff's interpretation of the term “ongoing” as it applies to the funding plan?

Mr. Segan started at a higher level to give more context. The policies within this were the subject of robust negotiation with valued partners, specifically the California Attorney General's Office and the League to Save Lake Tahoe, both of which provided invaluable input into this policy and improved it immensely. The fundamental difference right now can be traced back to a severability between the two parts of the funding policy. It became clear to me where we weren't seeing eye to eye when I was reading through past letters from the Attorney General's Office.

In one particular letter from November 18, 2025, they wrote about “the success of a separate and distinct funding effort, referred to as the 7-7-7 initiative.” We as staff were not aware of two funding efforts. We're only aware of a single funding effort being led by the bi-state consultation,

and that's the effort laid out in DP-5.4-A. That was what led to the 7-7-7 initiative and what was subsequently implemented.

You could say maybe the words were not codified well enough, and we've added additional language afterwards, or different expectations afterwards but fundamentally, there were expectations by partners that were not codified within the language of the Regional Plan that continue to persist today and maybe reflect many of our wider hopes and dreams for transportation funding. They're not unrealistic expectations. They're consistent with many of the conversations at the time, but they were not codified within our Regional Plan because we did not have an agreed upon proposal by the two states. Putting yourself back in that time frame there were a lot of individuals who aspired and hoped that we might have a Basin entry fee that would be a silver bullet and solve many of our funding problems. The way I think about that and probably my own aspiration in 2021 is that I wished my last presentation to you on VMT or transportation funding had been in 2021, and we had solved the problem, money was flowing in the door, and everything was working well.

Instead, I think we have a commitment and dedication from a number of partners to continue working to fill that gap. They have been successful thus far, and they continue to work at it. That's work every day, and many of you continue to be involved in that work. I'm sure all of you wish that we had already solved the problem and didn't need to continue working at it.

Ms. Aldean asked staff to recap what the supplemental compliance measures are that would be implemented if it's found that we did not meet our funding requirements.

Mr. Segan said the supplemental compliance measures are listed in DP-5.6, and they would increase the standard of significance for residential and tourist projects to no net VMT for projects that are above the screening level. We have a two-tiered evaluation system for transportation projects that basically allows most smaller projects to proceed forward by paying a simple fee, while establishing a different, higher bar greater requirements for larger projects to ensure that they are consistent with our long-term goals of reducing VMT per capita.

Ms. Aldean asked if there was also an exemption for public service projects.

Mr. Segan said there's not an exemption for public service. There is an exemption for affordable housing.

Ms. Aldean said then it's not for projects that address public safety issues.

Mr. Segan said no.

Ms. Gustafson said you did a very diplomatic recap of a lot of energy. I was fortunate to serve on that bi-state consultation group. I've been a longtime supporter of getting to a Basin entry fee. When the governors of both states tell you to convene a group and try to solve the problem in another way, that's what we did. On behalf of myself, that I continue to advocate in California with our elected officials because I think, ultimately, we can't deal with the number of people coming to our area. So much of our transportation funding is per capita or based on local revenues. We've gone above and beyond that at the local level.

I am very committed, and I hope that the parties that write comment letters are also doing that advocating to solve the larger problem because we need to. As California and Nevada are looking at how they implement road user fees to replace gas tax revenues, I think we have opportunities but we have to stay engaged as a partnership to do that. And we can remain committed as a Governing Board and as individual members, but we need our partners outside to stay with us in this and not ignore it.

For Placer County, we eliminated the sunset on our transient occupancy tax with the agreement that the funds would go to transportation and housing only. That was a huge commitment from our business community, which had previously had a routine sunset on that tax that had to come up for renewal so that those paying it felt they had some accountability from government.

I strongly support the hard work that we did in that committee to get to the 7-7-7 plan. The biggest challenge I see is that, with all of our employees leaving and entering the Basin every day, we have got to find ways to transport those employees. We've made great strides in that as well, with the business community going above and beyond, including running van shuttles down to Reno to bring people up to the Lake to work. I don't even think we're capturing all the efforts going on in the private sector to try to solve these issues as well.

I'm thankful for the hard work it took, Dan, and for how you articulated this, because it's much better. This is the most critical issue that I see us facing from the communities and from my constituents, who just really don't want anyone else here and don't want any more traffic because traffic represents visitors, and they just want the Basin to themselves. We don't own Lake Tahoe, we just own our property, and please work with us to solve those issues. I don't think everyone recognizes how hard we do work to try to get to a larger funding stream at the state and federal levels. It's imperative that we do that because we're not going to solve this issue otherwise. As I watch Northern Nevada and Northern California grow, and as climate change continues, people are coming to the Basin. We see the numbers when it is extremely hot and dry. They're coming here for recreation and to escape from those temperatures. We need to be able to capture some revenue from those day-use visitors as well.

Ms. Faustinos agreed with Ms. Gustafson's comments. I was also involved in a lot of those discussions and remember the conversations about how we could have a Basin fee and the difficulties involved in doing that. I just want to say that even when you do it, as we did in Los Angeles County, you're not going to get everything you need. The financial need is so extraordinary that even with a fairly large tax, we're facing challenges. You know, it's, "Hey, get ready for the Olympics, get ready for the World Cup," and it's been a struggle. So, a fee or some kind of tax is not going to be, frankly, the answer. It would obviously help, but it's not going to be able to address everything. I applaud our local governments for all that they're doing such as the Emerald Bay Shuttle. Everybody is pitching in to try to get this done, and it's just a difficult task.

I had the fortune of being here yesterday afternoon and getting rerouted by Google Maps around the traffic, you really feel for the local residents who are being impacted by people coming down residential streets. So, again, this is a difficult but I have to give a big shout-out to everyone who works every day on getting these things done.

Mr. Kieckhefer said I thought I heard a comment or suggestion that there had been a shift from calculating VMT on a total basis to a per capita basis. Is that accurate and what's the history on that?

Mr. Segan said that's 100 percent accurate. We calculate both now. We had a 1981 threshold for VMT that measured just the absolute amount of VMT. When we were going through the threshold update process, we reviewed the scientific basis for that standard. It was based on nitrogen loading to the Lake. At the time that the standard was adopted, cars produced roughly 97–98 percent more nitrogen than they do today. The thought was that one of the major sources of nitrogen was nitrogen enrichment through atmospheric deposition to our Lake. Clearly, that fundamentally changes when cars are no longer producing or releasing as much nitrogen. We had a number of conversations at the time about whether we still care about VMT and, if so, why. As part of those conversations, we started looking back at the old VMT standard. One of the things that became apparent was that when times were booming, we were above the standard, and when the economy went down, we went back into compliance with the standard. You had this sort of seesaw that reflected economic conditions rather than the impact of our transportation system.

Part of the discussion we had at the time was: How do you better align the measure VMT, or here, VMT per capita with the things that you're trying to achieve in your transportation system? If our goal is to not have people like Belinda being rerouted and driving a million miles trying to get somewhere, but rather to provide her with alternatives to walk, bike, or take the bus somewhere, how do you better reflect that? There was a growing number of jurisdictions around the country, really around the world, that were looking to VMT per capita as a way to measure the efficiency of getting people out of their cars, which is also a compact mandate.

