

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
GOVERNING BOARD

TRPA/Zoom

March 27, 2024

**Meeting Minutes**

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Vice Chair Ms. Williamson called the meeting to order at 10:12 a.m.

Members present: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Bowman (for Mr. Aguilar), Mr. Bass, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Diss, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hays, Ms. Hill, Mr. Hoenigman, Mr. Ferry (for Ms. Laine), Ms. Leumer, Mr. Settelmeyer, Ms. Williamson

Members absent: Mr. Rice

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Williamson led the Pledge of Allegiance.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Regan said there are no changes to the agenda.  
Ms. Williamson deemed the agenda approved as posted.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Aldean will provide her edits to Ms. Ambler for the January 24, 2024 minutes and Ms. Ambler will make two clerical edits to the February 28, 2024 minutes as requested by a member of the public.

Ms. Aldean moved approval of the January 24, 2024 and February 28, 2024 minutes as amended.  
**Motion carried.**

V. TRPA CONSENT CALENDAR

1. February Financials
2. Release of City of South Lake Tahoe Operations & Maintenance (O&M) Mitigation Funds (\$405,601.00) for the Purchase of Two XBroom Street Sweepers
3. Resolution of Enforcement Action: Unauthorized Tree Removal, Alpine View Estates LLC, 6731 N. Lake Boulevard, Placer County, CA, Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 117-071-053, TRPA File No. ERSP2020-1404
4. Appointment of Alternate to Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) Board of Directors
5. Tahoe Truckee Unified School District – North Tahoe High School Campus Modernization Improvements, 2949 Polaris Road, Tahoe City, Placer County, CA Assessor's Parcel Number

## GOVERNING BOARD

March 27, 2024

(APN) 093-010-015, TRPA File Number ERSP2023-1371

### 6. APC Membership reappointment for the Placer County Lay Member, Kevin Drake

Ms. Williamson said two items were reviewed by the Operations and Governance Committee, one by the Legal Committee and three by no committee.

Mr. Ferry said the Operations and Governance Committee recommended approval of item numbers one and two.

Ms. Williamson said the Legal Committee recommended approval of item number three. There were two amendments recommended to the resolution of enforcement. One was to ensure that there was irrigation with the replanting of the trees and the trees stayed alive.

### Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Ferry said as the chair of the Advisory Planning Commission he's thrilled to see that Mr. Drake will continue to serve as the Placer County lay member.

### Public Comments & Questions

None.

Mr. Settlemeyer made a motion to approve the consent calendar

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Bowman (for Mr. Aguilar), Mr. Bass, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Diss, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Hoenigman, Mr. Ferry (for Ms. Laine), Ms. Leumer, Mr. Settlemeyer, Ms. Williamson

Members absent: Ms. Hill, Mr. Rice

**Motion carried.**

## VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. Possible findings and direction regarding Regional Plan Goals and Policies (DP-5) that guide adaptive management towards Transportation and Sustainable Communities Threshold Standard 1 (TSC1), including possible direction to amend the revenue milestone (DP-5.4.B)

Ms. Regan provided context for the presentation today. First, rewinding to the January board meeting. The board engaged in a fantastic conversation on this very topic. It was important because it allowed us to hear various points of view from all board members and staff appreciated the thoughtful and productive discussion. Last month, in her executive director's report, she provided a more elaborate update summarizing those comments.

The discussion revolved around vehicle miles traveled and the new sustainability threshold adopted by the board as part of the Regional Transportation Plan and standard setting in 2021. Following the January meeting and subsequent one-on-one meetings with board members, it's evident that everyone holds valid perspectives on this matter. We aim to respect these diverse viewpoints, recognizing that experts and policy leaders may differ on such topics.

## GOVERNING BOARD

March 27, 2024

Staff's suggested motions for consideration today aim to harmonize these perspectives. We also express gratitude to all stakeholders engaged in this process. In the packet there is a proposal from the League to Save Lake Tahoe, among others. We've had discussions with the California Attorney General's office, representatives from the Tahoe Chamber, local small business representatives, and more. We appreciate everyone's respectful engagement in this dialogue.

She emphasized a strategic discussion point raised at the Environmental Improvement Program Committee meeting today. We deliberately highlighted our successful partnership in Tahoe in securing funding for environmental initiatives before diving into this conversation. It's crucial to showcase our proven track record of finding funding for Lake Tahoe's environment.

Our mission remains steadfast in achieving and upholding our standards through the Regional Plan. Today, we're discussing different viewpoints on how best to accomplish this goal. Our focus hasn't changed: reducing reliance on private automobiles, as outlined in the Compact. We're not changing the vision for a "Park once Tahoe" plan where visitors can park their cars and navigate Tahoe using alternative modes of transportation in concentrated town centers. However, achieving this vision has been challenging, particularly in funding mobility options like transit. Transportation, although vital, has historically received less funding within the Environmental Improvement Program. Despite not being authorized in the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act, there are opportunities at the federal and state levels to bolster transportation support.

In 2021, recognizing these challenges, they updated the approach, moving away from mere aspirational projects to actionable plans aligned with modern science and conditions on the ground. This shift was driven by discussions led by key stakeholders, emphasizing the need for tangible outcomes.

As we move forward in this discussion, it's important to maintain our commitment to implementing our goal while acknowledging differing opinions on the best approach. We believe the recommendations presented today can honor this diversity of perspectives.

TRPA staff Mr. Segan provided the presentation.

Mr. Segan will delve into the specifics of how we plan to achieve this and recommend a path forward. We're dedicated to seeing this through, recognizing the time and expertise individual board members have contributed to tackling the challenges we face in today's conditions. Since the board adopted the standard in 2021, the funding landscape has evolved significantly, which is a key aspect we'll discuss today. However, this isn't the end of the conversation. We've already scheduled further discussions at our next Transportation Committee meeting in April, recognizing the ongoing work required to launch the next Regional Transportation Plan.

Mr. Segan said the goal of the VMT Threshold Standard is to reduce driving in daily life around Tahoe. This includes making it easier to walk to the grocery store or take a bus to recreational sites. When we adopted this standard in 2021, with a 25-year timeline to achieve it, we established an adaptive management framework. Part of this framework involved reconciling differences related to milestones for funding targets and funding itself, which prompted today's discussion. After presenting it to you in January and receiving direction to revisit the framework, we've brought forward this item for further consideration.

## GOVERNING BOARD

March 27, 2024

We examined those two individual elements of the framework on how they work together to drive progress towards our threshold standard. Today, He'll walk through each element and our progress in implementing them.

The first part of the adaptive management framework involves independent advice and technical guidance to both TRPA staff and the board. In March 2022, we convened an advisory body, with members appointed from the six jurisdictions, including Carson City, the City of South Lake Tahoe, Douglas County, El Dorado County, Placer County, and Washoe County. Additionally, representatives from North and South Shore transit management associations, Caltrans, the Nevada Department of Transportation, the environmental community, and an at-large representative were included. Throughout 2022, this committee met multiple times to develop and approve its charter, which was brought to the board in September 2022. The charter outlines the committee's work for the upcoming year and its engagement with the board, which was approved at that time.

