

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
GOVERNING BOARD

TRPA/Zoom

March 22, 2023

**Meeting Minutes**

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Vice Chair Ms. Williamson called the meeting to order at 1:01 p.m.

Members present: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Aguilar, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Hicks, Ms. Hill, Mr. Hoenigman, Ms. Laine, Mr. Rice, Mr. Settelmeyer, Ms. Williamson

Members absent: Ms. Diss

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Regan said the Regional Plan Implementation Committee will reconvene at the conclusion of the Governing Board meeting.

Ms. Williamson deemed the agenda approved as posted.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Aldean provided her clerical corrections to Ms. Ambler for the January 25, 2023, minutes.

Mr. Hoenigman made a motion to approve the January 25, 2023, minutes as amended and the February 22, 2023, minutes as presented.

**Motion carried-voice vote**

V. TRPA CONSENT CALENDAR

1. February Financials
2. Release of El Dorado County Stream Environment Zone (SEZ) Mitigation Funds (\$110,000.00), for the Meyers Stream Environment Zone/Erosion Control Project
3. Resolution of TRPA v. Jacob Parker, U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California No. 2:21-cv-02243-TLN-CKD; Unauthorized Mooring of a Watercraft in Lake Tahoe; Regan Beach, City of South Lake Tahoe, California; APN: 026-050-006
4. Rules of Procedure, 2.16, Teleconference/Video conference
5. Memorandum of Understanding for Permit delegation between Washoe County and TRPA

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

two, and four. All expenditures are within budget and revenues are at or exceeding projections with planning fees remaining high but dipping over the past two months, most likely due to inclement weather. The committee recommended the approval of amendments to the Rules of Procedure regarding teleconferencing and video conferencing in order to encourage greater member participation at Governing Board meetings subject to reasonable restrictions which will allow us, among other things, to address safety concerns during adverse weather, conditions while still ensuring maximum public participation. That recommendation is subject to an amendment to Section 2.16.3, which now reads as: "During a teleconference, members may attend remotely from any location. No member may appear remotely for Governing Board meetings more than a total of five times per calendar year. These numerical limitations shall not apply to committee meetings not held on the same day as a Governing Board meeting.

Governing Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Conrad-Saydah said the double negative in the last sentence makes it a little confusing. The intention is that a member may attend a committee meeting remotely, and that if it exceeds five times per calendar year that doesn't trigger this rule. It only applies to the Board meetings themselves. It might be easier to state that more clearly these numerical limitations apply only to the Governing Board meetings themselves and not to the committee meetings.

Mr. Marshall said this is a holdover from the previous version of 2015. He proposed to say "This numerical limitation shall not apply to attendance at committee meetings.

Mr. Marshall said staff will also put the correct date on the adopting resolution.

Ms. Williamson said the Legal Committee recommended approval of item number three.

Mr. Marshall said they reached a settlement agreement with Mr. Parker on the litigation that they filed against him. It's for a violation of mooring off of Regan Beach illegally. It was a mooring for most, if not all, of the summer on an anchor as opposed to a legal buoy. The proposed judgement is for \$5,000 paid in installments. Mr. Parker claims substantial economic hardship and it was agreed upon to split the \$5,000 into two installments.

Chair Ms. Gustafson returned to the meeting.

Governing Board Comments & Questions

None.

Ms. Gustafson said item number 5 was not reviewed by any committee.

Governing Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Aguilar said if no other committee reviewed this item, he would like to have some background on it.

Ms. McMahon, Local Government Coordinator said TRPA has a history of entering into memorandums of understanding with local jurisdictions and public utility providers. They allow

those entities to do certain activities or permitting on behalf of the Agency. It's to streamline the permitting process and make it easier to get things done. Under the 2012 Regional Plan it called for local jurisdictions to develop area plans that are smaller geographic plans to further implement the goals and policies of the Regional Plan, and once those area plans are adopted, it also calls for TRPA to enter into a new memorandum of understanding with the local jurisdiction which allows them to do permitting on behalf of TRPA. When the Washoe County Area Plan was adopted close to two years ago, she reached out to Washoe County to get a new MOU in place. They've been working on this for a number of years. It replaces an old MOU that they had with them that's currently not in effect, it would allow for Washoe County after they have training to review non lakefront residential projects on behalf of TRPA.

Mr. Hester said the reason it didn't go through a committee is it's a standard format that they've used with a lot of jurisdictions.

Mr. Aguilar said if the County issues a permit in contrast to TRPA conditions, what is the remedy?

Ms. McMahon said they would provide the County training on how to review a project pursuant to TRPA rules and regulations and the expectation would be that they are issuing permits consistent with our rules and regulations. Staff also does annual audits to ensure that's happening.

Mr. Aguilar asked what the termination clause was on such an agreement.

Ms. McMahon said 30 days.

Mr. Aguilar asked if that was for cause or any reason.

Ms. McMahon said they would do an audit, and if there's problems, staff will provide training or give the jurisdiction an opportunity to correct the problem. If it's a larger problem, they could pull the MOU. They've not done that in the past five years that she's been the Local Government Coordinator. Generally, they can resolve the issues.

Ms. McMahon said this action will not create an environmental impact because they're not omitting any Regional Plan Goals and Policies or code. This would allow the County, if they choose, to issue permits on behalf of TRPA.

#### Public Comments & Questions

Doug Flaherty said many people recognize that this is nothing more than the nose of the camel in the tent to eventually allow Washoe County to approve accessory dwelling units in Incline Village. They are aware of what you're doing, and although he cannot speak specifically to a Board member, they want this Board to know that you're giving these people a glide path to double the human capacity in Incline Village which is already over capacity. They are already at risk of wildfire, there is no wildfire evacuation, roadway by roadway assessment. TRPA has not accepted their responsibility for public safety to create a basin wide roadway by roadway, fire evacuation assessment. Adding more ADUs eventually, which is the plan is going to do nothing but increase human and roadway capacity.

#### Governing Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean made a motion to approve the consent calendar with the changes made to the Rules of Procedure 2.16.3 Teleconferencing and Video Conferencing proposed amendment.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Aguilar, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Hoenigman, Ms. Laine, Mr. Rice, Mr. Settelmeyer, Ms. Williamson

Absent: Ms. Diss

**Motion carried.**

VI. PLANNING MATTERS

- A. Lake Tahoe Community College (LTCC) Student Housing Project, 33-unit/100 bed facility for students and one resident director office/apartment, 1 College Drive, South Lake Tahoe, California, APN: 025-041-023, TRPA File #ERSP2022-1992

Ms. Regan said we want to focus on the human element of this project before us. You as a policy board dive deep into the weeds of land use policy and very technical issues. Behind all of those issues, it's really a collection of humanity and stories and people's lives. Everyone in our community, not just on the south shore, but the entire lake and the region, is connected to this college and over the course of decades what began in an old motel on Highway 50 that has grown to this campus. Her husband left art school on the East Coast headed to San Francisco, but landed in Lake Tahoe, fell in love with the lake, and went to the college in the old motel. This project will address some of these issues. It affected his life, the love and passion for the lake, his art career as a fine artist, and ultimately her love and passion for this lake. That's one small story of thousands and thousands of human lives that are affected by projects like these. This also connects this to the Board's work as defenders of the Compact and the Regional Plan. And our academic partners, like the college, the University of California, Davis at the Science Center in Incline Village and the new University of Nevada, Reno Lake Tahoe campus, the Desert Research Institute, and many other universities help us carry out the intent of the Regional Plan through research, but also through their programming.

