TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

GOVERNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

June 24, 2026

TRPA/Zoom

1. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Vice Chair Mr. Hoenigman called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m.

Members present: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Rodriguez (for Mr. Aguilar), Mr. Bass, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Stephens (for 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. Aldean led the Pledge of Alliance.

3. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS – ON AGENDA ITEMS

Laura Patton, Natural Resource Director, Keep Tahoe Blue is providing comments on a couple of items today. Starting with Agenda Item 9.B, Stealthing requirements. On behalf of the League, we support the proposed amendments to Chapter 36 and appreciate TRPA taking proactive steps to address the environmental risks associated with plastic-based stealthing materials, and any kind of plastic that we put into the environment. Keep Tahoe Blue has worked extensively on microplastics prevention and cleanup efforts throughout the basin. And a few years ago, our volunteers brought the plastic issue to our attention, finding a ton of plastic needles coming off of cell phone towers. We've been working with staff and others to address these either through amendments or through any type of policy change. To come up with alternatives that already exist to comply with established scenic requirements for cell towers, while also protecting the environment. We support the ordinance provisions discouraging the plastic screening materials, requiring monitoring, and authorizing corrective action when deterioration occurs.

We also encourage strengthening of the ordinance further, if possible, to require applicants to demonstrate why non-plastic alternatives are infeasible in an alternatives analysis, minimizing the total amount of plastic were approved and requiring replacement with non-plastic materials.

Agenda Item 10.B, Annual Work Plan. I applaud TRPA for including threshold standards in that update. We've encouraged these standards to be updated, which many of them have not been updated since the 1980s. Focusing on recreation and biodiversity in this update is going to be incredible and a great step forward. Also, the technical cleanup of standards so that they're real and measurable before the next threshold evaluation at the end of 2027 is important too.
Cara Moore is commenting on Agenda Item 10.A Kuelper Commercial Warehouse rebuild. I’ve lived behind the Divided Sky for 13 years. I live next to the proposed mini storage warehouse in the heart of Meyers. One of my favorite things to do is sit in my backyard and look out at Cowboy Hat Rock.

It's a defining feature of our skyline, and it's part of why I live here. The proposer admits the building may impact some of the view, it will. In some areas, this three-story building will entirely obstruct the view of Cowboy Hat Rock. That's not just my loss, or my neighbor's loss. It's a loss for the character of Meyers. Finding 37.7.3 in the staff report requires that the building minimizes interference with existing views within the area to the extent practicable. The report's own response states that the structure will reduce some mountain views but will not entirely obscure them. But in some areas, it will. That's not minimizing interference, that's accepting it.

Finding 21.2.2.B requires that a project will not be injurious or disturbing to the enjoyment of property in the neighborhood. Losing this view is exactly that kind of injury and will disturb my and my neighbor's enjoyment of property. Finding 21.2.2.C requires that a building will not change the character of the neighborhood. A building that towers over everything around it and blocks our defining ridgeline view changes that character, irreversibly. This is exactly what Policy 1.1 of the Meyers Area Plan is meant to prevent, which calls for projects at a similar size and scale as surrounding buildings. This building is far larger than anything around it.

Section B.1.b.D of the Meyers Area Plan requires that screening of warehouses and outdoor storage be accomplished using walls, fencing, landscape planting, or some combination thereof. There is no way to screen a three-story structure. Policy 7.7 of the Meyers Area Plan directs projects to promote underground parking or other facilities to minimize the visual impact of development. There's no indication that option was ever explored.

Another concern is the precedent this sets. This building would tower over every other structure in the Meyers Town Center. If we allow a towering warehouse here, what stops the next storage building from going up along Magua Street? The Meyers Town Center, where this is proposed, is described in the area plan as providing a scenic, rural feeling. A three-story warehouse does not fit that description, and approving it here opens the door to industrial-scale development throughout our town center. Myers is a special place. Let's keep it that way.

I request that the project proposer consider putting in a smaller building to minimize the impact to the surrounding neighborhood.

Jeremy Feinberg, who also resides at 2001 Arrowhead Avenue, is commenting on Agenda Item 10.A, proposed 40-foot-tall warehouse. Cara Moore raised some great points and I agree with them about why the specific attributes of this project failed to meet many of the requirements of TRPA code and the Meyers Area Plan. Additionally, it is important for TRPA staff and the Governing Board to develop some guidelines about how we evaluate construction projects that are at the edge of the commercial zone as it butts up against residential zones, because that's what this is.

Map 1, the area in the Meyers Area Plan that's the commercial core of Meyers includes the Divided Sky and the strip that runs along Highway 50 is commercially zoned. It runs right up against a bunch of residences, and when we look at this area, we see relatively small buildings. None really tower over the adjoining residences. When TRPA makes a finding that says that the proposed building is a similar height to those around it, when it's clearly not raises a problem. But there's a bigger issue of how do we want to manage development and redevelopment in the commercial core at this boundary between commercial and residential? What I suggest is that we don't want to build up as tall as we can right against people's houses. We're going to come up against this in the coming

years as people want to redevelop their commercial parcels along this boundary between commercial and residential parcels in Meyers.

Cara cited a number of code citations within the Meyers Area Plan. I think it's worth reflecting on the potential adverse impacts to the character of the neighborhood. A 40-foot-tall warehouse clearly changes the character of the neighborhood. But once the first one goes in, that redefines the character and opens the door to additional tall warehouse buildings immediately against residential lots. Additionally, this parcel poses some interesting problems with snow removal and the potential access from the lot onto residential streets, including Arrowhead Court. I think there's going to be practical issues with using that as a pass-through, where traffic from the storage facility comes into our residential neighborhood, which is something that we want to avoid and prohibit. When a plan is eventually approved, that we're not seeing through traffic onto residential streets where kids play and people enjoy their property.

Alyssa Grabowski, who resides at 2055 Arrowhead Court is commenting on Agenda Item 10.A proposed Commercial Warehouse rebuild. I'm ten feet from the back of that structure. Currently, there's a fence down. It's not a through street; it's supposed to be a dead end. I am the only family that has children. There are cars zipping in and out already. There's no goodwill right now with the company that wants to rebuild the structure. They're blocking our streets with their vehicles, and we're a three-house street. I have a daughter who has been able to play on that street with no issues her entire life and now there’s cars zipping in and out.

The structure doesn't necessarily block the view; our house is set in a different direction than our neighbors. However, what's to say the next one's not going to go in in the next open lot on Magua? What does that create for the children that I'm raising in Meyers? This is our beautiful neighborhood where we spent so much time finding our house and building our home. What are the hours of operation going to be? Is it going to be safe? People who historically have spent too much time in their storage units in Tahoe because housing prices are too expensive. Is the safety of my home going to be compromised? We live close to CHP, and the law enforcement is near but people are quiet. Are the bears going to continue to come?

There's zero parking, two to three spaces are not adequate parking for a 50-foot storage facility. People aren't going to ride their bicycle to a storage facility to drop off one thing. They're going to have U-Hauls, trucks, trailers. Is the Magua Court prepared for the traffic that is supposed to happen on that side of the street? I agree with Cara and Jeremy. I would like to see a lot more information on this before anything gets approved.

Scott Leonard owns four parcels on Magua and I don't see a problem with building a new structure there because I want to build something similar. There's not a parking issue; the only parking issue is from the pizza business across the street. I want to build a similar storage facility because I was going to build a multi-family complex, but the Residential Units of Use (RUUs) are about $35,000 a piece, and I would need four of them. So, it's cheaper and it's zoned for a storage facility along with a few other things. I had to say something because I'm the only one that's affected by this thing, there's no real views from behind there.

Mr. St. Michel asked the audience not to make comments when other members of the public are speaking.

Alan Miller, Civil and Environmental Engineer is commenting on Agenda Item 10.B, Annual Work Plan. The Advisory Planning Commission (APC) recommended approval of code amendments last December for replacing certain types of piers. A recommendation and condition that you bring back in 2026 proposed amendments to prevent replacements of plastic piers in the shorezone. The Executive Director and other staff brought matters before you in the annual work plan, and there's nothing related to piers. There's no priority given to addressing the serious problem of toxic contamination with microplastics you've caused with your negligent approvals. Now you continue to delay action, and I've been screaming at you about this for nearly four years now with zero response. Your delays now constitute criminal negligence. Putting toxic materials in the lake, allowing it to continue year after year, ignoring the issue, trying to pretend it's not happening.

I suggest you reconsider your work plan priorities and make it a priority to get rid of these plastics that are contaminating our beautiful lake. It's simple to move forward, at least at some pace, with getting wood, metal, and stone in the shorezone. And that's what I recommended, and that's what the APC, your technical advisory group, made up of all the agency heads from all around the basin and the appointees from the Legislature and everybody else. You don't want to listen; you're just playing games. You're just running criminal, negligent activities behind the scenes, trying to avoid your responsibilities, and facing up to what you've done.

Tobi Tyler speaking on behalf of Sierra Club Tahoe Area Group regarding Agenda Item 9.A. We urge the Board to reject the proposed finding of no significance and require preparation of a full environmental impact statement before considering approval of the Tahoe Keys Marina code amendments. The issue before you are not whether the marina needs improvements. The issue is whether TRPA can lawfully conclude that increasing allowable building height to accommodate this project will have no significant environmental effects. The proposed amendment would allow construction of a 42-foot-tall, over 52,000-square-foot indoor boat storage building in an area where surrounding development is generally 20 to 25 feet tall.

The project is adjacent to open water, wetlands, and the Upper Truckee Marsh, making it highly visible from Lake Tahoe, surrounding waterways, public recreation areas, and nearby neighborhoods. Yet neither the City's Environmental Review nor TRPA's Finding of No Significant Effect (FONSE) contains meaningful visual simulations, viewshed analysis, line-of-site studies, or cumulative scenic analysis. Without that information, TRPA cannot determine whether this project is consistent with scenic threshold standards or whether it will degrade scenic quality.

The Tahoe Regional Planning Compact requires TRPA to attain and maintain environmental threshold carrying capacities, including scenic thresholds. Scenic resources are not simply aesthetic preferences. They are legally protected environmental resources under the Compact. Because scenic threshold attainment remains incomplete, TRPA cannot relax development standards without demonstrating with substantial evidence how the action will maintain or advance threshold attainment. The record contains no such demonstration.

Sierra Club has submitted extensive comments identifying significant concerns related to scenic resources, water quality, aquatic invasive species, biological resources, transportation, hazardous materials, and cumulative impacts. In addition, Sierra Club Tahoe Area Group and Tahoe Sierra Clean Air Coalition have formally appealed the City of South Lake Tahoe's resolution approving the Tahoe Keys Marina Project and its initial study mitigated negative declaration, citing substantial

deficiencies in the environmental review. Those same unresolved issues are now before TRPA and further demonstrate that a finding of no significant effect is not supported by the record.

We respectfully ask the Board to reject the FONSE and require preparation of a full environmental impact statement before approving this code amendment or associated project.

Jeff Gartner said we have lived at 2047 Arrowhead Court since December of 2000. In 2013, the Meyers community undertook the Meyers Area Plan, and that was unanimously approved by the TRPA on or about February 28, 2018. This plan took five years of meetings and workshops, and this extremely tall building in the Meyers community is going to affect the character of this community. We don't want to be known as the place with storage units before you get to Lake Tahoe. We want to be known as the gateway to Lake Tahoe. We want to have the character, the charm, to get into the lake. Residents also don't want to be walled in by these huge buildings that are planning to come in and feel like we're in some kind of military compound, with these buildings surrounding our neighborhoods and blocking the nature around us. I hope the TRPA Board seriously considers the negative impacts of these structures and other possible structures in the future.

Austin Rodriguez-Woodard said my family and I are full-time residents at 2005 Arrowhead Avenue. We're the first home located directly west behind where the proposed warehouse is. I'm asking that the Board deny this project because the findings required to approve it have not been met. I joined a little bit late, but I'm sure Cara and Jeremy and the others have addressed a lot of these issues. The core of the problem is that the Meyers Area Plan sets the base building height to 26 feet. Anything taller requires the Board to make four specific findings under Code 37.7: Findings 1, 3, 5, and 9, plus a visual magnitude analysis. That's not optional. The applicant made the wrong ones. The architects cite only the findings for 1, 2, and 3, but not one ever made findings of 5 and 9. These are to protect the area. We're trying to manage and maintain the feel and the function and recreation that happens along Arrowhead Avenue. There are hikers, bikers, and walkers. Everybody in the flats here uses Arrowhead Avenue to recreate. It's the gateway to Paradise Park and Washoe Meadows.

To address the no views, there's plenty of pictures. There's plenty of us that live behind Magua that have beautiful views of Cowboy Hat Mountain. Part of the reason we purchased our property here is because of the views, because of the trees. There's a lot of mentions as well in the plans of being able to be protected by these trees that are not 40 feet tall. If there is one, there's only one tree that is 40 feet tall, which would also go against the Meyers Area Plan, as we're not trying to add skyline of buildings to this area. We're wanting to maintain the natural feel of the area. And there's a lot of inconsistencies within the application and plans. Architects are citing 37 feet 4 inches for the building, but the application says 40 feet 4 inches.

There's a lot of mislabeling in the titles. There's a lot of mishandling, it seems, within this application, which brings up a lot of uncertainty and issues when it comes down to building this and what they're going to hold up to in terms of the building plans themselves.

Tom Rosenberg is commenting on Agenda Item 9.A, Tahoe Keys Marina Redevelopment Project. My comments focus on the water tank and boat storage facility. I'm commenting as a resident of South Lake Tahoe, a frequent user of Venice Drive East and all three entities it serves. I'm an advocate for preserving the beauty of Lake Tahoe, and I am a supporter and likely customer of the future Tahoe Keys Marina amenities. I’m asking the Board to delay its approval of the project and

draft permit, or of just the water tank and boat storage facility part of the project, until the issues noted here are addressed and mitigated to the Board's satisfaction.

I will also mention possible modifications to the boat building design and to Venice Drive East that might improve the project and benefits for all. My concerns with the boat storage building would be enormous and an intimidating new commercial structure sitting on formerly undeveloped land. A 50,000-square-foot footprint is 1.2 acres. It's 42 feet high, 325 feet long, and it would be between 150 and 170 feet wide. Imagine a billboard 42 feet, a few feet from the road, and two more, one at each end, 150 feet long. It's huge. It is sited along and towers over Venice Drive East, lakeside, Venice Drive East, the public entrance and only road to the marina and public conservation lands beyond. It's heavily used by walkers, bicyclists, and others.

A show-stopping issue is industrialization. This building would certainly change the character of the entrance to this special area from conservation and recreation to industrial.
The second important negative is view blockage from a public road. Views of the surrounding basin mountain peaks from Venice Drive East, presently available, would be blocked. The building seems incompatible with the special Tahoe location and with the TRPA mission statement to protect it.
The main cause of these two issues is lack of sufficient setback from the road.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Regan stated that Agenda Item No. 10.A Kuelper Commercial Warehouse Rebuild/Expansion will be continued.

Ms. Laine thanked Executive Director and TRPA. This item really hasn't had any public vetting, and I would very much like to bring it to the community and discuss it before it comes back to TRPA for any type of approval.

Mr. Hoenigman deemed the agenda approved as amended.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

May 27-28, 2026 Governing Board Minutes

Ms. Aldean made a motion to approve the May 27-28, 2026 minutes as presented.

Motion carried-voice vote.

6. **TRPA CONSENT CALENDAR**

A. May Financials
B. Release of El Dorado County Water Quality (WQ) Mitigation Funds ($50,000) towards the Fallen Leaf Road Rehabilitation Project
C. Release of El Dorado County Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Mitigation Funds ($35,000) towards the Cattlemans Basin/Black Bart Retrofit Project

D. Release of El Dorado County Mobility Mitigation Funds (MMF) ($38,000) to the Tahoe Transportation District for the 2026 Emerald Bay Shuttle & Parking Management Pilot Project
E. Advisory Planning Commission (APC) Membership reappointments for the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) primary representative, Steve Teshara and alternate Nick Speal

There are five items on consent. The first four items on consent were reviewed by the Operations and Governance Committee, and the final item wasn't reviewed by any committee.

