

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
GOVERNING BOARD

Round Hill Pines Resort
GoToWebinar/TRPA

July 28, 2021
July 29, 2021

Meeting Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Mr. Bruce called the meeting to order at 8:50 a.m. on July 28, 2021.

Members present: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates

Members absent: Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Hicks

Chair Mr. Bruce called the meeting to order at 1:26 p.m. on July 29, 2021.

Members present: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Hicks, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates

Members absent: Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Hill

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Hangeland led the pledge.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Marchetta said that Douglas County requested the removal of Consent Calendar Item Number 1, Release of Douglas County Operations and Maintenance Mitigation Funds for the construction of a stormwater decant facility.

Mr. Bruce deemed the agenda approved as amended.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Aldean moved approval of the June 23, 2021 minutes as presented.
Motion carried.

V. TRPA CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Release of Douglas County Operations and Maintenance Mitigation Funds (\$100,000) towards the construction of a Stormwater Decant Facility **Removed at the request of Douglas County.**
2. Release of City of South Lake Tahoe Stream Environment Zone (SEZ) Mitigation Funds (\$225,000), Water Quality Mitigation Funds (\$200,000), and Water Quality Interest Mitigation Funds (\$50,000), towards acquisition of property and easements for the Tahoe Valley

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

Greenbelt & Stormwater Improvement Project

3. Resolution of Enforcement Action: ZPP LLC; Unauthorized Grading and Disturbance of Vegetation without TRPA Approval, 253 S Martin Drive, Douglas County, NV, Assessor's Parcel Number 1318-10-417-014

Ms. Aldean said the Operations and Governance Committee recommended approval of item number two.

Mr. Marshall said the Legal Committee recommended approval of item number three as proposed.

Board Comments & Questions.

None.

Public Comments & Questions

None

Mr. Friedrich made a motion to approve the Consent Calendar.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates

Absent: Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Hill

Motion carried.

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. Phase 1 Housing Code Amendments to the TRPA Code of Ordinances related to: **a)** Bonus Unit Boundary, including amendments to Chapter 52; **b)** Non-conforming density, including amendments to Chapter 31; **c)** Accessory Dwelling Units, including amendments to Chapters 21, 31, 39, 50, 51, 52 and 90, Meyers, Tahoe Valley and Tourist Core Area Plans, and Rules of Procedure Section 12; **d)** Development Rights Strategic Initiative Code Clean-Up: Potential Residential Units of Use and Bonus Unit Pools, including amendments to Chapters 51 and 52

TRPA staff member Ms. Bettinger provided the presentation.

Ms. Bettinger said today staff is asking for approval on the Phase 1 Housing Code Amendments and Findings. The Regional Plan Implementation Committee recommended approval at their meeting this morning. The Advisory Planning Commission and the Local Government and Housing Committee recommended approval at their July 14 June 9 meetings.

These housing related amendments emerged out of consultation with the Tahoe Living and Housing Community Revitalization Working Group which is a committee of the Advisory Planning Commission.

The proposed amendments are focused on addressing the serious housing shortage we're facing in the Basin. This proposal is to encourage and allow more workforce housing types. It is fully within the growth caps and the development pattern identified in the Regional Plan and the 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. The impacts of that growth have already been analyzed. This

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

proposal moves forward policy changes that further implement the goals of the Regional Plan such as encouraging growth and walkable neighborhoods and centers, providing sufficient housing to meet local and regional housing goals, and providing housing that's sized appropriately for local workers and residents.

In January 2021, the Local Government and Housing Committee hosted a workshop called Missing Middle Housing. The workshop pointed out that often times the overlay of multiple regulations in the Basin can limit the types and sizes of homes that are built and results in construction of mainly larger homes that generally aren't affordable to the local residents.

An example is that they wanted to look at how the size of homes have changed in Lake Tahoe over time. Using GIS data they're seeing that people are incentivized to maximize their total building envelope especially in areas where single family is the only type of residential that is allowed. It's not to say that there's not a need for some larger homes but the needs assessments that have been completed in various areas throughout the Basin have shown that the majority of homes that are in need are studios to two bedrooms. The median size home has got significantly larger.

As part of addressing this overall issue to try to increase the amount and diversity of housing options and meet other Regional Plan goals they've developed the Phase 1 housing amendment. The first element of the proposal is to expand the bonus unit boundary to encompass previous planning efforts. The bonus unit boundary is the area in which someone can obtain a bonus unit in exchange for deed restricting a home or unit to an affordable, moderate, or achievable income level housing. The current bonus unit boundary is pretty much aligned with the 2017 Regional Transportation Plan. The boundary encompasses the ½ mile buffer from existing transit.

They now want to expand the buffer to capture changes from the 2020 Regional Transportation Plan, the town centers from the 2012 Regional Plan, and the existing multi-family zones where much of the affordable housing is already located. These areas also overlap with the community priority zones that were identified in the Regional Transportation Plan.

(Slide 5) The green designates all of those areas in total and is the proposal today to expand the total bonus unit boundary to the area shown in green. This increases the bonus unit boundary by about 15 percent from what it exists today.

(Slide 6) Illustrates the environmental analysis. The new areas of the proposed bonus unit boundary are shown in orange and align well with the low trip length traffic analysis zones. These are the areas where trip lengths are less or equal to that of the average, encouraging more development in areas that are at or below the average trip length contributes to bringing the overall down. Trip lengths are closely correlated with vehicle miles traveled.

The next proposed code change would allow non-conforming tourist density to be converted and used for multi-residential redevelopment on site as long as multi-residential is an allowed use in that specific location.

Under the current code a hotel owner with a hotel development that exceeds the allowable density can redevelop and keep all of those units on site if they redevelop as a tourist use. However, if they redevelop to residential then they have to comply with residential densities which are generally much lower than what is allowable with tourist densities and can be

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

significantly lower than some of the non-conforming tourist densities that exist now. These are areas where tourist units were built before the Regional Plan was approved and the densities were high then.

For example, if someone owned 17 tourist accommodation units they could redevelop and keep the same tourist use and be able to maintain their non-conforming 17 TAU density. However, if they were to try to redevelop to residential, they would only be allowed six residential units under the existing Code of Ordinances and density. This is a disincentive to redevelop for residential.

The proposed code change would allow those units to be redeveloped on site as residential density and keep that non-conforming density. Questions have been asked if this creates more residential development; it does not. The existing Code of Ordinances allows conversion of development rights of one type to another. Tourist units convert to multi-residential at a ratio of 1:1.5. Under the existing Code of Ordinances all 17 of these units could be converted to 25 multi-family residential units. There is no change to that with this proposal. What changes is how many units can be used on site. Under the existing code in the example, the owner would have been able to convert to residential and build only six units on site but would have to transfer off the remaining 19 units. Under the proposed code they could now build 17 residential units on site and could bank and transfer off the remaining 8 units. If the hotel owner decides that they want to redevelop to residential and want to deed restrict those new units to affordable, moderate, or achievable they could receive bonus units from TRPA's pool at no cost. This would potentially provide the opportunity for the project to pencil out.

Because the conversion of tourist units to multi-residential was analyzed during the Development Rights Strategic Initiative, environmentally neutral conversion rates were developed. The environmental impacts of allowing the same number of multi-residential units on a site as there are existing tourist units has already been analyzed. However, they did want to check to see if these units would generally be located in areas where they want to encourage and incentivize development. They looked at the GIS data to see where the existing tourist developments are and looked at the locations of those in comparison to the proposed bonus unit boundary. It was found that all of the existing tourist units that would be eligible to take advantage of this code change are within the existing bonus unit boundaries.

The next change is to allow accessory dwelling units on all residential parcels regardless of parcel size. Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) are also known as secondary units or mother-in-law units and can be detached from the main house, attached to the main house, or repurposing an existing space within a house known as a junior ADU.

The proposal would lift the one acre size limit allowing up to two ADUs per residential parcel to allow one attached and one detached ADU. Because ADUs would now be an allowed use on all residential parcels like any other accessory uses they wouldn't require special noticing as they do now. This is part of the effort to reduce the disparity between how easy it is to build larger single-family homes and how hard it is to build smaller workforce housing type units.

In Douglas and Washoe County's ADUs are not currently allowed on parcels of less than one acre. This code proposal doesn't change that unless they were to amend their area plans. There was a motion made by the Regional Plan Implementation Committee this morning that would further limit parcels that are less than one acre in size in Nevada from building an ADU per TRPA's Code of Ordinances.

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

On the California side each jurisdiction has passed or is in the process of passing their own ADU regulations that reflect the California law. Based on this, California county's would allow ADUs on all residential parcels but there would be restrictions of rentals of less than 30 days with size limitations.

Because ADUs would be allowed on any residential parcel they decided to model this using the transportation model because it's not easily accessed at a qualitative level. Based on how they developed the code proposal they do expect that most ADUs will be built inside the bonus unit boundary because that is where most of the incentives are. However, with a full development right people can build an ADU outside the bonus unit boundary. ADUs that utilize bonus units will get that deed restriction along with the bonus unit but ADUs that use a full development right (not a bonus unit) will not have to deed restrict a property. Allowing both of these options is still consistent with encouraging as many of the remaining development rights and allocations to be provided for smaller units that are more affordable to the local workforce.