The next part of the independent technical advice was integrated into our reporting framework. This framework provided a mechanism to insert the advice into our existing processes. Two reports were detailed for development by the committee, along with metrics to evaluate progress towards our goal of reducing reliance on automobiles and vehicle miles traveled per capita. The reporting framework was presented to the board in March 2023, outlining three measures for transit system performance, two for bicycle and pedestrian network performance, and two for automobile framework performance. Since then, the committee has been analyzing and developing the report, due in the second quarter of this year, which will include an analysis of each metric and recommendations for overall implementation improvement.

The first of our two funding milestones is also part of the adaptive management framework. As discussed previously, the 2020 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) forecasted a \$20 million annual funding gap starting in fiscal year 2026. Closing this gap is essential for realizing the reduction in vehicle miles traveled per person in our region. To achieve this, a proposal endorsed by the bi-state transportation consultation was needed to serve as the framework for raising funds to close the gap.

This proposal was developed with input from the Environmental Improvement, Transportation, and Public Outreach Committee with updates provided throughout its development. Finally, the proposal, known as the 7-7-7 proposal, was presented to the board.

The 7-7-7 proposal was sent to both the Nevada legislature and presented to statewide delegations at the Summit in 2022. At the June 2022 meeting, we asked the board to support this funding framework, and there were no objections.

The second funding milestone, which initiated our discussion last time, concerns the implementation of the funding strategy, scheduled to commence on December 31st, 2023. As discussed previously, the 7-7-7 framework was successfully implemented, with partners raising \$23 million, exceeding the funding target of 7-7-7 and bringing funds into the system three years ahead of the Regional Transportation Plan forecast for 2026. However, there is a need for reconciliation because of the sources that contributed to the funding within the 7-7-7 framework. The ongoing sources of funding raised were not what many originally envisioned when we wrote that funding milestone. This is a key point for our discussion, not just how much money was raised in a given year, but the different sources and our ability to maintain them going forward.

## GOVERNING BOARD

March 27, 2024

The next part of our adaptive management framework involves milestones for progress, which can be considered the backbone of our overall implementation system. While raising money and initiating projects are important, our ultimate goal is to ensure that people are actively choosing alternatives to driving. To measure this, we established VMT per capita milestones to track our progress. These milestones assess whether people are indeed using alternatives to driving. The first milestone is due for evaluation this year. This is just a precursor of what you will see of an actual evaluation of VMT per capita within our region. This evaluation will be included in both the report from the technical advisory committee and the threshold evaluation report this year. You've already seen precursors to this in the census and overall trends data, although this isn't actual VMT per capita, but rather raw VMT data reported by the two states Departments of Transportation, to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) as part of the highway performance management system. The latest data available goes through to the end of 2022 and there has been an overall reduction in VMT.

The final part of our adaptive management framework involves adaptive management responses, or the actions taken if we fall short of the milestones we've established. We've discussed the milestones and the transition to a no net VMT standard of significance if the revenue milestone is not met. However, we've talked less about the different milestones we've established if we start to fall behind on our VMT targets per capita.

Our discussion today isn't about wavering on the commitment to reduce reliance on automobiles, but rather focuses on implementation strategies and the adaptive management framework to achieve our shared goal. Specifically, we're reconciling two different actions: a funding milestone established in 2021 and the funding strategy, the 7-7-7 strategy, put forward in 2022 that we're actively working under.

There are issues related to the funding strategy and management response or overall impacts. He'll touch on each and suggest the next steps if you choose to endorse the two motions within the staff summary. Regarding funding, we've had calls to review our overall approach to establish realistic milestones and continue pressure on all partners to raise sustainable funding for the transportation system. There have been questions about whether we're raising money for the right things, such as focusing on operations and maintenance for our transit system or solely on VMT-reducing elements of projects. Additionally, there's discussion around what it means for funding to be ongoing.

We have decisions to make about whether to define individual sources fitting the ongoing definition or opt for a middle ground approach, such as considering successful strategies as ongoing funds retroactively. Regarding funding, there are questions about focusing on specific projects like operations and maintenance for transit or solely VMT-reducing elements. We could engage the transportation subcommittee for further guidance on aligning milestones and funding strategies. Regarding management, discussions emerged about exemptions for public service projects and the geographic focus of triggers. There's also consideration of "no regret strategies" within land use policy to reduce VMT per capita, even without full funding. These technical implementation questions will be brought to the Transportation Committee for review. The flexibility within the committee's membership allows us to incorporate land use experts to help craft strategies and responses that best suit the region's needs. This process will involve merging the work of the Transportation Committee and the Technical Advisory Committee into a comprehensive proposal for consideration by the board. The letter from the League to Save Lake Tahoe contains a proposal that attempts to reconcile various elements, establish new milestones,

GOVERNING BOARD

March 27, 2024

and address the overall landscape of the region. While it may not be the final proposal, it represents the type of input and collaboration we envision as we move forward with this process.

Presentation: [Agenda-Item-No-VIA-Transportation-and-Sustainable-Communities-Threshold-Standard.pdf](#)

Board Comments & Questions:

Mr. Bass said as he's thought about in the City's "7" and the local funding source, when he thinks about the ongoing funding it is operations and maintenance that is committed to transit. He doesn't see that we're that far off of meeting \$7 million. Placer County's Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) commitment is around \$2.2 million. The City is up to \$800,000 and Douglas County is in the \$600,000 window. Those alone are at \$3.6 million and so, we're about \$3.4 million off of reaching that \$7 million that's sustainable and committed to transit. He doesn't say that we should pull the trigger now, but that we set a goal to say that in ten months or one year figure out that \$3.4 million. Let's call it 5,000 vacation home rentals in the basin and there is no reason that we cannot tie a mitigation fee for transit to those TOT permits. For example, if it were \$1,000 per year for a mitigation fee on each VHR in the basin would be \$5 million and we're at \$8.6 million in dedicated funding. Let's not pull the trigger now, but let's not give up on the idea that we can create that funding.

The direction from this board could be to over the next year how to get that mitigation fee tied to these VHRs. He's not saying that locals still won't have a permit for VHRs as well, we do the same thing with building permits and a TRPA permit. There's no reason the same thing can't happen with the VHRs. Then we've met our goal. We know we need transit funding. He doesn't want to stop progress or pull the trigger at this point but also doesn't want to take our foot off of the gas. The VHR thing is directly tied to mitigating transit and doesn't see how you couldn't create the correlation between that mitigation fee and it directly funding transit.

Ms. Leumer asked what the board action was on the 7-7-7 formula.

Mr. Segan said the board action was brought as a discussion item and the board was asked to support 7-7-7 through a head nod and wasn't a formal vote. There were no objections to the support of 7-7-7.

Ms. Regan said at the time, we were under direction from the Nevada legislature to forward a plan that flowed out of the interim committee that ultimately then was endorsed through resolution in the Nevada State Legislature. We were vetting the Transportation Action Plan that Mr. Segan showed a slide of that had the dollars associated with the Transportation Action Plan. Staff vetted all of that at the board level and got general support in the action that Mr. Segan described.

Ms. Leumer confirmed that there was discussion only and no official action/vote was taken by the board.

