

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
OPERATIONS AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

TRPA/Zoom Webinar

March 22, 2023

Meeting Minutes

CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Ms. Aldean called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m.

Members present: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Di Chiara (for Mr. Aguilar), Mr. Hoenigman, Ms. Laine

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda approved.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes approved.

III. RECOMMENDATION ON FEBRUARY 2023 FINANCIALS

TRPA Financial Director, Mr. Chris Keillor presented the item. He said he would first like to address a couple of topics that could potentially impact the TRPA financials. The first is the recent banking crisis, and the second is weather related building expenses.

The banking crisis could affect TRPA in two areas. One is that TRPA has substantial investments in the form of mitigation funds and securities. Mr. Keillor said that none of these investments are in the four banks currently being targeted. Mr. Keillor added that TRPA have not been subject to any rating changes, and there has not been any marked movement on the market value of their bonds.

Referring to commercial banking, Mr. Keillor said that TRPA's commercial banking accounts are with Wells Fargo. He said everyone knows that there is an insurance cap of \$250,000, but TRPA cannot effectively get below that. Each week TRPA conducts either payroll or an accounts payable run, and both of those are well in excess of \$200,000. Payroll is a little over \$300,000 and accounts payable is usually around \$450,000. Mr. Keillor said they could maybe tighten up on how much money is kept in the Wells Fargo account, which would require more transfers, adding some additional administrative costs. Mr. Keillor said that with interest rates so low, there would be an additional cost in not leaving more money in the Wells Fargo account. Because it's a commercial account, they cannot make interest, but they can offset fees by keeping a larger balance. They've been keeping a large balance to eliminate banking fees.

Mr. Keillor said he believes they are fine on the banking issues but is prepared to discuss in more detail in next month's Treasurer's Report item.

Referring to First Republic Bank, Ms. Aldean said a lot of the major banks, including Bank of America and Wells Fargo, infused capital into First Republic, which reduced their available cash. She asked Mr. Keillor for his assessment on how that might affect TRPA. Mr. Keillor said it was a positive sign for Wells Fargo that they felt they were strong enough to throw \$5 billion into the pot.

OPERATIONS AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

March 22, 2023

He added that he has also reached out to TRPA's Investment Advisor who responded that they were not changing their guidance on banks, and in his opinion Wells Fargo are fine.

Mr. Keillor advised that he had been looking at a new agency credit card program. They have almost settled on a program through Chase Bank.

Referring to weather-related building expenses, Mr. Keillor advised they had had a couple of incidents. A snow/ice covered drain recently led to flooding on the second floor. The area is mostly warehouse space and houses less important items, but there were some older boxes of files. Staff will sort through the boxes to determine what, if anything, has been lost. Ms. Aldean asked if any of the files had been digitized. Mr. Keillor said they had not, but they were not a high priority for digitization. Mr. Keillor added that some water had also infiltrated some of the tenant spaces, and a remediation company had been hired to make repairs. He said that a bigger problem had arisen at the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) space who had a leak from the roof. Mr. Keillor estimates the overall cost for remediation work will be around \$10,000.

Following severe weather, heavy snow and ice pack, Mr. Keillor advised that the cost to remove snow from the roof is very expensive, perhaps over \$100,000. Many other buildings in the area are experiencing similar issues, with several roof failures. He does not like the cost, but it is necessary for building maintenance.

Moving on, Mr. Keillor said that Governing Board member Alexis Hill arranged a meeting with TRPA and the Governor's Chief of Staff Ben Kieckhefer on the Budget issue. They acknowledged that a mistake was made, but that that will be resolved, although it is still dependent on legislative approval. He added that there are two pieces in the TTD (Tahoe Transportation District) ask from Nevada. There is a small piece from TRPA to cover the cost of running TTD. The bigger piece of the 7-7-7 ask will be bonds, and is going through a different route. Both pieces will be considered separately by the legislature.

Ms. Aldean asked if there was a mistake in the translation for the budget request. Mr. Keillor said he was not clear about the nature of the error. He added that California were still working through the budget, so he has no update at this time.