Because ADUs would be allowed anywhere in the Basin they wanted to analyze an ADU scenario that took into account the furthest extent of where they might see this development. Staff analyzed a scenario about where they assumed that a significant number of remaining development rights would become ADUs and that all of these ADUs would be built in areas that are zoned for single-family only. Since there is now updated information on projects that are coming through that will use bonus units, they were also able to model projects such as the Sugar Pine Village and Pioneer/Ski Run Housing projects. Even though this was the worst-case scenario and shifted more people into longer trip length areas that had been in the Regional Transportation Plan forecast, that was offset by an increase in lower income households utilizing the bonus unit incentives. Overall, they found that the hypothetical ADUs that were built outside the bonus unit boundary made up about one percent of the overall development. These changes overall represent a pretty small shift that are basically absorbed by the other measures that they put into place in the Regional Transportation Plan and the Regional Plan.

They wanted to identify some of the questions and comments that came up at the informational hearings on these amendments in June including the Regional Plan Implementation Committee, the Local Government and Housing Committee, and the Advisory Planning Commission. Committee and Commission members asked for clarification on whether the amendments would affect the transfer of coverage from sensitive lands and in general wanted to be sure that the environmental analysis would address parking traffic and vehicle miles traveled. They tried to point out the outcomes of the analysis throughout the presentation but wanted to highlight that the amendments do not make any changes to coverage regulations in all of the incentive programs for transferring coverage will remain in place and not affected by these amendments.

Overall growth and growth pattern is consistent with what was analyzed in the 2012 Regional Plan. The analysis for parking, traffic, and VMT tiers off that analysis.

Additionally, a couple of questions came up at the Local Government and Housing Committee and the Regional Plan Implementation Committee meetings about ensuring that bonus units are used as intended and don't become extended stay hotels due to the lack of clarity in the definitions or compliance language. Based on these comments two changes were made to the proposed code. One is to modify the definition of affordable to specify that it is intended for permanent residents and seasonal workers and to clarify some of the compliance language in the bonus unit incentive program. These changes are included in the staff packet.

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

The Regional Plan Implementation Committee recommended moving this code package forward to the Governing Board for approval. They made a motion to restrict ADUs from being built on parcels of less than one acre in Nevada specifically. Both Washoe and Douglas County's already have a one acre size limitation for ADUs. Staff has provided specific code language for the motion distributed in an errata.

They'll begin the Phase 2 Housing Amendments in the upcoming months and will likely be bringing back an item to the Governing Board in February. These will be mostly focused on site constraints and additional incentives for ADUs.

Presentation can be found at:

[Agenda-Item-No.-VI.A-Phase-1-Housing-Code-Amendments.pdf](#)

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Yeates said the Regional Plan Implementation Committee said the committee doesn't have any issues with what staff is doing, what the working group has done and what the Local Government & Housing Committee, the Advisory Planning Commission has reviewed and recommended.

There were a few issues that were reviewed and discussed at the RPIC meeting this morning. One is dealing with the fact that they generally talk about accessory dwelling units being just a residential use that attaches to a residential use. There was a prior discussion of the term accessory dwelling units within TRPA's Code of Ordinances, secondary residences. Existing code allows secondary uses as shown on page 95, 21.3.2, Accessory Dwelling Units formally secondary residences that they could be attached to commercial use, public service, or recreational use. After committee discussion, they agreed that this discussion should go back to the working group and others for a discussion. Now, that we're changing everything back to the accessory dwelling unit and trying to follow the policies that were established by California and our own interest in promoting housing that's consistent with the Regional Plan, do we want to have accessory dwelling units attached to a recreational use? There may be a need for caretakers in some recreational areas for example. This may be a worthwhile discussion as it was pointed out the importance of having those kind of housing opportunities maybe for the benefit of the managers of these facilities or awareness of what's going on out there in areas of high fire danger. But we did adopt a Regional Plan that tries to get housing where housing should be located within the town centers, transit located where people work, have services, and schools.

The second one was about recent comments received about California law requires some changes in the application of accessory dwelling units which we're making those changes as shown in the staff presentation. California has a limitation on the use of accessory dwelling units to at least a rental of no less than 30 days. They've expanded that to allow ADUs on less than one acre amending the code to make it more available even up to two ADUs on an existing residential parcel for accessory dwelling units. If those accessory dwelling units are rentals, they will have to have more than a 30 day rental. The issue he raised is why not have that applied Basin wide, rather than reducing the one acre and also leaving up to Washoe and Douglas County's are going to do. As the TRPA, we should say "no." It should be at least a 30 day rental consistent with what Placer and El Dorado County's and the City of South Lake Tahoe are going to have to address.

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

As referenced by staff and the committee agreed to leave Nevada alone right now and have the working group, Washoe and Douglas County's and others to decide. Then it would come back to the Governing Board later within the Phase 2 process.

Ms. Novasel said the discussion was extensive at the Regional Plan Implementation Committee this morning. She didn't realize when RPIC's issues were being discussed this morning that there isn't representation from Nevada on the committee that was making this recommendation. That needs to happen. She's been proud of TRPA with working together with staff that they are very much aware of local government needs to have a voice because they are the closest to what is going on with their constituents. Being able to have that leeway has been very important in the vacation rental conversations they've had in the community. She agreed with the idea of coming back and having that conversation and then bringing back some other ideas.

Mr. Rice said Douglas County is still addressing short term rentals. They have an ordinance that was passed and is now in the courts. They've been enjoined from enforcing any of the new ordinances and will need to take a hard look at what was passed. At this point, Nevada wouldn't be able to support the changes that have been discussed. He concurs that this needs to be put on table instead of approving this as presented.

Mr. Yeates said they are holding Nevada without a change to the one acre limit but are moving ahead with the changes for the accessory dwelling units on the California side. It's not that they are not doing anything, at this time, they're not going to reduce it to less than one acre or say anything at all about the rental question.

Mr. Rice understands that due to the changes in California law it made it necessary for this body to come up with some answers. He appreciated not using a one size fits all approach to this.

Public Comments & Questions

John Falk, Tahoe Sierra Board of Realtors said they've been involved with this process from the beginning and there's been a lot of work done to date. He thanked everyone who participated both internally and externally. There was the heavy lifting by Ms. Fink, Ms. Bettinger, and others from staff who have taken this set of requests that they put together as amendments and made them workable. Second, as the legislative advocate for the Tahoe Sierra Board of Realtors they strongly support the Phase 1 Housing Code Amendments as presented in the packet today, not as proposed to be potentially amended through committee's this morning. All of the ideas presented in that packet are well thought out, thoroughly vetted, and are designed to remove disincentives, unnecessary and burdensome barriers to the development of more workforce housing. We need to increase the small footprint house because that's the only way we are going to house the workforce locally. It can be done through a variety of means, but frankly just the square footage of an ADU and such is going to dictate a lot of the pricing.

He doesn't want to get into the weeds about short term rentals because this has been dealt with at nauseum. The state of California's law is that new construction of ADUs cannot be short term rentals. Not all short term rentals can no longer be short term rentals. That's important for the north shore because we can't backfill with hotel beds the STR folks that utilize the area. It would destroy our economy if they were taken out. They urged that these amendments be adopted as proposed as an important first step towards a better melding of environmental goals with housing needs rather than viewing them as separate and opposing odds with each other. Rather, this modest package of amendments will accelerate both environmental and housing objectives.

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

Judith Miller would conditionally like the board to adopt the recommendation about excluding Nevada. She's a resident of Incline Village, Nevada and feels that they have no representation. Even, their own commissioner is not in attendance today. In addition to that, she represents a district of many more times the residents of the Tahoe Basin. Most of the things she's brought forward are not always in alignment with the needs of the people that live in the Basin. It would be helpful to hear about availability of residential allocations. It hasn't been a topic of conversation in Incline because they're mostly built out. Currently, are there allocations available? If there are, there is a legitimate concern about how they're going to be used. If there are many available the potential for more residential units is troubling, our capacity like many mountain communities is very challenged. We need to argue for limits on short term rentals, opening up housing for long term renters, not creating more housing and a bigger population.

She commended the Regional Plan Implementation Committee for their desire to impose a 30 day minimum for ADUs on the Nevada side as required in California. If affordable housing is the goal of these amendments why wouldn't the state want this? Washoe County recently enacted regulations allowing for unlimited numbers of short term rentals, almost all of which are in Incline Village and Crystal Bay. It shows little concern for affordable housing. Roughly half the housing units in Incline Village are small condominiums and for decades they were the primary source of affordable housing. The vast majority of short term rentals are condominiums with an estimated 1,000 in the community which that supply has now been decimated. The primary objective as she understands it is to increase affordable housing. Unless there's a minimum occupancy of 30 days, it's a valid concern that most of these ADUs in Washoe County will become short term rentals.

Kathy Julian, Incline Village resident thanked Ms. Fink for answering a number of her questions. She learned that there were around 1,200 single-family zoned parcels that have the coverage so that they could have new ADUs built on those properties. That does lead us to look at a large number of potential ADUs in Incline Village. That is the main concern that the previous speaker raised that these ADUs might be used short term rentals rather than in the spirit of your code change for workforce housing. We would need a 30 day minimum rental to ensure that we have these new ADUs converted to workforce housing and not short term rentals. The list of members on the working group doesn't include representation of the residents from Incline Village in such a manner that information from that working group gets fed back into their community. They have a member from the chair of the Incline Village General Improvement District board but don't receive a lot of feed back to and from this working group. It's important that any working group draws upon the residents of community. She asked that they consider including residents and people who are in trenched in the community on that working group. She's supportive of ADUs for workforce housing but in the context of Nevada she feels certain that it would be difficult for you to put on restrictions that will keep these ADUs from becoming short term rentals. This will back fire and will not achieve what the working is trying to do.