Mr. Marshall said there was no official action/vote taken by the board. It was a request by the Executive Director to get a general head nod. To the degree that you want to interpret that as general support together with the fact that no one objected.

## GOVERNING BOARD

March 27, 2024

Ms. Gustafson agreed with Mr. Bass about looking at alternative funding sources. It may vary by jurisdiction because Placer County found that the Tourism Business Improvement District (TBID) applying to recreation based activities distributes the burden on transportation more equitably and various jurisdictions might look at things differently than just vacation home rental fees. It might be a combination like we've done with the TBID which includes rentals of boats, jet skis, and bikes and other things that people are coming in through recreation traffic to use in the basin. She urged the technical review committee to look at that. In addition to the \$2.2 million of Placer County she believes we've got at least another couple of million coming in through the TBID and through special studies we're doing on transportation incentives. We need to make sure that we get the total numbers of what we're doing. Those of us in the local agencies did adopt resolutions supporting the 7-7-7 plan. She believed that most of the jurisdictions did adopt that resolution and were committed to raising the local dollars necessary to meet or exceed our share. The dilemma we've had all along is trying to identify the right sources of state and federal funding. She would like the technical review committee to also look at what is the operational deficit versus the capital because often state and federal funds are easier to raise for capital dollars. Then look at the deficit we have in operational needs to have a system that encourages people to get out of their cars.

For those of us representing the local jurisdictions, we've taken it to heart and having deadlines and targets for time reporting back is very important. It helps us in convincing our counter parts who don't represent basin interests to push for solutions. She agreed with the comments from the League to Save Lake Tahoe for having dates that are more firm for progress but isn't sure that you can realize that in six months or one year. It may take longer and would like to be more flexible on those dates. Each jurisdiction, even if the technical review committee comes up with solutions on funding suggestions that we should pursue, it's going take some time to implement those through ordinances, regulations, or other things. She wants to ensure that we don't find ourselves right back in this discussion when we're making great progress. It looks like VMT is down and we'll get the final analysis on that. We're raising more local money and getting more federal and state money and when we get on the same page, we can be successful.

She appreciated the discussion at the Environmental Improvement Program committee because it really brought it back into focus for her. We didn't do it overnight, we did it through collaboration and working hard together for long periods of time. We could charge the technical review committee with looking at these various funding sources and set milestones for continued progress.

Mr. Settelmeyer agreed with Mr. Bass and Ms. Gustafson. We have a great opportunity to increase the funds that are coming towards these projects. With that being said, we want to step on the gas but make sure we don't necessarily derail the car if we try to do a different route. There are many things we can do. We were talking about it at the Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources and trying to figure out a better parking area, potentially for Spooner in order to work with Lake Link. Maybe Lake Link can help us get workers to Sand Harbor since we've had a terrible time trying to find people who want to work for \$14 an hour. We need to find better ways of transportation and to get our workers in and around the basin.

Ms. Faustinos endorsed continuing down this path of 7-7-7 and agreed with Ms. Gustafson's comments that we have to be very careful. Federal and state funds absolutely, capital costs or what we can cover with that type of funding. That does set a burden on local government but that's where operational costs will typically come from. We need to know what the boundaries

## GOVERNING BOARD

March 27, 2024

are of all of these different funding sources and if there can be long-term solutions with state and federal funding because we have recurring appropriations for programs that have been in existence for decades. Being able to forecast that there is going to be that “sustainable” funding source through those programs is an important element. She commended staff and all the team members that have been working so diligently on this. Variances of how appropriations work at the state and federal level and even by local government is hard to predict. By history we can make some inferences and the important thing will be to have these milestones that we can check progress and don't backslide and then have to catch up with this.

Ms. Conrad-Saydah thanked the engaged members of the board and the public and others for working through all of and having meaningful conversations over many, many months. She echoed the comments that this is not an exact science and it's one that we're working on and figuring it out as economics change, tourism changes, and as demands in the area change. She appreciated that flexibility and all of us working hard together. She recognizes that our committees will continue to work at it so that annually we can meet these targets and support the needs of Tahoe. The state of California remains committed to finding this funding. We're having a lot of meetings with other agencies to try to highlight the importance of everything happening in Tahoe and bring sources of funding from a number of different agencies.

Mr. Ferry reiterated Ms. Gustafson's and Mr. Bass' comments from the locals. The idea of perhaps taxing vacation home rentals, is something we could look at. El Dorado County itself has increased Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) appropriations towards the 7-7-7. With that flexibility the locals are committed to the dedicated funding source. But having flexibility for us to decide what our voters and board choose is going to be critical but feels that we can there.

### Public Comments:

Gavin Feiger, League to Save Lake Tahoe said we've been down this road before in 2019, 2020, 2021, etc. and here we are again in 2024. You asked for a proposal, and we sent something in that we thought was pretty close to what we heard in January and then a bit last month too. It doesn't conflict with the vague staff recommendation, but instead suggests some important details. It sounds like it's still your goal from discussion we're having right now to keep the pressure on. Especially putting the pressure on decision makers outside of the basin. They have control over the funding that we need. Locally we're doing a good job bringing in funding as we've seen with the tracking. The pressure is proving effective. You're talking about these high level administrative conversations we're having when we're lobbying in Washington, DC and Sacramento the last couple weeks. If this isn't going to happen, we're not going to pay attention to it. If this could just be changed and go away, why would we spend time trying to shake the trees and look for money that everybody's looking for.

The pressure is working. There are viable identified funding sources that need pressure to get over the to get over the goal line. Locals are doing really well and love to hear these ideas. Tourism Business Improvement District (TBID) is successful. The vacation home rentals idea is pretty interesting. TRPA has a role to create consistent regulations across the lake and VHRs are probably one of the most consistent things we have right now. Without the pressure created by a deadline, state level decision makers are likely just going to listen to regions that have bigger needs, more people, and more representation, or binding requirements. We haven't had these high level discussions with the states and federal since he's been working on transportation funding for the past six to seven years. It would be inappropriate, potentially counterproductive



## GOVERNING BOARD

March 27, 2024

to pass anything today that does not have a date and doesn't keep the pressure on. We need to preserve a deadline with repercussions. The original proposal approved in 2021 has been watered down, conflated, confused, and pushed aside. We gave a lot of concessions to the proposal we sent and at the end of the day, there has to be some kind of date with the repercussion.

Steve Teshara, Sustainable Community Advocates and in his capacity as Director of Government Relations for Tahoe Chamber. He wanted to add that the business community was on the DC trip which wasn't mentioned. Over the span of 35 years, he's been to DC 35 times. He referred to the letter that he wrote to Attorney General Bonta on behalf of business and community leaders. He's been involved at Lake Tahoe for over 40 years and from time to time the business and community leaders have been a little irritated by the actions of the Attorney General. So, we wanted to invite the Attorney General to come here personally because this is in the spirit of collaboration that we've been talking about all morning that we do. And what we hear from is the Attorney General's representatives, we don't hear from the AG himself and feels it's time that occurs.