Moving to the TRPA financials, Mr. Keillor said there was a small negative in fees and grants due to a billing lag for grants, and because fees do not fully recover current planning costs. As far as fees are concerned, January and February are down a little bit. Some of that is weather-related, but that has also given the Permitting and Compliance Department some time to catch up on other planning activities. That said, they are still above the last 3-year average by 4-5%. On the expense side, they are tracking to budget and where they would expect to be at this point in time.

Mr. Keillor said they had provided two cashflow charts this month. The left graph shows total cash flow, and the second one shows before and after mitigation funds - on that one you can see how, during the course of the year, mostly the cash flow with mitigation is higher because they're collecting those mitigation fees along with planning fees. The inflection point shows when the transfer of mitigation fees happens. Mr. Keillor said he plans to clean up these charts to be more consistent and readable going forward.

Committee Comments/Questions

Ms. Laine asked what the TRPA fiscal year is. Mr. Keillor responded it is the standard July 1 to June 30, so they are two thirds of the way through at this point.

OPERATIONS AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

March 22, 2023

Public Comment

Ms. Pamela Tsigdinos asked if there was any effort to restore, rather than potentially destroy, the water damaged records – she strongly encouraged restoration. Mr. Keillor responded that the first step was to recover the boxes and allow them to dry. Staff will then examine the boxes to determine what records need to be retained. He said probably 10% were from a long dead program that has since been replaced by LakeTaholInfo, but they will conduct an evaluation of each record.

Motion

Mr. Hoenigman made a motion to recommend the Governing Board approve the February Financials

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Di Chiara (for Mr. Aguilar), Mr. Hoenigman, Ms. Laine

Motion carried.

- IV. Recommendation to approve release of El Dorado County Stream Environment Zone (SEZ) Mitigation Funds (\$110,000.00) for the Meyers Stream Environment Zone/Erosion Control Project

TRPA EIP Executive Assistant, Tracy Campbell presented the item. Ms. Campbell said that this mitigation request was from El Dorado County. The request is for the SEZ funds in the amount of a \$110,000 funds for the Meyers Stream Environment Zone/Erosion Control Project.

The first phase of this project was completed back in 2017, so this request is for phase two, which was developed when the County secured some additional funding through the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act and Prop 1. The project area runs along East San Bernardino Avenue from Bakersfield Street, to San Diego Street, where the watershed catchment will be disconnected from the existing uncontrolled drainage, and then re-routed to a wetland treatment system.

This work will help reduce water quality impacts from the Meyers residential area. Other benefits include ecosystem restoration and flood control. The project is scheduled for construction in Summer 2023.

Committee Questions/Comments

Mr. Di Chiara asked if the funds were for implementation and unforeseen construction costs. Mr. Donaldo Palaroan, Eldorado County Senior Engineer said the funds will supplement a funding package towards project implementation, including unforeseen costs. Ms. Aldean added that any unused funds will be returned to the mitigation fund.

Public Comment

None.

Motion

Ms. Laine made a motion to recommend the Governing Board approve the release, subject to the conditions contained in the memorandum.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Di Chiara (for Mr. Aguilar), Mr. Hoenigman, Ms. Laine

Motion passed.

- V. Recommendation regarding proposed amendments to Rules of Procedure, Section 2.16, Teleconference/Video conference

TRPA Legal Counsel presented the item. This is a package of amendments to Rule of Procedure 2.16, which is an internal rule for teleconferencing, and the ability of Governing Board members, and by default APC members, to participate remotely.

Over the years, TRPA have made amendments to this rule to make it more flexible to allow remote participation by Governing Board members. During the last several years, TRPA has operated under emergency orders of the two States, and were able to conduct purely hybrid meetings, without the limitations imposed by traditional state laws, and without TRPA rules conferencing. Coming out of that, they are now in an era where TRPA are back into their teleconferencing rules, which had some limitations. Also, in the meantime, there has been substantial revision to the teleconferencing policies of local governments in California (Brown Act), and Nevada (Open Meeting Law).