Natalie Yanish, Government Affairs Manager, Contractors Association and has also participated on the working group. She agreed with the points that were brought up by John Falk. They work with a lot of private industry and contractors who are building the houses and have received a lot of feedback from members who are frustrated because they have clients who want to build ADUs or junior ADUs but haven't been able to in the past. At the same time, putting a deed restriction any sort of ADU is a disincentive for an investor. The less regulations the better and the easier it makes it for the construction industry to build this affordable housing because it is a supply and demand issue. The restrictions and regulations need to be as easy as possible because people are not going to want to sign up for deed restrictions just to get a bonus unit for

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

an ADU. That model works well for large developers such as the Sugar Pine project. She appreciated the conversation about Nevada versus California; however, she doesn't understand why you wouldn't loosen the restrictions for Nevada, the same as California because the local jurisdictions still can be more restrictive. Any of the barriers that can be reduced are helpful with getting more housing on the ground. The Contractors Association is happy to provide feedback from their members.

Gavin Feiger, League to Save Lake Tahoe said the League is dedicated to protecting and restoring the environmental health, sustainability, and scenic beauty of the Tahoe Basin. In connection with that mission they advocate for the implementation of sound environmentally friendly policies that are contained within the regional land use and planning documents. They've been the only environmental group actively and continuously participating in the housing working group and the efforts leading up to its formation over the past few years. Ms. Fink and Ms. Bettinger have been awesome to work with as have other TRPA staff. So far, their input and feedback has been heard along with the rest of the working group members. Their concerns have been the same since the beginning; coverage, density, and transportation impacts. All of which directly and indirectly impact the environment. Addressing housing issues around Lake Tahoe is a priority but it needs to be balanced with protecting the environment. They applaud the process and support the ADU incentive package as presented today and see the potential for ADUs to help achieve housing and transportation goals but want to see data showing that they're an effective tool. The effectiveness of ADUs in reaching the housing and transportation goals as well as achieving and maintaining the environmental thresholds needs to be assessed before considering more incentives. Especially those involving coverage and development rights.

Coverage requirements and development rights are both critical to addressing the Lake clarity decline and development rights are one of the fundamental tools to ensure that the pace of development aligns with environmental capacity. This is done by capping the total amount of development potential and is baked into the Regional Plan and TRPA Code of Ordinances. There's opportunity within the existing development rights system to provide incentives and achieve our housing goals. For coverage, they prefer that TRPA uses its authority to reduce or eliminate parking minimums which would help reduce the coverage needed and reduce transportation impacts instead of allowing more coverage.

They support the ADU package as discussed today and provided in the staff report. They would like the package approved but would like to see clarification that further actions that affect coverage and development rights are longer term actions they may have significant environmental impacts need to be carefully considered. They would also like to see monitoring.

Steve Teshara on behalf of the Tahoe Chamber who are pleased to join with other business organizations and concerned folks who recognize the importance of providing additional affordable housing opportunities for the workforce at Lake Tahoe. The Covid pandemic and the recent changes in the real estate market have displaced a lot of the workers. It's at a crisis level. It's not just one solution that fixes this issue but this is one of a set of solutions. They've attended most of the working group, Local Government and Housing Committee, the Regional Plan Implementation Committee, and the Advisory Planning Commission meetings on this subject have helped shape it along the way. And along the way have listened to the concerns expressed and the perspectives of many people to bring the proposed package today. They listened to the RPIC meeting today, a lot of nuances. They encouraged the board to approve and move forward the staff recommendation today.

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Lawrence thanked Ms. Fink, Ms. Bettinger, and staff who worked on the code amendments, all of the experts that came and spoke to the board. In particular what resonated with him was the “missing middle.” He participated in the working group and Local Government and Housing Committee and supported their recommendation. That’s why he was a “no” vote at the Regional Plan Implementation Committee changing those recommendations.

In between undergraduate and graduate school he lived in an ADU in the Santa Cruz Mountains before leaving for graduate school in Eugene, Oregon. After that, he got an Assistant Planner job at TRPA but couldn’t afford to live up here. Many of the staff lived in Carson City who all carpooled to work at TRPA. He comes to the Lake quite a bit over Highway 50 and Mount Rose and when you travel in the morning there is quite a bit of traffic but is not all outdoor recreationists. There’s a huge workforce in the Carson Valley, Carson City, and Reno that working up here that need housing and we need to take action and move forward. He stands behind the recommendations of all the experts that presented to the working group and Local Government and Housing Committee. One of the challenges he has on the board when they look at code amendments is that the code is pretty dense. It’s sometimes hard to see the bigger picture they’re only seeing slice when looking at code amendments. His experience particularly in Incline Village with the Individual Parcel Evaluation System (IPES) all of the residential permits he wrote maxed out peoples land coverage. The profits are in the square footage. He’s not aware of a lot of parcels in Incline Village in particular that are less than one acre that have available land coverage for a detached unit that would be a short term rental. He did hear the public comment that there are possibly 1,200 of these parcels. We do need to chase that down.

This is an important issue. Regarding the one acre, one of the reasons he voted no against pulling Nevada out is because he was uncomfortable that there was no local government representation on the Regional Plan Implementation Committee. After going through the working group to then make that change without hearing from them made him uncomfortable. We have forest health, transportation, an affordable housing issues and we need to make a difference. While unanimous decisions by this board are important, if it is the desire to pull Nevada out to review some of these issues, he’s okay with that but would like to hear from Washoe and Douglas County’s. We need to move forward. They were talking about affordable housing when he was an Assistant Planner with TRPA in 1991. There is no perfect solution and we’re not going to be able to solve the short term rental issue and its challenges. In his opinion, it’s starting to get a little conflated. Making a difference with ADUs or some of these changes to get some opportunities with workforce housing. If it’s going to get wrapped around the axle of trying to solve a short term rental challenge which is global, he’s concerned that we’re going to get caught in a quagmire. We need to move something forward. If we pull Nevada out, he hates to see us not have that opportunity. He’s confident that if we decide not to look at Nevada today that we’ll look at Nevada very quickly with factual information.

Mr. Bruce agreed that there’s an urgency and thinks that it is appropriate for Nevada to go back to the working group to discuss issues and come back to the Governing Board.

Ms. Novasel said it sounded like staff would be back to the board in September. That was one of things she had some comfort on is understanding that the Local Government and Housing Committee needs to act on this.

Mr. Lawrence said Ms. Novasel has done a great job in chairing the Local Government and Housing Committee to further these conversations. September is fine but it would be very

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

unfortunate if this gets conflated to be something bigger than it is and gets wrapped around the axle and not make a decision.

Mr. Marshall said the difference from the first errata sheet to the second is that the table has three additional minor grammatical errors to 21.3.1.B, C, and D adding the “s” to units. On 21.3.1.E is also the same correction. It’s on page 95 of the packet. It makes all the accessory dwelling units plural. To codify the difference between California and Nevada is to make the proposed changes under the California heading, Code Section 31.3.2 and the Nevada section will be what is the existing language today. The status quo will remain for Nevada whereas in California you’ll be able to put up to two ADUs on a parcel less than one acre.

Mr. Bruce said there’s a commitment from him to create some urgency to get this back to the board. Is it correct that Nevada will remain status quo with what we have now until it comes back.

Mr. Marshall said yes, that’s correct.

Ms. Aldean made a motion to approve the required findings in Attachment A, including a finding of no significant effect, for the adoption of Amendments to the TRPA Code of Ordinances related to: 1) Bonus Unit Boundary, including amendments to Chapter 52; 2) Non-conforming density, including amendments to Chapter 31; 3) Accessory Dwelling Units, including amendments to Chapters 21, 31, 39, 50, 51, 52 and 90, Meyers, Tahoe Valley, and Tourist Core Area Plans, and Rules of Procedure Section 12; 4) Development Rights Strategic Initiative Code Clean-Up: Potential Residential Units of Use and Bonus Unit Pools, including amendments to Chapters 51 and 52, as shown in Attachment B.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates

Absent: Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Hill

Motion carried.

Ms. Aldean made a motion approve and adopt Ordinance 2021-___ in Attachment C, amending Ordinance 87-9, as amended, for the adoption of amendments to the TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapters 21, 31, 39, 50, 51, 52, and 90 subject to the changes contained in the revised errata sheet dated July 29, 2021. With one additional change on page 94 to Code Section 21.3.1e adding an “s” to unit in the second to the last sentence and with the understanding that the wording in Section 21.3.2b will be referred back to the working groups to be addressed in Phase 2 of the Housing Code Amendment process. That section has to do with accessory uses pertinent to commercial, public service, and recreational uses. In addition, the issue of prohibiting the use of ADUs as short term rentals in Nevada will also be addressed in Phase 2 of the Housing Code Amendment process in consultation with Washoe and Douglas County’s.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates

Absent: Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Hill

Motion carried.

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

Ms. Aldean made a motion to adopt Resolution 2021-___ to amend the Rules of Procedures as set forth in Attachment D.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates

Absent: Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Hill

Motion carried.