The letter also detailed what the private and the local public sectors are doing, particularly for transit. It's probably the most accurate and up to date detail of what's happening with microtransit and in our region with the various transit services, which is a big part of the issue. From the business perspective, just like from the environmental, the Agency's, and other perspectives, transit is the key. We want to get people to be able to move around without using their private automobile, which is the fundamental principle of the Compact. The other thing that he doesn't see in the Compact is giving one state or the other more power to push the other one around. Let's have an equitable discussion between California and Nevada. VMT is complicated, is controversial up and down California and is extremely difficult to measure. What's changed at Tahoe, and there's been reference to this, is that rather than people coming to gaming or things that are involved inside of buildings, it's really about outdoor recreation. The business community has no ability to control when it's 100 degrees in Sacramento or hot in the desert and people flock to Tahoe.

We also believe in deadlines and keeping the pressure on ourselves. But we also want to make sure that everybody understands that from the local public governments and private sector, we are stepping up. We met our commitment in the first year and we intend to continue to meet our commitments. And the other partners in the 7-7-7 need to do the same. It does have something to do with operations versus capital, but we believe that we're meeting our commitment and can accelerate our commitment over the years ahead and would love to have the opportunity to meet with the Attorney General here at Tahoe and explain that to him.

Doug Flaherty, TahoeCleanAir.org said you are kicking the can down the road. Adaptive management is adaptive mismanagement. TRPA has a history of adaptive mismanagement such as changing thresholds, changing timing, not holding yourselves accountable. He commented on the 7-7-7 plan in 2021 and tried to get the board to realize that those figures were already a false narrative because of the inflation that occurred at that time. By now the original figures that you've been using have probably increased by 50 percent due to inflation, yet you continue to ignore that. Somebody mentioned bringing in land use experts, what have you has been doing for 50 years? Aren't you supposed to be land use experts? Every time TRPA gets into a corner, you bring in experts on land use and planning. Somebody mentioned taxing vacation home rentals, you guys are grasping at straws. VHRs are harming the lake. That's a tax and you'll be in lawsuits

## GOVERNING BOARD

March 27, 2024

for years over that. You've put yourselves in a corner and now have to pay the piper. You're kicking the can down the road and you all should resign because you're not looking after the lake, you're looking after your own funding. The environment hasn't been talked about here and now how do we get around the funding and some of these issues that are not accurate?

Ellie Waller thanked Mr. Settelmeyer and Mr. Bass for their suggestions. We have to take into consideration how many people are day trippers. They're not going to take a bus. Our system is not broken, it's just not fully functional and is going to take many, many, years. She drives from the Carson Valley to meetings and isn't going to be an individual that can utilize any form of public transportation to attend meetings. You have to be cautious about assessing vacation home rentals/short-term rentals because they pay fees to each local jurisdiction. Is this going to be a TRPA fee or tax and not through the local jurisdiction, so they're not getting beat up. She would like to see the letter that Mr. Teshara spoke about. This was agendized at the Tahoe Douglas Visitors Authority. He was in DC as a representative and was not held for public comment. This is an important issue addressing legislators without public input. Public input may be coming from the business community, but what about the public at large? When the 7-7-7 plan was drafted as equal splits, Carson City has really no skin in the game with some things and Douglas County is a smaller jurisdiction. These things need to be addressed before a recommendation or mandate comes through. You have to give the locals the opportunity to vet this through the public and add it to their budgets. Thank you to the League to Save Lake Tahoe for coming forward. Kicking the can down the road was resonated by Mr. Feiger of the League today and we need to have repercussions and consequences. Just kicking the can down the road is not sufficient.

Ann Nichols, North Tahoe Preservation Alliance is concerned about the confusing data. The stewardship people were saying that the traffic's down at the South Shore, but it is up 50 percent going right on State Route 28 going west. TRPA doesn't consider surrounding growth in Reno and Carson City. There's conflicting data such as population is down, but we are seeing more people in town because of COVID. Let's get some uniform data and not promote more tourism, which is what she's seeing happening. There's 20 TART Connect parked underneath the Crystal Bay Club. Is that just 20 more cars on the road now that we have a free Uber service that costs us \$6 million dollars a year and is this really helping? She wishes they'd update the data, at least Placer County tried, it's \$17 a ride. There is no cohesive plan or a holistic approach. For instance, the new project, Kings Beach redevelopment, 39 Degrees North, came forward at 75 feet in height. It has more units than the Waldorf Astoria, which will create 2,800 more trips a day. This project is probably bigger. You don't have a real plan and you're not enforcing anything. You are promoting more attractions. And there was no vote on the Tourism Business Improvement District (TBID) and the public does not understand the 7-7-7 plan. You have to educate the public about what you're intending to do.

### Board Comments & Questions:

Ms. Aldean said there's no simple resolution to this and staff's proposal is a logical consequence of some unintended consequences involving the original decision made by this board with the best of intentions. The local jurisdictions have done a good job of meeting their obligations under the 7-7-7 plan. If you implement the trigger, it will punish the local governments, not the state or the federal government. We need to reanalyze this and using the Technical Advisory Committee is an excellent idea. But let's not do something again that is precipitous. She appreciated the work of the League to Save Lake Tahoe in outlining an alternative with new milestones which are important to monitor our own progress or lack of progress. A stick can be valuable, but who is it

## GOVERNING BOARD

March 27, 2024

hurting? It's antithetical to the original plan which relies on achieving thresholds through environmental redevelopment, using the development community as a tool. She's supportive of staff's proposal today. That doesn't mean that she's diluted her personal commitment to finding a reasonable solution and identifying sources of funding that can be reliable.

We are still in progress of finding a viable solution that will meet our objectives but in a realistic way given all of the potential pitfalls having to do with the availability of funding at the state, federal, and local levels. If you overtax an activity like a vacation home rental, those VHRs may go away and you're right back to where you started. Those taxes have to be reasonable to the people who are paying them. She doesn't feel that this is ready for a decision with respect to specific milestones or dates by which certain things have to be accomplished and certain amounts of money raised. We need to step back and reanalyze this and come back with something that is flexible but also reflects our commitment as a board and a community to achieve the objectives of the Transportation Plan.

Ms. Hill doesn't feel that we are that far off from what the public wants to see. She agreed in many ways with Ms. Aldean's points. There are opportunities to raise revenue on the local level and are looking into it. She's excited that we're going to have those continued dialogues with the Transportation Committee in particular. It needs to be a public dialogue because this will be changes for people living in the basin as well as visitors to the basin. Saff's recommendation is reasonable and supports it. As long as we continue to show our commitment and that we do want to have consequences if we can't figure out the funding. She's impressed with the partners and the states for stepping up. Even the Marlette Lake interim legislative committee wants to see transportation funded.

Mr. Bass agreed that the motion or what the staff has recommended is not too far off from what is good progress but thinks that having a milestone is important. That shows if we hold the line, there will be a will to make sure that we comply with what we're saying and that is the point. He's not saying that we pull the trigger right now. Let's say that there's these few things we'd like the Transportation or technical committee to work on so that in a year finding those funding sources.

Regarding vacation home rentals, he can directly correlate that transit mitigation that needs to happen from the amount of people coming into an overnight rental. A \$1,000 per year for that business in a neighborhood has an impact on our transit. Just that one proposal would create the gap that we have. He doesn't know if that \$3.6 million is accurate, that's just what he knows about.