Ms. Laine said the Operations and Governance Committee recommended approval of Items A through D. We are on target with the financials and are close to the end of our fiscal year with the budget looking very good. El Dorado County put forth three requests out of three different mitigation funds for a total of $123,000 that will help towards the Black Bart retrofit, some improvements to Fallen Leaf Road, and a contribution towards the Emerald Bay Shuttle Pilot Project for 2026.

Board Comments & Questions-Items A-D

None.

Board Comments & Questions-Item E

None.

Motion:

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

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

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

Ms. Laine moved to adjourn as the TRPA and convene as the TMPO.
Motion carried-voice vote.

7. **TMPO CONSENT CALENDAR**

A. Adoption of resolution approving the 2027 Active Transportation Program Metropolitan Planning Organization Guidelines

Board Comments & Questions

None.

Motion:

Mr. Bass made a motion to approve the TMPO Consent Calendar.

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

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

Ms. Aldean made a motion to adjourn as the TMPO and reconvene as the TRPA.

Motion carried-voice vote.

8. APPEALS

A. Appeal of Denial of Application for Existing Mooring Buoy, 225 Rubicon Avenue, Placer County, California, Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 085-252-001, TRPA File Number BUOY2025-0665, Mooring Registration Submission Number 11309

Mr. St. Michel, TRPA General Counsel provided the presentation.

This is the Mapes Appeal, which involves an appeal of TRPA staff's denial of an application for a mooring buoy associated with a non-littoral parcel. Before the Board reaches the merits on this item, we do have a threshold procedural issue.

What happened is that Appellant's counsel has requested a continuance after the agenda and staff materials were published, based on counsel's unavailability for today's meeting. Under TRPA Rules of Procedure, 2.1.2.3, the Board may continue an item at the meeting upon a showing of good cause. Our rule provides that good cause may include inconvenience or hardship to the applicant.

My recommendation today is that there is not good cause. It's up to the Board to make that finding, but my recommendation is for the Board to deny the continuance and to decide the appeal based on the written record before the agency. The staff materials, as well as the appellant's written materials, are all part of the record, and there is enough information for the Board to reach a decision.

Some procedural background, and this is all getting to whether or not there is good cause. This appeal is one of several appeals filed by Appellant's counsel that we have worked over the past year to schedule. We have been engaging with Appellant's counsel to schedule these matters for about a year. Earlier this year, we had a similar situation occur where we had worked on the date of February, and our staff had prepared the materials for the appeal. We published the agenda with the appeal on the February agenda, and we published the staff materials. At the last minute, Appellant's counsel said that he wouldn't be able to do it that month. Again, this was after we had already set that date. At a staff level, I decided with Director Regan to go ahead and allow that, but I did explain through emails, which I've quoted, that these appeals require a significant investment of staff time and agency resources. Once these materials are prepared and published, last-minute requests create operational challenges, take away from other items that could have been

scheduled for that month's Board meeting, and divert our staff, especially our legal staff, from working on other priorities.

I said while we would be willing to support a continuance in that instance, we do not anticipate being able to accommodate similar late requests in the future, absent a stronger showing of good cause, particularly where hearing dates have been confirmed well in advance. The Appellant's counsel did acknowledge that and apologized for the inconvenience.

Bringing us to the current appeal, which is a month or two later, in May, he raised the possibility of holding the Mapes appeal pending resolution of related litigation, which is the Kent Bryan litigation involving buoys and non-littoral parcels. He also requested that they be allowed to replace the buoy and use the buoy while the appeal remained pending. We did not agree to that. An email was sent on June 1 that because he had previously confirmed that he wished to proceed, we were continuing to keep the appeal on the June calendar. I said unless we heard otherwise by the end of the week, June 5, we did not anticipate removing the matter from the calendar absent good cause.

There was no response. Our legal staff prepared a very thorough staff report addressing all of the arguments that Appellant's counsel raised. We put this item on the agenda thinking it would be going forward. On June 19, a couple of days after the agenda and materials were published, the Appellant's counsel sent an email saying that he's out of town. The email says out of the county. I assume that it means out of the country and he believed the matter would be postponed.

In this instance, based on that record and correspondence that I have had with Appellant's counsel, we did not choose to remove this from the agenda.

The Board has two options.

Option one, which is our recommendation, would be to find that good cause has not been shown, deny the continuance, and decide the appeal on the written record.

Option two, you may elect to find that good cause has been shown and continue the appeal to a future meeting.

Now, because Appellant's counsel is not here, and because the written record is complete, you have enough to decide the appeal based on the written materials. If you do want oral presentations, if you think that's needed, then recommend continuing and bringing this back at a future time so that the appellant has an opportunity to do that.

<u>Board Comments & Questions</u>

Mr. Kieckhefer said I'm of the opinion that the record in our packet is complete. We should be fully capable of making a decision, and I don't see a need to continue the item.

Ms. Aldean asked if we've confirmed that the appellant is not here. His attorney is absent, but the appellant did have the option of representing himself at this hearing, and I presume he is not in the audience.

Mr. St. Michel said they are not here.

Mr. Bass said it seems like they have historical State Land Commission filings and that kind of thing. Is it that they didn't file for this during a period of time when it was required to register your buoy? Is that why we're not allowing it now?

Mr. St. Michel said no, they do not have the permission from State Lands. That's the crux of the issue.

Ms. Aldean said this motion isn't consistent with the motion that's in our packet. The motion would be to grant the appeal, and that motion would fail, correct?

Mr. St. Michel said because it's a little unusual, and I didn't want to go with the reverse motion. We can use the motions that are on the slides. That is sufficient to address what we have today.

Mr. Kieckhefer asked if it was appropriate to have conversation about the merits of the appeal, or do we need to dispatch the question over the continuance first.

Mr. St. Michel said you can dispatch with the question over the continuance first. Then if you'd like to discuss some of the merits, that's fine as well. Staff were not planning to do a one-sided presentation but are here to answer questions.

Motion:

Mr. Kieckhefer made a motion to find that good cause has not been shown under Rules of Procedure 2.12.3 to continue the Mapes Appeal and proceed with consideration of the appeal based on the written record.

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

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

Mr. Hoenigman asked the Board if there were any questions or comments regarding the merits of Appeal.

<u>Board Comments & Questions</u>

Mr. Kieckhefer said the Board packet was comprehensive and presented the arguments in support of staff's original denial, as well as addressing the concerns that were raised by the appellant. The fact pattern is clear, and the precedent set by the Board during previous appeals on similar or exactly situated arguments are clearly defined. I would be prepared to make a motion to deny the appeal when you're ready.

Motion:

Mr. Kieckhefer said based on the revised motion presented by our general counsel, I would make a motion to deny the Mapes Appeal and uphold staff's denial of the mooring buoy application based on the written record.

Ms. Faustinos said I fully support this recommendation. Staff did an awesome job and bent over backwards to try to address these issues. I support this motion.

Mr. Hoenigman said I don't like to do this without them here but these items take so much staff time, energy, and money that we could be using on other things. Also, there's a lot of time spent by Board members. We need to ensure that once something goes on the agenda that unless there's a critical issue with a lot of notice, we need to proceed.

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

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

9. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Proposed amendments to the TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 37 (to allow additional height for specified marina uses and buildings) and Chapter 90 (to exclude Venice Drive East from the definition of "Major Arterial"); and Proposed Tahoe Keys Marina Redevelopment Project, 2435 Venice Drive East, City of South Lake Tahoe, California, Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs) 022-210-021, 022-210-032, 022-210-040, 022-210-041, 022-210-044, TRPA File Number ERSP2025-0602

TRPA staff Ms. Roll, Principal Planner and Suntex representative, Mr. Feldman provided the presentation.

There are two elements being considered for decision today. The first is adoption of amendments to Chapters 37 and 90 of the Code of Ordinances. The second is the Tahoe Keys Marina Redevelopment Project itself, which includes landside and waterside improvements to the existing marina facility. The project is designed with building heights that are greater than currently allowed by code, so approval of the project is contingent on approval of the code amendments.

I'll begin with some brief project background, and then go through the code amendments before turning it over to the applicant, who will walk through the details of the project.

Both the code amendments and the project were presented as an informational item to the Regional Planning Committee this past March. Then, just last month, the Advisory Planning Commission considered the code amendments and recommended approval.

The Tahoe Keys Marina is located within the City of South Lake Tahoe and is the largest marina in the basin. Some of you may recall touring the property during the last Governing Board tour in June 2025. The project area consists of three upland parcels, as well as a portion of the lagoon shown on the map on the right. The marina is bordered by the Tahoe Keys residential and commercial development to the west, the Upper Truckee River, Upper Truckee Marsh, and Cove East Trail to the east. What makes this marina unique is that it is the only inland marina in the Tahoe Basin. It is located within a man-made lagoon and is physically and visually separated from the main body of Lake Tahoe. That inland location is important because it influences many aspects of the project design, including scenic considerations and the proposed code amendments.

Construction began in the late 1960s, and the marina began officially operating in 1971. By the 1980s, the marina had largely developed into the layout and building footprint that exists today. While portions of the facility have been replaced or repaired over time, there has not been a full renovation of the property in more than four decades. Suntex Marinas acquired the property in December 2021 with a vision of transforming it into a modern marina facility. In May 2025, they submitted the application that is now before the Governing Board.

The project includes building heights that exceed current code allowances. This includes the commercial buildings on the north side of the project area, which are proposed at 34.5 feet; the Dockmaster building, which is in the center of the project area, proposed at 36.5 feet; and finally, the boat storage building, which is proposed at 42 feet on the south end of the project area. Staff evaluated both the project and the proposed code amendments and found that the additional height will not result in significant scenic or environmental impacts due to the marina's inland location. Portions of the buildings on the very north end of the project area may be visible from very limited locations on the lake, but otherwise, this property is not visible from any designated scenic resources.

The additional height also comes with some trade-offs. Building upward rather than outward allows the marina to consolidate its sprawling outdoor boat storage into a building, which provides some visual improvements. It also allows them to reduce land coverage, which preserves space for things such as infiltration BMPs and landscaped areas.

There are two proposed changes to Chapter 37.

First, Code Section 37.5.2.A already allows up to an additional four feet of height for certain recreation uses where specific findings can be made, and that height is capped at 38 feet. The proposed amendment would expand that allowance to include marinas where the marina use is located at least 300 feet landward of the high-water line of Lake Tahoe, as measured from the entrance to a lagoon. We would just be adding another use to this list of eligible recreation uses. Rather than allowing additional height at all marinas, the language was specifically tied to eligibility based on the marina's distance from the lake, which is where the scenic threshold ratings are measured from.

Code Section 37.5.2.C currently allows up to an additional two feet of height for qualifying recreation buildings, with a maximum overall height of 42 feet. The amendment increases that allowance from two feet to four feet while maintaining the 42-foot cap.

The proposed Chapter 37 amendments were written to be narrowly applied to marinas set back at least 300 feet from the lake, including any mooring or water-based structures that are part of the marina use. That would include piers, buoy fields, and similar features. Of the 13 recognized marinas around the lake, Tahoe Keys Marina is the only one that meets this distance requirement. Slide 9 shows the Tahoe Keys Marina project area outlined in red. The stars show the approximate locations of the proposed buildings, and the yellow buffer shows the 300-foot distance from the lake. It gives you a sense of how far back this project area is from the lake.

There is also one proposed amendment to Chapter 90 related to the definition of major arterial. The definition includes all the major highways and connector roads around the lake, and Venice Boulevard is listed as a major arterial. This amendment would correct Venice Boulevard to Venice

Drive and then exclude the eastern portion from the intersection of Tahoe Keys Boulevard to the cul-de-sac at the marina. Slide 11 shows the affected segment of Venice Drive outlined in red, with an X showing where the road ends. Originally, Venice Drive was intended to continue eastward as part of a larger planned development in the eastern half of the Upper Truckee Marsh. That development never happened, and the property was later acquired and restored by the Tahoe Conservancy, leaving Venice Drive East as a dead-end road. Today, the road does not carry through traffic, does not connect neighborhoods or major commercial centers, and functions as a local access road rather than a major arterial.

This amendment is proposed because Chapter 37 requires specific findings for additional height, including Finding 1, which is shown on Slide 11. This finding requires that buildings propose additional height must not extend above a forest canopy or ridgeline when viewed from a major arterial. The proposed buildings will modify some localized views, particularly while traveling on Venice Drive East, but TRPA's Scenic Threshold Program is focused on protecting views from major travel routes and designated scenic resources where the threshold ratings are measured.
To be clear, this amendment does not exempt the project from scenic review. It simply applies the correct standard based on how Venice Drive functions. A full scenic analysis was completed as part of this project.

(presentation continued)

Mr. Feldman thanked Ms. Roll and staff for working closely with Suntex, and we'll talk about some of the outcomes of that collaboration. Julie Roll has done an outstanding job, and we appreciate all the hard work that has gone into this.

Suntex is perhaps the largest marina operator in the United States, with marinas coast to coast, and currently manages almost 50,000 wet and dry slips. That brings a wealth of knowledge that is conspicuously absent from the existing condition. The other thing that is notable about Suntex is that they understand community outreach, support, and collaboration, and have been willing participants in providing benefits.

From Suntex is Eric Metz, their Vice President of Development and part of the design team. We also have Don Clark from Cathexes, who did the land planning, Jason Drew from Nichols Consulting Engineers, and Leslie Suen, LSC Transportation Consultants.

It was in late 2021 that Suntex purchased the marina, and that led to our first opportunity to confer with the Governing Board. When Suntex bought the marina, it was in a significant state of noncompliance and disrepair, none of which was attributable to Suntex, but rather to the prior ownership. Suntex entered into a settlement agreement to address those deficiencies and, timely and quite expeditiously, went through constructing not only a plan for interim BMPs but actually constructing them. During the time between the submission of the settlement agreement and today, we were doing things on the ground in a distressed state to improve environmental quality as best we could, given a challenging playing field.

One of the requirements of the settlement agreement was to proceed with the dock replacement project. In the interim, Suntex reached out to the community in a broad and comprehensive way. We met not only with the California Attorney General's Office and the League to Save Lake Tahoe, but also various business interests and neighbors. We held public meetings and wanted to

gather information to help inform the direction of the reinvention of this project. All of which was, not surprisingly, enormously positive, because anybody who looks at the marina can't say with a straight face that they would like to maintain the existing condition. One of the notable deliverables are that Suntex has reached out and tried to incorporate the Environmental Improvement Program's aspirational goals, as well as public interest goals.

Today, there are 351 parking spaces at the marina. We're proposing a significant reduction to 231. As some of you with development experience will appreciate, that's counterintuitive to Development 101 to reduce public parking. But they're imposing paid parking and reduced parking, and what does that do? It advances alternatives to the private automobile, which is consistent with the Compact. It changes behavior. Willingly, they are imposing paid parking, which is going to discourage the use of private automobiles, as well as reducing the parking supply.

They've also incorporated public circulation, public access to the waterfront, storage for kayaks and paddleboards, coverage reduction, and you'll see the site is the poster child for legacy development that needs to be eradicated and redeveloped. Improved water quality is a no-brainer here. There will be state-of-the-art on-site stormwater management. One of the other things they're doing again, some of this is required, but much of it isn't within this large building we'll talk about for boat storage. They are incorporating a water tank storage facility to improve fire flow and reduce fire risk. They are also incorporating space for emergency medical services, police, fire, and the Coast Guard. It's not required, but they're doing the right thing. Another thing that advances significant values are the slip replacement. Every slip is EV-compatible. They anticipate the transition to electric watercraft. I remember defending lawsuits in the past about polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons but getting electrification into all of these slips is not required, but it has been done.

Again, collaborating with Keep Tahoe Blue, we're incorporating educational components, wayfinding, and, notably, as you know if you've been to the marina, there's a dead-end cul-de-sac. That's why it's appropriate to re-designate Venice Drive as a local road as opposed to a major arterial. It's the gateway to Conservancy Cove East. Suntex is also, not required, building public restrooms at the trailhead as part of this project. They've also adopted an aquatic invasive species management plan and purchased clean-drain-dry equipment to facilitate managing aquatic invasive species.