Mr. Kieckhefer said so originally VMT was more of a lake clarity threshold, and it became a transportation threshold. And we just decided to change it.

Mr. Segan said that's correct.

Mr. Rodriguez thanked Mr. Segan for making himself available to answer my questions. Thank you for the staff for always being available with information. I want to applaud the efforts that everybody's making in terms of shuttles as Ms. Laine has been leading the charge as well. And being able to see all the resources and everybody coming together as a community. I know how difficult it is for local communities to deal with the influx of people as being someone from Vegas when it is 110 degrees. From the Secretary of State's Office, happy to help in any way we can.

Mr. Hoenigman said I feel that we need to go with the staff recommendation today and move beyond this. We've done a lot of great work, but I don't think any of us think that we're done with this. We need to come up with a good, long-term strategy for consistent funding for transportation, especially operating costs, which are much harder to fund. The staff has been good at turning over those rocks and finding all the little pots of money. I think we just have to make sure to keep the pressure on so that we do this over time because, as Gavin noted, we'll be off to other things soon. We're going to be working on housing, Golden Mussels, etc. But we have to keep the pressure on this.

Mr. Bass thanked Mr. Segan for the very in-depth report. I think that we have done a lot since my almost eight years of public service. Where we've come from then to now with transit on the South

Shore is phenomenal. Tomorrow, we cut the ribbon for Lake Link's full expansion throughout the whole city. It's really been a transformation, and it's a testament to so much partnership and a lot of energy from all of us. But I think there is some merit in the fact that we do still need to have sustainable funding. To me, it's always transit operations. We're always kind of piecemealing how we're going to keep getting it done, and I know the North Shore struggles at the same level. I don't want to invalidate the work we're doing or trigger these things, but I just don't understand why the report can't outline that we do need sustainable funding. We're really in a place where the states need to recognize that it doesn't exist. In California, we have Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds coming out of our gas tax, and that's pretty sustainable. We know that's going to continue. We've seen Senate Bill 125 funds come out of California, which have been very supportive of these efforts, but those are limited funds.

I know there's been a real effort for Nevada to try to find that type of sustainable funding that can go to transit operations year to year, but it does not exist. When we started 7-7-7, I was a big part of that process on the Tahoe Transportation District Board. We talked about the 7 percent for locals, trying to create the Basin entry fee. Let's even talk about using TOT from locals. And we really couldn't get there. What we did was use our existing transit capital or transportation capital projects to fulfill our 7 percent part of the local 7 percent match. Ind so I don't think we should forget that. I think it should be in the report that we do need to find sustainable funding.

In my mind, it's transit operations that we continue to have to piece together. But hats off to all of you for doing it, because we are still making it happen. It has been a great change here in the Basin and on the South Shore. But we still have a way to go, and that's going to be a forever thing.

Mr. Segan referred to page 43 of the report, it echoes exactly the sentiment that you just expressed. I want to disentangle two different things that the report does. One is the assessment of the milestones established in the Regional Plan, and the second is the other recommendations.

One of the report's resounding recommendations in the transit space was that we continue to explore strategies to augment transit operating dollars, in particular, because I think a number of people within that Technical Advisory Group had the same sentiment that you have: We're doing really well on capital projects, and it is those operating and maintenance dollars that we should really be focusing our efforts on as we go forward. So that is included in the report's recommendations.

Mr. Bass said it would be great for us to also be putting future items in the report. I always bring up the gondola, but it's those type of things that are going to transform us and make it sustainable as a system that we can look forward to in a long-term plan and a 25-year vision. But anyways, a great report.

Ms. Hill said I appreciate the report today. Mr. Hoenigman said it beautifully about how the staff has done a great job. We need to move forward with their recommendation and keep the pressure on. The Washoe County Commissioners are committed to finding sustainable transportation funding for Tahoe. There are three different bills being run potentially that could help with this. This is something that's a big priority for my county and wanted to put that commitment on the record and we'll see what happens during the session.

Ms. Leumer said it was mentioned in the report that we were changing some of the data that the baselines are based on. How is that going to affect our ability to measure progress if, part of the way through, we're changing the data.

Mr. Segan said here are two parts to this recommendation within the report. The report also recommended that we do this in the 2024 report, and admittedly, we have not done it yet. So when you see the evaluation of progress from the last one, it says "incomplete."

The question relates to VMT per capita. The "per capita" within Tahoe includes all travelers within our region. While most jurisdictions just use their local population, we wanted ours to include everyone who is within the region during that day. It's complex to estimate how many people are in the region on any individual day, and we've experimented with big data to do so. We worked with the Tahoe Science Advisory Council to develop the input that's used now, which is called the Tahoe Effective Population Model.

The report's recommendation is to change from using StreetLight Data to count traffic volumes within our region. StreetLight Data is a big-data platform that uses your cell phone, connected autos, and other data to estimate traffic volumes. The recommendation is to change from using volumes estimated by this big-data source to actual Department of Transportation (DOT) volumes. The recommendation was rooted in the fact that StreetLight Data changed its algorithms for estimating volume, such that the 2018 volume estimates from the platform are no longer comparable to the 2025 or 2024 volumes. Our ability to track progress is therefore rooted in making this change to DOT volumes. It will be a slower reporting cycle because the DOT volumes are released at a slower pace. With StreetLight Data, we were getting volumes a month or two after the period for which they were estimating. It will slightly slow down the process, but the benefit of that slower process is better consistency in our tracking. That way, the actual progress we're reporting to you is real rather than being an artifact of a change in the data source.

Ms. Leumer said hearing from other Board members, Board Member Aldean opened it up well by saying that there seems to be confusion as to whether or not we've met the ongoing funding requirement. And hearing the other Board members speak to the efforts that are underway and the aspirations that we have, whether or not we've met it or not seems to be an open discussion. I feel that's something that the Board should be making a finding on. I know there's an appendix in the Advisory Committee report that states that we have met it. I think it's within the Board's purview to be making that decision, and we should be making that clear.

We have letters from both the League to Save Lake Tahoe and the Attorney General's Office asking us to do this. They are partners that we were negotiating in good faith with for years, and I think we owe them that accountability by the Board. If the decision is, "Hey, we've done it. Check the box. Ongoing funding has been completed," I think that's up to the Board. But I do think that is something that we should be taking action on. This is something that the Transportation Committee is well-suited to review and report back to the Board. There's more work that needs to be done here before we just move forward and say that, by taking no action, we're simply agreeing with what's in the appendix.

Mr. Segan said the last report the Board took no action on, and I think the suggestion has two parts. The action currently established within the Regional Plan is that the Board will make a finding if the requirement is not attained. The recommendation, both in the comment letters and in the

suggestion being made, is that we should modify the Regional Plan to require affirmative Board action, rather than requiring Board action only if the requirement is not attained. The suggestion is for a Regional Plan modification, not to change the process right now.

Ms. Leumer feels that the Board should be making a decision on that.

Mr. Segan said it's a Regional Plan amendment prior to that.