Ms. Gustafson said there may be more from a Tourism Business Improvement District (TBID) from Placer County. The City definitely has more. But just with the land use authority, the TRPA saying, overnight rentals are going to pay a \$1,000 annual mitigation fee, we're there. Why wouldn't we kick this out a year and we're going to get there, and we're not pulling a trigger or stopping progress, but we're also keeping our foot on the gas. He's all about the recommendations, but why wouldn't we give some direction, to make this happen so that when we set that milestone, maybe it's a year and a half, we're making it there. To him it's operations and maintenance, it is transit that we're clearly missing the gap on.

Ms. Leumer echoed Mr. Bass' comments. This was supposed to be an automatic trigger. It's important to honor the negotiations that we made with the League to Save Lake Tahoe and the

## GOVERNING BOARD

March 27, 2024

Attorney General's office. It makes it hard for partners to negotiate in good faith if we come to an automatic trigger and then step back from it. She acknowledged all the great work that the locals have done in raising the funds. This is working, we are seeing the states step up and trying to come up with solutions. She would endorse the League's proposal to have a date to commit to. We can revisit this in the summer in terms of the report but feels that we need a date to keep the pressure on. The League is being reasonable and trying to accommodate the feedback that they've heard from the board and push this out for a year. This was on the agenda in January and am not sure why aren't considering that it is a staff proposal this time around.

Ms. Gustafson doesn't disagree with many of the comments that we've heard on both sides of this. To further Ms. Aldean's comments, what does this impact? When we say, when we pull triggers, it impacts local government, but it doesn't necessarily hurt us. It hurts their ability to achieve water quality improvements and other environmental improvements that come from the environmental redevelopment in our town centers. North Shore is quite a bit different than South Shore in many ways. We are receiving almost 80 percent of the funding that we are putting toward transportation is coming from vacation home rentals. Each jurisdiction has adopted strategies and am suggesting that we honor those and come up with a commitment like we did on how we share as locals our share of the VMT and how we achieve those goals. If we're not able to do that as a local jurisdiction then TRPA can jump in.

To date we've allowed the local jurisdictions to come up with their own formulas based on their state law and their individual circumstances to get there. If we agree with environmental redevelopment, we need to find ways to incentivize these town centers to get updated. Much of their infrastructure on the North Shore is 50 to 60 years old. Boarded up buildings and a degradation of water quality can be solved if we continue with this pressure on the locals to come up with their fair share. If the 7-7-7 model isn't the fair share, she'd like the technical review committee to look at that and recommend different percentages. She's open to additional fees for areas outside town centers or additional funding mechanisms that we need to look into. She'd like the technical review committee to get into the nuts and bolts of it to help set those timelines of what's reasonable. What's reasonable to get changes in formula funding and or allocations towards some of the big capital projects that will achieve our goals. She doesn't feel that we've kicked the can down the road. We've made incredible progress. We have more operational dollars in transportation right now than we've ever had in the Tahoe Basin in 40 years. She agreed with keeping a target out there of some sort but let's not be unrealistic.

Ms. Conrad-Saydah said deadlines are good because they hold us accountable. She's loath to remove deadlines from the work that we do. And at the same time, those deadlines do have to be aligned with our various funding calendars and opportunities to bring funding together. She's trying to thread the needle here in saying we should maintain some deadlines. We have technical committees that can give us those deadlines but does think we should hold ourselves accountable by some date certain. She's comfortable with the Transportation or technical committee being the one to hold us accountable. Again, a negotiation with the states and the work that we're currently doing right now to try to find those other funding sources along with what the locals are doing. This discussion has pushed us in the way it was supposed to and go back to find these alternative sources and accountability has made a difference and doesn't want to lose that.

## GOVERNING BOARD

March 27, 2024

### Staff Response:

Ms. Regan said Mr. Teshara's letter is posted on the website under public comments for the March 27 Governing Board meeting. As mentioned in previous meetings, whenever we're talking about funding and investments, TRPA is often in a convening and funding support role. We don't have any direct taxing authority. Everything we do is in partnership with local jurisdictions or other partners who have that taxing authority. TRPA does have mitigation fees that we collect and will talk about that in her executive director report.

The Washington DC trip had TRPA representation, the League to Save Lake Tahoe, Tahoe Fund, the Washoe Tribe Chair Smokey, the Lake Tahoe Community College, and representatives from the business community including Steve Teshara and Barton Health. The public utility districts on the North and the South Shore and the US Force Service. They saw Capitol Hill members of our congressional delegation, but also several meetings with the administration in transportation and the Forest Service. It was a wide representation and thanked Mr. Teshara for his commitment over the many decades being a great advocate for Tahoe in DC.

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) contains escalations for inflation in the financial analysis, the overall twenty-five-year price tag for the RTP is about \$2.5 billion dollars. In the next RTP we'll be talking about those projects and how they might change. Some costs will go up as we heard in public comment, but others will go down and some projects have changed. One example is the US 50 Highway Revitalization Project, also known as the Loop Road. That project in the RTP is \$165 to \$170 million and does not include housing relocation costs, which was well over \$100 million.

That is a segue into a common theme she's heard from you is flexibility. However the board moves forward, we need to be flexible in that we know costs are going to shift in the update of the RTP, but let's keep our foot on the pedal and not let a forcing function go to waste. Forcing mechanisms drive action and we've already seen progress so far.

In terms of the consideration for the motions, this work will move to the Transportation Committee and one of the first agenda items is to talk about dates and milestones. The board committee of transportation has work to do with the milestone and the funding and then the technical advisory committee also has a lot of work to do, connecting things with land use. There are things that we can do connecting land use policy changes to reduce the VMT per capita and those are recommendations that could flow out of that group. You'll also be hearing in our threshold evaluation report a more robust analysis of what is happening with the trend of vehicle miles traveled and the standard that we have adopted. Mr. Segan walked you through the various policies. There's more than just this trigger policy to this story. It's a complicated package that the board adopted in 2021 and we're making good on those previous policy achievements we will continue our commitment to do so.

Mr. Hester provided more detail on the land use side that Mr. Segan discussed. You already have in the budget that's been approved for this year and we're getting ready to put out a Request for Proposal Design standard for complete streets that work for walking and for stormwater. The Regional Planning Committee is having a listening session today but will be getting some proposals for mixed-use in the town centers, which is part of the land use solution that we've been talking about. And in Ms. Regan mentioned the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy builds land use and transportation together for our requirements as a

## GOVERNING BOARD

March 27, 2024

Metropolitan Planning Organization. There's a lot of items under way that will interface with what the technical advisory committee sees.

### Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Leumer was remiss in not acknowledging what helpful partners the Attorney General's office has been. She appreciated their engagement and have been helpful for her to understand the context in the back story.

Ms. Conrad-Saydah agreed with comments by Ms. Leumer that the Attorney General's office being incredibly helpful. She agreed with Ms. Regan that we agendize deadlines for the first transportation meeting.

Mr. Bass had a question on the mitigation fees and what Mr. Marshall's opinion is in tying that directly to transit, knowing that we don't have a taxing authority which is left to the locals. TRPA as the ultimate land use authority, could we tie an overnight rental to the mitigation and need for transit and do you see that correlation being something that we could do?