This is what they purchased: a 50-year-old marina in a state of considerable disrepair, with a deteriorating dock system constructed of materials where people simply didn't know better. Those materials had essentially dissolved into the waterway, creating an environmental challenge. Again, that was inherited, but what Suntex did before they even had approval of what is before you today is very important. They went out and spent over $15 million to replace those slips with state-of-the-art, high-density polyethylene, enclosed, encapsulated materials that will resist deterioration and eliminate the risk of microplastic contamination. Many developers would not take that step before the upland project was approved. Again, that speaks highly of a partner that has put their money where their mouth is.

We have a lot of projects that come forward, and as you know, 90 percent of our land is publicly owned and 10 percent is privately owned. Much of that private ownership is legacy development. This is legacy development that didn't have to comply with any design or development standards. And that is bad.

How do we incentivize people to invest and change that? We're fortunate that we have come together, reached out to the community, and formulated what we think is a stunning redevelopment plan that has been scrutinized by the public, by staff, and by the experts engaged to help us deliver the best environmental outcome, the best scenic outcome, and the best operational outcome. We've done this through an arduous process. That process to date has probably cost about $1.5 million. We could double that number and spend another couple of years on an EIS and not have any more information than you have today.

So, this array of disorganization and sprawl is proposed to be consolidated into a new, intelligent plan. The existing condition which used to be a focal point, a major gathering spot in the south end of the community is not salvageable. It is time to scrape, rebuild, and reinvent. One of the lessons learned from looking at this aerial is the far-right portion of the slide, where you see a parking area and boat launch. If you experienced the operation at the Tahoe Keys Marina, you had a queue of trailers and boats backing up into areas where you were trying to park your car, walk to the restaurant, or get to your boat dock.

So, what were they thinking? The lesson learned is how we can improve circulation and management of this opportunity? With the assistance of some pretty smart people and the experience of Suntex, reorienting the land uses will be a much more effective use of this space. Rather than have pedestrian activity and boat launching competition and conflict, we've relocated the boat launch facilities to the south end of the project. All boating activities, the launch, storage, fueling, and limited maintenance done on-site is on the left side of Slide 24. On the right side are the marina accessory uses, food and beverage, and pedestrian amenities available for the public to enjoy without conflict with automobiles, boats, and trailers.

The building on the left is a large building. It is a multi-use building. We sometimes refer to it as a boat barn, but it's also a water tank storage facility for the fire flow I mentioned, as well as public service accommodation for police, fire, EMS, and the Coast Guard.

There is also 32,000 square feet behind that on the same parcel that was the subject of a negotiation between the Tahoe Keys Property Owners Association and Suntex. That transaction has not been consummated. It may or may not happen. It's a private transaction that has nothing to do with this approval, and that 32,000 square feet has nothing to do with the environmental analysis that has been completed for this project. It is excluded and irrelevant.

We do need some modest building height, and part of this is because of the limited site. We need to import fill, so we need to raise the grade by 2.5 feet. Why? Because we don't have enough land to infiltrate, and we certainly don't have enough land to put parking underneath. By bringing the site up, we achieve an environmental benefit with better stormwater retention and infiltration. We're maximizing the opportunity and not asking for a third story on these buildings. We're asking for enough height to comply with the city's 5:12 roof pitch to have beautiful, interesting architecture. The additional height, 42 feet, is typical in recreation areas for certain support buildings. It is necessary for us to take that chaos and clutter of scattered boats on racks, which could easily be 42 feet high, and enclose them in an organized, conditioned space.

It has aquatic invasive species benefits because we're going to try to keep these boats on-site and not have them go off-site, be trailered off, come back, and then require cleaning and maintenance.

We did have a complete scenic analysis performed on these proposed height amendments. The marina is not visible from any TRPA-designated scenic roadway unit or travel route, and the conclusion was that this impact was less than significant. Scenic vistas were preserved and improved, and structures blend with the environment. Dark colors and proposed landscaping result in a less-than-significant impact. As was noted before, the structures are six football fields back from the high-water mark of Lake Tahoe.

When we went through this scenic exercise, we had the benefit of the Executive Director attending the balloon study. TRPA staff scrutinized this with the vigor and rigor that you would expect, and I think the scenic analysis demonstrates that we were sensitive to the scenic impacts. In fact, the consequence of all of this is an improved scenic condition.

Slide 28 shows the dockmaster building and the beginning of a waterfront promenade. We're creating a walkable area almost a third of a mile along the waterfront. Behind that, we have a building that will have a boat showroom and, above it, three workforce housing units. We would love to have more, but for reasons that are not merely economic the reasons are that workforce housing isn't an allowed use we have three grandfathered units, and we want to maximize that opportunity. The boat launch relocated to the south side of the project, which will also have the gantry crane. This is a big building. It needs to be a big building because we need to store boats in it. There are trade-offs. It is also a very expensive boat barn to build, with architectural variation, use of materials, and use of colors. Slide 31 shows the existing vegetation screens the entry down Venice Drive. The impact as you enter what is almost a driveway to the marina is far less prominent than you might imagine. We also looked at it from across the lagoon, where homeowners are living. The historic condition shows an array of boats, trailers, stacking materials, and structures that we don't even know what they are disorganized chaos. The proposed condition shows the multi-use storage, water tank, and EMS facility.

The only public comment we have received from homeowners looking at this is how soon can you construct it? We may hear something different today, but that is what we've heard to date, and we've reached out with considerable effort.

I did mention that we are constructing public restrooms at the trailhead for the Conservancy. It is a multi-use building with trash pickup on the left-hand side, and as noted by the City of South Lake Tahoe's review, they have requested the large garage door be a darker color. We're happy to paint it a darker color. As you enter the marina, this is where we have the pedestrian-serving buildings, retail, and food and beverage. This will be anchored by a large, approximately 15,000-square-foot circular public assembly area called the Basin.

The Basin provides an opportunity to host art displays, educational opportunities, wine walks, and other activities that activate the center of the development and create a four-season opportunity rather than a five-month marina. The marina will incorporate a variety of food and beverages. We'll have grab-and-go, coffee, burgers, and beer, mid-price-point dining, and higher-end dining. That will be supported with additional marina accessory retail. This is an active place that, at the south end of the community, has been sorely absent.

There is an argument that this alone will reduce VMT because people at that end of town won't have to drive to the tourist core for everything. It serves not only the 1,600 residents of the Tahoe Keys but also the adjacent Tahoe Island Park and Gardner Mountain communities, which are within

walking and biking distance.

The architecture incorporates natural materials of wood, rock, and pitched roofs to comply with the city's design guidelines.

Slide 35 would be where the drop-off is. There will be paid parking, and there will also be valet parking. Again, this keeps cars out of the pedestrian zone. The promenade, which winds all the way around, providing tremendous views as well as views toward Cove East, another amazing viewshed. Fresh Catch is depicted in Slide 37 which was the focal point of the Tahoe Keys Marina for Decades. The proposal is to replace the blighted structure with state-of-the-art contemporary mountain architecture and materials, creating a marina that serves the community, serves the environment, and is economically viable.

I would also like to say that we have benefited from our collaboration with Keep Tahoe Blue. Keep Tahoe Blue has had a very active role in helping us realize the vision. We have been responsive to their needs, and the fact that they have come to the table on this is notable. Their assistance is much appreciated.

Public Comments

Gavin Feiger, Policy Director, Keep Tahoe Blue said we have been working closely with Suntex since they purchased the marina a couple of years ago. Keep Tahoe Blue considered trying to buy that marina before Suntex did. We didn't quite have these plans for it, but the idea was to have it redeveloped to an environmentally friendly redevelopment project. This is the best opportunity that we've seen, not just at Keep Tahoe Blue, but I think any of us in Tahoe have seen, to redevelop the Keys in decades. There probably won't be another opportunity like this.

Suntex, from our perspective, has proven to be a good partner. You probably all know that we don't generally support projects. The best you usually get is our coveted stamp of no opposition. This project gets that. We'd like to comment about what parts of the project that we support. There are items required by TRPA, and we went over a lot of those today, as well as some of the above-and-beyond efforts. We have also come to a side agreement with Suntex through a binding memorandum of understanding (MOU) to do even more above-and-beyond work. That includes things like more education, interpretive and educational signage, educational spaces that are open to nonprofits, electric vehicle charging, more bike parking, and restriping Venice, although that's now also a condition of the city's approval, so there will finally be a bike lane again. There are a handful of things like that that go above and beyond what is required for permit and project approvals. Those required items are reflected in the permit conditions that Julie Roll and her team did such a good job putting together.

That will also be a great test of the new accountability dashboard, because there are some great and important permit conditions in there, especially around aquatic invasive species and containment. We all know the Keys is the epicenter of aquatic invasive plant species in Tahoe. It's the biggest marina, it's bigger than all the other marinas in Tahoe combined. The Keys Marina needs a lot of attention. These permit conditions, along with Suntex's partnership and the above-and-beyond actions they're already taking, show a lot of potential to contain the invasive species problem within the Keys until we collectively can figure out a solution to eradicate them.

Again, those permit conditions, along with testing out the accountability dashboard that you built this year, there are going to be key provisions to make sure that happens. That's what we're hoping TRPA focus their energy on.

Alan Miller, Professional Civil and Environmental Engineer with a long regulatory history involving the Tahoe Keys Marina, I am speaking about my extensive written comments. While I'm not against the project and concept, there are a number of very significant issues and environmental effects that must be addressed before approval are granted. This environmental document was a rushed and deficient attempt to subvert the TRPA Compact and regulations yet again in this highly sensitive area, already so heavily impacted by Lake Tahoe. I pointed out numerous technical and legal deficiencies in the agenda item, as well as a lack of substantial evidence to support a finding of no significant effect.

Like many others, I suggested that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is required for the project. More than that, TRPA rules require you to prepare joint environmental documents with other approving agencies, such as the City of South Lake Tahoe and other state and federal agencies, whenever feasible, and you deliberately did not do that. The City Planning Commission's even worse attempt at a negative declaration, nearly identical to this one, has been appealed to the City Council, placing a stay on the project. I suggest that you should not approve the project today and instead prepare a joint Environmental Impact Statement and Report with the other involved agencies, as required from the beginning. Then, fully study the impacts and mitigation measures with public input so that this project can achieve its goals while protecting the environment to the greatest extent feasible.

Lake Tahoe has a truly extraordinary level of contamination with microplastics. For nearly four years, I've been raising the issue of toxic microplastics from the piers and other plastic structures in the shorezone that you have approved for decades. The plastic decking is a substantial concern, and I have staked my reputation on credible assertions that the decaying plastic shorezone structures are a significant contributor of microplastics to Lake Tahoe, if not the greatest contributor. Moreover, they are a controllable source, unlike any other affecting lake clarity.

Rather than face the microplastics issue you have caused with your short-sighted approvals, you have engaged in activities to cover up, misdirect, and delay abatement action, even though time is of the essence and there are viable alternatives using wood, metal, stone, or concrete. Yes, the decayed piers were removed, but with this proposal you are going to increase those impacts without addressing the legacy of toxic contamination from plastics in the soil, waters, fish, and wildlife, while exposing people to toxic waste unknowingly.

I oppose that, and I am here to demand that you cease what I believe is your fraud and criminal intent to cover up the microplastics issue you have caused. Stop violating the Compact and all your regulations. You could actually do something to protect Lake Tahoe and people by preparing an Environmental Impact Statement for this project jointly with the City and other agencies, as required, to determine what can reasonably be done to keep Tahoe pure, microplastics endure, use wood, metal, and stone in the shorezone. There is no exemption or right to pollute simply because it has been occurring for a long time.

Ashley Farr speaking on behalf of the South Lake Tahoe Windjammers Yacht Club (SLTWYC). The SLTWYC is a nonprofit, volunteer-run 501(c)(3) organization whose mission is to build a diverse

boating community on Lake Tahoe through sailing access, boating education, water safety, community outreach, racing, and stewardship of our lake and waterways. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Tahoe Keys Marina Redevelopment Project.

I want to be clear that our organization supports thoughtful reinvestment in the marina. Modernized facilities, updated infrastructure, and continued economic investment are important to the future of South Lake Tahoe's waterfront. Our comments today are not in opposition to redevelopment. Rather, we hope to highlight the importance of preserving meaningful access for the local recreational boating community as this important project moves forward. For many South Shore residents, Tahoe Keys Marina serves as one of the primary access points to Lake Tahoe for sailing, boating, education, community events, and organized recreation. Historically, we have partnered with the marina to host regattas, boating events, and programs that connect local residents to the lake. As boating costs continue to rise throughout the Tahoe Basin, practical access to the water is becoming increasingly difficult for many local residents. We are grateful that Suntex and Tahoe Keys Marina have expressed their desire to support community participation through access to launching facilities, storage opportunities, recreational boating, and community events.

We also believe it's important to recognize the role marina access plays in sustaining community-based education. Local sailing and boating programs provide opportunities for both youth and adults to develop water safety skills, environmental stewardship, and a lifelong connection to Lake Tahoe. These programs depend on affordable, reliable access to the waterfront. As redevelopment moves forward, we appreciate Suntex active interest in supporting educational and recreational opportunities that serve the broader South Lake community and ensure future generations have meaningful access to the lake.

Lake Tahoe is one of our region's greatest assets. We believe it is important that local residents have opportunities not only to enjoy its beauty from shore, but to actively participate on the water and develop a lifelong connection to the lake. We appreciate Suntex investment in this project and encourage continued consideration of the local boating community throughout the redevelopment process. South Lake Tahoe Windjammers Yacht Club stands ready to serve as a constructive community partner and resource to Suntex and Tahoe Keys Marina as this project moves forward.

Carol Chaplin, Lake Tahoe Visitors Authority said the Tahoe Keys Marina property presents a rare opportunity to transform an aging facility into a modern, environmentally responsible, and community-oriented asset that will benefit residents, visitors, and Lake Tahoe itself for decades to come. We heard in the presentation that this is going to become another community center that we need on the South Shore. This project incorporates meaningful environmental improvements, including modern infrastructure, sustainable design elements, and measures intended to improve environmental performance and protect the long-term health of Lake Tahoe. Continuing to reinvest in and improve existing developed areas is exactly the type of thoughtful planning that supports both environmental stewardship and responsible growth.

I'm particularly encouraged by the project's efficient use of already developed land and the inclusion of community-serving amenities, including a community gathering space. These enhancements recognize that the marina is more than a business it is an important part of the South Shore community and a place where residents and visitors connect with Lake Tahoe. Suntex has demonstrated that it is committed to being a long-term partner in our community. Since acquiring the marina, the company has invested locally, supported economic activity, and

recognized the important role the marina plays in the South Shore economy. Equally important, Suntex engaged residents and stakeholders early in the planning process, seeking community input and demonstrating a willingness to listen, collaborate, and refine the project. Lake Tahoe thrives when environmental stewardship, economic vitality, and community benefits work together. I believe this project achieves that balance and represents a significant investment in the future of our community. I encourage approval of the Tahoe Keys Marina Redevelopment Project and look forward to seeing this important community asset continue to evolve and serve the needs of residents, visitors, and the South Shore economy well into the future.

Bob Hassett has had the privilege and the responsibility of operating five of the seven marinas in South Lake Tahoe over the past 35 years. I currently own Camp Richardson Marina and operate Round Hill Pines Beach Resort. I owned the Fresh Ketch business from 2000 to 2013. For 13 years, we operated that great facility. We left in 2013 because the previous owner just let everything go into disrepair. It was so disheartening. The whole community loved that restaurant. It was our favorite restaurant before we owned it, and we hope that Suntex can bring it back to its full excitement.

The previous owner did nothing for the marina, and that's why we decided to get out. It was just time to move away because we saw where it was going. We were so excited when Suntex came in. Lake Tahoe is a world treasure. We have an obligation to protect and preserve it as we enjoy it. The gateways to that treasure are the marinas and beaches. To have a company like Suntex come in and be willing to put tens of millions of dollars into this property is an opportunity that we have to take. It's not just for the community; it's for the lake. The improvements aren't just to the infrastructure: they also include environmental benefits that the lake is going to achieve.

The big question I ask myself here is: If this project doesn't get approved, what happens? I think the answer is nothing. And that's something I don't think any of us should be willing to put up with. We have a company here willing to invest and make the marina the incredible asset it can be for the whole basin. We really need to take advantage of this opportunity. The project looks like a fantastic project, and I strongly encourage you to approve it.