Thank you to Ms. McMahon for moving this project forward because of this incredible funding from the state of California to make this vision a reality. There were some tight timelines on the administration of this permit and this project application, and everyone pulled together as a team.

TRPA staff Ms. McMahon and Dr. DeFranco, President of Lake Tahoe Community College provided the presentation.

Ms. McMahon said Dr. DeFranco will go over the college's facilities master plan, some of the projects that have been recently approved, and how the college's plans and programs align with TRPA's vision and mission, along with how the college is helping to support community needs. Today the focus is on housing. Ms. McMahon will provide an overview of how the student housing project complies with the Regional Plan and TRPA's Code of Ordinance.

Dr. DeFranco said he's been at the Lake Tahoe Community College for a little over a decade and President for the past six years.

The campus has grown over the years, and they see this as a very transformative project for our

campus and also for the South Shore community as there is a significant housing shortage. In addition to all of the things you'd expect for a standard California Community College in terms of associate degrees, they also have a focus in forestry programs, fire academy, and fire science. They do have a lot of public safety programs and environmental science programs that align with the care, restoration, and preservation of the Lake along with the alignment with TRPA's mission.

They have an approved master plan by their Board of Trustees that was originally approved and developed in 2011, and most recently approved in 2020, reflecting a direction for this housing project and now will be updated again to reflect the final housing project hopefully once it's approved.

The campus has continued to expand. The light blue buildings shown on slide 5 are the buildings that are in planning and nearing construction, or currently in construction along with other ones that are planned for the future. This is part of a multi-decade plan to transform this campus. One thing that is unique about LTCC is that they're not just a project, they're more of a program. This construction program about renovating the campus has been taking place for the last ten years.

They started in 2015 and anticipates this run to continue through 2025 with housing on active construction. Slide 6 shows a list of four large projects that are complete, two that have been through TRPA and have been approved and under construction. Both of those are anticipated to finish late this summer. Then the student housing project, which is funded and designed hoping to get some key regulatory approvals including TRPA and get out to bid to get shovels in the ground this summer. The final one there is the Public Safety Training Center that hopefully, they'll have opportunity to talk to you about in the future. It's partially funded and are looking for some additional State and Federal funds. It's about providing training for forestry professionals, EMS, criminal justice, forestry, fire, etc.

The Lisa Maloff University Center allowed them to bring four year degree partners to campus. It was made possible through a local donor. This has made their trend to moving toward more green building movements. All these new units have hydronic heated sidewalks which are good for safety and the use of less ice melt, runoff, and chemical impacts. The next one is the Early Learning Center with pre-k programs offered on the campus as well. This project was completed in 2021 and meets many of those more environmental forward building and landscaping design. The next project is the Mobility Hub that was completed in 2019, and then through a partnership with Liberty Utilities and the Tahoe Transportation District, it was electrified in 2022, and provides overhead charging for their fleet of electric buses. This project was critical because it put the campus in the center of the bus network. They are one of the primary stops, there are three buses an hour coming through campus. This was an important pre-step to prepare them to be ready for housing.

The Greenway Trail is the new bridge that was completed in 2021 and is on their campus which they helped fund that section of the trail. All these were about creating alternative routes to transportation to campus and off campus.

They've also done a number of things to reduce vehicle trips. A lot of the trail access that was mentioned, but additionally, their student group has shifted. They used to have about one quarter of their students online and the rest were face to face. Now, they're about 50/50. With about 50 percent of the students online, there's a lot less vehicle trips. Students will still come to campus sometimes to see a counselor, purchase items from the bookstore, but not in the number of trips

that they had when they were predominantly face to face. They've also implemented a telecommute protocol that's available for their permanent staff, a minimum of 50 employees and are up to about 70 right now where they get 20 percent or one day a week telecommute. These were all things that they did to help reduce the number of vehicle trips to their campus. They are one of many sponsors of Lake Link, but one of the more important roles is that they house those vehicles on their campus. They are also one of the highest if not the highest location of trip origin and trip completion.

They received this funding from California but have a bi-state mission, for instance, with their promise program which allows students to be tuition free for up to three years if they qualify. That's fully funded by their foundation for any student around the basin, including the Nevada side. They also recently got some legislation approved that allows them to enter into this Western Undergraduate Exchange, where any Nevada resident could pay 150 percent of California tuition and access the campus.

Slide 12 shows the current off-campus housing which was an existing set of condos. They entered into a five year master lease with the owner and made them significantly denser. There are six students living in each one: two students per bedroom with three bedrooms, total. This serves 30 students and a resident advisor. It's a small dent and is something that they'll continue to work on. There are some rules around the funding so, this would allow them to continue to serve, especially folks that come from beyond the basin. They have a lot of students that will come from Las Vegas, Reno, and out of state and even a couple of international students. This is in the Ski Run Boulevard neighborhood and close to public transportation.

The students have been impacted by the affordable housing situation as well. There's many stories talking to students about less than ideal living situations, landlord challenges, their housing being converted into a second home or VRBO, etc. They've had a lot of displacement of their students so that impacts their ability to access their education.

They are proposing 100 bed full-time student housing on the campus. It's dedicated to low-income students and deed restricted which is the agreement with the state of California. They are one of only 11 California Community Colleges that receive this funding. They're hopeful to start construction this summer. They received this funding at the end of June, beginning of July and at that time it seemed impossible to get a shovel in the ground. A special thanks to Ms. McMahon and the entire TRPA team for their responsiveness. It would literally cost them millions more to build if it was a year later.

These are full-time students that are on campus and are not trying to bring 100 students from another area to campus. It's to support students that are in town that maybe are looking to move out of their parents' house and get more independence. Maybe they have a less than ideal situation living in town, or maybe they're unable to find housing.

The location of the proposed housing is in the southwest corner of the developed part of their campus adjacent to the student center, cafeteria, library, workout facility, the gym, etc. It overlooks the Trout Creek area. It will connect to the rest of that campus and focus on walkability and connectivity to those other buildings. This area is pretty undeveloped right now and is going to be a little bit of a cornerstone project that will anchor multiple buildings together. There will also be a full-time residential director that will live on site. Each of the rooms have kitchenets, but there's also

community kitchen. There's two double occupancy bedrooms that are next to each other, and then they share a restroom. They do have a couple of single occupancy bedrooms because they do have folks such as returning veterans and formerly homeless students.

(Presentation continued)

Ms. McMahon said this project is before the Governing Board because it will require more than ten residential bonus units. It only requires five new parking spaces because it's located adjacent to an existing large parking lot on campus. It's located near existing college buildings, including the library, student services, classrooms, gyms, and ballfields.

It's a proposed two story building and is consistent with TRPA height regulations. The college is proposing to use earthtone materials that are compatible with the existing college buildings, and compatible with the wooded background. It's a 33 unit, 100 bed facility, and one resident director office apartment.