Mr. Marshall said that's something that we'd need to investigate and depends a lot on how it's structured, who it applies to, and how narrow or how broad it is. We already have mitigation fees for our mobility mitigation fee program. That would be so much on new projects but what you're talking about is on existing uses, which is something we generally don't do. It would take some further analysis to get a solid answer.

Mr. Bass said yes, if we're going to bring these back to the committees, that's great, but let's set a deadline, for example, within six months the committees are going to be back to the Governing Board with a recommendation.

Ms. Leumer said it would also be good for everyone to understand in the future if targets aren't met, if we're not making our goals, are there repercussions? What's the point of deadlines if we're not going to uphold them.

Ms. Aldean made a motion to direct the Agency to continue to support the implementation of the "7-7-7" framework while working with local, regional, state, and federal partners to refine the overall funding approach and establish appropriate milestones.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Bowman (for Mr. Aguilar), Mr. Bass, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Diss, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Hoenigman, Mr. Ferry (for Ms. Laine), Mr. Settelmeyer, Ms. Williamson

Nays: Ms. Leumer

Absent: Mr. Rice

**Motion carried.**

Ms. Aldean made a motion to direct continued engagement with the Transportation Committee and the Transportation Performance Technical Advisory Committee and programmatic experts to adaptively manage the policy framework to address concerns raised by stakeholders and the Board, including a review of the project impact assessment process and exemption of public

## GOVERNING BOARD

March 27, 2024

service projects. Both committees shall report back to the Governing Board with their recommendations within six months.

### Board Discussion:

Ms. Faustinos asked for confirmation that this work will include assessing the projected financial obligations incurring cost escalations in the 7-7-7 formula.

Ms. Regan said that financial work will not be done in six months. It is part of the Regional Transportation Plan and will carry into 2025.

Mr. Hester said the Regional Transportation Plan has to include project list funding tools.

Ms. Leumer asked if the motion could include a date.

Mr. Marshall said the current motion has a date to report back. If that's the date, it does not have a date by which anything substantive is triggered if that's what Ms. Leumer is asking.

Ms. Leumer said yes, that's correct.

Ms. Aldean said that depends on the recommendation that comes forward from both committees. At that point when it comes back to the board within that six-month framework, included in that report will be some recommended deadlines and milestones.

Mr. Bass said one way to further that is if the Governing Board hasn't adopted the recommendations or new policy in one year, we would consider the trigger again. That gives strength to six months for the recommendations to come back gives us another six months to adopt it. And if we didn't, then the trigger would still exist.

Mr. Marshall said regarding the trigger, there's nothing in this motion that says that the conditions have been found or not found. So, it's remaining silent on whether or not that trigger conditions have occurred.

Mr. Bass said then they still exist, and should we add that in a motion that if in one year the Governing Board has not adopted these new recommendations the trigger still could be pulled because they're saying it's still there.

Mr. Marshall said the trigger is whether or not when projects come to TRPA that the standard of significance during the environmental review process is either what's currently in the Code of Ordinance or reduced to a no net VMT standard of significance. That's the consequence of not meeting the funding provision that Mr. Segan talked about. That only happens when you have a project before you or the Agency. It's kind of an abstract notion to pull a trigger or not pull the trigger. When the rubber meets the road when you push on the accelerator, is when a project decision is either before the board, staff, or the Hearings Officer. Then a decision has to be made as to what's the appropriate standard of significance. It's either going to be no net or the existing standard review for residential and tourist accommodation projects. If you want to make a finding in the abstract as whether or not the conditions have been made or not. But regardless, it will be addressed when a project that meets those conditions comes forward and is reviewed by either the Agency or the Governing Board.

GOVERNING BOARD

March 27, 2024

Mr. Bass said with this motion being approved, are we saying that we do not need to pull that trigger, we have met the obligations we've set forward or is it still existing?

Mr. Marshall said it still exist. We're not saying anything in particular about the conditions under which the trigger may be pulled when a project comes forward.

Mr. Bass said the with people saying we're kicking the can down the road, which does put a kind of a safeguard to say that if we're not here in a year, we are going to revisit this, and we could consider at that time that we're only going to take no net VMT projects.

Mr. Marshall said yes, you may.

Mr. Bass suggested that could be a recommendation for the motion.

Ms. Gustafson said those of them at the local jurisdiction supported the basin wide entry fee as the regional solution that would have gotten us out of this situation. Both states asked us to step down from that, which we did. And we went out and raised the local money. The reason she wants to give us adequate time and doesn't know what that date is. But she wants to see us continue with progress, is for both states to take actions that deliver the funding that they asked us to step away from and agreed to the 7-7-7 formula. She's trying to buy the state's time. That's not within our individual control, here in the basin. She urged continued collaboration as we just talked about at the Environmental Improvement Program. She doesn't mind annualized reports in which the board can take any action and make any motions they choose to do if they feel that we haven't met those standards.

She can't say how long it will take the state to adopt legislation, especially in California who has some significant revenue shortfalls. So, what can we expect from the state of California to meet their obligation? Will they have a different thought moving forward and is their legislation or funding formulas that need to be adopted at the state level. It's the same with Nevada. We need to consider what we have control of and be diligent in reporting back to the board and to our state representatives to go to work on this and find the funding necessary to meet the obligations.

Ms. Hill agreed with Ms. Gustafson. It's important that the board does not say that we're going backwards because the triggers still exist. These are going to affect all these projects moving forward. There's no change that we just heard through staff evaluation. We're not changing any policies here, correct?

Mr. Marshall said correct.

Ms. Hill said it isn't appropriate to tell the community that we're disregarding our requirement on ourselves. It still exists and it's going to affect projects. Washoe County has projects that will be coming to this board. There will be discussion and we will have to see if they meet conditions moving forward.

Ms. Aldean respectfully declined to amend her motion.

Mr. Bass said it's confusing because the last time the board met, we said we are keeping it in effect, but the motion today takes it out of effect. Is that correct? The last time we met, we said



## GOVERNING BOARD

March 27, 2024

hold on, for 60 days there will be no new projects whatsoever. As we move forward today, we are allowing projects to be applied for that are no net VMTs. Because we're basically moving away from what we adopted in 2021 and we're saying yes, we're pulling it back to these two committees to bring back new recommendations. But we have made a move from where we were from December 31, 2023, to what we're approving today. Between that meeting and now, we said we are taking a pause, but moving from today forward, we are no longer in that pause. We are kicking what we decided in 2021 down the road and looking for new recommendations.

Mr. Marshall said there's no stay on any part of the Code of Ordinances that may be applicable to reviewing projects.

Mr. Bass said we did have that in place prior to this motion.

Mr. Marshall said we did not. It was there as a matter of fact; no projects are slated to come forward in the near future that would raise this question.

Mr. Bass said he can't support this motion because he'd like to see us keep real deadlines in place and it's hard for him to see that happening. It helps us legislatively with both states to have real deadlines.

Mr. Marshall said this motion does not change any deadline.

Mr. Bass said it also doesn't set one to say in one year if we haven't done this that we will consider going back to what we said we were going to do in 2021.