Steve Teshara speaking on behalf of the Tahoe Chamber. We have followed this project through its development process. The marina is at a very complex intersection of land, waterways, the lake, a variety of land uses, public access opportunities, and significant recreational and commercial activities. We also know that this is the largest marina on the lake, serving as an important access point to the lake for 50 years. Although many important issues need to be addressed, the property has experienced very limited investment in recent years. As noted in your staff report, many of the existing structures date back to the original construction.

When Suntex acquired the marina, the company indicated that they were prepared to make a substantial investment, and that's what's necessary. They also immediately understood the need to work collaboratively with TRPA and other interests to first address the most pressing needs for environmental and infrastructure remediation. The needed priority activities were captured in the TRPA-Suntex Settlement Agreement in November of 2024, which was approved by this Board.

While working on the compliance obligations set forth in that agreement, Suntex began developing a more thoughtful, contemporary marina design addressing the full range of environmental, economic, and marina community needs. Throughout this process, Suntex has continued to work

closely with TRPA, the City, and other partners, some of whom you've heard from today, to bring forward an excellent example of a major environmental redevelopment project. We use that term a lot—environmental redevelopment. This is one of them, and this is something that we shouldn't turn our back on.

In the judgment of the Chamber, the staff report you have today is thorough and detailed. It covers the proposed agency code amendments, the reasons for them, and the other pertinent issues that the staff report identifies in detail on pages 238 to 242. The 5G findings are appropriate. The proposed Tahoe Keys Marina Redevelopment Project is indeed an excellent example of environmental redevelopment, and the Chamber respectfully requests that your Board approve the motions related to the code amendments and the motion for the project.

Joby Cefalu, lifelong resident of the Tahoe Basin, a boater, and someone who has spent decades advocating for the protection and preservation of Lake Tahoe. I'm here today in support of the proposed renovation of the Tahoe Keys Marina by Suntex Marinas. As someone who deeply values Tahoe's environment, this project represents exactly the type of investment we should encourage.

Much of the existing marina infrastructure is aging and inefficient. Renovating these facilities provides an opportunity to modernize fuel systems, improve stormwater management, upgrade utilities, and incorporate the latest environmental protections that help safeguard water quality. Doing nothing leaves us with old infrastructure that was never designed to meet today's environmental standards. Equally important is the stewardship Suntex has demonstrated since becoming involved in the Tahoe Keys Marina. They have shown a willingness to work with stakeholders, invest substantial private capital into the property, and pursue improvements that benefit both marina users and the broader community. Responsible stewardship is measured not only by words, but by a commitment to maintaining and improving facilities for future generations, and Suntex has demonstrated that commitment.

There are also significant economic benefits to consider. The marina supports local jobs, tourism, recreation, and businesses throughout South Lake Tahoe. A modern, well-maintained marina enhances the visitor experience, supports property values, and helps ensure that boating-related economic activity remains in the Basin rather than being lost to other destinations. Most importantly, this project reflects a principle that many of us who have lived here our entire lives understand.

Protecting Tahoe does not mean freezing it in time. It means investing wisely, replacing outdated infrastructure, and ensuring that our facilities meet modern environmental expectations. Thoughtful renovation is often one of the best environmental choices we can make.

I respectfully encourage the Board to support this project and allow Suntex to continue investing in a marina that serves our community, our economy, and the long-term health of Lake Tahoe.

Robert Haen, Contractor who worked with Suntex to complete the dock replacement project. As a local business owner, Suntex has cut no corners on the project, and we talk a lot about access—access to the lake, access to the gem that we all love here. One big thing that I'd like to point out is all the ADA access improvements that are included. People who were never able to use the docks in the past will now be able to do so.

I also wanted to speak to the project's economic benefits. This will bring in a lot of highly skilled tradesmen jobs, and there is significant value in that. Additionally, once the project is complete, there will be many jobs associated with operating the new marina.

Mike Dunn is here today to express my strong support of the project, the proposed redevelopment plan for the Tahoe Keys Marina. I originally planned to write you an email regarding my opinion, which would have been lengthier and more detailed because I've tracked this project for a long time. But after running it through AI, it made me look like a novelist and a wordsmith, and it was really awkward. I canceled my morning appointment so I could come here and express my support of the project in my opinion and in my own words.

I moved to Tahoe in 1992, where it was supposed to be one winter, like so many people. I fell in love with Tahoe and chose to make it my home, where I'm raising my family and building my career. I used to live in the Keys and used to go to Fresh Ketch. My wife used to work in the marina. As an avid boater for decades, I've used the marina and its services for four decades.

Unfortunately, as we have seen with several aging commercial properties and cores throughout the Basin, the Tahoe Keys Marina has experienced a significant decline over time. Businesses closed, services diminished, and the property gradually became underutilized and visually blighting. I've had multiple opportunities to follow this project and review the proposed redevelopment plan, and it is absolutely awesome. This is what redevelopment should look like. Its design and circulation are well planned. It is based on thoughtful consideration of the site and the experience it will provide. It will offer highly sought-after and valued services and amenities not only to our tourist but to all of us locals.

In researching the project, I was pleased to see the enhanced BMPs, which show a meaningful commitment to environmental stewardship and improved Basin protection, modern infrastructure, and improved water quality measures. Improvements in any area of Lake Tahoe are definitely needed at this site. I also am beyond stoked to see the emphasis on improved public access to the water, particularly for non-motorized watercraft, improving access for activities such as paddleboarding and kayaking. These improvements not only create an amenity for our visitors, but they also provide another way to support locals who seek a life centered on health and wellness. The new owners of the marina operate over 100 marinas. This is not some random developer working outside their area of expertise. In my research on Suntex, I see a quality, experienced partner who is choosing to invest in our community, and I don't see risk here.

The redevelopment plan is going to be an important enhancement to South Lake Tahoe, and it will improve home values for the locals who live around the project. It will potentially shine a fresh light and create revived demand to live in the Tahoe Keys community. This is going to be an incredible amenity in everyone's backyard a clean and highly programmed operation that provides walking and e-bike access to thousands of local homeowners.

There is no perfect project, especially with the challenges that we face, but if I've ever seen anything as close to perfect, this is it. I strongly suggest you approve this project and everything that the developer is requesting.
Jean Merkelbach, resident of Lake Tahoe, for 45 years. Like Mike, I came for one ski season and stayed. I've been involved with the Tahoe Keys Marina from 2007 through 2021 in a variety of ways

and am really excited by what Suntex Marinas has done since their purchase of the marina. They are the first owners in decades to really care about this community and to care about the safety of the public that visits the marina.

Scott Birkey, partner with the law firm Cox, Castle & Nicholson and I represent the Tahoe Keys Property Owners Association (TKPOA). We submitted a comment letter on the marina redevelopment project yesterday for you to take into consideration as you deliberate on this item.

Mr. Feldman has already alluded to this, but we want to ensure that the Board is fully aware of the fact that TKPOA is currently in contract with Suntex to acquire a portion of the property that is included within the project area. Specifically, a 32,000-square-foot portion of the lot designated as APN 022-210-040. That contract contemplates that Suntex will take whatever actions are necessary to ensure that this portion can be conveyed to TKPOA for their use as a corporation yard. Both the staff report and the Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) omit this important background and context. Mr. Feldman stated that the agreement between Suntex and TKPOA has not yet been consummated, and he has stated in other forums that TKPOA still has actions to take under the agreement.

These statements are incorrect. TKPOA has consummated the option in the agreement. Suntex has since acknowledged that the option was exercised properly. Therefore, it is Suntex, not TKPOA, that still has obligations remaining under the agreement, and in particular, to convey the 32,000 square feet of property to TKPOA.

The reason these details are relevant to your consideration today is that the conveyance of this property to TKPOA for development as a corporation yard may have significant implications for the marina's design and layout. We highlighted some of those implications in our letter.

To take just one example, conveying this property to TKPOA could further increase the marina project's already nonconforming coverage. This would mean that the marina project may require revisions or other design changes to shrink or modify its development footprint. Neither this nor any other implications related to the conveyance of this property is evaluated or considered in the staff report or the IEC. This suggests that Suntex has not disclosed to TRPA the existence of the agreement between the parties or the ramifications of that agreement to the marina project.

In addition to all of this, as discussed in our letter, the environmental review for the project includes what we think are several defects, not the least of which is a failure to adequately evaluate scenic, biological, and traffic impacts.

I understand that Suntex is now working through the agreement with TKPOA, but in the meantime, TKPOA would like to make sure that TRPA is aware of all of this background as you consider whether to approve the code amendments and the project this morning.

Diondra Colquhoun, local business owner operating out of the Tahoe Keys Marina said I am excited about the redevelopment project and the opportunity it creates for residents, visitors, employees, and fellow small business owners. I believe thoughtful investment in this property can strengthen our local economy, create jobs, support entrepreneurship, and provide a waterfront destination that reflects the quality and beauty of Lake Tahoe. Our business brings thousands of customers to the marina every summer, giving me a firsthand view of both its tremendous potential and its

current challenges.

While the marina serves an important role in our community, many of the existing buildings, infrastructure, and parking areas have reached the end of their useful life and no longer reflect the experience visitors expect when they come to one of the most beautiful destinations in the world.

For years, I have believed the marina has the potential to be much more than simply a place to launch and store boats. It has the opportunity to become a true waterfront gathering place for residents and visitors alike, a destination that enhances the South Shore experience while supporting local businesses and recreation. One of the most exciting aspects of this project is the opportunity it creates for local small businesses and year-round jobs in a primarily seasonal destination. A revitalized marina will attract more visitors, create more foot traffic, and provide opportunities for businesses to thrive. This project will create an ecosystem where restaurants, retail shops, tour operators, and service providers can all succeed together. It will elevate South Lake Tahoe's appeal and encourages visitors to stay longer and support more local businesses.

While there has been discussion regarding the height of the proposed marina storage building, I believe it is important to consider the overall visual impact of the project. Today, much of the boat storage is spread throughout the property in a manner that creates visual clutter and detracts from the appearance of the marina. Consolidating boat storage into a purpose-built structure will help organize those uses, reduce the appearance of scattered storage areas, and create a cleaner, more attractive waterfront environment overall. The question is not simply the height of a single building, but whether the overall marina will be more attractive, functional, and welcoming than it is today. This project accomplishes that goal.

Parking and traffic impacts have been a topic of discussion throughout this process. As a charter operator, we have always encouraged and partnered with local transportation providers, such as Uber, Lyft, and taxi services, to reduce the number of vehicles brought to the marina by our customers. Many other charter operators do the same. Several staff members ride their bikes to work. It's important to all of us to minimize traffic and parking impacts, and reduce our overall vehicle footprint and use alternative transportation whenever possible. The marina's location within the Tahoe Keys neighborhood also provides a unique advantage, as many local residents can walk or bike to the property with their families.

It has the potential to become a true community destination that encourages alternative transportation and reduces reliance on vehicle trips for local visitors. The Tahoe Keys Marina Redevelopment Project represents an investment not only in the marina itself, but in the future of South Lake Tahoe's economy, small business community, and waterfront experience. I'm proud to support the project.

Tim Flanagan, member of the Beach and Harbor Association that is adjacent to the west of the Tahoe Keys Marina Redevelopment Project, and I'm here to speak on behalf of and in favor of approval of the project. The project is positioned as a model of environmentally responsible redevelopment in the Basin. It addresses the long-standing environmental challenges on site while delivering a world-class facility for the residents of South Lake Tahoe and the Basin.

It also addresses a deteriorated and outdated facility, and that is something that is critical to improving water quality, especially through the BMPs throughout the site, modernized stormwater

treatment, runoff management, and enhanced overall water quality. Suntex is also bringing its expertise from operating world-class marinas across the country. In addition, I think the boat barn offers additional AIS mitigation through on-site storage by keeping boats and trailers on-site and contained in indoor storage. That is a value-add and enhances water quality in the East Cove.

It's important to note the improved recreational and public access. The continuous waterfront promenade, the expanded opportunities for locals, non-motorized, or sail-powered craft to access the water, and the amenities connecting to the California Tahoe Conservancy (CTC) project.

I often frequent Venice Drive East, either going to the Beach and Harbor or to East Cove. A new state-of-the-art facility would be an improvement over the current condition, and it would not jeopardize views of Heavenly, Freel Peak, or even Tallac when you're headed back west.

I'm very much in favor of the project and can't speak highly enough about what the Suntex team has done so far since they've taken over the marina. They've been transparent in their communication, they've lived up to their promises, and they've been a great partner and neighbor at the adjoining parcel. We look forward to the approval and future development of the project.

Ash Avildsen said someone who's lived in Lake Tahoe for several years, loves it, champions it, and also rents a slip from Tahoe Keys Marina every summer. The place is a mess. It's embarrassing when you compare it to Tahoe City's Marina, which I frequently visit with friends and family. If there's a real opportunity here for them to renovate, modernize, and make the marina much more efficient, including improving how the boats are parked. The current condition is a smoldering dumpster fire as far as what I would consider appropriate water management. Unless there is a more compelling alternative, this project should absolutely move forward and allow the marina to be properly renovated and updated.

As someone who lives and breathes Lake Tahoe, the current state of that entire marina area, which I use every summer, is so off-brand for what Lake Tahoe should represent as a world-class marina destination. Unless there is a very compelling, significant reason not to allow it to be upgraded, I truly believe this project will be what's best for the community and for everyone who uses the marina.

Applicant Rebuttal

Mr. Feldman said I think we've covered this, kind of what I think is beyond the scope of the environmental issues with Tahoe Keys. We hope to work that out with them. I have nothing further and be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean said it's my understanding that TRPA has no obligation to enforce private agreements between the applicant and third parties, in this case, the TKPOA. Could you expand on the TKPOA's attorney's comments about this 32,000-square-foot area and the commitment that has been made?

Mr. Feldman said there is a real estate transaction between the Tahoe Keys Property Owners

Association and Suntex, and there was a condition precedent to the transfer of 32,000 square feet from the existing parcel. The existing parcel contains the boat barn and multi-use building, as well as undeveloped land behind it. TRPA does not permit the subdivision of private land. So, there is not a subdivision opportunity to satisfy the condition precedent.

I am pleased to report that I had nothing to do with the transaction. I'm just bringing you up to speed that there is a procedural obstacle to perfecting the transfer of this land. The parties are at the table working collaboratively, but the important takeaway from this is twofold.

The first is that the 32,000 square feet are not within the project area. It has not been considered in terms of its environmental impacts, and to the extent the issue has been raised as to what the future use of that parcel is that would be speculative. We have been told it could be used to drill a well. We have been told it could be used for a corporation yard. We have been told it could be used for a water tank. If and when that property changes hands, TKPOA will come forward with whatever it intends to do with that property, and TRPA and other interested parties will then evaluate that proposal and establish the appropriate conditions of approval if a project comes forward. It would be independent, completely segregated, and have nothing to do with this project.

Ms. Aldean said microplastics are a concern for a lot of people. One of the biggest proponents of using alternative materials is Mr. Miller. I understand that there are brown aluminum docks that can be used, and I'm assuming that the polyurethane synthetic plastic material is being used on the decking and is not being used as part of the flotation.

Mr. Metz, Vice President of Development for Suntex Marinas said we have an aluminum deck system that has High-Density Polyethylene (HDPE), which is a polymer system. Those are the floats that encapsulate the flotation devices. Inside of those, as part of the submersion process, the technology we use is that the float inside is all bound together. So, if it were to be punctured, you are not going to get the beads and the balls that come out from that. It is a monolithic float there on the water with an aluminum decking frame. On top of that are concrete pedestals, so you're walking on a full concrete system. It is one of the best systems for this application.

Ms. Aldean said and one of the most environmentally sound.

Mr. Metz said there are other systems out there, but they don't necessarily work as well in the winter, particularly in Tahoe conditions with ice.

Mr. St. Michel reminded the Board that when you approved the settlement agreement in 2024, part of that involved the dock rebuilding. We worked with Suntex on putting in a standard that was based on a bill in California. It came directly from that legislation regarding best practices for what these dock materials should be made of to protect against plastic and Styrofoam coming out. The Board built that requirement into the settlement agreement that we approved with Suntex.

Ms. Aldean said beyond the approval of this project, it has been intimated that some action was taken by the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) in terms of forwarding a recommendation to the Governing Board about standardizing the requirements in our Code of Ordinances, Is that correct?