This project does require 41 residential development rights and the college is located in the older Bijou Al Tahoe Community Plan. The City of South Lake Tahoe has plans to update this older community plan and develop a new area plan, but they couldn't do it in the timeframe they needed to get this project approved. One obstacle identified early on in the process is, there's this policy in the Bijou Al Tahoe Community Plan that limits TRPA from allocating no more than 20 bonus units to a project. Bonus units are the type of development right that TRPA gives out for deed restricted affordable, moderate for local achievable housing. TRPA asked the City if they could provide 21 residential units of use which are the banked development rights that the City got from tearing down an old motel. Lake Tahoe Community College asked if they could use those for this project and they would go to the Board to ask that 20 bonus units be allocated to the project. The plan is for TRPA to reserve the other 21 residential bonus units and when the City gets their new area plan adopted, removes that outdated policy. Then TRPA will give this project the remaining bonus units, and then the college will return the residential units of use back to the City. The City's been using those residential units of use for various affordable housing projects, or accessory dwelling units.

She thanked the City of South Lake Tahoe for supporting this project and working with TRPA on this.

TRPA staff found that the project was consistent with the Regional Plan code and community plan and have made all the project findings and are recommending approval of the project.

They did receive a public comment letter from the Tahoe Prosperity Center expressing support for the project and is the only comment letter received on this project.

Presentation can be found at: <https://www.trpa.gov/wp-content/uploads/Agenda-Item-No-VIA-Lake-Tahoe-Community-College-Student-Housing-Project-1.pdf>

#### Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean asked if it was correct that this mitigated negative declaration is because of the findings of significance on page 295. This has to do with some quality issues that state "No" with mitigation, it won't have an impact if the impact is mitigated. Because on page 297, none of those boxes are checked under determination. She assumes the box that should be checked is "B" proposed project

could have a significant effect, but due to a list of mitigation measures which have been added to the project, would ultimately not have a significant effect.

Ms. McMahon said correct, it was not marked but based on the conditions in the staff report, this project wouldn't have a significant impact. This project had an Initial Environmental Checklist prepared.

Ms. Aldean said the Initial Environmental Checklist says they have included the full document as well as the final initial study, a mitigated negative declaration. She wanted to ensure that there is not an inconsistency between the document as we've completed it, and what was submitted by the applicant.

Mr. Marshall said there is not.

Ms. Aldean said it's the college's intent to make this housing available to students within the basin, do they have a marketing program in mind so that they're not attracting students from outside of the basin?

Dr. DeFranco, LTCC said because the nature of this funding from the state of California is limited for California low income residents who are full-time students. For example, the University of California, Berkeley has had some housing challenges, a lot of their housing is focused on like international students or out of state students. In this instance, this is limited to state of California residents.

They've talked a lot about this internally. Their target opening date is July 1, 2025, and there's still work to be done on that. They've talked with their folks that do the basin wide High School outreach from Tallac and South Tahoe Highschool and also do outreach to Whittell, Incline and North Tahoe High Schools. You could go away to college and have that residential experience here. A lot of it will also be through their basic needs center where many of their students are having housing insecurity or affordability issues. This is going to start at \$500 a bed monthly rate including their utilities, internet, etc. A lot of it is going to be focused on those students that have high affordability needs. A lot of their basic needs staff are already connected with who those students are. They'll have a lot more details as they get closer to opening.

Ms. Conrad-Saydah said based on the demand, they are seeing a lot more remote students, but what is the average demand for housing.

Dr. DeFranco, LTCC said they hired the firm Brailsford & Dunlavey who have worked with schools from San Diego State, Western Oregon Community College, the University of California, Berkeley and everyone in between up and down the West coast. They did a demand survey for LTCC based on a price point that was actually a little higher price point than this. The demand might even be greater at this lower price point. Through that demand survey, there's all these steps, and then they keep cutting them down and cutting them down, and they got down to about 200 students which is they estimated for the annual demand. The initial demand study says there's demand for 440 beds, but then they take out all these folks that they don't think will actually act, or may not be able to afford, or folks that may not stick with it. They believe there's significant pent up demand for this and is their intent to maintain that 31 bed unit off campus, especially because that can serve out of state students or international students. But at the same time, he doesn't think any of us see in the foreseeable future, thinking about having another hall or multiple halls.

Ms. Conrad-Saydah asked what their average annual enrollment is because when the housing is



available, they may see more demand.

Dr. DeFranco, LTCC said their headcount will serve 7,500 students in a given year. With that said, 450 of those students are older adults that come for the silver sneakers workout classes. Then 500 of those students are taking winter classes such as avalanche rescue and whatnot that are coming from all over the region. Then 500 of them are part of the rising scholar's program, which are incarcerated students. A couple of thousand are fully online students. A couple of hundred of them are firefighters from San Jose to South Lake Tahoe, that they train at the at their fire agencies. It gets to a much smaller number but you're talking about a couple thousand students that are degree seeking in the region and then a much smaller number of those of about 500 that are full-time degree seeking on campus.

Ms. Conrad-Saydah said given that the school doesn't run year round, have they any conversation about usage for summer camps or summer school?

Dr. DeFranco, LTCC said the agreement with the State has to be 24/7, 365. Because this is also trying to meet the low income housing need, some of those students might formally be foster youth or students that don't have another home to go back to, the intent is that it's available year round.

Mr. Friedrich said with the 500 full-time equivalent year round students, presumably this would be serving that group and based on the housing shortages, their assessment that this could support an additional 100 new students, or 20 percent more that otherwise might have come to LTCC in the past meeting that crucial FTE need to sustain college operations, and this will help facilitate that. Is this helping to create a pathway for students who otherwise have not been able to afford to be in that 500 FTE full-time category?

Dr. DeFranco, LTCC said this is a little bit less of a growth, but more of a maintain. They recently worked with a firm from the University of California, Davis that did interviews of the students to see why they left, and a lot of the times it's because the housing turns over. After the Caldor Fire, they had significant enrollment dropped from a week before when they evacuated to when they came back. Students got displaced or lost their jobs. A lot of it is that there's students that are getting displaced, having turnover, having issues, and they're leaving the college because of that. The other issue they hear from students is they needed to work more hours in order to afford to live. This is more about kind of maintaining these students that have demonstrated interest, but they can't afford to live, work, and go to school. There are too many demands on them. Or some of the students that have had so much housing turnover. For example, they had a student that was a student leader a couple of years ago, that moved four times in her final year at the college because the house got sold, got converted to a VRBO, etc. That might have been a more extreme example, but there's many anecdotes of that from their students.

Mr. Friedrich said Dr. DeFranco is an advocate of energy efficiency and renewable energy and mentioned earlier of work on existing buildings to make them more efficient. But he didn't hear him share any plans for efficiency or sustainable building elements here.

Ms. McMahon said the architect for the project is online.

Dr. DeFranco, LTCC said this building will be built with a lot of energy efficiency lifecycle costs all those things considered. There's a lot of things that they've been trying to do environmentally with

heated walks and connectivity. That requires less use of the blowers and the deicer and all those things that impact the environment. There was a lot of thought given to the location of this facility related to Trout Creek and the existing walking trails and how to connect to this campus but maintain and preserve that natural environment but also allow the folks that live in this housing to be able to access it. The biggest thing that's not in this project, but it's adjacent to this project, and a little premature, but they are in preliminary conversations with Liberty Utilities about doing a solar array on the north side of this housing that would come a later time. It wouldn't be enough solar to power the facility, for instance, but more of a demonstration site. There's a spot north of this housing with some covered spaces for trash enclosures and transformers that they've been talking about for a potential solar array in the future.

Ms. Williamson said two things that LTCC does well are that they attract older students and a range of students and they have great daycare. She asked if family housing is factored into this project, or that they see a need of for students or single parents.