Ms. Leumer asked what the amendment would be.

Mr. Segan said DP-5.6, current policy construction is, "If it is found that the milestones have not been attained," then the Board would vote that it has not been attained, rather than having an affirmative requirement that they have been attained. The responsibility is the decision of the Board either way. We're following the process as it was laid out when we adopted it. At the time, the Board said, prior to making this decision about whether these milestones had been achieved or not, we'd like to hear from other people. We'd like to get the guidance of the Independent Advisory Council. That doesn't delegate the decision-making authority to that group. It provides additional input for you as you consider your decision. Then, the process would be, if you reject that, there's this whole process that is initiated in DP-5.2 and 5.6 that says you would do two things. One, you would initiate a vote that says, "I don't believe the milestones have been attained." And two, we'd provide a written explanation. In this instance, the topic that we're discussing is the funding milestones. So we would provide a written explanation. We would suggest both to the Technical Advisory Committee, as well as to the Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR) and the California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA) and the bi-state consultation that developed that plan.

Because ultimately, saying that the milestone has not been achieved reflects on the plan that the agencies developed and provided to the legislatures. It's important to provide specific guidance to them on how to rectify that.

Ms. Leumer said going back to the staff proposal today, the inaction by the Board would accept the finding that the ongoing funding requirement has been met.

Mr. Segan said correct. You would not be making the finding that it has not been met, consistent with DP-5.6.

Ms. Leumer said that's what I'm having an issue with. I think we need to have a longer discussion on that.

Mr. Segan said as we were rereading the policy, preparing for this, and struggling with how to bring this forward, we were wrestling with this same issue with the current construction. The Regional Plan are the rules that bind this discussion and dictate how we bring this forward. The supplemental compliance measures automatically go into effect if the Board makes a finding that they have not been met. There's no affirmative finding that they have been met. It would be Board action saying they have not been met, based on the current construction.

Ms. Leumer said I'd like the Board to have the opportunity to make that distinction, either vote that it has or has not, rather than just an inaction.

Mr. St. Michel said what I'm hearing Ms. Leumer's proposal to be is to make a motion that the milestone has not been met. That would be the proper way. That's why this item today is agendized for possible action to leave the Board an opportunity to make a motion. But again, to be faithful to the Regional Plan as it's written, that is the proper wording, because that's what it is. The supplemental compliance measures go into effect if it is found that the milestones have not been attained.

If I can editorialize, the Board can make any kind of motion that it wants. You can make a motion to find that the waters of Lake Tahoe are clear. But when any public body or agency takes action, that puts us in a different posture. Hypothetically, the action that you take is subject to judicial review. The record here is exceedingly strong that, if you were to make a motion that the milestones have been achieved, that would be very defensible on this record. But again, it puts us in a different posture, and that is not faithful to the way that the Regional Plan is written. No action is required if you choose to accept the report. These reports will continue every two years. Part of the way that we do this now does set precedent a bit for the future. And that's why we're sticking to this and to be faithful to the way that it's written that there's no action required.

I don't know that the Board wants to get into a situation where every two years, when this report comes out and there's a conclusion from the evaluation that's required to do says that the milestones have been met, that will always come to the Board and give the Board an opportunity to object or disagree.

It doesn't require, in the Regional Plan as written, that the Board needs to accept or act or adopt that and take affirmative action. The proper motion would be for example, "I move to find that the milestone has not been achieved," and let that vote play out, rather than trying to make some kind of an affirmative motion.

Ms. Leumer said that's helpful. I will turn to my fellow Board members because it seemed like everyone who spoke had different feelings about whether or not we've met it or not. For newer Board members, there may be a need to have a deeper dive on this to better understand what "ongoing funding" is. A lot of us have been through this conversation a number of times, but there are new Board members who could benefit from a briefing. Or have the Transportation Committee discuss and then report back to the Board.

I would look for feedback from other Board members if they're comfortable taking this inaction and deeming that we've met this ongoing funding requirement today.

Ms. Williamson said what I heard from our fellow Board members is a desire to move this forward. I am comfortable with the staff recommendation not just, I think, because of what the record shows, but also because I think it's the best way to move the transportation funding conversation forward. It's also important that the League and the Attorney General's Office are two of our very important partners, along with the local jurisdictions and the State of Nevada, which I believe agreed with this recommendation. I think the other partners that maybe haven't spoken, or some of them at the table have spoken, are comfortable moving forward.

Ms. Leumer said I've heard that too, but I'm hearing that maybe folks are tired of talking about it and want to move on rather than "Yes, I totally agree that we've met ongoing funding." It would be good to get clarity from folks as to whether they believe we've met ongoing funding.

Ms. Williamson said that may not be fair to Ms. Gustafson.

Ms. Leumer said sorry, this was not meant to be targeted at Ms. Gustafson.

Ms. Gustafson said I'm happy to have that dialogue. I feel strongly that we need more money in transportation. There is no doubt. And all of us at the table that have met the commitments that we made to the partnership in that bi-state consultation were very clear that we had to come up with the money locally because the states were not coming up with it in a manner that was going to solve our issues. We've done that and made those commitments. On top of that, we are continuing to seek those solutions because we realize that, at any given time, the state and federal contributions could change. That's beyond our control as a local Board. We would then have to react to it and make those findings that we haven't met. But we've been meeting and exceeding them to date. That's where I'm comfortable making those findings today, with the clear understanding that we need more money and real solutions for transportation.

Ms. Conrad-Saydah said we've been discussing this for many years. This is where I struggle with how to keep pressure on the states and the feds to be part of the solution, because the locals are standing up so much of the effort. I've talked about this in the past that having an annual "we've met the dollars" is challenging because, obviously, money comes and goes, and some years, we'll have more from one pot than another. I'm struggling with saying we've met it because I want to keep the pressure on those other institutions for contributing funding. I want to support our local partners in doing so much work to meet their end of the bargain, and I still want an avenue to require or put pressure on the other contributors.

Ms. Aldean said the problem is the supplemental compliance measure is a no-net VMT. That doesn't punish the federal government or the states. It punishes the locals and projects that are in the queue and that may be service or public safety projects. The real crux of this is what is the definition of "ongoing"? Are we at the 90-day deadline?

Mr. St. Michel said we are within it. I believe it ends in September.

Ms. Aldean asked if you can defer a "no action" so that we can have further conversations. Because we're kind of operating in a very vague environment here, because we have a disagreement about the language that was agreed to. I believe that is fundamentally important before we move forward.

Mr. Bass seconds that.

Mr. Segan said staff's perspective, I think it would be very useful to be quite specific about which milestones we're talking about and how and why they're not being achieved.

Ms. Aldean said the conversation has dealt almost exclusively with funding the 7-7-7 plan and whether or not "ongoing" implies that you have to have an indefinite commitment, which I think is aspirational but unrealistic, or whether we're talking about meeting that threshold on an annual basis.

Mr. Segan said it is DP-5.4.A the proposal from the bi-state consultation was deficient. That is the discussion we're having right now. Is that correct?