VII. PLANNING MATTERS

- A. Update on the US 50 Tahoe East Shore Corridor: Including the US 50 Tahoe East Shore Corridor Management Plan and upcoming project within the corridor.

TRPA staff Ms. Friedman provided an overview of the US 50 Corridor Management Plan, the Warrior Way, Safety and Water Quality Improvement Project, and the Round Hill Pines Access Improvement Project

Corridor management planning is the bridge between TRPA's Regional Transportation Plan; goals and policy of that plan and implementation and long term operations of the projects that are identified in the Regional Transportation Plan. The corridor planning framework was developed to increase collaboration and accelerate the challenging transportation improvements that need to occur along these corridors that often cross jurisdictions and land uses. Corridor planning allows TRPA to leverage its transportation and land use policies to create synergies and maximize the cost efficiencies and benefits of the projects.

The Tahoe region is broken up into six corridors based upon unique characteristic and needs of each corridor. More recently, TRPA approved the State Route 28 Corridor Management Plan, as well as the State Route 89 Recreation Corridor Management Plan.

The US 50 East Shore Corridor Management Plan extends from Spooner Summit down to the California Nevada Stateline and it's a 13 mile segment on US 50. The purpose in need of the corridor management plan is to assess and evaluate the needs along this 13 mile corridor. Create a mobility vision, developing supporting goals, and identify improvement strategies for the corridor based on existing regional plans, stakeholder input and assessment of travel and safety data. Examines potential multimodal solutions including pedestrian bicycle and local and regional transit services as well as innovative transportation and mobility strategies to serve the unique seasonal and visitor driven fluctuations in use along this corridor.

The Nevada Department of Transportation is leading a corridor management plan, along with project partners, including TRPA, the Tahoe Transportation District, the USDA Forest Service Lake Basin Management Unit, as well as local, state partners, and the public. They have hired Wood Rodgers to help develop the plan as their consultant.

The corridor management plan goals include improving safety, expand multimodal transportation choices, enhance the visitor experience, protect Lake Tahoe, and promote economic vitality along the US. 50 Corridor. These goals will be further developed through the development of the Corridor Management Plan, and will involve input from study partners, stakeholders, and the public.

The development of the plan was kicked off in the winter of 2021. First was the development of a draft existing conditions analysis along the corridor. This, analysis looked at the existing

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

conditions, such as, traffic conditions and traffic patterns, level of service, speed limits, and analyzed the crash data along this corridor, looking at where hotspots were for crashes, and what the causes of those crashes were. This summer, they have been doing a public canvassing campaign to gather public input on the project. What and where people think the hot spots are and what the solutions might be. Moving forward, the team will take input gathered from that public canvassing to develop draft strategies and solutions in the Fall of 2021. That will lead to a Draft Corridor Management Plan in early winter of 2022. Then in the winter of 2022, the study will be complete, and there will be a Final Draft Corridor Management Plan. This plan will be coming back to the Governing Board at various times throughout this planning process, and back in the winter of 2022 for final adoption.

The Nevada Department of Transportation led the public canvassing starting in June 2021 which they held four public meetings and had a public survey available on their website. They sent out 4,000 direct mailers to people that live along that corridor. They've received to date 253 responses from that survey, and they identified key issues of concern, including safety and high speeds, difficulty accessing driveways and side streets, high summer visitation, and roadside parking, interest in extending the Tahoe Trail, which is the Stateline to Stateline shared use trail, and concern for any potential lane reductions in the future. NDOT has a website dedicated to this corridor plan and on that website is a story map where people can look at the problem areas along the project and potential solutions. There's also a web app available on the website and that allows users to go in and highlight to polygons, draw their own polygons on the map, and identify what they think are problems in the area and also provide potential solutions.

(Slide 7) Just north of Zephyr Point is the Warrior Way Intersection and then just south of that between Zephyr Point and Elks Point is the location of the Round Hill Pines intersection. Both the Warrior Way Project and the Round Hill Pines projects will be implemented in 2022 in concert with the development of the corridor management plan. All of the project partners felt that it was really important to move forward with these projects instead of waiting until the plan was complete, because all of the planning documents as well as public input have expressed a need for immediate action at these intersections. There's a lot of safety issues at these intersections and they've heard from the public that something needs to be done to address those concerns.

The existing conditions analysis looked at crash data and where there were hotspots for those crashes. The project area between Round Hill Pines and Zephyr Point intersections were identified as a hotspot because of the high number of crashes that occur there. Between January 2015 to December 2019 there were 119 crashes. At the US 50 and Warrior Way intersection, there were 10 crashes. The TRPA 2019 Safety Strategy also identified Warrior Way is a priority intersection to implement the project to improve the safety there.

Warrior Way is a secondary street to US 50. Along Warrior Way is the Zephyr Cove Elementary School and the George Whittell High School. There's also the Zephyr Cove Park which has a disk golf course, tennis courts, a library, and a variety of other recreational amenities. There's also a Douglas County Fire station at that intersection as well. NDOT is proposing a signalized intersection at US 50 in Warrior Way. This will include bike and pedestrian improvements at that intersection. The project will also include drainage and water quality improvements to treat and infiltrate stormwater generated from the highway. It will also provide a new access point into Zephyr Cove. The Forest Service has future plans to add another access into Zephyr Cove to help recirculate people within the resort and to provide another access point into that area. The project will also redirect people to park along Warrior Way instead of along US 50, which creates a lot of safety issues, and the improved intersections will allow for safe passage of pedestrians and bicyclists to cross from Warrior Way to Zephyr Cove to enjoy the beach. NDOT plans to

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

implement this project in 2022.

The purpose of the Round Hill Pines Access Improvement Project is to increase safety and improve accessibility for visitors entering and exiting Round Hill Pines from US 50. The project is needed because the current US 50 entrance configuration into the resort has safety concerns due to limited sight distance for vehicles traveling in both directions and unprotected turning movements across US 50 for vehicles accessing the resort. In addition, the current configuration of the resort access road is very narrow with sharp curves, steep grades and doesn't allow for two-way traffic. This configuration is not conducive to transit or other large vehicles such as emergency vehicles accessing this area.

The Round Hill Pines Access Improvement Project proposes to relocate the entrance 0.2 miles to the north. Relocating the entrance here will meet safety standards for sight distance for the speed of this highway. The new intersection will also have a northbound median left turn lane and a northbound acceleration lane. This will prevent some of the safety issues that occur because vehicles will have a refuge to turn left and resolve some of the random collisions. Then the acceleration lane will provide space for cars leaving Round Hill Pines to get up to speed of the roadway reducing collisions due to vehicles in the travel lane being unable to slow down enough to accommodate those cars entering the roadway. This new intersection will tie into improvements that are planned at Round Hill Pines Resort by the Forest Service. The Forest Service has planned a new entrance road at this location that will be wider allowing for two lanes of traffic. It will connect people to two new parking lots, and a roundabout. The two new parking lots will be paved and people will park there instead of on the unpaved areas that are occurring right now at the existing entrance road. The roundabout will provide a place for transit to safely drop people off at this resort. These improvements have been planned with NDOT and Central Federal Land who is the project lead and TRPA to meet the purpose and need of the project while minimizing the impacts, minimizing the width of the roadway that's needed to make this a safe intersection and the other impacts associated with the project.

The Round Hill Pines Intersection Project is being evaluated under an environmental assessment. Central Federal Lands Division of Federal Highways is the lead for the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and TRPA is a lead under TRPA. This just finished public comment for the public draft environmental assessment and they are in the process of looking at those public comments, reviewing, and responding to them in preparation of the final environmental assessment. Construction of the Forest Service improvements at Round Hill Pines Resort are planned for this year 2021 and construction of the Round Hill Pines access improvements along the highway are planned for 2022. It's important that these projects are constructed in this way so that while they are being constructed, visitors can still access the Round Hill Pines recreation site through the existing entrance. Once both of these projects are complete, that existing entrance will not be available for public use.

Over the next four months, the Corridor Management Plan Team will begin development and evaluation of alternatives. It will address multimodal and recreational connectivity along the corridor including a parking needs assessment and developing supporting strategies for that including public transit, transportation demand management, and emergency management. They will also continue their public engagement including steering committee meetings, key stakeholder meetings, including Douglas County officials, resort owners and operators, emergency services, and environmental organizations. They will also continue public outreach and focus groups to help shape this corridor management plan, and it will be coming back to the board at various points for your input and for final plan adoption in late 2022.

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

Presentation can be found at:

[Agenda-Item-No.-VII.A-Highway-50-corridor.pdf](#)

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Lawrence said that was wonderful yesterday and always nice to be at Round Hill Pines. The first question is regarding the Warrior Way Project which currently doesn't have any traffic controls. It seems like the strategy regarding traffic improvements has not been to go to signals, it's been to go to roundabouts similar to what's being proposed at Round Hill. The jump from no traffic controls to a signalized intersection as opposed to a roundabout, was that considered and part of the conversation?

Ms. Friedman said it was part of the conversation. For clarification, the roundabout at Round Hill Pines is not going to be at the highway. It is going to be a small roundabout internal to the resort. So, when transit or other vehicles such as emergency vehicles or delivery trucks come into the resort, they'll have a place to turn around and help with the circulation. During the planning of the Warrior Way project, a roundabout was looked at there and it was determined that a signalized intersection would be the best option. One of the reasons was there is a signal currently at the Zephyr Cove entrance that is about one half a mile to the south and there are no plans to change that right now. The corridor management plan may have different recommendations but roundabouts work best when they're in concert with each other and they make a little less sense when you have a roundabout and then a signalized intersection. Input received from the public were not in favor of a roundabout at this location. .