Dr. DeFranco, LTCC said the campus master site plan has a mixed-use residential plan. It's completely hypothetical right now. It's north of the campus by the Forest Service Building. They did this space holder when they went through the California Environmental Quality Act process but there's no momentum or funding toward that right now. This project does not address that because this design is pretty much the vast majority of about 90 of the students are in double occupancy setup, and then only 10 are in single occupancy. Typically, you'll have a different location for family student housing and more of a townhouse or condo, with a playground and open space. There's conversations with folks on campus that would like to see that as a next logical evolution but is probably a ways out right now. In July 2019, they had zero housing, then they entered into that five year lease, and now they're doing this. They know that housing insecurity and this dynamic between number of hours you need to work and the number of hours you need to go to school impacts their students ability to complete and get degrees.

Mr. Settelmeyer asked if they've spoken with institutions about limiting factors such as, is there a limitation on how long someone can stay at this particular place? For example, he had a friend with a two year degree, but he was in school for eight years. Are you going to make this available to people that are 100 percent virtual degree? If so, he questions that. He appreciated the preference for people out of the basin, but there may be some individuals currently that are driving daily to the campus that you could prevent from having to drive daily out of the basin. It's available obviously for Nevada and California, but in that respect, if you meet the need within the basin, and you still have room, would you then allow people out of the basin, or would these then be unoccupied?

Dr. DeFranco, LTCC said there is definitely going to have to be an end. With their promise program right now, they get up to three years. These are two year degrees but that doesn't always happen. They'll probably be looking at three years and then there's an appeal clause if there's an extreme circumstance. The intent is not to be a student and be able to get housing and have this become their long-term housing.

Once this is built, they'll have these 100 beds on campus. This is specifically limited per their agreement with the state of California, who basically wrote a \$40 million dollar check to support this, it must be California low income residents and full-time students. This housing is limited by those elements. They are going to maintain their other off-campus housing because they serve a lot of students that are not California residents. They do have many students that commute from

## GOVERNING BOARD

March 22, 2023

Minden, Gardnerville, Carson City, etc. to the campus that they want to provide local options to reduce those. At this time, they have these two suites of housing that one of them is fully locally controlled, which is the off-campus housing and the on-campus housing, they have local control within the constraints of the agreement with California. As they get further down the line, they'll be due for another one of those demands surveys to see what the missing gap is. Is there more demand for out-of-state housing, family housing, or low-income housing?

Mr. Settlemeyer said he's a little bit troubled that this is a bi-state Board and you're saying Nevadans aren't welcome.

Dr. DeFranco, LTCC said he completely understands that and they've spent a lot of time in Sacramento, trying to explain to folks the bi-state nature of their institution. They have had some good luck with two different bills where one got them the California Nevada interstate attendance agreement which allows them to serve the East shore of the basin. Most recently, Assembly Bill 1998 got them the Western Undergraduate Exchange that now allows them to serve Nevada students at 150 percent cost. In this case, it was part of a Governor's proposal for California and these constraints were on it. They do have a number of Lake Tahoe clauses but in this case, it was not available to them.

Mr. Settlemeyer remembered working with former Senator Gaines and Mrs. Gaines on the Western Undergraduate Exchange (WUE) concept.

Dr. DeFranco, LTCC said Senator Gaines was very helpful with the initial California Nevada Interstate Attendance Agreement.

Mr. Aguilar asked if there is a relationship or partnership with the University of Nevada, Reno and the new campus in Incline Village.

Dr. DeFranco, LTCC said they have a relationship with UNR. They had a very close working relationship with Sierra Nevada College prior to UNR. They taught classes in the LTCC University Center and had multiple students getting four year degrees here in the South Shore with the Sierra Nevada University degree in faculty. Since it's become the UNR Tahoe campus, they've had some conversations, but still being worked out. Not speaking for them but he thinks they're establishing their offsite center now, and kind of working out some of the implementation steps of that. There is a potential possibility of that in the future. In the past, LTCC was basically like a satellite campus for Sierra Nevada College, now UNR Tahoe is a satellite campus for University of Nevada, Reno. So, they don't have as good of a fit there anymore in that regard. But they do have transfer agreements and met with the forestry program leadership to align with their program. There's a lot of academic connections, but with the UNR and SNC switch over, it's changed the dynamic a little bit.

Mr. Aguilar is asking because of Director Settlemeyer's question of reciprocity between UNR Tahoe and LTCC. Are they serving Californian's just the same as you are serving Nevadans and vice versa. Maybe there's a bi-state compact that can be done there.

Dr. DeFranco, LTCC said the Western Undergraduate Exchange is a big element of that. Any given year, they could have more students go to UNR than any other California State University or University of California. Their top transfer schools are UC, Davis, Sacramento State, and UNR. It varies, some years UNR is at the top of that. That is another one of those things that they have to do

some educating on. That's also part of the reasons they brought that University Center to campus, because if you live on the South Shore and are commuting to Sacramento or Reno for classes, isn't always a great option. There is also that emphasis on trying to get these four year degree offerings on campus as well.

Mr. Aguilar asked what the percentage is of Nevadan's enrolled at the Lake Tahoe Community College.

Dr. DeFranco, LTCC said an estimate is its single high digits across all the programs and then the California Nevada Interstate Attendance agreement, which is the Stateline to Incline Village students was 22 this past year.

Ms. Laine expressed her appreciation to the College. They've spent so many years talking about housing at the college with partners. They've looked at it every which way and weren't able to come up with anything viable until the College stepped up. Congratulations and thank you for your leadership and taking this step. And thank you to the City of South Lake Tahoe for being great partners.

Mr. Rice asked what a full-time student is now.

Dr. DeFranco, LTCC said they are a quarter school with Fall, Winter, and Spring quarter. It's 12 units in a primary academic term. They wouldn't have to necessarily go full-time in summer to maintain the housing. Twelve units in a quarter school is like three, four unit classes. They tell students if they want to graduate in two years, they need to take 15 units a term, but 12 units qualifies for full-time for aid and the purpose of this housing.

#### Public Comments & Questions

Hilary Roverud, City of South Lake Tahoe, Director of Development Services said Ms. McMahon mentioned the City's role in supporting this project, in the form of providing residential units of use. Their City Council approved the agreement to facilitate that transfer at their meeting on March 14, 2023. That action is consistent with city adopted housing element policies and programs to support the community college and developing student and faculty housing. They are excited about the community college pursuing the opportunity to develop this student housing project and their ongoing general commitment to addressing the housing needs of students. They support the recommendation to approve this project and appreciated Lake Tahoe Community College, TRPA, and all of their partners that are committed to solutions that provide more housing opportunities for members of our community.

Mike Glover, CEO of the Tahoe Chamber said on behalf of their members and Board of Directors, he's pleased to share their support for the proposed project. LTCC has a unique and valued asset serving our region. The Tahoe Chamber has a long history of supporting the college, including support for the development and approval of their facilities Master Plan and support for the individual projects that are coming forward consistent with that Plan that includes the proposed student housing project. They provided letters of support to the California Legislature and Administration when the State grant for this project was being considered and ultimately approved.

Gavin Feiger, League to Save Lake Tahoe said they are in support this project based on the land use,

the environmental findings, and the community need. It meets the goals and policies and helps further those from myriad of regional and local plans.