Ms. Aldean said if we claim that is a deficient element of the plan, then the no-net VMT requirement goes into effect. That's what I'm trying to avoid, because there are some legitimate issues that need to be addressed, and there's clarity that's needed. To punish the people who are working hard on projects that are in the queue or being proposed, I feel would be detrimental, potentially, to local governments and the people who live here. I'm trying to think of some way of furthering the conversation and perhaps taking no action on this item today. I think the way this is written is awkward in terms of handicapping us and making it difficult for us to defer this item so that we can engage in further conversation.

Mr. Bass agreed with Ms. Aldean's comments. I need more understanding of what the real consequences are at the local level. To me, it's the fact that we didn't exempt public safety projects that is bothersome. I want to understand exactly what we're doing if we do trigger this. I also agree with Ms. Conrad-Saydah and Ms. Leumer that we have to keep the pressure on. We don't have the ongoing funding that we need to keep this up, and I feel these measures were put in place to keep that pressure on. We need to take more time. I don't want to do this today because I don't think we have what we need. Let's try to push this out and not make one decision or the next. The Transportation Committee is a great idea. I think we should spend more time on this.

Ms. Williamson asked if we take no action today, what will prevent the Board from continuing to work on this issue in the Transportation Committee. Are those two things mutually exclusive, or could we take no action today without stalling anything?

Mr. St. Michel said the direct answer is no action is fine and it doesn't preclude ongoing discussion. The fact of the matter remains that DP-5.6 says that the compliance measures go into effect if it is found that the milestones have not been met. Unless and until those milestones have been found by vote to have not been met, the status quo remains. That doesn't mean that funding isn't important or that we can't continue to work on these issues, however the Board would like to do that through committees. You would have to make that decision about how you want to work on that as an agency. But today, the reason we're here is because, pursuant to the Regional Plan, as required, your advisory committee had to do a report that evaluated the milestones. The report came out, it made a finding and presented you with that information. Some Board members wanted to talk about that, and that's why we're here.

If you want to take direction today, you would make a motion to make the finding that it has not been attained. If you don't want to do that and just want to go forward and continue the conversations, nothing is required. There's no formal motion needed for that, although you could make a motion to say, "Keep the conversations going."

But we have to think about what that directs staff to do. When we get motions and directions from the Board, it's very helpful, as the intermediary between the Board and staff, to know exactly what you're directing. We would appreciate that guidance.

Mr. Hoenigman echoed what Mr. St. Michel just said. These things take so much staff time, Board time, and the public's time. If we are putting this off because we don't have enough information, we need to be very specific about what information we need from staff to look at this again. To me, it feels like they've given us everything they've got. I don't know if putting it off another month is going to uncover anything different. It's all out there. It's a tough decision. I don't think any of us are super happy with it because I think we all wish we had some magical pot of money that flowed

to us continuously that we could use for all the things we need to use it for. Unfortunately, that's not the case right now. I do think staff and the Board are committed to it. But in terms of the action today, I'm just not sure that we're going to get anything else that's going to make this clearer to us at our next meeting. If there are things, let's be very specific about what we're asking staff to present at a future meeting.

Ms. Faustinos said Mr. Hoenigman made my comments. We're in a position right now where we've adopted and used this procedure in the past, where there has been agreement on the metrics that we were using. Mr. Segan clearly stated, and it was proven in the charts that we saw that we have met those funding thresholds. I think if there are questions about what "ongoing" means, those discussions should happen. But to me, the bottom line is: How much money have we collected, whether it's state, federal, or local? And we have exceeded that every year.

I feel comfortable moving ahead today. I totally get that it would be wonderful to have a crystal ball to see when federal money is going to be available, when state money is going to be available, etc. I appreciate that those discussions have to happen and that we need to have some direction we can give to staff in terms of what they're fighting for with legislators at the state level. Coming from state government, I know how uncontrollable that can be depending upon who's in leadership, and again, it's just one of these moving targets. But I appreciate the fact that we have to have those discussions.

Mr. Kieckhefer said I feel it's crystal clear that the measures have been met. The question over "ongoing," to me, is that there's an ongoing commitment to seek continuing appropriations from local governments. The 7-7-7 plan is predicated on the idea that local and state governments will operate through their continuing appropriation cycles to fund these projects. If that's the agreed-upon mechanism for the balance of funding, then it inherently assumes that we're going to have to go back and seek continued appropriations on an annual basis. No legislature or local government is going to be able to promise that, five years from now, an appropriation will be ongoing. It just doesn't work that way. To me, all of these measures have been met. I think we're good to go. Continuing discussions in the Transportation Committee over operating funding are perfectly appropriate, but that can be done totally outside of this process.

Mr. Bass said if we do nothing today, we're basically agreeing with the staff recommendation, if that's what Mr. St. Michel was recommending. Is that correct?

Mr. St. Michel said that's correct.

Mr. Bass said part of what I'm curious about is what does it do if we say that it has not been attained? I imagine the intention of this policy when it was passed was that if we aren't getting that funding, this mechanism that gets triggered would then create the political will to get the funding. Are we not doing what we should do to use the policy that we put in place to make sure that we have sustainable funding? If we have to stop these projects because that funding isn't happening, people who want to get their projects done, and they have political will to help us get this funding.

That's what has to be considered. For me, that's why tabling this maybe two or three months, so the Transportation Committee can wrestle with that. What are the consequences and benefits?

Mr. St. Michel said the report came out as it was required, and it made an evaluation as was required, and the Board was required to receive that. I don't think that there is anything necessarily that precludes, prevents, or prohibits the Board from, at any time in the future, deciding that at this time we want to make a finding that this milestone has not been attained. There's a 90-day review period, but I think when that 90 days ends, it's not like the Governing Board suddenly can never act. Maybe that's a point of clarification here that helps everybody: The DP-5.6 trigger can always be pulled if that's what the Board chooses. It doesn't have to happen within this 90-day period.

The other piece I wanted to clarify is to remember that the funding milestones were the very first of the milestones. We move forward over the next many years until we get to that final in 2045 where we're looking at incremental reductions in VMT.

VMT reduction is really the threshold. To the extent that those incremental VMT reductions in the future are not being satisfied, these compliance measures will kick in, and presumably funding for transportation projects is part of being able to meet those future incremental VMT reductions. Again, that's meant to provide some assurance. I'm going out of my lane as an attorney here but just to counsel that, I think it's not to say that the staff position is turning a blind eye to the importance of funding.

Ms. Laine said this has given me a lot to think about, and I've been hearing about this argument for years. It's been helpful to hear from people who have been wrestling with this, including our partners, but then also to hear a new perspective from people who are just coming into the fold. I think maybe there's a middle-of-the-road opportunity here. If we have to look at the question of whether we have satisfied the financial requirement to date, to Mr. Kieckhefer's point, it's very clear that we have.

Going back to Ms. Aldean's comments about the word "ongoing," there seems to be a conflict among all of us, even as a Board, but certainly including our significant partners, about what that word means. I don't think we can predict the future or obligate the future Governing Boards and bodies to indefinite funding.