Mr. Marshall advised that the Legal Committee recently had a working session to discuss upcoming changes, and where they may want to propose some additional flexibility. Firstly, because people are more comfortable with the concept of teleconferencing, and also because of the substantial public safety concerns, as indicated by today's weather, in terms of storm and weather-related risk.

The first proposed change affirms that members can attend remotely, and there are two sub-questions that need to be considered. The first sub-question is whether or not members attending remotely need to be within the jurisdiction they represent - should there be some connection with where you are located, and what jurisdiction you're representing. The proposal essentially says that once you are remote, it does not make a lot of difference where you are.

The second question refers to the quorum. The current rule states that a quorum of members to conduct business, is four from Nevada, and 4 from California, need to be present within the basin. So they can be remote, but they can but they have to be within the basin. The proposal is to take that that requirement out. The Brown Act has a more stringent requirement, that the quorum has to be present, and the Nevada Open Meeting Law has a substantially more relaxed quorum requirement – in essence there is no quorum requirement. Mr. Marshall said they could consider whether to move off a more jurisdictional requirement for quorum.

The current rule also dictates that TRPA Governing Board meetings must notice where members were appearing remotely, make that open to the public, and have an agenda posted. Essentially it was a remote office for TRPA, and people could appear there if they wanted to. Mr. Marshall thinks that everyone is comfortable with moving away from that, and saying that if you provide members of the public with the opportunity to appear remotely, the individual locations where Governing Board members are located need not be open. So the proposal is that the member can make that location open, but there is no requirement to do so, since the public can participate in three different manners: two-way connection using telephone, internet connection, or in person.

So part of the the new proposal, coming out of California, is whether to emphasize that the first option is to attend in person, and the second backup option is for remote appearances. And so there's a limitation on the number of remote appearances. Working with the Chair, staff proposed five remote appearances per year, accounting for winter months, and three in a row, which comes out of the California amendments to the Brown Act. These are intended as a back-up mechanism, not the primary directive for Board Members, and not to make this standard practice.

March 22, 2023

Mr. Marshall said that another key requirement from the Brown Act, is the disclosure of adults in a remote location. So if anyone aged 18 years or over is present in the room when appearing remotely, they must be disclosed to the public.

Finally, Mr. Marshall said that the current rules require that all votes are Roll Call Votes (including approving the agenda, or adjourning the meeting). The proposed amendment would promote a little more efficiency in meetings by stating that voice votes are allowed for administrative matters. That is more technically defined in the rule language or the rule language, as votes that are not specified in Chapter 2 – essentially administrative procedural matters.

Mr. Marshall said he also wanted to emphasize the handout, referring to Rule 2.16.3, which essentially removes the quorum requirement for members in the basin, and also removes the requirement that they must appear remotely within their jurisdiction. So for example, if a member has a meeting that takes them out of the jurisdiction they represent, they can still participate remotely.

Committee Comments/Questions

Mr. Hoenigman said that, as a member from California, with frequently conflicting meetings in far flung places, Mr. Marshall mentioned the Brown Act requirements, and asked if they needed to comply with those. Referring to three consecutive meetings consecutively, he said he arose at 3:30 a.m. to drive through torrential rain, and it was a little terrifying coming over the pass. If the weather had been worse it would have been really risky. He wonders if they could just have the five in-person meetings per year as the requirement. It is his intention to attend every meeting in person, but the flexibility would be a good option.

Mr. Marshall said yes, that is an option. Article 3.D. of the Compact incorporates either the Brown Act, or the Nevada Open Meeting Laws, whichever is stricter, for which meeting shall be open to the public. It does not incorporate the entire panoply of the rules, it expressly references only those provisions that control whether or not the meeting is open to the public. So the meetings will always be open to the public, as controlled by Nevada Open Meeting Law, which is stricter on that front.