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Friedrich congratulated Dr. DeFranco and staff for being proactive in meeting affordable housing needs for students. This project is crucial for the viability of the school, which in turn is a cornerstone of South Lake Tahoe community, and our region, which is why the City so strongly supports the projects. It's certainly one of the best and most needed projects that have come before us, in recent memory and anticipates also, for the future.

Mr. Friedrich made a motion to approve the required findings, including a finding of no significant effect.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Aguilar, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Hoenigman, Ms. Laine, Mr. Rice, Mr. Settelmeyer, Ms. Williamson

Absent: Ms. Diss

**Motion carried.**

Mr. Friedrich made a motion to approve the proposed Student Housing Project including the allocation of 19 affordable residential bonus units and one achievable residential bonus unit and reservation of 21 additional bonus units for the future use of the project subject to the conditions in the draft permit.

Mr. Settelmeyer said as a Nevadan, he appreciated and supported this bi-state concept. He hopes in the future, that things will be looked at in a bi-state way, otherwise, he will no longer vote in a bi-state way.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Aguilar, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Hoenigman, Ms. Laine, Mr. Rice, Mr. Settelmeyer, Ms. Williamson

Absent: Ms. Diss

**Motion carried.**

Dr. DeFranco, LTCC said they'll keep sharing geography lessons in Sacramento, and are going to try and get some of the key stakeholders as well for a groundbreaking.

B. Permitting Improvements Action Plan - Implementation Recommendations

Ms. Regan said today's presentation will talk about some permitting improvement processes and wanted to elevate that discussion away from some of the technical issues that you'll be hearing. These are very important to think about your role as the policy makers of the Basin, and looking at how we drive compliance of the Regional Plan. Permitting is a key strategy for us to bring properties into compliance. What's she's seen in her couple of decades of work at TRPA is the more challenging and difficult the permitting process, the less interested folks are to participate in that process. Having done a lot of research, focus groups, and workshops in the communities, and if TRPA make the rules so difficult that people can't understand and how to comply, they're never going to get to

the vision that we have of the Regional Plan and to bring older properties into compliance. It's also a matter of good public service as public stewards, public taxpayer dollars. They have a responsibility to work with our communities, to move older properties into compliance and to ensure that new properties are developed responsibly in an environmentally compatible way that meets our environmental standards here in the basin.

Mr. Stockham and the interdisciplinary team at TRPA staff level, who've been working on this very diligently. Mr. Stockham used to be with TRPA and helped them lead the Regional Plan Update over a decade ago and is intimately familiar with our processes.

Mr. Stockham, Stockham Consulting provided the presentation.

Mr. Stockham will be presenting a refined package of permitting programming improvements. The focus is to improve the permitting process which in turn will help facilitate environmental redevelopment and threshold attainment. They've tried to stay focused on, can we make the process more effective, more efficient, more consistent, and what are those changes that would do the most good without creating any harm?

These recommendations were developed through an incremental process. It started with a staff team for permitting improvements which have just been instrumental throughout this process. They started with a development of ideas, where should we start looking for areas for improvement? Then they did an issue assessment with a lot of stakeholder outreach, where are the opportunities to improve? They sent that documentation and got feedback. Ultimately, that evolved into the permitting Improvement Action Plan which they presented to this Board in August 2022., and that was endorsed to move forward.

That's started identifying the strategies and the more specific topics and more detail in the change recommendations. Since that August meeting, they've spent a lot of time in the technical details of what's going to work, what's not going to work, and pitfalls. The 45 pages are very detailed specific recommendations that they think changes can be made that are not going to have negative environmental impacts but are going to have significant procedural benefits.

The goal today is to get comments, course corrections, and concerns from the Board. They're asking for endorsement, and then will be coming back in August 2023 with the final ordinances, fee schedules, etc. for approval. They're anticipating an implementation date of October 1, 2023, for this first suite of improvements so, they can do some training before it goes into effect.

They'll be working on Phase 3 improvements after that August stage through the winter and then hoping to have everything buttoned up and new programs in place in February 2024.

Slide 5 shows the six priority topics and action items that were identified in the Permitting Improvement Action Plan.

Overarching is efficient, consistent, and predictable processes. So, people have a reasonable expectation of what's approvable, what's not approvable, and everything's done as consistently and efficiently as possible. It's a complex Code of Ordinances, so, it's never going to be perfectly efficient.

The second topic is minor applications. They heard a lot that really little things at TRPA can take a very long time. Big things also take a long time, but the real improvement opportunity is to make routine actions a lot easier, simpler, and less time intensive things. Things that are clearly in conformance with the Regional Plan and Code of Ordinances. They have a whole suite of changes focused on clarifying the Code requirements. They have a lot of standards that are not measurable. For example, the definition of coverage and coverage as a measurable, quantifiable limit, but the definition isn't quantifiable, it's subjective. There's been a whole suite of interpretations over the last generation to make these kinds of non-quantifiable definitions measurable. That creates a lot of confusion and difficulty. They want to write that detail into code.

They have some recommendations on customer service improvements and communication. There's more longer term efforts focusing on enhanced staff development and training. Lastly, funding which is really another crux issue. With the procedures currently in place, the fees generated through permitting are not covering review costs. It either requires subsidies from other funding sources or significant efficiencies.

The first topic is a suite of administrative improvements which are important for consistent operations. Resourcing this effort, getting all of the permit templates, review documents, and documents used by staff consistently. Increasingly relying on staff teams, sub-supervisory roles with different functions, and a big one is the procedure manual. There aren't really any written procedures at TRPA. There are some, but it's a lot of institutional knowledge and word of mouth. They want a very comprehensive manual that's publicly available on how the permitting review process works, what people can expect, what things need to be checked with different types of applications. In the long term, they're going to look at opening up the application forms and requirements and improving those as well as part of a Phase 3 effort.

Next is to simplify procedures for minor applications and sequential approvals. The first big one is a new category of application called a minor application, that would be much quicker and easier to apply for and to review. The second is increasing use and allowances for concurrent processing. A lot of times people have to do an application for, say, a development transfer before they can then do a development project. Bundling those and getting those to the same planner for review.

There are a couple pinch points that are taking a lot of time and not doing a lot of good such as the Qualified Exempt process and the Historic Resource Determination process, and then, looking at some additional staff level decisions as well.

The minor applications are for the types of projects that clearly conform with the Regional Plan, they're not pushing the limits, basically looking at cutting the review time about one third, simplifying the application process, having standard findings, making these a lot more routine with a dedicated staff review team. For example, if someone was adding a little bit of coverage for a deck addition, or something like that, it wouldn't need to be a 120 day process, it would be a 40 day process. The criteria for eligibility exclude some of the projects that require complex reviews and detailed findings, if it's in the shorezone, or sensitive land wouldn't be minor applications. If it's a standard home Improvement project that they see over and over again, it could be processed a lot quicker and easier.

These are some more of the criteria such as some additional grading being allowed on the list of bundled and concurrent applications, or below. Again, development right transfers together with

permits, maybe lot line adjustments. They're all kind of looking at the same things through different types of applications.

The Qualified Exempt process is very odd. These are things that are exempt from TRPA review, and essentially require a property owner declaration, saying they promise that it fits within this category. What's evolved is essentially a de facto review and approval process that isn't supported with application fees. It's very challenging and kind of being used as a way to get a de facto TRPA approval without going through the project review process. These are very minor things such as interior remodels or not adding coverage. They're recommending pushing that back to be a property owner declaration, and not doing an entire TRPA review of those declarations. Some of those Qualified Exempt activities, from staff's perspective, are no value in that process, and there are some of the easier ones that are recommended to be fully exempt. There's two pieces there, let's fully exempt more activities and for the remaining QE activities, many of which have to pay a mitigation fee, or installing BMPs that they have a quick and efficient process. They're recommending a consistent fee for all of them. Some of these declarations have no fee, so, it's a money losing operation for TRPA. Basically, a simple process, \$200 to cover review time.