Today, maybe we agree that we've met the obligations as they've been laid out for today and then refer this matter to the Transportation Committee to take a look at what the word "ongoing" needs to mean. Maybe they could do a projection of five-year funding and what that might look like, or a 10-year funding model, again knowing that we can't obligate anybody and we don't know what the Emerald Bay shuttle is going to produce. We're hoping to make that a transit opportunity that funds itself, but all of that funding should come into play with regard to the local contribution. It's impossible to really be clear about what we need to do. But if I had to decide today, have we met the obligations today? Yes. In the future, we've got to figure that out.

Ms. Williamson wholeheartedly agreed with Ms. Laine and we have to do nothing to do that.

Ms. Regan said it's important not to lose sight of the fact that we are all in agreement that we want to drive down VMT. Everyone shares that common goal of improving transportation, bringing more investment, and reducing VMT. I appreciate our stakeholders from the California Attorney General's Office, as well as Keep Tahoe Blue. But this discussion, and previous discussions as has been alluded to, indicate that this is a complicated issue. The ultimate "eye on the prize" standard

is our threshold standard. We're getting a little deep into the policy language, which is Regional Plan policy, but we are on the hook to achieve the VMT threshold, and there are milestones along the way.

What has always been conflated is that funding equals a direct reduction in VMT. It is one of the many factors that will affect a reduction in VMT. The next threshold evaluation will be measuring our plans against the standards and the threshold. The next threshold evaluation report will be in 2027 and released in 2028. We have another two-year reporting cycle for this.

There are two Board actions that have already documented the commitment of the Governing Board and agency staff to continue that commitment to funding and ongoing funding pursuits. One is the Regional Transportation Plan action of July of last year. In that Regional Transportation Plan, we are not showing that same $20 million gap. We're showing constrained, foreseeable funding of $2.5 billion, and we are exceeding pace on that. That's an action this Board has taken that is committed to those many hundreds of projects in the transportation space.

The work plan that you just adopted last month shows transportation as a strategic priority. There was a very robust discussion at our Governing Board strategic planning session about the need for not just planning, but implementation. Transit funding and ongoing operational funding are key goals of not just this Board, but also those of you who serve on the Tahoe Transportation District Board, as well as our communities.

There are a couple of actions that I think are very clear that we're all committed to ongoing support for funding. I just didn't want to lose that as we took this deep dive. I appreciate all the perspectives here. Maybe just to put a fine point on it: We feel we are following our policy to the T. If there is to be a change in how we affirm that in a different fashion, that would be a separate item for a Regional Plan amendment.

Ms. Aldean said the irony is that if we were to implement these supplemental compliance measures of a no-net VMT, that would also negate the effort to develop affordable and workforce housing which is designed to reduce VMT by allowing people to live where they work. I feel it would be highly counterproductive for us not to move this forward.

Ms. Williamson thanked everyone.

8. EXECUTIVE REPORTS

A. Executive Director Status Report

Ms. Regan said I appreciate the discussion around the VMT item. These matters can get very technical. Thank you for the thoughtful conversation, and thank you, Dan, for your presentation and your work on this important topic.

Since we last met in June at the Governing Board, July 4th happened. We got a little preview of that in our conversation and introduction with the U.S. Forest Service Acting Forest Supervisor, but I wanted to put a finer point on it. Parades were held, fireworks happened, and almost 500 volunteers cleaned the beaches on July 5th. Collectively, as a basin, we picked up a lot of trash, but it was less than last year, and it has been consistently decreasing. I think that is a great tie-back to

our last conversation. When the basin sets its mind to something and we come together as a partnership, we get things done. Things happen, and it is important to keep that momentum going. And yes, we need to keep the pressure on, because no one wants to see a national news article on July 5th go around the world saying that Lake Tahoe is trashed.

There are always a lever and a hammer. I appreciate the discussion on the transportation side, and there is equally a hammer on the destination stewardship side, because we all want the community locally, regionally, and globally to know how much we care about this lake. It took a lot of work to achieve less trash year over year after the big uptick we experienced a few years back. That did not happen by accident. It took a lot of work and a lot of partnership, both private and public. A big shout-out goes to the U.S. Forest Service, which mobilized significantly more law enforcement presence, as did our local jurisdictions, at considerable expense. It comes down to those three E's: education, engineering, and enforcement. We did all three, and I think it shows that we can improve the experience not only for our local and regional communities that want to enjoy the lake, but also for anyone visiting Lake Tahoe for the first time.

We also have an emerging threat of Golden mussels. We are maintaining our vigilance through boat inspections, with our partners at the Resource Conservation District looking at every boat coming in. We have intercepted five boats with Golden mussels. This is a new threat, a new species that was recently discovered in the Delta area and we are not letting our guard down. As Dennis Zabaglo has mentioned, in this situation, Golden mussels are essentially Quagga mussels on steroids. We were already geared up to keep Quagga mussels out, and now Golden mussels present an additional threat. The big push now is for all of you to help spread the message in your circles about cleaning your gear; clean, drain, and dry.

You may have seen the billboards on Highway 50 near Spooner, on the California side, and at the Folsom Auto Mall with the message "Clean your gear. Stop Golden mussels." We have to get the word out that kayaks and stand-up paddleboards can transport these species into our watershed, and that would be a disaster. Our teams are working very hard to keep moving forward on all of these high-priority programs. We have also had some people tampering with their inspection seals in an attempt to circumvent the inspection system. Our Legal Committee will be hearing more about that later. We are investigating those incidents and may bring enforcement actions.

We have had a big response to the Emerald Bay Shuttle, which was funded through philanthropy, private dollars, public dollars, and mitigation funds. We just moved some funding out of committee with a recommendation, and you voted on the consent calendar to support the Emerald Bay Shuttle. Thank you to Member Laine, Member Gustafson, all of our community partners, and the multi-jurisdictional partnership involved in the all-hands meetings that Member Laine has been convening. And, on the Nevada side, we have the East Shore Express. Look at the ridership we had last year, and participation this year is also very strong.

The Emerald Bay Shuttle is a fee of $10. The East Shore Express is free, although, as we discussed earlier, transit is never truly free. It comes at a significant cost. We are trying to incentivize people to ride through free service in some of our Lake Link and TART Connect programs, but there is a real cost involved. We are seeing more law enforcement at Emerald Bay and, certainly, more tickets being written. There is also work underway to achieve more standardized ticket prices around the lake because there are different enforcement rules between California and Nevada. I also want to note something Mayor Bass brought up in his remarks. The Lake Link service truly got

off the ground sooner than planned on the South Shore because of stakeholder engagement from the public, the community, and the California Attorney General's Office. Lake Link was launched as part of the event center program, ahead of schedule, and it has been wildly successful. Now the team is expanding that service to the Y, up to the top of Kingsbury, and throughout the Nevada side of the South Shore. So, there has been great progress. Continued commitments will be needed to keep that going.

Paul Nielsen, our Deputy Director here today, is building on 30 years of work at TRPA. We have a new acronym around the office. If you have ever watched *Better Call Saul*, our version is "Better Call Paul." Paul has pretty much seen every question you can come up with in TRPA and has done a good job of answering those questions.