Mr. St. Michel said we'd have to go back and confirm that. I think that's outside the scope of this,

other than a recommendation.
Ms. Conrad-Saydah asked if the enforcement fees from this action are sufficient to ensure that the developer meets the required and voluntary commitments during and after construction. With searches about Suntex, there are complaints regarding crumbling infrastructure over time and aggressive management elsewhere in the country. I want to make sure we have sufficient enforcement fees should that come up in this development.

The thing with a big company is it's easy to find dirty laundry about them elsewhere, so I want to avoid any unintended consequences by having sufficient enforcement authority and fees.
Ms. Regan said we have not yet determined the cost of the BMP security deposit, correct, Julie?

Ms. Roll said correct.

Ms. Regan said, on a project of this scope, we request the BMP Management Plan, and that then triggers the amount of security that we will hold. That should be more than sufficient to cover any compliance issues related to the water quality system. There are water mitigation fees in the project, I believe in the amount of $84,000, that goes into our general mitigation account to support other environmental projects in the Basin.

Ms. Roll said Ms. Regan covered it. We'll collect our typical security deposit of 110 percent of the cost of installing the BMPs. We also have our normal enforcement procedures outside the scope of the permit.

Ms. Conrad-Saydah said for future work, we should think about amending our rules and regulations to include sufficient worker housing. In Mr. Feldman's presentation, he noted that the rules and regulations prevented that from occurring. I want to flag that for the future.

Lastly, we have seen permits approved in the past that have never actually been pulled, and the development occurring. Do we think this development will occur? And if this permit goes through, at what point do we expect construction to begin?

Mr. Feldman said I would say the level of confidence should be quite high, since they've just spent $15 million replacing the docks with no approval for the upland structures, which are likely to require a further investment of more than $100 million. They have demonstrated the ability to perform, and they self-finance, so this isn't contingent upon outside financing. I'm glad you teed this up because I think it's important to recognize that our process is a complex process. It's a lengthy process. Suntex is uniquely poised to execute. You're correct, we have lots of projects that come before you, many of which have been in bankruptcy or have been foreclosed upon. The opportunity to do business in Lake Tahoe is complex, expensive, and replete with risk. Of the array of projects that I've had the opportunity to be familiar with, I can't think of a project with a higher level of confidence of execution than Suntex in this instance.

Ms. Conrad-Saydah said I would request that in the future, if we provide this much time for an applicant presentation, we really focus on objectivity and facts so that we can have a shorter presentation and speak specifically to the objective facts.

Ms. Leumer echoed Ms. Conrad-Saydah's last comment. Also, building on Ashley's point about the enforcement piece, I'm curious about what we're doing to make sure there are measurable

outcomes and how they are tied to our thresholds. It's always helpful to connect those dots. If there is going to be long-term monitoring, what does that look like? How are we making sure that information is reported back to us and the public?

Given the significance of this project and the implications of what it could mean for the lake if things aren't followed through on the way they've been promised; we need to make sure we are keeping an eye on this over time. If things are not being complied with, I would like to see significantly high fines to ensure that we are holding people accountable to what they have promised.

Ms. Regan said the presentation that Ken Kasman made to you last month is a good example of tracking compliance over time for a large project. This kind of project is the perfect candidate to be really transparent to the community. We've heard a lot of public comments about this, and we all know that once construction starts, the public interest is even higher than it is at the outset. There will be a lot of eyes on this project, and we'll have our inspectors be very engaged during construction, making sure all the BMPs are followed and all permit conditions are met. There is also an extensive list of permit conditions that will be part of the tracking process to ensure all obligations are met.

Ms. Roll said no, you said exactly what I wanted to say. We've had a lot of internal discussions about how we can get this into our new tracking software as a pilot project. There was a lot of discussion about how we write the permit conditions so they are enforceable and measurable, etc.

Mr. Bass said we've heard a lot about the project and I very much support it. As has been said today, this part of town and the marina really need reinvestment, and I think it will really serve the public and our locals well. It has been mentioned that the ADA access is significant. There is no other marina that has this style of ADA access, along with the number of charters that operate from here and provide so many people access to the lake. There are some concerns around the reduction in parking. I do believe in the theory that it is about mode shift and behavioral shift regarding how people will get there. It would be good to see a shuttle that could potentially operate for some of the larger charters, so when people are booking a charter, they have an option to be picked up at their hotel. I think that's a great recommendation. Also, we should consider things like secure bike storage, so people can come by bike and have a secure place to store it.

But, overall, I think the design here will really improve the Tahoe Keys Marina. Again, the commitment shown by the $15 million investment made before approval, shows that Suntex is going to do what they've said they're going to do. I'm happy to support this. I think it's great to see this kind of investment in town.

The other thing is that 32,000-square-foot parcel, it seems to me that getting a parcel number issued there is probably not going to happen. So, what is the highest and best use? To me, if that could become parking for trailers if there isn't another solution for the Property Owners Association. I don't know if we need to make that a requirement, but I would hope that if it becomes available, we could make more parking so that Venice Drive doesn't become overflowed. I think the City may have to look at some things on Venice Drive as well maybe two-hour parking or other measures. That's future planning to look at.

Mr. Hoenigman said this is an incredible project that accomplishes a lot of our goals, and I'm very excited about it should it be completed as presented. As a developer, I know these large projects are complicated, with economic shifts and many other factors, but we owe it to everyone that we receive the benefits of this project. Often what happens is you give up the profitable part, and then there is even less reason for it to ever be fixed in the future. I don't understand yet what our permit conditions are that they have to follow through on. I want to understand what they are legally responsible for regarding the phasing and what is required as a condition of this permit.

The bare minimum that we will get from this project is important to understand because right now it is showing a lot of environmental benefits and public access benefits, including bathrooms and other improvements. I want to know what exactly is required of them.

Ms. Roll said there is a long list of permit conditions, including annual BMP maintenance monitoring and reporting. The AIS monitoring and management plan. There is a requirement for annual reporting, and employee transportation measures to encourage non-auto transportation. Those are a few examples.

Mr. St. Michel added the public restroom is also included as one of the permit conditions. When these conditions are included in the permit; we do take action if they are not followed through. If a permittee takes the benefits and completes the things that we authorize but does not follow through on other conditions included in the permit, we would consider that a violation. We can take action, including seeking injunctions, to ensure they follow through, and we are doing that currently in other matters. There are other complicated issues to consider, but yes, we are actively doing that kind of work.

Mr. Hester said there is a list of conditions starting on page 249 through 258 that must be followed. This also partly answers the earlier question about how costs are covered. This project, and many other projects we have, pay for what is required from us to go through the permitting process. It is not simply a flat fee. We have a mechanism in place so that if we need to conduct additional inspections, and the inspections we perform up until construction is complete require additional effort, we can charge for that. Then, as Director Regan pointed out, the new system we showed you all last month for tracking conditions after construction is also something which we are working on.

Mr. Hoenigman said it says, "authorization to develop," not a requirement. If staff feels comfortable that the benefits of this project are part of this permit and that we will see those benefits happen, then that's fine with me. I would love to see it all completed, but I know things happen during development. I just want to make sure you feel confident that what needs to happen will happen.

Ms. Regan said yes, and we will be monitoring.

Ms. Aldean asked if there is a phasing plan. These are a lengthy lists of conditions, but I'm curious what the phasing plan might look like.

Mr. Feldman for the applicant. We have some uncertainty because we heard something about an appeal of the Planning Commission decision today. Plan A is to commence demolition this fall, start construction in the spring of 2027 and complete the project over a two-year build period. The

intention is to construct the entirety of the project at once.

Ms. Roll said for the reasons that you've heard today, and everything detailed in the staff report, staff is recommending adoption of the proposed code amendment and approval of the Tahoe Keys Marina Redevelopment Project. The staff recommendation for approval was informed by the full project record, including technical studies provided by the applicant and analyses prepared for the project. These materials are also available as part of the overall project file and are available for public review online.

Mr. St. Michel said one additional clarification as well. We reviewed the public comments, and there was one public comment that noted a statement in our draft permit. The transmittal letter includes a statement that says, pursuant to TRPA rules, a permit may be appealed within 21 days. That statement is a remnant in the draft permit transmittal letter and does not apply when the Board issues the permit. When the Board issues the permit, anyone may seek judicial review pursuant to the Compact. I just wanted to make that clear, and we will strike that sentence from the draft permit transmittal letter.

Motion:

Mr. Bass made a motion to approve the required findings, Attachment A, including a finding of no significant effect, for adoption of proposed amendments to Chapter 37 and 90 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

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

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

Mr. Bass made a motion to approve and adopt Ordinance 2026, Attachment C, amending Ordinance 87-9 to adopt the proposed amendments to Chapter 37 and 90 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

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

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

Mr. Bass made a motion to approve the required findings (Attachment A), including a Finding of No Significant Effect

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

Motion carried.

Mr. Bass made a motion to approve the proposed project subject to the conditions contained in the draft permit (Attachment B).

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

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

B. Proposed amendments to TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 36 regarding stealthing requirements for wireless telecommunications facilities, including standards for stealing materials, maintenance, and other measures to address material deterioration

TRPA staff Mr. Nielsen, Special Projects Manager provided the presentation.

In 2023, the Tahoe Science Advisory Council convened a Microplastics Working Group to review the current research and discuss next steps based on the available science.

In 2024, the Governing Board received a presentation on the working group's findings. The report concluded that while there is not yet a complete scientific understanding of the best ways to prevent plastics from entering Lake Tahoe and the surrounding environment, any action taken to reduce plastics in the Tahoe Basin will have a positive environmental effect. Although additional research is still needed, any steps taken now to reduce plastic pollution are beneficial.

In April 2025, the TRPA Local Government Committee received an update on the ongoing science. The committee acknowledged that reducing plastics associated with TRPA requirements is an area where meaningful action can be taken. There are a number of initiatives TRPA staff are pursuing to reduce plastics in the environment. Some of these can be implemented administratively by staff, while others require amendments to the TRPA Code.

At the staff level, TRPA is developing new conditions of approval for projects that require the timely removal of plastic-containing materials, such as temporary erosion control fencing and vegetation protection fencing commonly used at construction sites. The goal is to ensure these materials are removed promptly once construction is complete and site conditions allow, rather than being left in places where they can deteriorate over time. Staff are also working with one of TRPA's interns, in coordination with the water quality team, to review the Best Management Practices (BMP) Handbook and identify opportunities to encourage the use of erosion control products that contain little or no plastic.

The proposed amendment includes a policy statement intended to clearly document in the TRPA Code that monopines are not the preferred design choice for wireless facilities in the Tahoe Basin. A monopine is a cell tower designed to resemble a pine tree.

Many people are familiar with monopines, and they can often be spotted while driving. However,

staff wanted to share observations from a recent site visit to illustrate concerns with these facilities. About a month prior, staff visited a monopine located at the corner of Pioneer Trail and Washoan Boulevard that has been in place for approximately 20 years. Although the site had been cleaned up about two years earlier, staff found plastic debris on the ground, including individual artificial pine needles, partial branches, and complete branches. A closer inspection revealed individual pine needles scattered around the site. Staff collected a recently fallen branch to demonstrate what the material typically looks like when first installed. The branch retained its dark color, dense structure, and full complement of artificial needles, which is representative of the original appearance of these towers.

Staff also found another branch that had been partially buried beneath natural pine needles and appeared to have been on the ground for one to two years. The material had noticeably faded, lost mass, and showed clear signs of degradation from ultraviolet exposure, snow, wind, and weathering.

Finally, staff found a heavily degraded piece protruding from the ground that was almost completely buried. This represented the final stage of degradation. The concern is understanding what happens to the material as it breaks down over time and where those plastic fragments ultimately end up. This raises the broader question of whether these facilities are necessary in all cases and whether alternatives can be constructed that do not rely on plastic materials.

While there are numerous sources of microplastics, the focus of this amendment is on the breakdown of larger plastic components (macroplastics) into microplastics. The proposed amendment states that monopines are not the preferred design choice. However, this is not intended as a prohibition. There are circumstances where a monopine may still be the most appropriate solution, and the amendment recognizes that monopines remain one tool available for wireless infrastructure when justified.

One example is the former Harvey's tower, where cellular panels are mounted directly to an existing building rather than constructing a monopine. In contrast, a tower at Fire Station No. 7 in Meyers is located within a forested corridor where the surrounding tree density and canopy supported the use of a monopine. That facility was constructed approximately five years ago. The amendment encourages applicants to consider alternative design approaches whenever possible.

Many of these practices are already being implemented during project review but are not formally documented in the TRPA Code. As a result, staff often must request additional information after an application has been submitted, leading to additional back-and-forth with applicants and delays in reviewing these important public service projects.

The intent of the amendment is to codify existing review practices so applicants know the requirements before submitting an application, making the permitting process more predictable and efficient.

An example of an alternative design is a wireless tower located behind BevMo at the "Y" on the South Shore of Lake Tahoe. Although it is located within a scenic corridor, it is not a monopine. Due to the screening provided by the adjacent building, the tower's height, and its color, many people are unaware that the tower is even there.
The amendment also requires applicants to submit visual simulations. While TRPA already requests

these simulations during project review formally requiring them in the Code allows applicants to include them with their initial applications rather than being asked to provide them later. Visual simulations depict the proposed project and can also illustrate alternative designs for comparison.

One current application under review included a simulation showing a monopine proposed for the industrial area of South Lake Tahoe. Because there are relatively few trees in that area, the monopine stands out more than a standard tower would. Staff requested an alternative design without the artificial tree, which is shown in the comparison simulation. Staff is continuing to work with the wireless carrier to reduce the size of the antenna array and shorten the tower, providing a real-world example of the collaborative design review process.

The amendment also requires applicants to provide information regarding the durability of artificial tree materials, including manufacturer specifications. This information will allow TRPA to monitor long-term performance and evaluate how different materials hold up over time. Artificial tree materials inevitably degrade. One example is a monopine at Sierra-at-Tahoe that was constructed approximately six or seven years ago. When first installed, the tower appeared full and dense, earning what staff jokingly described as a "solid B-plus or A-minus." The artificial branches effectively concealed the tower structure.

However, because the site is exposed to significant wind and weather, the tower has deteriorated substantially over time. The artificial branches have thinned dramatically, and the tower no longer resembles a tree. Staff compared its current appearance to a toothbrush or even asparagus, noting that while the original design intent was understandable, the facility no longer achieves the desired visual effect.

Regarding the approval process, staff explained that significant public outreach has been conducted. Graham St. Michel has been instrumental in developing the amendment and worked closely with staff throughout the process. The Advisory Planning Commission (APC) held a public hearing and discussion on May 13 and subsequently recommended that the Governing Board approve the proposed amendment. The Governing Board hearing represents the final step in the approval process.

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean referred to page 294 regarding Attachment A, draft code language. Under subparagraph 36.15.5, paragraph C.2, states: “Photographic documentation of the facility and the surrounding ground conditions.” Is it possible to require that they use a digital camera with a date and timestamp? Otherwise, they could submit any photograph and claim it was taken recently.

Mr. Nielsen said we deal with this on many projects. We make sure the photographs are dated, stamped, or we physically stamp them when they are received. If they're submitted by email, we verify the receipt date.

I also wanted to add something in response to comments we heard earlier today about how this proposal connects to the Regional Plan and the environmental threshold standards. This amendment relates directly to those thresholds such as scenic and improving water quality.

Ms. Laine said for me, it opens up a larger discussion, it's not specifically relevant to what's before us today, which I completely support. I'm seeing this everywhere. The U.S. Forest Service marks tree boundaries with plastic ribbon-type material, and they never come back and pick it up. Well after the project is over, those ribbons are still flying in the air, or they've fallen to the ground and you're finding pieces of them. Also, the road crews put down those plastic markers in the pavement. Once they've gone through and striped the road, they don't come back and pick them up. Eventually they break apart, and they're left on the side of the road.
Finally, the utility companies that come through our residential neighborhoods to mark gas lines or other utilities that they're locating with high-powered marking guns that embed little plastic markers into the ground.

There's just so much of this material. I'm hoping TRPA can address it, and if we can't, point us in the right direction so we know where to go because this is a much bigger problem. Yes, if we can control the monopines, let's do it, but it's bigger than that.