Generally, they look to both statutes to control how they interact with the public, and how agendas and notices should be set. But TRPA are a Bi-State agency and should generally fall within their guidelines for administrative practice. They would like to keep as close as possible, but at the same time they're a different agency than most local governments with smaller representations, whose members come from local counties or cities, as opposed to far-flung statewide representatives. Mr. Marshall said he would be comfortable with the will of the committee to make that recommendation.

Ms. Aldean said she thought there was a compact provision among the controlling documents that indicates that if a board member misses three consecutive meetings, that they are subject to replacement. She asked if that was the origin of this amendment. Mr. Marshall said that was if a meeting was missed entirely. He believes that there is flexibility to allow for attendance by new technology since it does not stipulate 'appear in person'. Ms. Aldean said she thinks they have the option to either adopt the language as presented, and whether or not members are able to comply. If people are not able to comply, and meetings are cancelled as a result of a lack of a quorum they can revisit the issue. Or, they can defer to out of basin members and proceed by eliminating the three consecutive months in a row requirement, and see if they get any push back.

Mr. Marshall confirmed that the committee members proposed to keep the five remote meetings per year limitation, but to eliminate the three remote meetings in a row limitation. Mr. Marshall reminded members that the Compact imposes a requirement that if a member misses (does not attend in any capacity) more than three consecutive meetings, they are subject to replacement.

OPERATIONS AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

March 22, 2023

Ms. Laine emphasized how important it is to be in person where possible. The convenience of zoom is great, but all who have participated in that way realized that there is a decrease in the level of engagement. She strongly recommended members attend meetings in person, and only use zoom where necessary. Mr. Marshall said they could also add a requirement for members to appear on video when they are remote. Ms. Aldean said that would probably instill a greater sense of responsibility to be engaged in the meeting. Mr. Marshall said that would mean that if a member has difficulty with video, perhaps due to bandwidth issues, they would no longer be able to participate in the meeting. Ms. Aldean recognized that may mean that the meeting loses quorum and needs to adjourn. Ms. Laine said they should maybe continue with the current practice where the meeting chair requests that members turn on video, but it is not a requirement. Ms. Aldean said she was confident that everyone serving on the Board is committed to their responsibilities. If there is abuse of the new flexibility they can revisit and strengthen the rule.

Regarding noticing of who is present in the room, Mr. Hoenigman asked if that opened them up questioning whether the vote was legitimate in the future. If for example, someone came into the room, and it hadn't been noticed. Mr. Marshall said it is always conceptually a possible problem, but if members are diligent in acting in good faith to disclose, that's a very good defense to any subsequent challenge.

Mr. Di Chiara asked how this would work on the occasions where he has to step in on the Secretary's behalf for a committee meeting, and must attend virtually due to logistics, but the Secretary then takes over in person for the Governing Board meeting. Would that count as remote or in person attendance? Mr. Marshall said in that case he would advocate that would not count as a remote appearance due to the distinction between a committee meeting versus a Governing Board meeting. Mr. Di Chiara asked if was possible to institute some sort of exemption that could be requested if a member has a specific circumstance. He said he would always prefer to attend a meeting remotely, rather than not attend at all. Mr. Marshall said it was possible to add that the five remote appearances could be subject to extension by exception. Ms. Laine said she did not want to make too many opportunities to extend beyond five. They have twelve meetings per year and are notified of the schedule ahead of time. She recommended that they try it and revisit if necessary. Ms. Aldean agreed.

Public Comment

None.

Committee Comments

Mr. Hoenigman motion to recommend the Governing Board approve the required findings, including a finding of no significant effect for the adoption of the amendments to rule 2.16.3 in the Rules of Procedure as amended and discussed at this committee meeting, "During a teleconference, members may attend remotely from any location. No member may appear remotely for Governing Board meetings more than a total of 5 times per calendar year. These numerical limitations shall not apply to committee meetings not held on the same day as the Governing Board".

Ayes: Ms. Laine, Mr. Hoenigman, Mr. Di Chiara, Ms. Aldean

Motion passed.

Mr. Hoenigman made a motion to recommend adoption of Resolution 2023 - ___, to amend rule 2.16 of the Rules of Procedure, as amended on the record.