Devon Cartwright, Nevada Department of Transportation said it wasn't a quick decision to go to a signal at this location. There were over eight different options evaluated, and what they wanted to do was tackle the multitude of safety issues at this location. Through evaluation, it was determined that a roundabout didn't necessarily address one of the major concerns, and that is the pedestrian access issue, and minimizing the footprint at the same time while doing that. That's a big, long straightaway on Highway 50 through there and there tends to be higher speeds and to get a roundabout to work through a corridor like that they would need to introduce some artificial curvature to the road and go outside of the traditional highway footprint facilitate that. It would be a roundabout taking a lot of the right-of-way and probably impacting the nature or the corridor in a pretty large fashion. Whereas they can get a good safety value and safety improvement from a smaller footprint signal.

Mr. Lawrence said he'll be interested in that moving forward. Where he lives in South Reno there's a fairly functional roundabout that's fairly close to traffic lights and doesn't seem to be a problem. He does understand that they do work best when there's a series of them as opposed to a roundabout and then another signal. What he's hearing from NDOT is that there is a speed issue and they want to get people slow down before they get to the roundabout. He does get concerned as we work on transportation and congestion that adding more signals keeps backing people up as opposed to keeping the traffic flowing through. It is a bit counter-intuitive to him but he's not a transportation expert. This maybe ties into the roundabout when they talk about eliminating parking on Highway 50 and then moving the parking to Warrior Way. With the SR 28 Corridor Management Plan, when they started removing highway parking between Sand Harbor and Incline Village, they replaced it with paid parking in the right-of-way over by the Tunnel Creek Café. So, when we're looking at Warrior Way and parking, is paid parking part of the mix there in order to encourage less single use vehicles coming in, or is that a topic that's been settled or is that topic down the road?

Ms. Friedman said right now, paid parking is not proposed as part of the Warrior Way Project.

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

All of the roadside parking and solutions to that will be a big part of the US. 50 Corridor Management Plan. The conversation of paid parking and where that would be will come out of that planning document. It is something that could be implemented in the future, but it is not planned for this individual intersection improvement project right now.

Mr. Lawrence said it does make sense to be part of the larger corridor study. He feels that it needs to be looked at and that we need consistency around the Basin in order to make it easier for the visitors to understand what the rules of engagement are regarding recreation up here. We've had before this board the topic of a mobility hub in Incline Village and certainly more planning work needs to be done. But as part of the long term vision of the Regional Transportation Plan is if we are going to discourage single use vehicles here for recreation users we need a series of transportation hubs, or whatever, so people can use a public transit option. He's hopeful and encourages that as part of this plan that we think about that more upfront and as part of the public process, so we don't kind of find ourselves in the same situation that we are in Incline Village. In Nevada, there's always a series of county land bills, and those county land bills are opportunities to identify federal lands that can be used for public purposes. We have a stretch of Forest Service land in this corridor. We want to be able to take advantage of those opportunities. When that bill goes through Washington, DC., if there's a need for some transit improvements that would require Federal land, we need to identify them sooner than later. He urged that type of creative thinking moving forward with this corridor plan.

Ms. Aldean said she thought even though some of the unimproved parking at Round Hill Pines was going to be removed as part of the master plan that the existing entry road was going to be maintained. Perhaps for no other reason than to provide a secondary exit for emergency purposes. There's also the issue of the existing cabins that the road is currently used to access.

Ms. Friedman said correct. The plan now is to keep the existing access road but will not be accessible to the general public. One is to access to the cabins. The Forest Service is still deciding what their future plans are for those cabins. Another reason is the Round Hill General Improvement Districts wastewater treatment plant is located there. It's right behind where the retreat was. The hope is that once the new road is built the Round Hill GID may decide it's just as easy to access their facilities from the new road. For those reasons the existing road will remain in place but that may change in the future. Having another entrance/exit for emergencies is a possible benefit. Having the new road to be wide and allowing for two lanes of traffic or being able to control an entrance and exit does help with any type of emergency.

Mr. Rice said a minor correction is that it's not wastewater treatment at the Round Hill Pines General Improvement District facility, it's their main water intake and filtration site. So, that's rather important that they be able to access that building.

Ms. Friedman said she misspoke; it is the water treatment plant. They do understand the importance of being able to access that regularly, which is why they worked with the Round Hill GID to maintain access and we will continue to make sure that they have that access.

Mr. Friedrich said he appreciated Mr. Lawrence bringing up the idea of a roundabout. As Ms. Novasel would say is that there was huge opposition to putting a roundabout in Meyers in a transition point between 55 and 40 miles per hour. It seems to be working just fine and all the horror stories haven't happened. It seems to be the trend of communities around the country and in the world to have roundabouts and no signalized intersections. The research he's seen suggests that the safety is enhanced, the emissions are lower, and is more efficient. Especially when you have a constant traffic thoroughfare like Highway 50 and a side street that periodically has traffic, is not the ideal scenario for a light versus a roundabout for obvious

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

reasons. He's not sure if it's still possible to consider for those reasons, or at least to make those comparisons of safety emissions and efficiency clear in the document so that it can at least be evaluated while there's still an option.

Mr. Bruce said one of the things that the NDOT representative mentioned was the pedestrian danger. Because there's going to be a lot of parking on Warrior Way and people coming across the highway, he thinks that that was one of the primary focuses that they had. We'll leave the highway design to them and monitor it along the way.

Mr. Lawrence said they had that issue with the East Shore Trail and the solution was to have pedestrian access under the highway which alleviated having to have red lights or roundabouts with people crossing the highway. Not sure what the water table is there compared to the East Shore and knows that it makes it more expensive, etc. but there are other solutions.

Ms. Aldean said in speaking with Mr. Haven, this is commonly done. If it is a lit intersection that the two lights would be synchronized. So, hopefully there will not be a lot of stopping and starting.

Ms. Novasel said the roundabout that Caltrans put in is one lane and they did that on purpose. You lose a lot of safety when you put a two lane roundabout in. The Meyers roundabout was a win for the environment because there's not all the stop and go. As people get used to it, it's becoming better and better. They are planning to put another one at Pioneer and Highway 50. If there is going to be parking on Warrior Way, are you going to have parking spaces there or how are you going to address that?

Mr. Rice said there's a large piece of land behind the fire station and the senior center. The Tahoe Transportation District along with Douglas County are discussing the possibility of creating paid off street parking at that location. They don't expect that they're going to take all the traffic off of Highway 50. They are looking at a large area that could be used for off street parking. They hope to have the paid parking there to supplement transportation.

Ms. Novasel said the Tahoe Transportation District is one of the partners in this project and it's been mentioned that they are talking about possibly putting a maintenance center in somewhere there. When we talk about things such as parking and the ability to put other services in, it sounds like there is an opportunity around there somewhere to be able to use that. Keeping that open with the Tahoe Transportation District, they're always looking for areas on the East Shore to put the busses, not just for bus services, but also for people and parking for them. And possibly a mobility hub.

Mr. Rice said the conversation is the possibility of a mobility hub as well as at Spooner where State Route 28 comes off of highway 50. The conversation is being held; no decisions have been made but everything is inter-connected. That's why he doesn't want to get too far into it, because it's still in the planning process.

Public Comments & Questions

None.

B. Briefing on Meeks Bay Restoration Project

TRPA staff Ms. Cremeen, Ms. Sibr, US Forest Service Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, and Mr. Lewandowski, Ascent Environmental provided the presentation.

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

Ms. Cremeen said they made a presentation to the Regional Plan Implementation Committee in January 2021 to get input on the range of alternatives. The alternatives have been refined and today the board will hear an update on the project, share what they've heard from the public, and provide the board with an opportunity to give feedback prior to the environmental analysis.

Meeks Bay is located on the West Shore of Lake Tahoe, south of Sugar Pine Point State Park and north of Emerald Bay. The planning for this restoration project is a partnership between the Forest Service, TRPA, and the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board. A joint environmental document is being prepared that meets the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and TRPA requirements.

This restoration project is part of a bigger vision in planning for Lake Tahoe and the West shore. The habitat improvements at Meeks Bay will complement the work being done on the Lake Tahoe West Restoration Strategy. Meeks Bay is also one of the recreational hot spots along the State Route 89 recreation corridor identified in the SR89 Corridor Management Plan for transportation and visitor management improvements including parking, transit, and bicycle and pedestrian connections. This project is being coordinated with the planning team that is studying trail alignments to connect Meeks Bay with Emerald Bay and the South Shore. All the recreation and shoreline improvements planned for the Meeks Bay project will be consistent with the Lake Tahoe Shoreline Plan.

Upstream from Meeks Bay is Meeks Meadow and slide 5 shows the Washoe Tribe working on a restoration project at Meeks Meadow. The Tribe is heading up the project that will remove encroaching Conifers and introduce traditional cultural burning practices. The objective is to raise the water table and encourage meadow species to thrive. Restoring Meeks Creek will directly benefit the meadow by improving wildlife connectivity and hydrologic function.