Mr. Nielsen agreed. You think about synthetic athletic fields as well. As the Tahoe Science Advisory Council continues its work, and as we continue to receive the results of the science being conducted, I think we'll have a better idea of where to direct our efforts so we can make the biggest impact possible in reducing plastics. We hope that if this amendment is supported today, it represents a positive step in the right direction. I also hope we can take additional steps in the future as we learn more from the science and have a better understanding of how to inform future policy recommendations.

Ms. Gustafson appreciated the work on this. There was a monopine that was installed years ago behind the Safeway grocery store in Truckee that sticks out like a sore thumb in the middle of the forest. When we talk about stealthing and say that visual impacts should be minimized to the extent reasonably feasible, it leaves a lot of room for debate. Have applicants really done everything they could? Some of these structures simply can't be fully camouflaged.

How do staff evaluate these requirements? For example, with FirstNet, we need a certain number of cell towers. As you know, you're helping us with one on the Dollar property. We're going to receive complaints anytime people can see one of these structures and concerns about all kinds of things, but we desperately need FirstNet service for our first responders. How do we reasonably and feasibly camouflage cell towers?

Mr. Nielsen said let me share some of my experiences. We use our best professional judgment when evaluating stealthing techniques based on what we've seen here in the Tahoe Basin and in other jurisdictions. To date, we have not been in a position where we've had to recommend denial of a project because we could not make the required scenic findings. We've been able to find workable solutions for all of these projects. As new technology develops, I'm optimistic that the size and scale of these facilities will continue to decrease. Perhaps more satellite technology will be used in the future, and we'll see fewer of these facilities in the landscape and they'll be less visually prominent.

Also, it's significant that the most recent threshold evaluation did not identify these facilities as creating a visual problem. It didn't conclude that we had been making the wrong decisions or that these projects were continuing to create unacceptable visual impacts. It didn't say that. I believe we've been making the right decisions. We have not taken these projects lightly. We've worked

closely with the local jurisdictions, and I'm optimistic that continuing to apply our best professional judgment, based on experience, will keep us moving in the right direction without unnecessarily delaying these important projects.

Ms. Gustafson said that's encouraging. I do support getting rid of the fake plastic trees if I wasn't clear about that. That's horrible what you just showed us. We've got to do better than that.

Ms. Conrad-Saydah said the progress you've made on this is really appreciated. Have we made Progress on aggregating multiple service providers on a single tower and forcing that decision? Obviously, if we can do that, it limits the total number of towers we need. I understand that they all have their own service territories, but we hear the same argument for the need for every tower. This isn't part of the agenda item, so I'm also happy to wait and hear about it in an Executive Director's report.

Mr. Nielsen said I'm happy to address what I know. The Tahoe Prosperity Center sponsored an Effort about ten years ago, where we brought the cellular providers together with the intent of doing exactly that of coordinating future facility siting around the basin so we could maximize co-location. It was a positive effort until we asked them to share information about where their future facilities would be located. They told us, "We're not sharing that with you. It's proprietary." So that effort was essentially derailed.

We don't have language that requires co-location, but we do discuss co-location with every project application. In fact, our review process incentivizes co-location. If you have an existing facility that has already been approved by this Board, another carrier can add an antenna to that tower without having to return to the Governing Board for approval.

That's a significant incentive for carriers because they don't have to go through a lengthy public hearing process or respond to public comments. It's something we discuss early in the review process, and in most cases, they've already done their homework. If they can co-locate, it's less expensive to build. In fact, if they don't have to build a monopine, they don't want to build one either. Monopines are more expensive, require ongoing maintenance, and carriers would generally prefer to construct a standard pole. These amendments are memorializing many of the practices we've already been following. We wanted to put them in writing and make the process more predictable so applicants know up front what is required.

Mr. Hoenigman said I'd like to ask that we keep the discussion focused on this agenda item. There is a lot to cover regarding microplastics and cell phone towers. Let's accomplish what we're here to do today, and then we need to make sure we get through the other two agenda items as well.

Mr. Bass said I support the change. I wish that if we're going to allow a monopine, it would not be made from materials that become microplastics. I think we should prohibit the use of any materials that have the potential to break down into microplastics, as you've shown us today. I think that's the standard we should be holding ourselves to.

I've spoken about this before, and I think when you look at it in a larger context, years ago I suggested that we undertake a comprehensive planning effort that isn't driven by the telecommunications networks themselves. Instead, we should hire our own consultants to identify the best locations for these towers and locations that meet our scenic requirements to develop a

plan that actually requires co-location.

We're tasked with protecting land use and meeting our environmental thresholds. I think we can get to the right answer if we have the right study that identifies exactly where towers are needed, exactly where coverage gaps exist and then build one tower to fill that gap while requiring all of the telecommunications companies to share that single tower. We have to require that because otherwise the companies argue over ownership. If one company owns a tower, its competitors often choose to build a new tower nearby rather than co-locate on the existing one. If we don't require co-location, we're going to continue seeing these applications.

You also mentioned another good point. In two to five years, these towers may not even be needed for telecommunications. We may be relying much more on satellite technology by then. We need to be thinking about that as we continue to approve these facilities. We should pursue a long-term planning effort and potentially even consider not approving additional towers until that planning effort is completed. That will encourage carriers to co-locate if they want to provide service in the near term.

Ms. Aldean asked if there's a provision in the permits that we issue requiring the removal of towers if they're no longer being used and who would pay for that removal.

Mr. Nielsen said that is not currently a requirement in our permits.

Ms. Aldean suggested that it should be. These facilities will become obsolete at some point.

Ms. Gustafson said I need to check with the local jurisdictions because that may be where our requirements overlap, and we require that.

Mr. Hoenigman said again, that's not specifically what we're discussing today.

Ms. Aldean said it does relate to monopines.

Mr. Hoenigman said I'd like to keep the discussion focused.

Mr. Bass asked if we could add that requirement to this amendment since we're already amending the code.

Mr. Hoenigman said we'll entertain a motion and if we'd like to put that as a requirement.

Ms. Gustafson said she cannot support adding that requirement without the Placer County staff reviewing this first to see what the implications might be. I agree with the concept, Cody.

Mr. Bass said it would simply require removal if they completely stop using the tower. It's not intended to apply at any other time. If the tower is abandoned, they would be required to remove it.

Ms. Gustafson said oh, I thought you were going back to the co-location discussion.

Ms. Aldean said the parties have already approved the language, and the only latitude we have

to make changes is if the language we add is substantially similar to what has already been reviewed and approved. It needs to be pursued through the permit.

Mr. Nielsen said as staff, we'd like the opportunity to think through the implications of that and discuss it with our local jurisdiction partners. The last part of this amendment addresses adaptive management and recognizes that we'll continue to learn from implementation of the ordinance change and make modifications as necessary.

Motion:

Ms. Gustafson made a motion to approve the required findings (Attachment A), including a Finding of No Significant Effect, for adoption of an amendment to Chapter 36 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

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

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

Ms. Gustafson made a motion to adopt Ordinance 2026-__ (Attachment B), amending Chapter 36 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances to add Section 36.15, *Stealthing for Wireless Telecommunications Facilities*.

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

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

Ms. Gustafson apologized to Mr. Bass; I thought he was trying to change code for the co-location requirement. I agree with some of those conversations today that we need to bring back an item to discuss co-location and removal. We need to include the local jurisdictions in those discussions to see what they have in their permits for those facilities.

10. PLANNING MATTERS

A. Kuelper Commercial Warehouse Rebuild/Expansion, 1063 Magua St., El Dorado County, California, Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 034-322-006, TRPA File Number ERSP2024-0821

Item continued.

B. Fiscal Year 2026-2027 Annual Work Plan.pdf

Executive Director, Ms. Regan provided the presentation.

Governing Board
June 24, 2026

I am going to take you back to last month at the Granlibakken. We had an excellent strategic planning session. I appreciated the input, and for those that weren't able to make it, this will be a good catch-up session because what you're seeing in this work plan is a direct reflection of that discussion and previous discussions that we've had as a board.

To ground us in the work plan, to tier up to the bi-state Compact, of course, being our constitution, that's our North Star. The Compact directs us to have a regional plan with various elements, and our thresholds are our environmental standards. There are ten different categories, from air quality, water quality, and lake clarity to noise and recreation, soils and vegetation, and transportation and sustainable communities, our newest number ten.

I appreciated the discussion around various projects today and how do these projects advance and maintain our thresholds. The Code of Ordinances is how our staff implement this vision to get from the big policy direction of the Compact right down to the project level, as we did today in the program. It's challenging to implement that kind of vision on the ground with very complicated questions that arise in every single project. But we have an incredible staff that implements that through our Code of Ordinances. And then, of course, our mission. The work plan is grounded in these high-level principles.

Slide 3 illustrates the various departments that we have. We have roughly the same headcount in terms of staff as last year: 77 full-time employees. We have an incredible team of talented interns. We have our seasonal crews, including our two boat crews that are on the water, our watercraft team, our eyes and ears, providing education and implementing our Shoreline Plan. The various departments implement those responsibilities, and our Permitting and Compliance Department is the largest. The work plan breaks down the organizational charts for each of those departments in your packet. What an incredible, talented staff that we have. We're so fortunate to attract the best and brightest minds in the area, and people are truly mission-driven that work in this building. They've dedicated their lives, in many cases their entire careers, to supporting the lake and our mission.

Slide 4 illustrates a couple of pictures from the Granlibakken, and I want to thank Cindy for being our host in Placer County. We had a great field tour on the Wednesday portion of the regular board meeting. That’s a picture of us near Fanny Bridge, at the mouth there, the terminus of the lake into the Truckee River, and the Bureau of Reclamation project where they’ll be working on that dam, which is more than 100 years old. It was incredible to get out in the field and talk big picture about what we want to see happen looking out ten years from now, and then how to turn that vision into reality. That’s where the rubber meets the road in this item, the work plan, and then in the next presentation that Chad Cox will make on our budget.

When you look at the constitution and the hierarchy of the compact, and drill down into our ten environmental threshold categories, you can roll up a lot of the work that we do into four big strategic priorities: the lake, the forest, Connecting Tahoe, which is our transportation system, and Tahoe Living, which is our housing initiative.

At the retreat, we had excellent presentations from Kim Carringer and John Hester, breaking down each of those strategic priorities. A couple of highlights of what’s inside the work plan with the various departments.

In the strategic priority of lake and watersheds, the big-ticket items are clarity, of course, number one. We're trying to get back to the 100-foot standard for lake clarity. That's our threshold standard. We've been stabilizing that trend for about 20-some years now. We had been on a nosedive of decline, losing more than a foot a year of clarity at one point. Since 2000, we've been stabilizing, but we aren't seeing that return to 100 feet. We want to improve, not just hold the line. Despite the pressures from the warming trends of the lake, all the different atmospheric conditions, and things that are changing in the ecosystem, we're excited just to be stabilizing the trend. But eventually, we need to get back to that 100-foot standard, and we're working with the science community to better understand that.

We have talked a lot about aquatic invasive species. I won't belabor it, but Golden Mussels, Golden Mussels, Golden Mussels. Clean your gear. Get the word out that people can bring in golden mussels in kayaks and stand-up paddleboards. It's not just powerboats and motorboats that are the vectors for these new invaders, potentially. We found another boat with Golden Mussels in just the last couple of weeks. Aquatic invasive species continue to be a super high priority, as well as watershed restoration.

Third Creek, Rosewood Creek in Nevada, and the Upper Truckee River, which is the big watershed focus on the South Shore, are among the key areas. Multiple partners in the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) are working to restore watersheds because, of course, the natural filters of sediment are our meadows. More than half of the wetlands in the basin were developed before we even had a regional plan, so we're going back and restoring those meadows. That not only helps water quality, but also supports wildlife habitat, climate, carbon sequestration, and other environmental benefits. The Tahoe Keys and the invasive weeds are a huge focus for our team and the partners, as is stormwater.

Tahoe was developed without even sidewalks. We're still catching up and putting in sidewalks. Some of the construction that you see relates to sidewalks, and that means better stormwater conveyance. We have to go back and re-engineer areas to facilitate more modern stormwater treatments.

On the forest health and wildfire strategic priority, I will note that today is the anniversary of the Angora wildfire of 2007. It was a pivotal time in the agency's history and our basin's history. It put our partnership around forest health and wildfire, including the creation of the Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team. There was already work going on, but it supercharged the situation and, has forever changed our collaboration for the better in the basin.

Through this board's action in February, we have already adopted our new forest health standards that are science-based. Now we have to implement them, carry them forward into the day-to-day work, not only at the agency through projects and programs, but also through our partners. The Forest Service, being the biggest land management agency, is a very important partner in this area. Public communications around emergencies and evacuation are another focus of this priority.

Transportation: You heard from John Hester at the strategic planning session about connecting all the dots in transportation, which is a huge challenge. Many of you also sit on the Tahoe Transportation District Board, and you know firsthand the complexity involved in not just transit, but all the other four T's of the regional transportation plan: Transit, trails, technology, and town centers.

The goal is to make all of those systems work together. Our vision is that you could take a bus from here and it wouldn't take two hours to get to the North Shore or require going to Reno to get to the North Shore on a bus. That vision is going to take a lot of investment, but luckily, I feel like for the first time in a very long time we're making some real, meaningful progress in this area.
We have a couple of key federal grants that are helping us support our local jurisdictions and emergency responder partners in system management, operations, and overall resiliency. That work will help us better plan for evacuations regionally and support the work of the destination stewardship groups.

A key question is how people who come to enjoy our public lands can get around better. How do we do a better job giving them information before they go, so they're not driving around looking for parking lots? If we could automate that with technology, it would be an environmental benefit and a benefit to the quality of life for the people who live here.

This board has heard a lot about our *Cultivating Community, Conserving the Basin* strategic priority. Work is underway on the environmental impact statement. You'll be making a very big decision on that in the next fiscal year, in the first several months of 2027.

Our main goals in that strategic priority are consistent: reduce the time and cost for affordable housing, improve water quality and housing at the same time, implement more stormwater controls and treatments, and give people more housing choices instead of having the market automatically default to building the largest, most expensive properties.

A big thank you to the Regional Planning Committee, with chair Hoenigman's leadership we have made a lot of progress in recent years. We've been doing this in different phases, but this is a big undertaking, and I'm proud of our team for working in lockstep with the community and reaching out to the communities most affected by the lack of housing and, in many cases, the substandard housing that exists in the basin.

There is always everything else that does not fit neatly into the four strategic priorities, and those items are also equally important. The threshold update is one example. You heard about it in public comment today from Keep Tahoe Blue. We are down from about 180 standards to 111 standards in the thresholds across those ten categories. That is still too many, because we have a lot of antiquated standards that are not based on science. We need to do the work, and it will take a very heavy lift in collaboration with the Science Council. That is a high priority for us.

I won't go through all of these, but there is still a very big lift around government relations, trying to free up more federal money, and better tracking on permit conditions. That came up in the Tahoe Keys Marina presentation. There is also work on community design standards with our local jurisdiction partners. We haven't updated our signage ordinance since the 1980s, so there is a lot of work that we are going to tap our Advisory Planning Commission to help us with, as well as the community, to bring many of our standards up to date. You also heard from Paul Nielsen's presentation about the work we're doing on microplastics. We are trying to reduce the amount of plastics getting into the environment in a number of ways. The Best Management Practices Handbook is a big priority for us in this next work plan because, as Board Member Laine pointed out, this is part of our daily life. The fabrics we wear and how much we dry our clothes in the clothes dryer affect microplastics in the environment.

We are looking at all of it and leaning in with the science community to help guide our work so we can be as effective and efficient as possible and get the biggest bang for the buck. There is a lot of work that we're doing on a day-to-day basis that may not be obvious, and I'm happy to dive deeper into that when the time is right.

Recommendations from the strategic planning session included being out there more on the water. We are eight years into implementation of our updated Shoreline Plan, and it is still taking time to get the word out about some of those new provisions. We are also working with concessionaires. We have illegal concessions and in litigation with one case, so there is a lot of emphasis in this work plan around the shoreline and having more eyes and ears on the water.

Another great idea was having a parking lot for future discussions and policy recommendations. We heard some examples in discussions today that we're going to add to that parking lot. We may not be agendized for a certain topic at a meeting, but we are not going to lose track of it, and we are going to implement that. Another fantastic idea was a strategy session or some kind of joint meeting with the Tahoe Transportation District Board, since there is a good deal of overlap. We can work on that.