The Historic Resource Determinations are another kind of procedural requirement that takes a lot of time, it's not funded, and it's not adding any significant value. The feedback was to be more aggressive on this and they had initially proposed. The Regional Plan essentially calls for development of a historic resource inventory list, and special procedures for those listed properties. Essentially every building that's over 50 years old has to go through a historic determination before they can apply for a project. This is capturing an increasing number of homes built during the 1960s and now the 1970s. It delays project reviews two to three months, and it's not really catching anything. It's kind of a standard, busy work process. Option one is to streamline the administrative procedures and make it part of the application review process. A lot of stakeholders said you should go further than that addressing policy matters and take it back to what the Regional Plan calls for. Essentially don't do these parcel by parcel determinations but update the historic inventory list, apply special rules and special incentives for those listed areas and free up the other 95 percent of the homes in the region that aren't historically significant.

Slide 12 shows additional staff level decisions recommended. Again, these historic modifications. Currently, if you're determined to be possibly eligible as a historic resource, Hearings Officer review and approval is required for any improvements, it's become cookie cutter, busy work and can be done at the staff level. There's some outdated avalanche hazard language in the Washoe County Area Plan that they're recommending goes away.

For shorezone decisions moving to an enhanced staff review process where there's neighbor notification, there's appeal rights, but the initial decision would be done at the staff level. That would make things move a lot quicker and more efficiently, while at the same time preserving safeguards to approve disputed items to this Board.

The Code Matters has a whole suite of interpretations that have been documented since 1989 and have not been put into code. They plan to write that language into code consistent with the interpretations that have been made for 30 years. In addition, they want to add some clarification to things like coverage and building height and how those are measured. Some of those are written interpretations and some are unwritten from institutional knowledge. Building height is another one, some rounding standards. These take a ton of time. You wouldn't think a lot of staff time would be required to determine building height, but they're very subjective. It's not clear how you measure



the roof pitch, it's not clear how you measure the slope retained across the site. While it's about the most complex ordinance you could develop for building height, at least having clear guidelines for how it's measured would be great.

The topic of focusing on high value work. There are two ordinances they're targeting here that require a lot of staff time and not a lot of value. The first is the below the IPES line drawing, which has become redundant with the exit of the allocation incentive pool. They're looking at merging those programs and using the more efficient approach.

Additionally, the discussion earlier about area plan audits, there was a lot of feedback that auditing 10 percent of the projects approved is excessive and requires an extreme amount of staff time both at the local agencies and TRPA. There's a recommendation to reduce the auditing standard to 5 percent of issued permits rather than 10 percent. That change alone will probably free up about two months a year of TRPA staff time and probably similar amounts for local agencies.

TRPA Code relies on all these different documents. They are often hard to find. They have those on a common list with hyperlinks to each, so those will be easy for applicants to find.

For customer service improvements they are preparing to implement dedicated staff for customer service questions, similar to what Mr. Weigel used to do. Also, recommending three customer service improvements associated with that, webpage resources for who to call, and who is the staff planner for different applications. Standardized pre application meetings, items like that. They have a draft customer service policy just to get consistent expectations for things like return calls and out of office messages. They're planning continuing coordination meetings with the stakeholders. The stakeholder input has been very important here and there's also been a lot of applicant input. The League to Save Lake Tahoe has been helpful in being another set of eyes filtering through these recommendations to make sure they're not inadvertently creating impacts. They made a number of changes based on those discussions from their initial recommendations.

Priority 5, Expand tools for staff development and training is part of the Phase 3 work. Once they have all these administrative tools, they want to expand training opportunities and rely on lower-level staff to do more routine determinations, more administrative staff work, more assistant planner level work for the easy stuff with written guidelines.

The cost of reviews significantly exceeds the application fees and it's being driven by a handful of different application types. Long term, they are strongly recommending a cost recovery program where the permitting program covers its expenses with enhanced monitoring of expenses. In the interim, there are a handful of applications where the fees are mismatched to the amount of work required, and most of those are shorezone applications. It's just eating up a ton of staff time, and there's no budget left for all the rest of the stuff. They are recommending some fee increases at this point for shorezone scenic reviews, mooring lottery applications, buoys, and additions to existing piers. Those are all applications that have nominal fees and are not covering the cost for reviews and won't cover the cost even with the efficiency improvements.

The issue of notices and appeals for staff process are not addressed in the fee schedule. They're recommending a 25 percent add on for that type of review which compares to 40 percent for Hearings Officer or 80 percent for Governing Board. It'll be less extensive than those options but still reflect the added work.

Outside the shorezone, pretty modest changes, recalibrating lodging fees to be the same as multi-family fees. Now, lodging is less expensive than multi-family. Daycare, they're recommending a reduction in fees essentially an intentional fee subsidy, not unlike how you handle affordable housing because that's an important community.

He's already mentioned the Qualified Exempt nominal fee. There are two additional minor requests that don't have any fee, that they're recommending \$200 for restamping final plans. Then there's an outdated multiplier fee and special planning areas. The remaining community plans you have to pay 25 percent higher fee than if your project's located anywhere else. They're recommending that goes away. There's only a couple left, Bijou and Round Hill.

Those are the near term fee changes being recommended. On the fee mismatch, they're trying to attack this 80 percent with efficiencies but there are some fee adjustments that are important at this time.

Staff are requesting endorsement today with any concerns or comments. The details will be put together between now and August, and they'll continue to coordinate with stakeholders on that language, especially the ordinance language. They plan to return to the Board in August for the adoption of the proposed changes and implementation on October 1, 2023.

They'll continue to update the website with project information. The entire team meets bi-weekly to work on these process improvements and Ms. Borawski and Ms. Self will be assisting with the implementation steps.

Presentation can be found at: <https://www.trpa.gov/wp-content/uploads/Agenda-Item-No-VIB-TRPA-Permitting-Improvements-Action-Plan-1.pdf>

#### Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean said she's appreciative of the index that they'll be creating because she's spent so much time searching for appendices. On page 316, where it states that the recommendation is to convert the 30 day application completeness review to a preliminary project review, would there be any benefit when these projects are not being reviewed pursuant to a Memorandum of Understanding to include local jurisdiction staff as well in these project reviews.

Mr. Stockham, Stockham Consulting said on the routine application reviews there's just not enough staffing to involve everyone, it's more the larger, significant major projects. A lot of this is going to be the deck addition or a new family room. They've met several times with the local agencies' staff, and they heard a lot more support than concern.

Ms. Aldean said with respect to the relaxing of the Qualified Exempt applications, would there be any benefit to posting these qualified exempt projects online so they are accessible to neighbors who might inquire about the validity of the project and if a permit has been issued or whether one is required?

Mr. Stockham, Stockham Consulting said that's happening now when a qualified exempt declaration gets submitted. They would still stamp it as accepted and post it on the Parcel Tracker and people

will be able to see those items, that won't change.