Mr. Marshall said there's not a specific deadline in the Code of Ordinances to make the finding. There's a deadline as part of the adaptive management structure, whether or not funding has been in is in place or not.

Mr. Settelmeyer said if we vote no on this motion, we will be stating that we do not want the technical advisory committee to look at these issues and determine appropriate triggers and timeframes for recommendation to the board at a later date. Some of these triggers don't appropriately hurt, per se, the bad actor or the person, or entity, state, county, city or whatever is not appropriately putting forth the money. Instead, we will potentially be just stopping environmental gains and stopping projects that are currently contributing to bad lake clarity.

Mr. Marshall said yes or no to this motion will not directly affect the criteria under which projects are reviewed. At some point a project is going to come forward that meets one of the classifications for which the trigger would have changed the standard of significance. That doesn't necessarily mean that that project can't move forward, it means it has to either have to get to the standard of no net VMT or it has to be a project.

If it's an impact, for example, it's a residential project within a town center and the impact that we're trying to mitigate is VMT and it generates additional VMT that can't be mitigated. If the project in fact is not inconsistent with achieving thresholds, which is measured by our threshold, which is VMT per capita, not just straight VMT, the board or staff can suggest that this board make conditions of overriding considerations that if, for example, there are multiple other environmental benefits and the project has exhausted its, feasible mitigation and other alternatives then that project can be allowed to move forward. The trigger does not create a

## GOVERNING BOARD

March 27, 2024

moratorium on projects. It creates a condition of review that has to be met. And the projects that will get cut up and probably be stopped if the trigger happens are those projects outside of town centers that create additional VMT that can't be mitigated. And that the location of the project does not promote per capita reductions in VMT.

Mr. Hoenigman said that the trigger is pulled essentially. Is that where we are today?

Mr. Marshall said no, the trigger has not been pulled. The board has not made a determination as to whether or not the conditions have been met or not met. Through these motions is choosing not to make that finding one way or the other. The finding will have to be made when a project is brought forward that has the impact that's discussed within the trigger and the standards of significance.

Mr. Settelmeyer said the motion before us is do we want the technical advisory committee to continue to look at these issues and concerns.

Mr. Marshall said correct.

Mr. Settelmeyer said if we vote no and it fails, then the technical advisory committee is not going to review this.

Ms. Regan said the Transportation Committee and its first item of business can discuss that timeline. The motion is a commitment to bring back these recommendations, which are important because they are refinements that are necessary.

Mr. Bass said it's not that he doesn't support it going back to the technical committee. He just wants to see that in one year, if we're not here as a Governing Board, we will reconsider pulling the trigger. If that's added to the motion, he can support it. He doesn't want to see us say we are not going to consider pulling that trigger. It's a political carrot that gives us what we need in both states and keeps the Governing Board on track. He'd like to see us get transit funds that are operations and maintenance that are vacation home rentals or from some other source. He's open to the time frame.

*Vote on Ms. Aldean's motion made before board discussion:*

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Bowman (for Mr. Aguilar), Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Diss, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Hoenigman, Mr. Ferry (for Ms. Laine), Mr. Settelmeyer, Ms. Williamson

Nays: Mr. Bass, Ms. Leumer

Absent: Mr. Rice

**Motion carried.**

## VII. REPORTS

### A. Executive Director Status Report

## GOVERNING BOARD

March 27, 2024

The Summit will be held sometime during the Senate summer recess period in mid to late August. While Secretary Pete Buttigieg's current commitments may impact his availability, his presence would significantly elevate federal transportation discussions, potentially catalyzing further policy refinements. We've never had a Secretary of Transportation attend one of our summits before, but we're hopeful. This could serve as a catalyst for concluding ongoing discussions.

### 1) Update on the Traffic and Safety Monitoring Report for the Round Hill Pines Resort Intersection Improvement Project.

Ms. Regan said this item is related to Round Hill Pines Resort permit that was approved by the board with a permit condition to condition to come back after the project was completed with an update on safety.

Ms. Friedman acknowledged that there was a slight change to the traffic data submitted after the agenda and packet were posted, resulting in a minor update to the staff report, which was submitted via errata yesterday.

Ms. Friedman provided some background and context, especially for the new board members, as it has been a while since we discussed this project. The Round Hill Pines Resort is located in Douglas County, Nevada, off Highway 50, approximately a mile from this office. It's a popular summer day-use recreation spot providing access to Lake Tahoe operated through a concessionaire on Forest Service land. The Round Hill Pines Resort Intersection Improvement Project was deemed necessary due to the unsafe conditions of the old intersection. These conditions included limited sight distance, lack of protected turning movements, steep and narrow roadways, and inadequate stormwater management practices.

The project involved relocating the entrance 0.2 miles northward to an area with improved sight distance, adding a northbound left turn lane into the resort, creating a northbound acceleration lane, and integrating stormwater management practices. Additionally, improvements were made within the Round Hill Pines Resort, such as paved parking and enhanced circulation to accommodate larger vehicles like transit. The map illustrates the project area, with the old intersection situated at the southern portion and the new intersection to the north. Adjacent to the new intersection is Sierra Sunset Lane, a private road serving three residences and associated accessory units.

During the planning phase, concerns were raised by the property owners along Sierra Sunset Lane regarding potential adverse impacts on their access due to the relocated entrance. These concerns were addressed through discussions with the project team and were a focal point during the approval process by the Governing Board in October 2021.

As part of the approval, a condition was added to the permit, requiring the Nevada Department of Transportation, TRPA, Forest Service, and the Federal Highway Administration to meet with the residents of Sierra Sunset Lane to review their safety concerns within one year after project completion. In November 2021, the project team met with the residents to further address their concerns, which had been raised at various stages of the planning process.

Now, we're here to discuss the traffic conditions within the project site. NDOT analyzed a 0.72-mile segment of Highway 50, including the project area and buffers on both sides. They examined annual average daily traffic counts and accidents before (in 2021) and after (in 2023) the project.

## GOVERNING BOARD

March 27, 2024

Prior to the project, there were 21,100 annual average daily traffic counts, which remained relatively unchanged after the project at 29,000. This was expected given that the project did not alter site usage or increase capacity significantly. Before the project, there were four accidents (indicated by red stars on the map), whereas after the project, there were two accidents (blue stars), representing a 50 percent reduction. This reduction brings both property damage-only and injury crashes below the Nevada state average, whereas the four accidents prior to the project were above the state average for a road of this nature.

### Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean said as shown on the map, the accidents that occurred after these changes were not directly adjacent to the entrance to Sierra Sunset Lane, they were before and after that entrance. Those changes in configuration did not contribute adversely to the recorded number of traffic incidences.

Ms. Friedman said that is correct.

(Executive Director Report continued)

Ms. Regan said during the Environmental Improvement Program Committee meeting, we extensively discussed the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act as the federal share vehicle of the Environmental Improvement Program and the commendable efforts of Team Tahoe in the nation's capital. We have a photo of the members of that team and can add a caption with all the organizations and representatives to ensure transparency with the public.