There was also a recommendation to bring Washoe Tribe representatives, including Chairman Smokey, to this board to share insights into the priorities of the Tribe, how well we have been working together with the Tribe over the last several years, and to raise more awareness about some of the great work that is going on.

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Gustafson said I appreciated the retreat, and hearing that there is a parking lot. On the transportation side, we were just saying we are going to coordinate with these other jurisdictions or collaborate on management of parking, but I think there was consensus at that retreat that we may need to convene a larger discussion on that with the states and the other jurisdictions to talk about how we deal with growth in the drive-up range of Tahoe. People have a need, want, and desire to come to Tahoe, but we do not make it easy or provide them spaces where they can park and get on transit or use other alternative modes.

Mr. Bass said I also very much appreciated the retreat and found it very useful. I'm curious where we are with looking at piers in the shorezone and the materials that can be used. I know we had put some work into that, but I'd like an update. Is that going to be part of what we're looking at this year if we still need to make amendments?

Mr. Hester said as you heard Paul Nielsen say, we can already do some things administratively. We're not allowing certain materials now. I can't remember exactly how they described what they did in the Tahoe Keys but that's what we're requiring administratively. Julie mentioned community design standards at the Advisory Planning Commission (APC). We're going to them with a broad menu of items and ask what they want to look at. Hopefully, earlier than this time next year, they will come back with the broad range of things they looked at, these are the first priorities, and here's the approach we think you ought to take. For example, do more enforcement, or it ought to be regional, or local, etc. We're working on those two tracks, and I think we'll get to what you're talking about.

Mr. Bass said great. Currently, administratively, we've been able to stop Styrofoam.

Ms. Regan said yes.

Motion:

Ms. Conrad-Saydah made a motion to approve the FY 2026-2027 Work Plan as shown in Attachment A.

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

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

C. Fiscal Year 2027 Annual Operating Budget

Chief Financial and Administrative Officer, Mr. Cox provided the presentation.

The work plan is tied to the budget. It reflects the strategic priorities that Julie just walked you through. It provides the framework to meet our thresholds, and it connects all of that to funding activities. I'm going to walk you through a chart that we went through as part of the retreat. This version has a little more detail in it, but it walks through the diverse set of incomes we have to run this work plan. This work plan and this budget invest in our group, our talent, and our agency. It also continues ongoing process improvement. A lot of what we've been doing as an agency is figuring out how to self-fund continued work programs through efficiency.

The general fund remains flat. During the retreat, I walked you through a 10-year view of the general fund, and it has been relatively slow-growing. I know a lot of times we get comments that our budget is growing a lot. The general fund has been relatively stable, and will be effectively flat compared to last year, going from $12.9 million last year to $13 million this year. We are going to see growth in grants. That's great because that means projects are happening on the ground. The takeaway is that the proposed budget is $36.5 million.

The way we're going to balance it, because there is a slight imbalance, is by using the fiscal year 2025 surplus. I don't want to call it a shortfall, but we do need to balance expenses with revenues. It is slightly unbalanced by $574,000, and we plan to use that surplus from fiscal year 2025 to cover the delta. A couple of other key assumptions: this fully funds the work plan. It assumes full staffing levels of the 77 people as well as our interns and seasonal staff. It also provides for a cost increase for merit-based salary increases of 4.5 percent.

Finally, we did have a great discussion about a potential new boat in the future. That is not something we're going to put into this work plan, but we are going to use fiscal year 2027 to develop a plan around it. That plan would address the timing, what type of vessel we are looking to upgrade to, and what funding options we could pursue. Could we do it internally with shoreline funds? Should we go to the states for an appropriation? Is there another bill we could potentially

leverage to get a new vessel? Our current vessel is costing quite a bit in maintenance, and we do not want to end up in a position where we do not have a boat crew that can go on the water. That is the summary of the budget.

Grants are a big portion and are going to be up $6.3 million compared to last year, mainly driven by the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act. We are anticipating more than $11 million of Lake Tahoe Restoration Act funds in this budget. The Bipartisan Infrastructure Law is another big item, at almost $2 million. Through our transportation grants and CalSTA grants, we'll have almost $6 million. Those are projects on the ground. Those are areas where we serve as project managers. We have some staff time allocated to that, but the majority of the way we work those grants is by hiring third-party contractors to implement them.

State funding is anticipated at $8 million, which is flat compared to fiscal year 2026. From a fee perspective, the $4.8 million is made up of a few things. The main component is our permitting group. We have assumed a 3.5 percent fee increase based on Western State CPI. That is what is in the budget. We'll come back to the Operations and Governance Committee for approval of that rate increase in October, but we did need to make an assumption in the budget, and the assumption included is 3.5 percent.

There is also shoreline permitting in that figure. As we have settlements, like the ones you all have seen and approved over the last fiscal year, we have some of those included as well, so we made a small assumption for settlements within that figure.

Finally, the last small bit of income is in the "other" bucket. We have funding from the counties of $150,000. We have rent income from our tenants on site of $365,000, which is up slightly based on rent escalations in our contracts. We also have investment income. The Operations and Governance Committee reviewed our principal investments last month. This is a relatively conservative estimate based on how our state funds and principal funds have been yielding. That makes up the remainder of our revenue sources.
Before we jump to expenses, are there any questions on revenue?

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Kieckhefer asked why don't we sync approval of the fee increases with the fiscal year? Why do we wait until October to do that?

Mr. Hester said when we brought the permit process improvement plan to you about two years ago, it was Board Member Settelmeyer at the time who said I'll vote for the across-the-board increases, and as I call it, a time and motion study. Staff Jennifer Self is working on that and should be ready around October. We anticipate some fees may go down, some may stay the same, and some may go up because we're trying to track with a lot of detail exactly what each type permit takes.

Mr. Cox said the other thing is they do become effective January 1. If you think about the building season, it tends to be summer-based, so we make a decision in October, it becomes effective January, and then we run for the year.

Mr. Kieckhefer said that it makes it tough to budget for a fiscal year that starts July 1 when you don't know exactly what your fee rates are going to be going into January.

Mr. Cox said the rate is based on Western State CPI, and I track that every month. We lean on whatever the Western State CPI actual is in August, and that is our recommendation, plus anything else we may bring to you. We have a good idea. It's probably going to be between three and four percent, plus or minus 50 basis points. It shouldn't be materially different.
Mr. Kieckhefer said regarding the general fund revenue, you mentioned carrying forward from fiscal year 2025 to cover a shortfall in fiscal year 2027?

Mr. Cox said correct.

Mr. Kieckhefer asked if that is being held in reserve right now.

Mr. Cox said that's correct.

Mr. Kieckhefer said it looked like there was also a shortfall for fiscal year 2026 and we're covering that shortfall.

Mr. Cox said correct. The shortfall from fiscal year 2026 was covered from the fiscal year 2024 reserve. We've tended to be very conservative in our budget, and almost always, as I look back, we have spent less than we had budgeted and built toward a reserve. The thing is, audits become final in the fall, and we'll bring that to the board for approval in December. We don't really know what the shortfall or surplus is for fiscal year 2026 yet until we go through the whole process through the summer and fall.

Ms. Conrad-Saydah said with the grant funding, are those all encumbered such that the funding will go out the door in the next fiscal year, or are they planned to be spent over a number of years?

Mr. Cox said most of these grants are over a number of years. This is the anticipated amount for fiscal year 2027.

(presentation continued with expenses)

Contracts are a big number and we do this on purpose. We staff at a level that we hope to be able to cover with the general fund, or I should say the state appropriations. It's close. Contracts are where we can flex up and down to implement our program. What I've tried to capture here is the contracts by program. I have provided, in the backup, contracts over $100,000 for transparency. That's something the public has asked for, so we've put that into the packet.

The good news is that, within this contracts number, more than $13 million is for environmental improvement, including the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) program and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS). If you look at some of the things to run the agency, such as facility infrastructure support and our permitting group, it is a small amount of that $24.5 million. Overall, 66 percent of our budget is going toward those contracts.

Compensation is anticipated at $10.5 million. We build this up based on the people we have, the anticipated increases in medical and benefits, and the salary increase. We also assumed turnover

and continued the agency's retirement contribution of 15 percent. This is a pretty solid number. It is up around $400,000 compared to last year. Financing is a chunk of our budget. It is a smaller chunk, but it is important because we do own this facility. I captured some of the details here that you may not have seen in the past. Our initial loan amount has a great interest rate of 4 percent. We are locked in through 2045, and the current principal balance is $7.2 million. We'll continue to pay that down, and that is a good deal. Thanks to Chris Keillor for locking that one in years ago.

Finally, in the other bucket, we have things like IT software and IT-type equipment, as well as building operating expenses, property taxes, utilities, and maintenance. We also spend a bit on our employees. We want to continue to develop and train them, so there is an element of professional development and certifications in there. We also have a small amount of funds for items such as renting a facility for the aquatic invasive species decontamination area up at Spooner Summit, as well as fuel for the boat and things like that.

This is very detailed. It is a bottoms-up view by program, and there has been a lot of input from staff and my finance team to build this budget.

Board Comments & Questions

None.

Mr. Cox said if approved, what are you approving? This would approve the overall expenditures of the agency. It will approve the grant agreements, contract expenditures, staffing level of 77, and the merit-based salary increase. This would also authorize us to make any small tweaks as we finalize the budget. We wouldn't go over or above the expense or the revenue number, but as we go through, there may be some small tweaks required.

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Laine said the big thing is that our general fund is stable, but it is flat. Through cost efficiencies and through the contracts, we are able to give staff increases. It is not because we are getting more money from the states, but it is important that we are able to stay competitive in the market.

Grant revenues are the big item. They are up more than $6 million, and a lot of that is AIS which alone represents about 30 percent of all of our grants, so that is a big number.

Thank you for the great job that you and your team did. The budget is balanced, and yes, we need to use that little carryover from 2025. We are fortunate that our staff and all the different departments do such a great job throughout the year, not overspending and really being conservative, so we have that little bit left over if we need to backfill. Good job.

Ms. Conrad-Saydah said when you're considering the boat, could you please look at an electric-powered boat, especially given that if the Tahoe Keys Marina goes through, we'll have a way to charge it. This would be amazing to take one fossil fuel-powered boat off the lake.

Ms. Regan said we all know it's budget-fighting season in California, and it is always in Nevada too, even in the off-seasons with interim finance and so on. It's hard to fight for money for the lake

when there are a lot of important priorities in both states. I just want to thank all of you who have been fighting for us in California and Nevada to keep our general funds stable.

I appreciate Member Laine flagging that, because over time, our overhead is going to continue to rise. We will need your thinking caps on strategically going forward about what approach we should take for the general fund over time so it can increase to match that. We do not automatically receive cost-of-living adjustments because we are not a state agency in either state. That is something we can work through the Operations and Governance Committee to strategize long term and make sure that we stay whole.

I also want to thank the board for fighting for the additional grant funding. To have $22 million in grants supporting Lake Tahoe Environmental Improvement Program projects is significant. Those dollars are going on the ground to project implementers. We play a big role in that, especially in aquatic invasive species, as was mentioned.

That is threshold attainment. That is driving us toward progress in terms of our thresholds. It is a huge accomplishment to be able to grow that pie year over year and to collaborate with the Forest Service, which sometimes does not even get a budget decision in Washington until spring of the year when they are supposed to obligate money by October.

We have now developed relationships where we can partner strategically, working with the partners, to deploy that money in a responsible and timely way. That did not happen by accident. It reflects the great staff that Chad and the finance team have, and the professionalism they display in being the fiscal agent for many of those dollars.

I just wanted to make sure the public knows the $22 million in grants is not staying in TRPA's coffers. We are moving that money out into the environment for the benefit of the lake.

Ms. Aldean said one of the reasons why we have a sterling reputation when we go before the legislature's requesting additional funding is the fact that we do budget conservatively. With all the overspending that is occurring in various states at the federal level, it's nice to be part of an agency that is conservative when it comes to budgeting and living within our means to the extent we can. That helps to increase our legitimacy.

Motion:

Ms. Conrad-Saydah made a motion to approve the FY 2027 budget.

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

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

11. EXECUTIVE REPORTS

A. Executive Director Status Report

Ms. Regan wished Mayor Bass well in delivering the State of the City Address in a couple of hours. Bike Month! We have 520 riders around the basin registered for Bike Month. It's a competition! TRPA staff, Thea Schwartz designed beautiful stickers for the bike month. Bike to Work Day was June 17th.

Slide 2 reflects in some of the media clips that Jeff Cowen sends you, with updates about things happening around Lake Tahoe and mentions of TRPA and our partners in the press. This was a strategic opportunity to work with some new journalists. We had about seven journalists over two days who toured the entire lake. We partnered with many members of Team Tahoe around the basin. Water and fire were two of the major topics and tour stops. The Golden Mussel discovery happened to break while they were here. It just so happened that these reporters got a scoop while they were visiting to cover feature stories about invasive species and wildfire. We also visited the Caldor Burn Scar and the Angora Burn Scar. It was a great opportunity to generate a series of stories throughout the region before our 30th Summit anniversary, where we'll be spotlighting various Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) projects from the past 30 years that have made a difference in our environment.

We've also had coverage of the Tahoe Fund's Match for the Marsh campaign, which is raising philanthropic support for the Upper Truckee Marsh Restoration. Keep Tahoe Blue was also featured with the Clean, Drain, Dry station shown in the upper right of slide 2, where people can rinse off their gear before heading to the lake. We were just trying to get the word out in a creative way.

I'm most proud of during my time at TRPA has been working with our staff to launch the environmental scholarship program. We've now been awarding scholarships for 22 years to local high school students pursuing environmental studies in college. This year, Sebastian Guerrero and Rory Wallach earned the scholarships. Thea Schwartz attended both awards nights at the North Shore and South Shore high schools. Sebastian is attending the University of Southern California to pursue a career in environmentally focused real estate development, and Rory is headed to UC Berkeley for a dual degree in environmental policy and political science.

These scholarships are made possible by your generous donations, as well as contributions from our Advisory Planning Commission and TRPA staff. We have a payroll deduction program that makes it easy for staff to contribute either a set amount each paycheck or a one-time annual donation. We've truly changed the lives of local high school students who have gone on to make a difference in environmental fields, and some have even returned to serve their communities here in Tahoe.

Years ago there was concern that Tahoe Yellow Cress, a plant found nowhere else in the world except Lake Tahoe, might be listed as an endangered species. We mobilized our partnership and accelerated the conservation plan for the species, and we've been successful in protecting it.

It grows right along the lakeshore. Recently, nearly 80 volunteers and agency partners came together to plant 366 Tahoe Yellow Cress plants. During the event, the group also removed nearly 3,000 invasive plants and collected 60 pounds of litter. So it wasn't just a planting event, it also provided several additional environmental benefits.

Shoreline education is going to be a major focus for us in our 2026–2027 work plan, and our compliance team was proud to report that they recently removed 12 illegal buoys on the California side of the West Shore. That effort reflected more than a year of partnership with the California State Lands Commission to ensure every legal requirement and notification process was properly followed. Our boat crew and compliance team continue to work on additional removals in Nevada as well, coordinating with the Nevada Division of State Lands on priority enforcement areas.

It's a very long and detailed process to verify that these buoys are not someone's property, complete all required notifications, and work through every legal step. Our partners are always interested in how we remove illegal buoys from the water, and we're actively engaged in that work.

Because shoreline has become such a significant priority, Jeff Cowen, our current Public Information Officer, will move into a dedicated position supporting watercraft education, shoreline implementation, compliance, and enforcement. He'll help communicate not only shoreline issues but also educate new property owners about TRPA regulations, tree removal requirements, and other rules. We've seen an increase in enforcement cases because many properties changed hands during COVID, and many new residents are unfamiliar with our regulations.

Jeff will focus specifically on supporting those teams, and we're backfilling his Public Information Officer position, largely using grant funding thanks to the creativity of our finance team.

We also announced during the strategic planning retreat that we're changing our IT services contract to the new DTS team. They're based in Minden, Nevada. We're excited to work with them, and we're extremely grateful for the outstanding service Xogenous has provided over the past ten years. The transition has been seamless, and I want to thank everyone who made it successful, especially Chad and the multidisciplinary TRPA team that collaborated on the Request for Proposal (RFP) and selection process.