Ayes: Ms. Laine, Mr. Hoenigman, Mr. Di Chiara, Ms. Aldean

Motion passed.

VI. [Shoreline Implementation Update](#)

TRPA Permitting Program Manager, Tiffany Good presented the item. Ms. Good said she would provide a brief background on the Shoreline Plan, and then highlight some of the implementation milestones and accomplishments, as well as what the staff is currently working on.

Ms. Good said she wanted to point out upfront that, as with the adoption of any major planning initiative, it takes a lot of time and resources to figure out how to put a set of complex policies into motion, in a way that's effective, transparent, measurable, consistent, and digestible to the public. She is proud of how hard staff have worked to accomplish these objectives, and of how they're continuing that work as unique challenges continue to arise.

Ms. Good said that getting this plan across the finish line was quite the effort - it took decades and endless hours of stakeholder collaboration. The plan focuses on balancing the built environment, with new structures and uses, and recreation access in the shore zone. The Shoreline Plan allows development and redevelopment in the shore zone in a way that hadn't been done in a very long time. Ms. Good said they opened the doors to new shore zone permitting opportunities for the public, while also emphasizing the importance of natural resource management along the shoreline. The major tenants of the shoreline plan include capped development, especially new development in the shore zone. They also established guidelines for appropriate uses, and provided updated regulations for things like piers, buoys, boat ramps, and marinas.

Ms. Good reiterated that the addition of new piers and moorings is capped on Lake Tahoe, and that's a very important thing to remember. Because these caps are for new structures, it's important to differentiate between new and existing. New structures are those that are permitted and put into place after the adoption of the plan, and existing structures are those that have the benefit of approved previous TRPA, State or Federal authorization, or were in place prior to 1972.

Ms. Good said she would be talking about two big programs – the mooring program, and the new pier program. The mooring program has two major pieces, phase 1 and phase 2. These terms are used to differentiate between existing, and new. Immediately following adoption of the Shoreline Plan, staff focused on addressing existing/phase 1 mooring first.

The program also differentiates between mooring registration, and mooring permitting. So a TRPA permit is the mechanism required to place a mooring or a structure, and the registration is simply the fee to mitigate the annual boating impacts created by that structure.

Ms. Good said one of the first orders of business, after adoption of the plan, was to recognize the existing mooring on the lake - moorings that had already received appropriate authorization, and simply had to be registered. This was a pretty big bucket, but it was really important to tackle these first, before addressing any new moorings, to ensure they kept within the parameter in both the code, and the environmental impact analysis. To date, staff have processed 1,140 registrations, which accounts for about 5,400 existing moorings. Other applications outside of the dark blue section on the pie chart (slide 5), are either still in review, or are paused due to the need for additional information, or are on hold at the request of the applicant, or have been denied.

Slide 6 indicates the accomplishments for phase 1 registrations that require a permit. All moorings require registration, but not all moorings in the phase 1 bucket require a permit. Some of those phase 1 moorings were already authorized and didn't require a permit. For those that did, approximately 90% of those applications have been processed.

Moving to phase 2 (slide 7), said these are applications and permits for new moorings. In order to distribute the new moorings equitably, they work on a 'slow as you go' approach, in consideration of private, public, and marina uses. TRPA have created an annual lottery system to facilitate this

OPERATIONS AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

March 22, 2023

approach. Staff are making good progress on issuing permits for these new moorings, and have recently dedicated additional staff resources to these permits specifically.