Ms. Aldean said when they're cataloging what were important code interpretations addressed years ago, that those policy changes and how the code has evolved over time will be preserved as a future reference. It would then allow someone to see how the policy evolved from point A to point B. Mr. Stockham, Stockham Consulting said yes, they hope that by putting this language into the Code that will be less necessary. There's a lot of tracking pulling up old interpretations, but definitely want to keep that as a resource. This catalog is not just administrative interpretations, it also includes some legal memos and some other issues that need to be maintained for administrative purposes.

Ms. Aldean referred to page 339 under Pier additions, the option that was selected was to increase the fee for additions only, with no change for pier modifications. But then, down below, where you've itemized the change in fees, pier modifications, low scenic has actually increased from about \$3,900 to \$5,300 even though up above it says there'll be no change in the pier modification charges.

Mr. Stockham, Stockham Consulting said the fees are complex as well. There's a base fee, and that's not changing. The change for the total fee increase is because of the scenic review fee increases. There's a big difference in review time between a minor pier modification and adding 60 feet to the end. It's adding that 60 feet to the end that they're trying to recover costs for.

Ms. Conrad-Saydah thanked them for focusing on cost recovery, because when she got involved with TRPA, the first thing she noticed was that they needed to increase full cost recovery for these types of actions. She also liked the idea of simplifying, so that there's a standard approach for things that we do as bread and butter that provide certainty to people. If there's less certainty and more complex, they move right to cost recovery.

Depending on how much they move towards these declarations, they may need more enforcement to ensure that the declarations are true, and that property owners are holding to them. It would be good to note that there may be increased enforcement costs as we move away from more involved permitting, which is fine, we just have to acknowledge that in the long run.

Ms. Williamson said thank you for streamlining this. She liked the customer service piece and knowing that's available is helpful. This is probably 90 percent of people that live here will be interfacing with TRPA with just this. She loved hearing that they're talking to the public about it and thinking about making it easier and more accessible. This is the exact right path to be on.

Ms. Hill said great work and likes the subsidies for daycare facilities. Regarding the automation of permitting and sees we do a lot online which is awesome and am wondering how much more should the Board be supporting on technology for automation, so a person doesn't have to make as many phone calls. They could see that they are in the queue and, for example, have 15 days left of their review time.

Mr. Stockham, Stockham Consulting said staff emphasized that to him as well. Using technology is very important, and it's an ongoing process that TRPA is working through. This kind of works in concert with that. You don't want to create a whole computer system for a flawed process. They wanted to button up the process so that the technology could work more efficiently and work together. This is set up to incrementally evolve into more and more technology based processes for

permitting whether it's complete electronic permit review. There are a lot of different models for increasing use of technology. That's not a replacement for the key kind of organizational administrative tools that they're recommending. It doesn't matter how good your technology is if the ordinances are unclear. It's designed to work together and implement this; they're going to have to make some platform changes within Accela between now and October and do some technology changes in order to implement these recommendations.

Ms. Aldean said tiering off Ms. Hill's comment, the converse of that is, she appreciated the fact they'll have people at the front desk that you can communicate with who can answer questions at least preliminarily and get you to the right staff member. Automating things is great, but the human touch is still critical, because so many things become so depersonalized, and people are irritated because they're tired of calling a number and getting an automated voice. She doesn't want to sacrifice efficiency, but they've come a long way enhancing our personal service to our clientele and wants to ensure that's not sacrificed on the altar of technology.

Mr. Stockham, Stockham Consulting said that's even more important a TRPA because many of your ordinances are structured with more flexibility in implementation than you are accustomed to seeing, a lot of findings. It's not always clear, yes, that's allowed, no, it's not allowed. He doesn't think you're going to be able to get away from that human factor while this ordinance stays in place.

Ms. Faustinos said regarding the historical designation issue, she hopes they're taking care in how those definitions are going to be applied. In particular, for architectural design, some spectacular designer 10 to 20 years from now is going to be important. She wants to ensure that those issues are robustly addressed so that they're not inadvertently damaging something that could have some historical significance ten years from now.

Mr. Stockham, Stockham Consulting said there are two categories of recommendations. Category one essentially keeps the framework we currently have in place but makes the process more efficient. These category two changes would be a different planning process. You could take different approaches. You could ask the local agencies what should be a designated resource, you could do a new study of designated resources, a place like Fallen Leaf Lake may warrant some special standards for that area because the concentration of this historic. If the Governing Board wants to go in that more substantive policy change direction, they're suggesting you do that through the annual work program. It's going to take more thought than 1 of 20 recommendations through this process.

#### Public Comments & Questions

Doug Flaherty on behalf of the TahoeCleanAir.org said every organization needs to go through this type of a process and applauds it. His concern is being involved in many of these issues in the past few years, what seems to be minor to one person at the staff level, to save time, and what is actually a cornerstone of a project that may be approved through self-approval or self a testament. Those are all incremental and would hope, recognizing that this is a process that's valuable, you host one or two workshops once these changes are in place to the point where you think the public will be able to comment. He also believes that since there are going to be code changes, the word minor is in the eye of the beholder, he hopes that they do an environmental impact statement on this. The TRPA environmental checklist is a sham. Many people recognize that, and it prevents the ability to trigger basin wide cumulative impact analysis.

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Williamson made a motion to endorse the Implementation Report for TRPA Permitting Improvements as shown in Attachment A.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Aguilar, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Hoenigman, Ms. Laine, Mr. Rice, Mr. Settelmeyer, Ms. Williamson

Absent: Ms. Diss, Mr. Friedrich

**Motion carried.**

VII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director Status Report

1) Tahoe In Brief – Governing Board Monthly Report

Ms. Regan said the big story of this year is the weather. A global weather data look from NASA, shows most of the world had a pretty warm winter. The west coast and the Sierras are the exception to that. The mascot for Tahoe this summer is the pothole. Having lived 38 years in Tahoe, she's never seen anything like it, because we just have this incredible cycle of free thaw that's ravaging our roadways. It's very interesting to know scientifically what's going on with all these multiple, more than a dozen atmospheric river storms. The Lake level is up to 6,225.3, a couple feet above the natural rim. It went up a foot from February 1<sup>st</sup> of this year. The natural rim at 6,223. The Lake did mix all the way to the bottom, which many of you probably saw in the news reports, which is a very good thing ecologically, for the Lake and the clarity data that will go looking at last year's 2022 average will be coming out within a month or so, more to come on that.

Hats off to our local government partners who've been working hard to keep the roads safe for locals and visitors alike. Also, the first responders, there were many states of emergencies in our local jurisdictional areas.

Notably, we were 4 to 8 degrees colder in Tahoe this winter, and that has affected overall the conditions on the ground, because the snow extremes of cold then warming, and that's part of the condition of the pavement that affects Lake clarity. We just beat the 1982 and 1983 winter record at 677 inches of snow for the year.

She thanked the members of Team Tahoe that accompanied herself and Devin Middlebrook, TRPA's new Government Affairs Manager that went to Washington, DC with several partners. They met with the delegation on the Nevada and the California sides. The four Senators offices, members and staff, as well as California and members of the House. They were reaching out to members in the in the House that are putting their hat in the ring for Senator Dianne Feinstein seat because Feinstein's legacy will go on forever here at this Lake. They want to make sure that Tahoe stays relevant and top of mind for anyone who might be venturing into that race.