What's coming up?
July 4th is always a major event in Tahoe. Kim Carringer and the EIP teams have been coordinating with our partners to ensure we have enough volunteers, adequate law enforcement staffing on the beaches, and strong Forest Service support. There will be at least 20 additional law enforcement officers, if not more, assigned specifically for the July 4th holiday. There will also be additional trash cans, more volunteers, and extensive public education efforts. We're actively coordinating all of that with our partners.

At the upcoming board meeting, we'll provide the Tahoe Living update, including how the project alternatives are shaping up for environmental review. Shannon Friedman will provide an update on other Environmental Improvement Program projects currently underway during the construction season. The interim meeting of the Nevada Legislative Oversight Committee will take place on July 17, and we'll also hold a committee work session in August.

In July we'll begin a discussion regarding the glyphosate issue that came up during our Governing Board strategic planning session. We've had very thoughtful conversations with stakeholders who commented at that meeting. Dan Segan, our Chief Science and Policy Officer, our communications team, and I all have a series of meetings scheduled this week and next week. I want to thank everyone from both the board and the community who has engaged productively on this issue.

Since our last meeting at Granlibakken, the Forest Service has published a Frequently Asked Questions document. They have stated definitively that they will not be using herbicides in the Caldor restoration burn area during the 2026 or 2027 seasons. We have submitted our letter to the Forest Service, and both Kim Carringer and I have been in contact with their leadership. They've informed us they are actively preparing a written response, which we have not yet received but expect very soon.

There's also a new acting Forest Supervisor who began work in the basin on Monday. His name is Aaron Gagnon, and he will lead the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit on a 120-day detail assignment. He comes to us from Oregon and has served throughout the country as a U.S. Navy officer and reserve officer. He brings a tremendous amount of experience that will benefit the basin, and I look forward to working with him during his assignment.

Our understanding is that the Forest Service is also recruiting for a permanent Forest Supervisor position, which is important because we need stable, long-term leadership in the basin. That leadership will be critical as we continue working together on Caldor restoration. It's another important factor in how we move forward with discussions about glyphosate.

I also want to thank the board members for their strong interest in how we address this issue going forward. Our recommendation is to work through the committee structure. Belinda Faustinos has graciously agreed, as Chair of the Environmental Improvement Program Committee, to lead a discussion as early as next month to begin framing how we want to approach this complex issue. There is still a great need for additional science and data collection, and we believe a committee setting will be the most productive venue for developing that framework.

Looking ahead to August, we'll have Dr. Stephanie Hampton and the State of the Lake Report team will return to discuss what's happening with lake clarity. If you haven't already registered for the Tahoe Summit, please do. We already have hundreds of RSVPs for the event at Sand Harbor on August 19. We also expect to bring the Tahoe Valley Area Plan Amendment to the Regional Planning Committee in August, although those plans are still being finalized.

Board Comments & Questions

None.

B. General Counsel Status Report

Mr. St. Michel said we don't have a full litigation update today. The Legal Department here at the agency is very busy supporting staff on policy initiatives, like Cultivating Community, as they're working through the code amendments, Regional Plan redlines, and the environmental review that's underway. We're also handling enforcement matters and settlement matters.

One of the enforcement settlements involves a California Tahoe Conservancy (CTC) project that we'll be coordinating with CTC on. We're involved in litigation as both plaintiff and defendant. We’re making a lot of progress, including with your help today. The accomplishments we got through today are helpful.

I also want to acknowledge the contributions of our legal team. Katherine Huston recently did a tremendous amount of work on an administrative record, which requires a lot of effort. I also want to recognize the significant contributions of Jack Mensik and Marsha Burch. We have an intern this summer who has also been helping. It's surprising how much of a difference having one extra person can make.

Board Comments & Questions

None.

12. GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER REPORTS

Ms. Aldean said regarding the commercial warehouse project that was continued, it was my understanding and I believe we've had this discussion about the value of having these projects go before the local jurisdictions first, before they make their way to TRPA. The local jurisdictions are obviously constantly communicating with members of the community. They have a better understanding of what the concerns are, and I think it would be far more productive to have the local jurisdictions take the first look at these projects, rather than continuing them at the board.

Mr. Hester said that's a terrific idea. When Clem Shute was on the Regional Plan Implementation Committee. One of our first projects was from Washoe County, and RPIC took an action, and then Washoe County changed it. It was an area plan amendment, as I recall. Mr. Shute said from now on, the RPIC doesn't want to see anything unless the local government has acted first. So, maybe we just want to take that direction. And possibly put it into our Rules of Procedure for projects and plan amendments because it makes sense. There's no reason for us to act if the local government doesn't support it.

Ms. Leumer said I appreciate the email about the Transportation Sustainable Communities Performance and Recommendations Report. As I understand it, we're on our 90 days' notice now. Because of the implications on previous discussions we've had in public about VMTs and projects going forward, I would love to have a report at the next Board meeting on this to better understand it and have an opportunity for public discussion.

Ms. Laine said I have two items that I just want to bring to the Board's attention. The Emerald Bay Shuttle Program is starting this Friday and will operate through September 7th. Also, a shout-out to Vail Resorts, who, on their own, decided to hire El Dorado Arts and Culture to find an artist who would do a rendering on two of their gondola cars. The rendering is of the Emerald Bay area, and it's well done.

What's astonishing is that inside every single gondola car is a big map that shows people how to get to Emerald Bay. It shows the fixed-route transit service going from Stateline to the Y, and then the shuttles from the Y. Tahoe always does this kind of stuff of what can I do to assist or add to this project. A big shout-out to Vail for partnering in the way that they could add to the project.

Ms. Aldean said this may be online but it would be helpful to periodically have staff come back to the Board with an update on the progress being made, especially on these major projects, such as Homewood and the future marina restoration project. Maybe do it quarterly, just to keep the public and the Board informed.

13. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Legal Committee

None.

B. Operations & Governance Committee

None.

C. Environmental Improvement Program Committee

None.

D. Transportation Committee

None.

E. Regional Planning Committee

None.

F. Local Government Committee

None.

G. Tahoe Living Working Group

None.

14. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS – ON ANY ITEM

Tara Thorton, Protect Tahoe comments are on the issue of glyphosate and herbicide spraying in the Basin. We are interested in getting it banned in the Basin and building a bioregional model from Lassen down to El Dorado. We know your authority is within the Basin, but you also have influence outside of it. We have had many meetings with your Board members and your staff, and they have been outstanding. We are happy with the progress and the conversations, thank you for that. We see a path forward. We are working on language right now. In some of the meetings we've discussed changing your Code of Ordinances from just discouraging the use of herbicides to explicitly prohibiting their use. We were originally saying synthetic herbicides, but we are now modifying that to say conventional herbicides.

The reason for that is you may hear a public comment about a product called Firehawk, which is a non-toxic, organic herbicide. However, it is technically considered synthetic because, to achieve the super concentrations, it has to be synthetically processed. We would take the word "synthetic" out of the language we're going to be sending to you and instead use "conventional herbicides," with an exclusion for the use of bio-herbicides.

We've also had some discussions about language for any future potential uses. Protect Tahoe wants to be very strict around explicitly prohibiting the use of conventional herbicides. We would like to look at language for perhaps a more streamlined process should a brand-new invasive species emerge that is resilient to every other prescribed method of control. In that situation, perhaps a fast-track process could be considered. We do not want to open any loopholes through the wording.

We're talking about something that is currently unknown because everything being dealt with both terrestrial and aquatic has prescribed management methods that do not require the use of conventional herbicides. We have appreciated the conversations and are grateful that you've agendized this issue for further discussion.

While the U.S. Forest Service – LTBMU's use within the Basin is not planned until 2028, we think it is urgent to move forward with this in a timely manner. We will continue to work with you on. We're very encouraged. We can make a model out of Tahoe. There's no better place. This is a national treasure, and let's make a model here for how to do forest regeneration and wildfire resiliency the best that can be done.

Alan Miller, Civil and Environmental Engineer, referred to his comments submitted about public hearings and the need to have public comment during the time when items are being considered not just at the beginning and end of the meeting. If you don't want to do that, we can send your legal department some additional work. You need an EIP for removing existing plastic piers and a threshold for toxic microplastics in Lake Tahoe.

I wanted to talk about dredging because that wasn't part of the Tahoe Keys Marina project. I sent my comments on the marina project to the Tahoe Keys Property Owners. I consider the Tahoe Keys ground zero for the microplastic bombs that are always going off. It's only going to get worse. You're considering the Tahoe Keys Marina renovation and reset, but the entire Keys needs a reset and starting with the marina. We don't see much new dredging in Lake Tahoe, but I'd like to suggest that the entire Tahoe Keys may benefit from dredging. New dredging could clean out the accumulated plastic contaminants, aquatic weeds, muck, and other wastes. I know somebody who lost a boat in the lagoon. It just sank and couldn't be found.

The benefits might be deeper and colder water, which equates to less plant growth and may keep the weeds below the levels of entanglement with boats and propellers that are exacerbating the spread and costing a lot to control. There could also be better water quality because the water would be deeper and colder. Typically, plants don't emerge if the water is more than 6 or 8 feet deep unless it's extraordinarily clear.

Again, I'd just like to suggest that going forward, dredging somehow be made a priority to get some dredging done in there and get some of that material out, because it's going out into the lake, it's fluxing out of the sediments, and it's not going away. It's only going to accumulate more. It's probably very bad, and we need to do some studies on that.

Let's get the toxins out of Lake Tahoe. Tahoe Keys is ground zero and a good place to start.

Gavin Feiger Keep Tahoe Blue said thank you to Supervisor Laine for continuing to champion the

Emerald Bay service, and to the Tahoe Transportation District and Mr. Marino for jumping through hoops to get this thing launched this Friday.

Member Leumer mentioned the report that came out of the TAC regarding the VMT threshold. I didn't realize that it had already been sent out to the Governing Board. I thought that it was coming to a public hearing. In that report, there is the decision that the Governing Board has to make regarding whether or not that funding target has been met.

Reid Reichardt, I live near Meyers, next to the Caldor area. After the fire, I remember seeing the first blades of grass come back, then the wildflowers, then the chaparral. It would be wonderful to jump straight from wildflowers to big trees again, but chaparral is amazingly vital for erosion control and the reemergence of biodiversity and animals, which are already back in the area.

In their so-called restoration plan, the Forest Service calls the native chaparral species "competitive vegetation" that needs to be removed to make way for planting conifers. But there's already an abundance of conifer seedlings out there, with two, three, and four years of growth. The chaparral is playing a vital role in preventing them from growing too closely together, which will reduce fire danger in future years. What's happening in Caldor right now is what's supposed to be happening. It is not deterioration.

A quote directly from the Forest Service website: "While chaparral has little commodity value, it has great value in slope stabilization, watershed cover, wildlife habitat, and nutrient cycling. Chaparral vegetation reduces flood potential."

After Caldor, one of my neighbors called the water flow off the mountain "Caldor Part 2." Yet this agency, with this knowledge on their own website, is telling us they're going to remove that vegetation from the mountain, spray the exposed soil with synthetics to keep it exposed, and somehow what they're spraying won't make its way into the waterways. Everything on that mountain flows down. The Forest Service calls its plan restoration and reforestation, but the forest has been reforesting itself for five years, and it's doing a great job. Let's be clear about what their plan really is. It's deforestation, followed by planting of a monocrop, their commodity crop to the detriment of the rest of the forest.

If this deforestation, monocropping, glyphosate strategy is allowed to start in Tahoe, it will become the worst thing that's happened to the Basin since the Comstock clearcutting. That means a ban on all synthetic herbicides in the Basin will be the most important thing you will ever do as stewards of this special place. This should be your top priority right now.

As for human health, the entire community of Meyers is 1,600 acres, sitting next to a spray area of 2,400 to 3,600 acres. The idea that glyphosate-laden dust won't blow into our area on windy days is simply not credible. We're not all going to get sick, but there will be some for whom this will change lives completely one day, in heartbreaking ways. You must think ahead for those people. Whatever your priority, healthy people, healthy forests, healthy lake, healthy wildlife, healthy soil, everything points to a full ban on all synthetic herbicides in the Tahoe Basin right now.

Marylou Lunsford, owner of a parcel located at 1105 San Bernardino Avenue, South Lake Tahoe. I am submitting this comment to alert the Governing Board to a significant error in TRPA's public tracking database that unlawfully restricts my property rights using outdated information. TRPA's

public system lists my lot with an IPES score of zero, mapping it as a Class 1B Stream Environment Zone. This data is false based on both legal and physical evidence. The historic zero score was tied to a restricted covenant placed on my lot on July 16, 2001. On November 8, 2024, a legal instrument was successfully executed and recorded with El Dorado County, entirely removing and dissolving the deed restriction. Because that contractual restriction has been legally terminated, TRPA has no ongoing authority to label this lot as retired.

As proven by the El Dorado County Department of Transportation recorded drawing sheet CL4R in Meyers, the county permanently altered the neighborhood's hydrology last summer by building a blanket-lined channel above pipe IT1BLC, directly adjacent to my lot. This engineering network actively intercepts and redirects historical stormwater away from my parcel.

Localized data and certified professional land surveys show that my property sits on high-capability soil matching the 5-6 building capability rating of the Meyers Elementary School directly behind my lot.

TRPA cannot maintain public mapping records based on erroneous information under Chapter 10 of the Code of Ordinances. I have submitted a formal request for correction to TRPA's Executive Director and Legal Department. I ask that the Governing Board ensure staff complies with Bi-State Compact Article 6 by correcting the public record and halting an administrative overreach on unrestricted private parcels.

Kathleen Hallal, Firehawk Bioherbicide said I have a background in environmental policy and sustainable land management. I led the movement in Irvine, California, for our city to adopt an organics-first citywide policy for landscaping and parks. We need to prioritize environmental health, soil biology, and water quality when we care for the land. Effective land management and environmental protection can work together.

As you consider how to manage the forest around Lake Tahoe, I would encourage you to search for alternatives and approve products that are organic, 25B exempt, or bio-herbicides, such as Firehawk Bioherbicide. I now represent Firehawk because I want to offer people an alternative to conventional chemical herbicides. I spent more than a decade looking for alternatives, and it took me a long time to find one that worked, but Firehawk is very efficient.

Even if it's not Firehawk, I would encourage you to please be careful about what products you're applying to the forest around the lake, because it could all run into the lake. We need practical and environmentally responsible solutions. The importance of reducing environmental impacts is obvious at this point, given what's going on in our environment and supporting the life around the lake and throughout our communities. Priorities in Lake Tahoe need to be protecting water quality, forests, biodiversity, and watersheds. Wildfire risk reduction is essential, but the management methods matter.

I would like to offer my support for using products like bio-herbicides in managing the forest where it needs to be governed. And alternative to conventional herbicides wherever appropriate.

Conventional herbicides cause a lot of downstream damage to the environment. They have runoff, they stay in the soil, and they could further damage the lake environment. What you need to develop is an integrated wildfire mitigation strategy. The environmental benefits of paying

attention to what products you're allowed to use in the forest and around the lake will support environmentally focused land management. You could reduce reliance on chemical inputs by searching for better solutions. Using products such as Firehawk will protect natural resources while addressing your vegetation challenges.

Environmental protection and wildfire mitigation can work together, and I would encourage TRPA to please evaluate sustainable vegetation management tools.

Kelly Ryerson, Protect Tahoe said I've watched over the last five or six years the development of Firehawk, and I've been very excited watching it go through EPA evaluation, finally coming out and being approved. What I have long looked for in my world of glyphosate advocacy is a one-for-one swap, and this is it. I'm just thrilled that it should be available in time for our Tahoe forests.

Second, we are counting on TRPA, given your specific authority in regard to being federally recognized as having power.

Since I deal quite a bit at the federal level, I know this is a lever that we need to be able to further protect our forests. I look forward to continuing to meet with all of you and seeing what we can get done.

15. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Gustafson made a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Hoenigman adjourned the meeting at 2:05 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Marja Ambler
Clerk to the Board

The above meeting was recorded in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the recording of the above-mentioned meeting may find it at https://www.trpa.gov/meeting-materials/. In addition, written documents submitted at the meeting are available for review. If you require assistance