Referring to slide 8, Ms. Good highlighted new pier permitting accomplishments. This is another capped category, and TRPA distributes new piers in a lottery system similarly to the mooring lottery system. The lottery is conducted bi-annually, and took place in 2019 and 2021. Staff are now gearing up for the 2023 allocations. Ms. Good said staff have made good progress here, especially considering that all of these new pier applications either need to be considered by the Governing Board, or by the Hearing Officers,

Another important piece of shoreline implementation is enforcement. Ms. Good said they have really beefed-up enforcement of the no-wake zone with two patrol boats, logging approximately 1,200 hours on the water, and resulting in 620 enforcement actions. These enforcement actions really educate people on the no-wake zone, and on downloading the Lake Tahoe Boating app – hopefully making a safer environment for people on the lake,

On the mooring enforcement side, they have really focused on illegal moorings that are placed offshore of public land, especially where it is clear that a permit cannot be issued for that mooring. The compliance team and boat crew have tagged 47 illegal buoys, most of which have been removed, and the enforcement presence will continue to strengthen with advances in the mooring, permitting, and registration program.

Ms. Good commended the great work being done by the permitting, boat crew, compliance, AIS, research and analysis, long range planning, and legal staff.

Ms. Good said it has been asked why it is so hard, and why it takes so long to permit shore zone projects. Firstly, she said the shoreline ordinances had not been updated for a very long time. As a result of the past, more restrictive shore zone permitting environment, there is a lot of pent-up demand to pursue shoreline projects, with limited dedicated staff resources. The shore zone is also a very complex environment. It's very sensitive from an environmental perspective, and also from a policy and property rights perspective. Finally, there are a plethora of State and Federal agencies that have jurisdiction in the shore zone, and a high level of coordination is required on every project, from placement of a buoy, to dredging projects, to marina projects.

Ms. Good said the good news is that they have learned so much over the last four years since adoption of the plan, and they are constantly becoming more effective and efficient with implementation and permitting. As previously mentioned, internal resources have also been added and redirected to the shoreline permitting team, and they are already seeing an uptick in output. The weather has also helped by providing a small reprieve from other permitting pressures.

Ms. Good said they have also added and clarified a lot of the shore zone ordinances that are in place, so they can be implemented more efficiently. This is an ongoing effort to make things more understandable and achievable both for internal staff and customers. She said they are also focused on internal process improvements, and that has been the benefit of where we are now of learning over the past 4 years.

Committee Comments/Questions

Ms. Aldean said the monthly Tahoe in Brief Report includes the permitting activity in connection with shore zone. She questioned whether there would be benefit in expounding on the circumstances in the event that a permit is denied - so that applicants might better understand the requirements, and some of the reasons why a permit may be denied. Ms. Good said she thought that would be very relevant to internal process improvements. She said they are consistently updating and clarifying online documents, to communicate cases where projects could be approved versus cases where a project could not be approved. She added that they are striving to make more of those finer points that aren't necessarily blatant in the code, and communicate them in

OPERATIONS AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

March 22, 2023

application or information packets. Mr. Marshall said that they do issue denial letters, and suggested it may be helpful to add a link to those documents. He said they would want to avoid incorporating everything from the denial letter into Tahoe in Brief. Ms. Aldean agreed that was a good idea, assuming there were no legal implications.

Ms. Aldean asked if both TRPA patrol boats were operable. Mr. Keillor said, in short no, but they will be in time for the season.

TRPA Executive Director Julie Regan said she was incredibly proud of the team and of Ms. Good for her leadership. She said that whenever a large new policy initiative is implemented, it is difficult and challenging. Mr. Regan said that during her one-on-one interviews with members of the shoreline permitting team, she was impressed with the amount of care and thought that the team are putting into this program, under very difficult and pressured circumstances.

Ms. Aldean said she understands that TRPA tags illegal buoys, but are not responsible for removing them. She asked if the anchors as well as the buoys are removed, and are they returned to their lawful owners or considered abandoned because they are on public property? Mr. Marshall said the process is outlined under the MOUs with both States. He said he cannot directly recall who is responsible in detail, but both state land entities have more authority than TRPA to remove a buoy. Sometimes that will include the block, sometimes it might not. The key thing is that they are only removed after a notice and demand that the owner removes them has been issued. Oftentimes these buoys are offshore of state or public lands so no one will claim them since they are in violation.