Mr. Nielsen said I did take two years off to recharge my batteries. I'm honored to be sitting in this chair. I know how fortunate I am to be here as Deputy Director and Chief Planning Officer. I promise you two things. First, I don't have all the answers. Nobody does when it comes to Lake Tahoe. But if I don't have an answer, I'll get it and come back to you. Second, I'll give you my best. I'm committed to doing that for the environment, for the community, for staff, for the APC, and the Governing Board.

Ms. Regan also introduced Shayla Dorstad. Shayla and her husband moved to our area in Nevada from Washington State, and Shayla is our Public Service Specialist at the front desk. She has experience working in the nonprofit community, helping people experiencing homelessness. We have complicated rules, and Shayla, along with our entire Permitting and Compliance team, is helping us in explaining them.

We also have new team member Stephanie lojica. We appreciate the experience she brings from working with a local architecture firm. She's worked with many projects on the other side of the table, helping project applicants prepare their applications. So, she brings an interesting perspective. She has a degree from Berkeley, and we are also very honored to have her because she was one of the first female Scouts in the Eagle Scout program. As Paul mentioned, none of us, not even our incredible science partners, have all the answers. But we bring the best and brightest to the table.

As we discussed regarding traffic counts and data, this is complicated. We have not updated our travel models for many years. Some may receive a survey in the mail about travel behaviors. We are targeting around 4,000 respondents. In a basin community of approximately 55,000 people, that is a significant effort to get an up-to-date picture of how people travel around the region. It is particularly complicated in a resort community to capture these travel and commute patterns. In a big city, commute patterns are often much more predictable in terms of work commute times and travel in and out of the area. Here, we have freight movement, a highway that runs coast to coast through our main streets, visitation, local community members, and commuters. I believe this work will help us advance our goal of addressing transportation funding issues in the future by having better data available. The team is working very hard to get this going.

You also heard the good presentation about the Summit. If any questions arise from today's discussion or other matters, certainly feel free to contact me, Kim Caringer, or Devin Middlebrook. We had a Nevada Oversight Committee meeting last Friday at TRPA and it was the last Tahoe meeting of the interim committee. The next meeting will be on August 20 in Carson City at the

Legislature. One of the things the committee will, I'm sure, be taking up is the commitment to funding. So again, there is a through line connecting all of these conversations.

In August we will be bringing back the conversation around herbicides and glyphosate at the EIP Committee. We will also have Dr. Stephanie Hampton from UC Davis coming in August to give us the State of the Lake report. We are also going to have an informational briefing from the U.S. Forest Service; our local Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, the Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest to talk about the master planning initiative underway at the top of Mount Rose, at Tahoe Meadows.

I appreciate hearing from Member Guthreau and Member Hill about the community engagement around that. There are some workshops coming up, and this ties directly to our destination stewardship work: how do we manage resources at a time when we want people to enjoy the outdoors? How do we best manage that use to protect the resource while still meeting our goals?

On September 23, as part of the Board meeting, we are going to do a field tour on the Nevada side along Highway 28, where we will see some of the implementation work taking place along the corridor. We are going to talk about the projects underway and all the work happening there. We will most likely have our regular business meeting here, stage from here, and then take a bus up the corridor.

We have an Area Plan Amendment coming through the Regional Planning Committee. We also have another Transportation Committee meeting looking at the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP). That will be a perfect time to tease out some of the conversations we just had around the dais.

We will be happy to talk with Chair Hill and Vice Chair Bass about how we fold some of the conversation we heard on the last item into that Transportation Committee meeting. So, we will get organized around that. We also have our fall inflationary adjustment coming up, which we do every year, when we adjust our filing fees based on inflation. And there are some appeals in the pipeline as well.

Board Comments & Questions

None.

B. General Counsel Status Report

Mr. St. Michel announced the conclusion of *Eisenstadt v. TRPA*. With the Board's adoption of the Monoplane Ordinance last month, we fulfilled our obligation under the settlement agreement, and the plaintiffs dismissed the litigation with prejudice earlier this month. I don't know how widely known it was that the ordinance was part of a settlement agreement we negotiated with the plaintiffs, but I think this is a great outcome for the agency. It was a long-running litigation matter that we were able to bring to a close while, at the same time, advancing some of our regulatory goals. I want to thank the Legal Committee in particular, as well as Hayley, Alex, Ben, Belinda, and Shelly, because we had several closed-session meetings where we discussed these settlement ideas.

There are no further legal updates this month.

Ms. Williamson thanked Graham, Katherine, Jack, and Marsha.

Board Comments & Questions

None.

9. GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER REPORTS

Mr. Bass said I feel like there were a lot of great recommendations, and Ms. Regan said that they'll have the Transportation Committee look at that. I would like clarity on the question of whether this decision can be made outside of the 90-day shot clock. I want to make sure we have clear direction that this is coming back to the Transportation Committee for review. And Ms. Laine had some great suggestions, including looking at what "ongoing" means and other issues that were brought up.

Ms. Regan said I'm happy to meet with you and Chair Hill, to flesh out what that agenda item would look like but committed to bring that back.

Ms. Laine said with regards to the Emerald Bay pilot project this summer, we're doing everything the same out there as we did in 2025, but bigger and better. That means more barriers, more shuttles and we doubled our efforts on enforcement. But the big piece is that we raised the no parking fine from $100 to $300.

Ms. Gustafson said I'm not on the Transportation Committee, but I will make sure I get my data to you all on what some local jurisdictions are already doing. The second item I wanted to bring up is a great amount of gratitude to the U.S. Forest Service. They had around 22 additional staff in the basin for the Fourth of July. We reconvened because we did have the roving groups of unsupervised teens that we have experienced at other locations around the basin migrated into Placer County and into my neighborhood on July 3. It was an interesting experience, both as an elected official and as a Governing Board member, to watch hundreds of kids descend on a beach that many local kids have traditionally gone to in much smaller numbers. But with the use of social media, there were suddenly hundreds of kids. They outnumbered law enforcement. One of the challenges for law enforcement is that when they arrest an underage individual, they have to reunite that person with their parents, who may not even be in the basin. It was very interesting to hear those comments as we tackle this issue of parents renting homes and then not coming with their children to our jurisdictions.

We're learning as we go about what TikTok takeovers are and what Snapchat is. Back in the day, it was word of mouth. But I also appreciate the coordination among State Parks, the Forest Service, and our local county sheriff to address these issues. And I think it's important to remember the broader context. We didn't have serious crimes or arrests that needed to occur, and the vast majority of people coming here are coming here to do the right thing. Sometimes we forget that when we hear about these incidents. I had to remind some of my neighbors that, all in all, the kids were pretty well behaved. It was just intimidating because of the sheer number of them that showed up. As law enforcement tried to get them to take their garbage with them, some were running from the sheriffs and other law enforcement officers, so they didn't take all of it. Some of

us went down afterward to help pick up. I wanted to commend the Forest Service in particular for its response. They have also committed to providing that additional staffing next year as well.