There was a great moment where the delegation introduced the extension of the Lake Tahoe

## GOVERNING BOARD

March 22, 2023

Restoration Act. That was a highlight, that bill was dropped, and Senator Cortez Masto signed that Bill right before it was dropped in the Senate, and it was also dropped in the House by Congressman Amodei.

Tom Fortune from Vail Resorts, who oversees Heavenly, Northstar, and Kirkwood was regaling them with stories of snow which everyone was excited to hear. Also, part of the Tahoe Team is Darcie Goodman Collins from the League to Save Lake Tahoe and Steve Teshara representing the Tahoe Chamber and Sustainable Community Advocates.

They were also pushing very hard for Fiscal 24 spending for the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act. The funds from the Restoration Act are supporting things that you heard today, such as the Trail Feasibility Study around Emerald Bay. They also received the \$600,000 grant from the state of California from the Housing Community Development Agency that the Board approved the resolution a couple of months ago. There will be funds available to start some work on housing policy. There are a couple of other larger grants in that department that are outstanding. TRPA was invited to serve on the Regional Housing Strategy Development in Cape Cod with the Cape Cod Commission. They are struggling with many of the same things that we are, as many resorts are in the country, and it will be a great opportunity for us to learn from them as well.

Congratulations to Amy Fish, who's going to be a speaker feature at the upcoming Esri Conference in Southern California. She'll be talking about the Boating app which is also something that they talked about in the shoreline presentation. This is an app that folks can pull up on their phone or tablet while they're on the Lake to see where they are, how close they are getting in terms of the no wake zone and lots of other important information about the Lake. We're proud of our GIS team and Amy Fish in particular.

### B. General Counsel Status Report

No report.

## VIII. GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER REPORTS

Ms. Gustafson said Placer County is undertaking their Tahoe Basin Area Plan Amendments which they have met with quite a bit of public concern about it. There is a workshop tomorrow night in Kings Beach from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. Everyone is invited to attend and provide input to staff.

Ms. Gustafson, Commissioner Hill, and TRPA staff, the Town of Truckee staff, PCTPA staff, SACOG staff will meet tomorrow to discuss rail and the efforts Caltrans has put into a rail study to expand rail service.

Ms. Hill said the Incline Village Mobility Hub survey is online at <https://inclinevillagemobilityhub.org/>. In addition, all of their public workshops are also online.

## IX. COMMITTEE REPORTS

### A. Local Government & Housing Committee

No report.

B. Legal Committee

No report.

C. Operations & Governance Committee

Ms. Aldean said the building has sustained some damage as a result of the heavy snow. There was a water leak that damaged some documents in the storage area downstairs and the snow is currently being cleared from the roof. We are looking at a financial hit of about \$100,000.

Mr. Keillor touched on some of the bank failures and assured us that we're transferring more money out of the Wells Fargo account and the LAIF account to redistribute some of our assets. Right now, we are not receiving any guidance from Wells Fargo on any impending doom. Wells Fargo along with other major banks were instrumental in helping to shore up First Republic.

Ms. Regan said TRPA's budget is continuing in both state legislatures. She thanked member Hill and Vice Chair Williamson who attended a meeting in the Nevada Governor's office with Mr. Keillor to advocate for funding for TRPA's one third share. Also, thank you to Director Settlemeyer who has been helpful in helping them understand how the bonds will move forward in the legislative process for the Environmental Improvement Program. They are waiting for the May revise in California.

D. Environmental Improvement, Transportation, & Public Outreach Committee

Ms. Faustinos said they had two informational items on the agenda for the Transportation Performance and Recommendations Framework and the Cascade to Meeks Trail Feasibility Study.

E. Forest Health and Wildfire Committee

No report.

F. Regional Plan Implementation Committee

No report.

X. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Kathy Astromoff, Chamberlain's homeowner is concerned with the recent direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort. The direction the developers are taking are breaking the promises they made 2011 Master Plan where they declared an intention of maintaining the heritage of a ski resort that can be enjoyed equally by local residents and visitors. Instead of doing that, they are severely restricting public access to Homewood Mountain Resort which in the future is going to be through paid membership. This will be extremely limited aka only open to residents' multiple times each month, no holidays or weekends, which seems a little counter to the Master Plan that was approved. In addition, the new resort's design is not conceived as an Alpine Village community in the architectural style of classical Tahoe Lodges, that's also direct quote from the Master Plan. The developers have already begun building homes in a mountain modern architectural style, how did

they get permission to do that? Thank you to TRPA for being active on this matter and letters raising these questions to the developers. What they're looking for is the next step. They'd like to stop the construction underway on Fawn Street, which is not consistent with the Master Plan. They want to pause permitting until the developers submit a plan that's consistent with the Master Plan and then ultimately continuing to determinations from TRPA specifically that their most recent proposals are not compliant with the Master Plan.

Doug Flaherty gave a shout out; he knows we're a bi-state commission to the Nevada contingency. The Nevada side of the Lake has been Californiated way too long, they're suffering. The East Shore is being degraded. The East Shore bridge is an eyesore, there's erosion, pollution from dog waste, human waste and so forth. He hopes their Nevada contingency will step up to the plate and protect Nevada's interest in our pristine East Shore which is being degraded every day.

He's also protesting the silencing of public comment on the issue Washoe County item being heard at the Regional Plan Implementation Committee. These people come down here, they've waited a long time. Some of them have prepared for days for their delivery. It's insensitive and rude to put a two minute time limit on these people. They work very hard.

Tobi Tyler, Tahoe Area Group of the Sierra Club has stated before that we have a carrying capacity issue here in the basin and the trajectory of increased density, height, and coverage throughout the basin are on a collision course with increasing environmental degradation. She brings to your attention to the excellent opinion piece in the Reno Gazette Journal-Tahoe's Future Hangs in the Balance again. The cumulative impacts from the numerous development projects and the allowance of greater density, height, and coverage are not being evaluated, which violates the National Environmental Policy Act and the California Environmental Quality Act. These developments do not address affordable housing needs and will result in an increased population in transportation pressures at a time when we already exceed anyone's vision of maximum carrying capacity with the 60 million visitors per year.

TRPA has basically eliminated the VMT standard, and now is opening the door to increased traffic nightmares and environmental degradation from the additional people in the basin. TRPA is not complying with NEPA and CEQA with their environmental checklist which most projects are approved under. Increased density puts the entire community at risk in the event of the evacuation because of fire and other disasters. It also increases air and water pollution because of increased fossil fuel, bikes, cars, boats, and snowmobiles that come with increased density. Also, we currently have the ski industry shutting down lifts and news organizations, telling people not to come up here. When we have that, then we have carrying capacity issues that need to be addressed, not just continuing with approval of this sort.

Beth Davidson Incline Village resident said this is the first time she's been to a TRPA meeting. When a meeting is announced for the Regional Plan Implementation Committee and it's four hours later that you finally get to this, this is not respecting public comment and customer service. She's glad to see that you intend to improve your approach in terms of permitting with public communication and customer service. She hopes in that customer service that you are including the people who live and work here. She doesn't see that in her first meeting. She'd like to see better respect for the communities as they exist around the Lake.

Workforce housing, for instance, is an abstract. How about the businesses that already exist here,



GOVERNING BOARD

March 22, 2023

finding out how many people they employ, what kind of housing these people need and drive that first. If you're going to drive compliance, drive that compliance before you begin additional expansion of development.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Aldean moved to adjourn.

Ms. Gustafson adjourned the meeting at 3:16 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Marja Ambler  
Clerk to the Board

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