Public Comment

Mr. Gavin Feiger on behalf of the League to Save Lake Tahoe (the League), said that the League was one of the key members of the Shoreline Steering Committee, and was involved with the plan's development. They have been closely tracking implementation, and working with TRPA, local jurisdictions, marinas, and concessionaires. They really appreciate the focus on permitting, moorings and piers over the last four plus years, and the staff really has done a fantastic job. There have been both expected and unexpected complexities that have been handled perfectly.

However, Mr. Feiger said there are four main areas that have not been fully implemented: no-wake zones, boating safety and education, concession permitting and enforcement, and the Aquatic Invasive Species Management plans. For no-wake zones, an MOU with all the local law enforcement agencies was supposed to be in place 6 months after adoption of the plan, so June 2019. Mr. Feiger said he acknowledged that staff were working hard on building relationships with local law enforcement agencies and have started tracking water engagements which they really appreciate, but the on-water coordination and vision of the MOU still has not happened.

Regarding boating safety, Mr. Feiger said the League and TRPA hosted a safety clinic for concessionaires in 2022. The League cannot do that every year, but would love to see someone take that on, and to see boating safety messaging included in concessionaire permitting.

Mr. Feiger said permitting is the third thing they have not seen implemented as much as they would like. He said the permits are only given once, and it needs to be done right. The League proposed a list of permit conditions a couple of years ago, and only one permit has been issued to Ski Run Marina. He said that Ms. Good included much of what they requested in that permit, but there are still some pieces missing, such as checklists for concessionaires to ensure permit conditions are being met and secret shopper spot checks. He understands there have not been a lot of requests for permits, so they would like to see TRPA take a more proactive approach in reaching out to potential concessionaires, and enforcing non-permitted operations.

Fourth, the AIS management plans were supposed to be completed in December 2021. Mr. Feiger said he hears they will be done this summer, which is great, but Ski Run got their permit without an

OPERATIONS AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

March 22, 2023

AIS management plan. He wanted to highlight that to ensure those management plans get done this year.

Ms. Good said that TRPA coordinates with League staff on a fairly regular basis, and are very aware of their concerns regarding implementation. Speaking directly about those AIS management plans, Ms. Good said that staff have worked on creating guidelines and templates for the plans. They will be rolled out this year, and presented at an upcoming Marina Association meeting. Regarding concessions, Ms. Good said staff are on an active education and outreach campaign to get these operations to come into TRPA for a permit. The caveat being that they cannot always issue permits for these types of operations. That said, staff are working with marinas, public land managers, and ramp operators to ensure that all are addressing the same set of rules.

Referring to the Mr. Feiger's comments regarding MOUs with local law enforcement, Ms. Aldean said she was aware there is still an issue with conflicting speed limits at Emerald Bay. But, she said that in the case of Sheriffs, these are independently elected officers who are in charge of implementing rules and regulations. Therefore diplomacy is important in any negotiations. She hopes a reasonable compromise can be reached.

VII. Upcoming Topics

Mr. Keillor said next month's offsite retreat will focus on strategic initiatives and plans. The May and June meetings will bring items on next year's TRPA budget.

Mr. Hoenigman said that there has been a lot of public comment on certain issues, which has been pushing the Governing Board to the point where they do not have a quorum and have to stop the meeting. He asked if the committee could document the public meeting process, so that if there is a lot of public comment they can respond to the issues, while also making sure that it doesn't push business back too far. Perhaps by adjusting the amount of time for commenting. Ms. Aldean said that without limiting free speech, about all they could do was ask commenters not to repeat what has already been said.

Mr. Marshall said staff would be happy to bring an agenda item to the next committee meeting, presenting some mutually developed strategies that may address some of the concerns that members have about how to manage extensive public comments, while ensuring that the public have an opportunity to speak to the Governing Board.

Public Comment

None.

VII. Committee Member Comments

None.

VIII. Public Interest Comments

None.

OPERATIONS AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

March 22, 2023

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Hoenigman made a motion to adjourn.

Ayes: [All]

Chair Ms. Aldean adjourned the meeting at 10:07 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tracy Campbell

Tracy Campbell
Executive Assistant

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.