Ms. Sibr, Forest Service said Meeks Bay has a long history in the area and this project started about 15 years ago. The purpose of the project is that they're looking at it to restore the Meeks Bay Marina back to a wetland and lagoon ecosystem. They want to make sure that this system is functioning, both hydrologically, as well as, for the rest of the ecosystem, and really try to bring back that wetland lagoon ecosystems. And another important piece to remember is that this is an active recreation site. Part of the project is also to preserve and enhance recreation opportunities. (Slide 7) is an aerial view of Meeks Bay which is separated and basically on the north half which is the Meeks Bay Resort which is currently managed by the Washoe Tribe. The Meeks Bay campground is south of the marina and the Creek Campground and day use. The project area is outlined in green. It basically covers all of the resort in the campground area as well as a little ways upstream in Meeks Creek.

In thinking about this project and why they would need to do this project, there are a couple of needs in the area. There's this need to improve the hydrologic functions and processes of Meeks Creek, the lagoon, and the flood plain. If you're not familiar with what a lagoon ecosystem is like, if you've ever been out to Taylor Creek or Taylor and Tallac Creeks essentially, there's those swales and that backwater system where the groundwater backfills into the area, and the mouth of the creek moves back and forth. That's what is called the lagoon system and the barrier beach is the beach that has the mouth that is variable based upon the flow, that happened that year, as well as the water level in the lake. There's also a need to repair some of the habitat that are associated with these barrier beaches. They're looking to try and provide a high quality habitat in this area for some of those sensitive species that we have, one of them being the Tahoe Yellow Cress. Most folks are familiar with the plant which is endemic to Tahoe. The struggle with Tahoe Yellow Cress is that it only grows on the beaches based upon lake level.

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

That species grows very effectively in these lagoon and backwater ecosystems because they provide essentially more habitat for them to be able to grow in. Lahontan Cutthroat Trout is another species of interests that currently cannot get past the Meeks Creek Bridge because of the aquatic organism constriction there.

Meeks Creek has been identified both in this project and in the Lake Tahoe West Project as a creek that has been identified for restoration in aquatic organism passage and restoration of the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout in the whole system going back up into the wilderness. Depending upon what the water level is coming out of the creek, there's no barrier or very little barrier up to sometimes even multiple feet of a barrier there. This bridge is a constriction, so, the aquatic organism passage being an issue in this whole area. Originally in this project, it did not include replacement of the bridge. However, that was always a desire but essentially, Caltrans just was not ready going to begin looking at the Bridge replacement. They have since signed on to the project and are they're working on getting their full involvement. The bridge is now included in the project.

These are recreational sites and want to maintain access to Lake Tahoe and National Forest Systems lands, but they want to be able to do that in a way that is sustainable and provides recreation opportunities consistent with a functioning ecosystem. What's out there right now is a marina that has not actually been operated in a couple of years. It's basically an area that is kind of like the Tahoe Keys. It's shallow, warm water at this point, and in its current state isn't providing a recreation amenity. The impetus for this project is restoration, but they became aware pretty quickly that the restoration was going to actually impact the recreation site. They wanted to ensure that it's maintaining sustainable recreation in some form or another and was included as elements of the project and was identified as a need in the project. With that restoration work, there's many opportunities to provide educational and interpretive opportunities. There's been quite a few discussions with the Washoe Tribe related to some of the content that could be going into the restoration area once that work is complete. Then they would also like to enhance species of value to the Washoe Tribe. A lot of that comes with just basically doing the restoration work, because a lot of those species are things that will be promoted by this habitat improvements as well as that lagoon ecosystem.

In order to get all this done, they've had to get everyone involved. Initially, the Forest Service received funding that was a pretty short turnaround time. They were able to get that to TRPA in order for them to be able to hire a Ascent Environmental who is the contractor for this project. The Forest Service and TRPA has a participating agreement for the entire planning of this project. The end result of this will be a joint environmental document that is EIR/EIS/EIS. For the CEQA side of things, it's an EIR and Lahontan is the lead agency leading the CEQA for this project and then it will be a TRPA EIS as well as a Forest Service, NEPA, EIS.

They now have involvement from Caltrans on this project and are in the early stages of getting that agreement worked through with Caltrans. They believe that it will be three separate agreements; an agreement for the planning/environmental phase which they're in now, then the second phase will be design, and the third phase construction.

Mr. Lewandowski provided an overview of the project alternatives that are proposed for consideration in the environmental document.

These alternatives are all intended to achieve the purpose and need that Ms. Sibr described and that includes achieving the ecosystem restoration goals for the project. The alternatives also consider how the restoration affects the overall use of the site and they attempt to provide appropriate recreation opportunities that are compatible with the restoration. These

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

alternatives were all developed over the past year or so. And through a collaborative, stakeholder and public planning process that Ms. Cremeen will talk about.

All of these alternatives will be treated equally in the environmental document, although the lead agencies will identify a staff recommended alternative prior to the release of the draft environmental document.

The No Action Alternative is essentially the status quo. It represents what would happen if the project's not approved. This No action alternative will be evaluated in the environmental document, and it will be treated the same as the Action Alternatives. (Slide 14) shows the conditions at Meeks Bay today which would continue under the No Action Alternative. Those two green areas are the two campsites, with six campsites between them on the north and south side. The existing marina infrastructure and boat ramp is shown in the blue, right in the middle. Ms. Sibr mentioned it hasn't been operational for several years, and slips have been removed, but it does have capacity of 100 boat slips. The parking areas are the gray/brown color, and the day use is in orange. There's an existing bike path, the brown line on the north side of the project area that right now ends within Meeks Bay. With the No Action Alternative, the marina would remain and there would be no restoration of the creek or lagoon. And that marina could be operated, again, when the water level is high enough.

The upland facilities, the campgrounds, day use areas, and parking areas would generally remain as they are today, but there would be on going management that would continue like Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) control.

They've also developed three action alternatives and all of these action alternatives would include the same basic approach to the restoration. (Slide 15) The existing compacted fill and marina infrastructure would be removed. The dredged lagoon would be recreated to create a more natural, wider and shallower lagoon. At the upstream end of the restoration area, the State Route 89 bridge would be replaced, and the channel would be enhanced to raise the channel bed and reconnect it to the riparian floodplain. Near the center of the restoration area, there be transition zone from the creek to the lagoon, which would include log structures or other aquatic habitat features. Then the lagoon would be restored to a more natural wetland. It would have more complex edges with shallow water and emergent vegetation. It would be in a better condition to increase the filtration of nutrients and fine sediment flowing from the watershed before they reach the lake. At the mouth of the creek, the sheet pile and dredged channel would be restored to a more natural barrier beach, like the ones that Ms. Sibr described and there would be a bike and pedestrian crossing that would connect the north and the south sides of the project area. It would be designed as an elevated boardwalk were similar designed to minimize the environmental impacts. There are also a number of other features that came up through the alternatives development process that really made sense to include in all of the alternatives.

These include the removal of an older rock gabion shoreline protection that's at the north end of the project area and that would be replaced with a more natural shoreline protection including boulder's and native vegetation. All of the alternatives also include the replacement of the State Route 89 Bridge. It will include an interpretive walking trail, signage and other interpretive materials that are focused on the local, natural and cultural history, including the importance of Meeks Bay to the Washoe Tribe.

A paddle craft storage rack or shed would be included in all the alternatives and wouldn't be very visible from the lake but would allow the public to store kayaks and paddle boards on-site. Hopefully, that would reduce vehicle trips if nearby visitors don't need to drive in and out of

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

Meeks Bay with their paddle craft each time, they want to use it.

The alternatives also include a number of resource protection features, such as the protection of the Tahoe Yellow Cress. All the alternatives, particularly the restoration would be made through an ongoing adaptive management process.

The major differences between the action alternatives are summarized on page 203 of the packet.

(Slide 16) Alternative 1: It would include the removal of the marina and the full restoration of the creek. The restoration of the lagoon and creek would require the removal of the boating access facilities in the marina. This alternative seeks to offset that loss of boating infrastructure by including a new pier on the north side of the creek. The pier would allow boats to access Meeks Bay from elsewhere on the lake but not launch from Meeks Bay.

For example, somebody that was boating on Lake could pull up to the pier, temporarily dock their boat, access the beach, the restrooms, or the snack bar. To reach a navigable water depth, even during low conditions, this pier would need to be about 300 feet long and would include one boatlift at the end, that could be used for public safety or firefighting boat. This could improve the emergency response capabilities by providing a fireboat on this portion of the Lake. With Alternative 1, there would be no change to the campground on the north side. The south side, the alternative would include minor reconfigurations of the campground to increase privacy and improve access. With this reconfiguration, there may be a need to remove a couple of campsites or there might be an opportunity to add a site or two. They won't know until the final design layout of the campgrounds is complete, but they'll be evaluating a high-end addition of two campsites in this alternative. So, pretty much close to the existing campground capacity.

This alternative as well as the other two action alternatives would also seek to create a different camping experience on the north end campgrounds. This would be achieved by limiting recreational vehicle hookups, spur lengths, turn radius, and instituting vehicle length limits or other similar measures on the south side. This alternative would also reconfigure and expand the day use areas near the pier on the north side and as well as the one on the south side. On the north end, it would also remove two existing motel style cabin buildings that are located right on the lake shore. They would be replaced with new cabins that are located a little farther from the beach. This would allow for an expanded natural beach area that would be open for public use. It would improve scenic quality but would not change the overall lodging capacity within the project area. There would also be a connected bike path that's shown in the reddish brown line on slide 16. That would include two loops; the main alignment would go parallel to State Route 89 and would be for through traffic. It would also include a slower speed spur loop that would go through the project area and would get close to the pier, the other day use and beach areas.