Ms. Caringer also commented on how grateful we are to the Forest Service for all the extra law enforcement they brought to the table on the 4th of July and what a difference it made. Our staff is working on a thank you letter on behalf of the partnership from Team Tahoe on that level of law enforcement they brought.

10. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Legal Committee
No report.

B. Operations & Governance Committee
No report.

C. Environmental Improvement Program Committee
No report.

D. Transportation Committee
No report.

E. Regional Planning Committee
No report.

F. Local Government Committee
No report.

G. Tahoe Living Working Group
No report.

11. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS – ON ANY ITEM

Tara Thornton. Protect Tahoe appreciated all the meetings we've been having with the board members, the staff, executive and science team, and we are thankful that the issue is going to the EIP committee for review at the next board meeting. We want to meet with the final members we have not met with, especially the committee members. We urge you move fast on the process of the initial environmental checklist findings of no significant impact and then move to vote for banning or to change ordinance to explicitly prohibit. We don’t believe there needs to be any lengthy EIS process involved in this. There are equivocal swaps and other prescriptive tools that can be used. So there is not something like, what will our landscape here be like without use of conventional herbicides? If that were going to become an issue, then we would challenge back that there was no EIS done for the use of conventional herbicides terrestrially. We don't want a

prolonged money spend. It's not necessary. I think you're going to find the checklist of no findings on this, because there are other prescriptive tools to use.

California data from Pesticide Use report from the California Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) latest finding data is from 2023. In 2016, there were only 4,000 pounds of conventional pesticides applied to forests in the state of California. That number was doubled over a couple of years, and then after 2000, by 2023, it went up to 266,000 pounds applied on the forest, primarily on wildfire burn scars. This is a new market, is not an entrenched or commodity established market like ag industry. This is a new market for the chemical industry and it is not necessary or needed. And the public is outraged that it's even being considered and that it's happened. Even people that work on this issue didn't realize the scope of what was happening. It can be unwound. There is no need for it.

We want to work with you. We have every resource and tool available to help in the conversation for the board, committees, and staff can make decisions. We urge you to move quickly. If you want to look at large wildfire scale, look at the province of Quebec and a 25-year ban on conventional herbicides for wildfires there. You'll see that the use or non-use does not, on the landscape, affect it long term. Wildfires overall, but short-term use of conventional herbicides actually increases the risk of fire.

Reid Reichardt said last month I shared how Chaparral is playing a vital role in the Caldor recovery, citing the Forest Service's own website on Chaparral's value for erosion control, watershed cover, wildlife habitat and nutrient cycling. I didn't have time to share the research about what chaparral itself needs. The California Wildfire and Forest Resilience Task Force, a collaboration that includes the Forest Service, found that losing chaparral too soon after fire before it replenishes soil seed banks, reduces the native plant's ability to ever recover, and opens the door to invasive, more flammable grasses. In other words, the Forest Service's plan contradicts research they helped produce. It will likely increase fire risk, require more herbicide in future years, and, ironically, leave us wishing we could get the forest back to exactly where it is right now.

We've longed recognized Comstock as a mistake that we're still managing today. We're now on the verge of a mistake, driven by the same motivations with far wider biological reach in a more fragile environment. The difference this time is we all know what's at stake. When the Forest Service uses words like thoughtful approach about planning to mass spray a probable carcinogen that even Germany, home of producer Bayer, prohibits in public areas. And when they use words like limited application and low volume without disclosing actual volumes, that vagueness should alarm you. If it's so limited, just use hand crews instead. The Forest Service's own FAQ ends with six words "invasive plants can convert entire ecosystems." Why pursue a plan that may dramatically increase invasive, more flammable species in Tahoe forests? That's a rhetorical question at this point, Comstock.

The question is whether this board will allow a naturally recovering forest near Meyers to become the entry point for perhaps the greatest threat the Tahoe Basin has ever faced. Remember one of the core reasons this agency was created to protect this place we love. Doing that now means simply adhering to your own Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The Forest Service plan is the

opposite of reforestation. It is anything but routine and it involves chemical use that was never exempted from review. You must demand the Forest Service submit an application now.

Also, numerous written comments on this matter, including mine, are missing from your public record, while later ones appear. Finally, amending TRPA Code of Ordinances to prohibit synthetic herbicides will be the most consequential action this agency will ever take to protect the Tahoe Basin, its lake, forests and wildlife, and the people who call this place home.

Ms. Williamson said staff works hard to get comments uploaded by a certain time.

Ms. Huston said comments that specifically cited this board meeting were provided at this board meeting. We are collecting all comments received on glyphosate in a separate folder. So they are in the record. And they'll be provided when we have an action item.

Sophia Heidrich, Advocacy Director for Mountain Area Preservation (MAP) also participates on the Tahoe Living Working Group made comments about the cultivating community item. Thank you to staff for creating an alternative that focuses on housing preservation and getting folks into existing units. This is something that MAP has supported from the very beginning. From my perspective, this is the most environmentally friendly option and also likely the fastest option for getting people into homes as quickly as we can. Building anything in Tahoe takes a long time. So even with all of the incentives on the table, we're probably not going to see a bunch of new workforce housing developments anytime soon. In line with Ms. Aldean, I think the best outcome is likely a combination of the two approaches, and I look forward to having those discussions once the EIS is out, and we better understand the potential impacts associated with the various policy considerations.

That said, I find it frustrating that we still don't have any concrete policy ideas showing how TRPA will unlock existing units or what the housing preservation approach looks like. We have brought a lot of ideas to the table on this, creating a mitigation fee and using that fund to support programs run by local jurisdictions, or considering a housing threshold and an impact fee, or developing incentives for local jurisdictions to create their own programs where they don't already exist, etc..

I feel like every time we brought up an idea; we've pretty much been told that it won't work or TRPA doesn't have the ability to do it. The question is, what can the TRPA do? Now, we're two years in and we don't have an answer to that. Even now, it's one of the alternatives under consideration, the housing preservation alternative. But there are no details about what that alternative looks like. The other alternative, the housing forward alternative, is well defined. For the most part we know what those policies would be. It’s frustrating that even after almost two years of beating the drum on unlocking existing units and a lot of support from the community on this topic, there's nothing concrete behind it. I hope that this option gets a fair shake, because it seems like efforts thus far have been focused on the housing forward approach.

MAP wants to be a partner on this. I would love it if there were a brainstorming roundtable specifically focused on the housing preservation approach and what those policies could look like. Because right now, it seems like the EIS is moving forward without a full understanding of what that approach means and what the EIS should analyze. There were a lot of good comments today

and that VMT item was very interesting. I appreciate all your thoughtful consideration to what we have to say.

Jenny Lundine echoed the concerns about the use of glyphosate and other herbicides in the Tahoe Basin. I am right outside the Tahoe Basin and unfortunately, I've already been affected by the spraying. It's deeply concerning with the quantity, the volume, and the sheer devastation it's causing in our forests. I would hate to see this happen in the Tahoe Basin. I also am concerned about some of the areas that have been sprayed near the basin that are likely to affect the wildlife, also blowing into the area and affecting El Dorado County's water sources in general. I would like to see this more action taken on the part of TRPA. We've been speaking about this for months and would appreciate more quick action.