It was a wide swath of our community. The meeting was historic in many ways because of the diversity of the Team Tahoe group. Also to have the Chairman of the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California as a key presenter at our press conference was a significant highlight. The Washoe Tribe participated in the kickoff of the Environmental Improvement Program and is a signatory of the Memorandum of Understanding that established the Environmental Improvement Program in the late 1990s. The Chairman expressed a commitment for the tribe to remain engaged, if not more so, in future endeavors. As TRPA staff, we are pleased to collaborate with the tribe in executing the EIP and get the tribe more engaged in projects such as Meeks Bay.

It was a good opportunity for Lake Tahoe to make a splash in the Capitol, amid various competing priorities, was remarkable. We had member-level participation, including senators, house members, and their staffers, all of whom play crucial roles in matters concerning the lake. We extend our gratitude to all who supported these efforts and look forward to continued progress, particularly with the extension of the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act, which will allow us to address other vital needs in transportation, sustainable recreation, and public access.

During the during the Operations and Governance Committee meeting we discussed mitigation funds. These funds are returned to local jurisdictions to support various initiatives, such as purchasing street sweepers, building bus shelters, or contributing to environmental improvement programs to meet our environmental thresholds. One significant project discussed was the acquisition of the Motel 6 property on Highway 50, a target of the California Tahoe Conservancy for decades. With a willing seller and a coalition formed, the property was acquired for public benefit, particularly to restore the adjacent river and wetland area. This acquisition holds immense importance for water quality, public recreation, scenic resources, and habitat restoration efforts. Collaborative projects like these, involving partners from various agencies,

## GOVERNING BOARD

March 27, 2024

are crucial steps toward improving lake clarity and habitat in the basin. This endeavor signifies our commitment to environmental stewardship and the preservation of Lake Tahoe's natural beauty for generations to come.

The California Tahoe Conservancy pulled funds from various sources, including the state of California, multiple funding sources, private contributions from philanthropy, such as the League to Save Lake Tahoe and the Tahoe Fund. TRPA also collected \$3.5 million of mitigation funds from projects over the years to support this acquisition. The Conservancy executed an impressive real estate deal, which was complex and involved managing the transition from the Motel 6 property to restoration efforts. This aligns with the goals of the regional plan, focusing on removing development from sensitive areas. While transitioning people out of the Motel 6 and demolishing the structure presents challenges, the process will be transparent moving forward. This acquisition marks significant progress toward our regional plan goals and demonstrates effective collaboration with our partners.

Looking ahead, we have exciting topics for the upcoming board retreat on May 23rd, although the location is yet to be finalized. The April agenda includes discussions on a solar project from the South Tahoe Public Utility District, the Climate Dashboard, our Active Transportation Plan, and the update of our Regional Transportation Plan. Additionally, we'll have a forest health update as we approach the upcoming wildfire season.

Ms. Regan welcomed new Chief Financial Administrative Officer, Chad Cox. Mr. Cox brings a wealth of experience from the private sector and a strong commitment to community engagement. She acknowledged Chris Keillor, who has served TRPA for 12 years as a steady leader and a respected financial manager. His dedication and professionalism have been invaluable to our agency's success and will be greatly missed. His expertise and leadership have been instrumental in advancing TRPA's mission.

### Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean worked with Mr. Keillor very closely over the years as a former chair of the Operations and Governance Committee. Chris' steady leadership and his unwavering commitment resulted in fiscal accuracy, which is a quality that every member of the committee appreciated.

Ms. Hill said it's been an honor to work with Mr. Keillor. He's a consummate professional and appreciated the time that he took to go to the Governor's chief of staff to support funding for TRPA this last session. Without his knowledge and background, we wouldn't have had such a successful meeting.

Ms. Williamson echoed other commenters. His complete grasp of the budgets, the numbers, and always being calm, cool, collected and professional has served this agency well.

#### A. General Counsel Status Report

No report.

## GOVERNING BOARD

March 27, 2024

### VIII. GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER REPORTS

Mr. Bass said there's been some comments from one of the City of South Lake Tahoe's council members about the Motel 6 project. Four of the council members highly support this project and see it as a great opportunity. They've already relocated the employees that were living at the motel.

Mr. Bass at a previous meeting he asked about agendaizing a discussion around looking at the residential units of use on vacation home rentals compared to the tourist accommodations or a new TAU that would apply to those. As we're looking at funding it would be good to have both of things happening simultaneously.

Mr. Hester said staff is addressing scalable development rights which includes that as part of the Phase 3 Housing Strategic Priority.

### IX. COMMITTEE REPORTS

#### A. Local Government Committee

No report.

#### B. Legal Committee

No report.

#### C. Operations & Governance Committee

No report.

#### D. Environmental Improvement Program Committee

Ms. Faustinos said the committee received an update on the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act extension. They hope to have a virtual field tour or a trip out into the field to see Environmental Improvement Program project sites at their May meeting.

#### E. Transportation Committee

No report.

#### F. Regional Planning Committee

No report.

### X. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Steve Teshara, Sustainable Community Advocates and the Tahoe Chamber provided a preview of a comment that he'll be making at the next Transportation Committee meeting. It's unfair that this trigger discussion only has a trigger on one sector. He appreciated the comment by a board member about who we are punishing and why are we punishing.

GOVERNING BOARD

March 27, 2024

John Messina said you do a lot of good work and it's a lot of effort but in 55 years, you've not addressed one of the most significant housing problems in the entire basin. And he's beginning to feel like your nimby's because it's right in your backyard. Douglas County used to have 50 affordable housing units for their entire county down the street, but they allowed them to go to market rate housing. Right now, there are 4,000 people living in South Lake Tahoe and working at jobs in Nevada because there is not sufficient affordable housing in Douglas County. It's displacing our workers from our city who are now asking us to build housing for them because Nevada's workers are living in our housing. You need to stop dumping the responsibility for the housing on all these little communities that aren't creating it. The large field right across from the new events center would be perfect for building large affordable or workforce housing. Instead, you're looking at all these other little towns who are putting up ugly buildings. We just put up a 428 unit housing unit in South Lake Tahoe that looks like a dump, high density slum. Nobody's doing anything about the casinos here in Douglas County.

Doug Flaherty, TahoeCleanair.org raised awareness on the part of the public regarding the East shore Corridor Plan which runs from Incline Village to Cave Rock. A slogan being created is "Keep the East Shore true, say no to Trail Two." Trail two is next segment of the Corridor Management Plan from Sand Harbor to Thunderbird. It was approved under a sham TRPA desktop environmental checklist. That checklist and the US Forest Service environmental assessment was created before we had data on the number of east shore trail users. It indicates a significant increase in VMTs from 1,000 data counts a day to 3,400 data counts a day on the East Shore trail. That trail will run along the lake in the shorezone and should be moved to the other side of the highway like the first part of the East Shore trail. To the Nevada contingent, please try to keep what was once a pristine east shore. There's a lot of new information that has surfaced since that environmental checklist was completed. He wants to make it a corner piece of TahoeCleanair.org to get that section of the trail moved to the other side of the highway.

Many of the past Advisory Planning Commission agendas have been in violation of the Nevada Open Meeting Law.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Bass made a motion to adjourn.

Vice chair Ms. Williamson adjourned the meeting at 12:36 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).*