(Slide 17) Alternative 2: It includes the full restoration of the creek and lagoon. This alternative would include a pedestrian pier in the same location as the boating pier in Alternative 1. This would be a pier that's universally accessible and it would allow people to get out on the lake but it wouldn't be used by motorized boats. It is proposed at about 100 feet because it doesn't have to reach the navigable water depth. It would be a floating pier design where the pier deck is floating on the water with the pilings sticking above that. Like Alternative 1, this alternative would include the reconfigured camp sites with potential minor adjustments in the number and configuration of sites on the south side. This alternative would also expand and reconfigure the day use areas and it would include those connected bike paths similar to Alternative 1. But the alignment in this alternative doesn't go as close to the beach, it's more in the middle of the

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

project area.

(Slide 18) Alternative 3: Includes full restoration of the creek and lagoon. This alternative would not include a pier. It does propose a small paddle craft launch structure about 30 feet long on the south end. It's intended to be a universally accessible structure. Something that would allow people with all abilities to launch their kayaks or other paddle craft but would not provide access for motorized boats. This alternative would also reconfigure the campgrounds and it would expand them by adding a total of up to 22 campsites with up to 10 sites on the north and up to 12 on the south end. That would be within the larger campground footprint. This would also reconfigure the parking on the south side. It would include a drop off area near the beach, but then the main parking area would be located between the highway and the campground. The intent is to provide direct access between the campground and the beach and to help buffer the campground from the noise of the road. This alternative would also increase the parking capacity by about 14 spaces on the south end. It would also include a similar bike path alignment as Alternative 2 except in this alternative the alignment through the project area would be more direct and would pass through the extended campground on the south side.

Ms. Cremeen provided an overview of how they've been working with stakeholders and the public throughout the planning process, and then also share the feedback that they've received thus far.

The Forest Service first scoped this project in 2018 and did receive quite a bit of interest and concerns over what was being proposed at the time which then the proposed action included a pier and boat launch on the south side of the Bay. The Forest Service decided to take a step back and spend more time on a robust public engagement strategy, that would look at a range of alternatives and more closely, involve stakeholders. This is where TRPA came in under the agreement to help lead the environmental planning and public engagement.

They engaged the services of Ascent Environmental and Consensus Building Institute. For this project, CBI headed up a stakeholder assessment and led the stakeholder forum meetings. The forum included representatives from nearby property owners, the Washoe Tribe, the Tahoe Lakefront Owners' Association, the Marina Association, the League to Save Lake Tahoe, Friends of the West Shore, and the Meeks Bay Fire District.

They've met five times over the 1.5 years to flesh out issues as they developed project alternatives and identified potential areas of environmental effect. They've also held two virtual public workshops with over 150 attendees.

Throughout this process, they've tried some new engagement tools. They launched the Meeks Bay project website in 2020, where the public can get background on the project, access meeting information, and review alternative themes. They introduced a new interactive tool where folks can go in and look at the alternative designs, click on an area of interest and provide their feedback directly. Those responses have been really helpful for them to understand where folks are concerned or interested in seeing changes or keeping things the way they are.

In June they published a full page article on Meeks Bay in the Summer Edition of the Tahoe In Depth which was distributed throughout Tahoe. They also distributed and published rack cards in English, and Spanish and distributed those to Meeks Bay Resort and campgrounds.

After all of this outreach and engagement, what are they hearing from their stakeholders and the public? Overall, they're receiving very broad support for the stream restoration. The majority are in favor of leaving Meeks Bay the way it is now without a marina or launch. There's concern that introducing piers or launches would result in obstruction of views, less beach

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

areas, noise, and user conflicts in the water. They've also heard a desire to retain the two different types of camping experiences. The resort side can accommodate RVs and hookups while the south side is geared towards campers, tent campers, and smaller vehicles. The Meeks Bay Resort has more amenities, snack shop, paddle craft rentals, and cabins while the south beach does not.

When they solicited feedback on introducing a pier to Meeks Bay, there was concern that motorized boats could exacerbate conflicts on the water between user types. If the pier alternative is selected, there should be clear separation between motorized boating and non-motorized, swimming and paddling. This could be accomplished by clearly delineating the swimming areas, the no wake zone and buffers around the pier.

They also heard from the Meeks Bay Fire District and others that there is a need to improve emergency response at Meeks Bay and along the West Shore. They responded to this concern by including a pier in one of the alternatives that could be available to the fire district to moor a fire boat. However, the primary purpose of any pier at Meeks Bay would be to enhance recreation and it would have to be open to the public as well for them to temporarily moor their boats and walk out on. If this alternative with the pier is not selected, it would not preclude emergency responders from proposing a pier or other public health and safety facilities at Meeks Bay in the future or another location along the West Shore. They do recognize that lake wide emergency response planning is needed but at this time, there is no agreement from land managers and emergency responders as to where the best location is on the West Shore. TRPA is committed to continue working with emergency response providers on a more comprehensive strategy.

Funding and implementation strategy for this project: The planning environmental phase work that's been done to date has been funded by the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act. They've also got some aquatic invasive species work done in the lagoon, slide 24 shows some of those initial stages where they took out the marina infrastructure and they're laying down mats to control the AIS in the lagoon. That work will continue in the near future. The Forest Service estimates that the overall restoration and recreation improvements would range from \$5 to \$10 million to implement. This does not include the bridge which is estimated at \$4 to \$5 million. Progress is being made with Caltrans to include this project in this environmental analysis which is a good first step. They're well on their way to positioning this project for additional funds, given its multi benefits and its tie to the State Route 89 Corridor Transportation Improvements and Trail as well.

The next steps for this project are to consolidate the public comments and what they hear today to move forward with a proposal for a preferred alternative. That preferred alternative will be evaluated equally with the other alternatives in the environmental document, which they anticipate releasing in October 2021. They would bring that back to this board during the public review period, which will be around 60 days. They anticipate having the response to comments next spring and then taking the final EIR, EIS, EIS for consideration, late Spring or Summer of 2022.

Mr. Sibr said they've done a couple of versions of this presentation and would like to mention one thing. They mentioned that the No Action Alternative essentially includes sort of the existing site out there, as well as, operating that marina. The point of a no action alternative is to say, okay, if this project didn't exist, what would be happening on the site? That's essentially why they included the operation of the marina, in the No Action Alternative. In addition, they did look at multiple hybrid alternatives. Where they looked at trying to maintain a smaller marina with a boat ramp and a few slips. They had a lot of internal and external conversations and it's really not feasible on a couple of different levels. One level was when the existing

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

marina was operating with 120 slips, it almost covered the maintenance of that facility. But anything with a fewer number of slips would definitely not be able to fund itself. In addition, the engineering of having that marina piece with essentially a creek mouth right next to it, is a significant engineering feat. There was a question about the build ability of it, as well as the maintenance cost, etc. They looked at multiple alternatives and, in the end, they couldn't move forward with an alternative that included some type of marina or hybrid system because it didn't meet the purpose and need for the project and could not accomplish either the restoration or keeping a meaningful recreation activity.

Presentation can be found at:

[Agenda-Item-No.-VII.B-Meeks-Bay-Restoration.pdf](#)

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Bruce said wonderful presentation and amazing project. He likes the possibility of the alternatives and it's going to be interesting to go through the process.

Ms. Novasel said she's very excited about this project. It's longtime coming and is a great restoration project and is so needed. Glad to see that old marina getting out of there and the idea of bringing it back to an ecologically, comfortable, and clean environment is exciting.

Ms. Aldean said all the alternatives with the exception of the No Action Alternative have a cleaning station for paddle boards, canoes, or whatever is being launched. Is there no cleaning station now? Are people allowed to launch their personal watercraft without going through an AIS inspection at Meeks Bay?

Ms. Sibr, Forest Service said currently there are no AIS inspection facilities. There was never a boat inspection station when the marina existed. There's no actual paddle craft inspection station. They're trying to promote the clean, drain, & dry and provide the facilities for people to do that there. Because folks get busy and they don't always remember to do it when they go home.

Ms. Cremeen said they could improve the education on that through the water trail and interpretive signage, etc. As of now, they don't have anything proposed specifically for that kind of operation.

Ms. Aldean said if the No Action Alternative was selected and is not suggesting that but will there be an opportunity to include a cleaning station, even though there's not a place for storage of paddle boats. Her assumption is that it's a fairly popular activity to launch personal watercraft at Meeks Bay.

Ms. Sibr, Forest Service said yes, it is a very popular activity there. Under the No Action Alternative, they wouldn't be proposing any new facilities there. If that, in theory, is what moved forward, there would probably be another project, at some point, to address the different maintenance at the marina, as an example. But something like a clean, drain, & dry, is not something they need NEPA for. They've included it in this, because folks ask about it but things like that are not something they need environmental documentation for. That could be something that could go out on the site very easily, at any point.

Ms. Aldean said she would certainly encourage that. Another comment is that she understands that there's some opposition to the idea of any type of pier whether it's intended for motorboat use or for pedestrians. But was there any thought given to incorporating some kind of dedicated ADA parking or some sort of walking block to allow people who have mobility issues to access

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

the lake? Alternative 3 does have ADA parking.