Melissa Soderston represents Tahoe Forest Matter and Eco Integrity Alliance. First, I would like to say again that holding these public interest comments at the end of the meeting is not conducive to transparency or true engagement. We should be allowed to make our comments at the beginning of the meeting, when we know that all parties are equally engaged and paying attention, and we should be able to comment after each individual agenda item.

I would like to also comment about glyphosate and extend that into the broader issue of what is happening in our forests. I encourage you to drive Pioneer Trail and see the horror that is being perpetrated on these environments. The Forest Service seems to have forgotten that the forest contains more than simply trees. These are entire ecosystems and habitat and food sources, and denning. All of it is being destroyed by these projects. They are leaving no native vegetation. When it comes to glyphosate, we know that most of the invasive species are highly resistant to glyphosate. They are not trying to prevent the growth of invasive species. They are trying to prevent the growth of our native shrubs, which is vital to forest health. I encourage you to walk within the Caldor burn perimeter. This is a beautifully rejuvenating landscape, essential habitat, highly lacking in our forests. The 25 trees per acre thing has been debunked numerous times, including by the Forest Service's own studies.

Our forests are not meant to be parklike, as witnessed by numerous photos from before the Comstock era. What's happening out there is causing long term, irreparable harm to our forest ecosystems, to our watersheds, to our wildlife, and to our future as a human race. We cannot exist without these ecosystems. People come to Tahoe to experience a much cooler, more habitable climate on those hot days in the valley. We don't have those cool days anymore. It has been nearly 90 degrees and it's not even August. If you walk through these thinned forest areas, there is no shade, no habitat, no food, and it is not cooler. They are much hotter, drier, and windier. Our soil is being dried out and all of that is dust and sediment that is ending up in our watershed.

If you truly care about the quality of lake clarity and our environment here, we need to focus on building out our transportation infrastructure, including ways for people to get into the basin without bringing their vehicles. We need better sewage and drainage. We need home and infrastructure hardening, buried utility lines. We still have drop lines connected to trees. These are the things that will be actionable in the future. Please take a different stance. You need scientific oversight, not a rubber stamp board.

KT Merry, Nevada native is commenting on the proposed herbicide pesticide use. I agree with everyone who has mentioned that these issues need to be a meeting on the agenda. This meeting has been going on for hours and for those of us juggling work lives it's very difficult for the public to make comments. Look at how these herbicides are viewed in Europe, how they're used in other places and look particularly at what's happening in Ladera Ranch in Orange County, California. Spraying these types of pesticides in areas like parks is wreaking havoc not only on the wildlife and the natural environment, but on children and the rare bone cancers that are now sprouting up. This is going to lead to expensive legal issues for that county in the future. This is devastating not only for the environment, the ecosystems, which are very precious in Lake Tahoe, but for what that means for the community and our vulnerable animals and children.

I urge this board for the community to look at this very seriously. The data does not back up what you are proposing. And it is just reckless harm that you are looking at creating. This needs to be an issue that you take seriously before you take taxpayer dollars to spread poison across the land. Make this an agenda item. Listen to the community, make it transparent for us to comment and look at the data and alternatives before we take the work that has gone into keeping this a pristine environment and landscape for generations to come. We need to be thinking not about the next fire season, we need to be thinking about the next seven generations. I urge you to think about the legacy that each one of you wants to be leaving, and the data in the future is going to show that this is not the solution. Please listen to the concerns and look at your children and look at the lake that we all love dearly and preserve it for future generations and preserve the health of those concerned.

Tobi Tyler on behalf of Sierra Clubs Tahoe Area Group urges TRPA and the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit to prohibit the use of glyphosate and other herbicides in the Caldor Restoration project and throughout the Lake Tahoe Basin. The science is clear that herbicides are not necessary to restore a healthy forest, and they introduce unnecessary risks into one of the world's most sensitive watersheds. The primary benefit of glyphosate is economic it reduces short term vegetation management costs. But cost savings are not ecological restoration. Post-fire shrubs are native vegetation and are not weeds. They stabilize soils, reduce erosion, and improve soil fertility, support pollinators and wildlife, protect young conifers from heat and drought and naturally guide forest recovery. Eliminating this biodiversity to create even aged conifer plantations is timber management, not ecosystem restoration. The risks are substantial. Herbicides can damage soil microbial communities, reduce mycorrhizal fungi essential for tree growth, increase the transport of contaminants into streams, threaten Lake Tahoe's extraordinary water quality, reduce carbon storage, and degrade wildlife habitat. Even careful monitoring cannot prevent these impacts once chemicals are introduced into the environment. We are equally concerned about the people expected to apply these chemicals. Restoration projects often rely on seasonal contract workers operating on steep slopes under difficult conditions. No agency can realistically assume perfect compliance with safety protocols or eliminate the risk of spills, drift, equipment failures or occupational exposure.

A restoration Program should not depend on exposing workers to avoidable chemical hazards when effective non-chemical alternatives already exist. Lake Tahoe deserves restoration worthy of its international significance. Before herbicides are considered, agencies must demonstrate that non-chemical methods have been fully evaluated and proven infeasible. This has not been done. We therefore urge TRPA and the Forest Service to eliminate glyphosate and other herbicides from

the Caldor Restoration Project and future Tahoe Basin projects and instead invest in true restoration methods that protect water quality, preserve biodiversity, safeguard workers, and allow natural forest recovery to build the resilient forests that Lake Tahoe deserves. Please see our more extensive written comments provided yesterday.

Kelly Ryerson is concerned with the thought of taking time for an environmental impact study. I've been involved in a lot of those across the country, and it always takes such a long time to do it and we're talking about a short time frame right now. My recommendation would be to put a pause on the use of all conventional herbicides while further study is taking place so that we don't do the damage and then have to come back and figure out how to take care of it. There are plenty of biological evaluations already performed on glyphosate and other herbicides done by the EPA. It's fascinating because given the results of those biological evaluations, they should have banned the use of these herbicides a long time ago, but they've continued using them anyway because they're so valuable to agriculture. For example, glyphosate has been shown to impact over 90 percent of endangered species when applied. We cannot afford to do that in Lake Tahoe.

Glyphosate is hydrophilic. It's water loving and goes wherever the water goes. Of course, that's our big priority to keep the lake safe. Another interesting thing that I learned just this week is in talking with Chubb Fire Insurance and they don't support the use of glyphosate for fire prevention, because they found it makes things more flammable. It's desiccating the brush that would otherwise provide some moisture and potentially slow the progression of wildfire. A lot of the logic is missing in this overall idea to go forward using herbicides.

If you haven't been following the story in Ladera Ranch with the pediatric cancer pocket is heartbreaking. We don't want to see that happening in Tahoe. We can do this and we can be the model for the entire country.

12. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Aldean made a motion to adjourn.

Ms. Williamson adjourned the meeting at 12:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Marja Ambler

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. The initial draft of these minutes was generated with the assistance of artificial intelligence tools using the official meeting recording and transcript. The draft was reviewed and edited by TRPA staff for accuracy and completeness prior to approval.