Ms. Sibr, Forest Service said they did not include a specific project component for that because it's part of what they have to do when they design these facilities. The Forest Service has outdoor recreation accessibility guidelines that they have to follow. Anything that they redo will be made to be accessible. She thinks the element that Ms. Aldean is seeing is the accessible paddle craft launch facility because all of the alternatives will have accessible parking in them.

Mr. Lewandowski, Ascent Environmental said that was really the impetus for that paddle craft launch facility in Alternative 3 because Alternatives 1 and 2 would have piers that would have accessible walkways and would provide accessible access to the lake. They had also called out the ADA parking specifically in Alternative 3 because they're relocating the parking area much farther from the beach. They wanted to make it clear that there still was ADA accessible parking near the beach but that the rest of the parking would be farther from the beach.

Mr. Hicks had some questions about the No Action Alternative. Is there a possibility that what is shown as the existing marina would be reactivated? The second question is that if it's not reactivated is there a possibility that those 120 boat slips becoming 120 buoys?

Mr. Lewandowski, Ascent Environmental said under the No Action Alternative there is a possibility that the marina would be reactivated. They'll be evaluating that in the environmental document. The bulk of the infrastructure is still out there today even though it's been closed down for a couple of years. The assumption is that it could be reactivated under the No Action Alternative. One thing the environmental document will be taking a close look at is the effects on overall boating access. They know that's an important recreational amenity. There will be more detail once the environmental document comes out. The shoreline plan does not allow new buoy fields and there's no proposal to move those moorings from slips in the marina and create a new buoy field in Meeks Bay.

Ms. Sibr, Forest Service said they did an exercise to look at what that would be if they put those buoys out into the Bay. When you look at the aerial, and you put the buoys on, at the appropriate spacing with a number of slips that were there, it essentially took up the entire area that is shallow enough to have buoys. From the TRPA shorezone standpoint, that was a non-starter and changing the character of the Bay with making the slips into buoys was more than what the Forest Service was willing to accept.

Mr. Friedrich said it's an exciting project. He commended everyone on the extent of the public outreach. The innovative ways of getting feedback directly from people on site in particular, who probably have more connection, then just about any of us. The public comment seems to be correlating with the top level goals of the project for sustainable recreation and compatible with restoration. In his view, it would also probably be the one that minimizes AIS spread that they've seen in other parts of the lake with boat propellers spreading Eurasian watermilfoil, etc. That would seem to be a benefit and to have some separation of uses with the motorboats and non-motorized boaters. That would be another benefit of an alternative, such as, Alternative 3.

Ms. Novasel asked if the plan was to completely remove the RVs or is it going to be minimization. She's curious because the 56 acres in South Shore, they're talking about wanting to increase RVs.

Ms. Sibr, Forest Service said they're not proposing to remove these. In all of the alternatives, essentially the existing RV campground on the north side of the resort would stay. There are some spaces to fit some more in if they wanted to. The discussion about possibly limiting RVs on the campground side is based on some of the feedback that they've received from some of the stakeholders. From the Forest Service perspective and the trends that they see in recreation,

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

providing tent only camping sites, doesn't fit with trends in recreation as well as the facilities that we see a demand for. One of the things that wasn't explicitly mentioned today that they've talked about before, is that they are exploring the use of things like yurts. They see that those types of facilities get used by a lot of entry level users, It's a lot cheaper to rent a yurt for your family for \$80 a night than it is to go out and buy a tent, sleeping bags, etc. They are still thinking through what that mix looks like on the south side and still taking the input related to that. There's definitely a feeling that there's two different experiences in these campgrounds and that the resort side is the RVs and more of the party side and that the south side is more of the quiet campground.

Public Comments & Questions

Judith Tornese, President of Friends of the West Shore provided comments on behalf of the that group. They have over 500 subscriber members. They appreciated the involvement of the community in the development process for this project. They also liked the idea of taking the best features of all four alternatives and having the ability to mix and match the features. Approximately two thirds of their membership is in favor of Alternative 3 which is the non-motorized recreation with no pier but with some modifications. First, install a paddle board, kayak storage for day users on both beaches. All water activities should be available and launched from both beaches and not concentrated on one beach. Second, they do not favor the relocation of the day use parking on the south beach. Parking should remain close to the beach as it is now for the easy access and convenience of day users. They also favor increased parking for day users to avoid overflow parking on Highway 89. Third, they suggested getting feedback and recent statistics on this summer's activity from the Meeks Bay staff. They're the people who work there every day and they should be aware of what's going on. Four, they favor the idea of moving the cabins on the north beach to increase the beach area for the public. Lastly, they do not favor a paddle craft launch. It's not needed and would cause confusion and congestion in one area of the beach versus spreading the launch area across the entire area, for both beaches, as is done now. Thank you for the opportunity to make these comments on behalf of this important project, which affects the public.

Steve McNamara, Division Chief and Fire Marshal, Meeks Bay Fire Protection District said he also acts as the Division Chief and Fire Marshal for North Tahoe Fire and Alpine Springs County Water. He commended the collaborative approach taken by the US Forest Service, TRPA, and the many stakeholders on the project. Staff from Ascent Environmental who provided an excellent process for all involved parties to have a voice and input. Fire Chief Michael Schwartz, Fire Chief Steve Leighton, and himself have been acting on behalf of the Meeks Bay Fire District in relation to this project since 2018 when they provided a comment letter to then Forest Supervisor, Jeff Marsolais. It was their hope then, as it is now that the Meeks Bay Restoration Project could enhance our emergency service delivery as well as the safety of the communities they serve.

Specific to the project update that is before you today, they wanted to extend their previous intent to request an establish a pier for a fire boat in Meeks Bay as reflected an Alternative 1. Although, Alternative 1 includes public access, they're also open to augmenting that in eliminating public access by public watercraft on the pier. They do recognize that the informal polls with the stakeholder groups and the public conflict with this desire, but it is their civic duty to continue to attempt to improve their emergency services delivery. Furthermore, the addition of a fire boat to their fleet would also benefit all the communities in the Lake Tahoe Basin. This is especially applicable to the entire West Shore of Lake Tahoe as the closest such vessel to the West Shore is located in an Incline Village or Zephyr Cove, Nevada. It should also be noted that these are the only two boats equipped with both firefighting and rescue capability on Lake

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

Tahoe. Their response to an incident on the West Shore may take upwards of one hour. This amount of response time could mean the difference in saving life or property. Meeks Bay is an excellent location to respond to an area of the Lake that is currently underserved, as well as being close to their existing Meeks Bay Fire Station 67. This location is in a protected harbor and will allow the quickest response from any of our current fire stations at both North Tahoe and Meeks Bay Fire. Thank you for your consideration and enhancing emergency service delivery to not only the West Shore of Lake Tahoe, but also the entirety of Lake Tahoe and its shoreline.

VIII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director Status Report

Ms. Marchetta said the Governing Board retreat yesterday was perfect smoke clear day on the lake shore. She thanked all the Governing Board members for your very, very robust participation. They had a very successful day. She thanked the staff who helped set the arrangements and set up and tear down in record time during a lightning storm in the afternoon. Marja, Steve Biddle, Katherine, Dan, Julie, Jeff, Kim, and Dennis and if she forgot someone, mea culpa.

1) Quarterly Report: April – June 2021

No further report.

B. General Counsel Status Report

No report.

IX. GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER REPORTS

None.

X. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Local Government & Housing Committee

Ms. Novasel said they'll be having a committee meeting next month.

B. Legal Committee

None.

C. Operations & Governance Committee

None.

D. Environmental Improvement, Transportation, & Public Outreach Committee

Mr. Lawrence said the committee will meet at the conclusion of the board meeting. Discussion today will include how do they achieve a sustainable revenue source to pay for the \$20 million delta in order to get our Regional Transportation Plan. We'll also have a chance to meet the consultants that have been hired to give us some additional capacity to solve this complex problem.

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

E. Forest Health and Wildfire Committee

Mr. Hicks said they had a good meeting today and you'll be seeing them again soon with a proposed amendment to allow the use of mechanical equipment on steeper slopes. Today they heard about the erosion effects. Overall, to quickly summarize it, it looks like that's not going to be an impediment.

F. Regional Plan Implementation Committee

None.

XI. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

None.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Yeates moved to adjourn.

Chair Mr. Bruce recessed the meeting at 2:30 p.m. on July 28, 2021.

Chair Mr. Bruce adjourned the meeting at 4:28 p.m. on July 29, 2021.

Respectfully Submitted,



Marja Ambler
Clerk to the Board

The above meeting was taped in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the tapes of the above mentioned meeting may call for an appointment at (775) 588-4547. In addition, written documents submitted at the meeting are available for review

Key themes and activities

TRPA Governing Board Retreat Summer 2021

July 28, 2021 | Round Hill Pines, NV

Prepared by Zephyr Collaboration

Purpose and Background

This is the first opportunity for the TRPA board to meet in an informal planning setting since late 2019. The goal of this session is to build common knowledge of TRPA history, to strengthen relationships among board members. Also this retreat hopes to focus on lessons from, and best practices for, collaborative leadership.

Activities

During this retreat, board members:

- Discussed motivations and responsibilities as TRPA board members
- Reviewed a history of the planning and regulatory challenges in the Tahoe Basin, and the evolution of TRPA since the establishment of the bi-state compact in 1969
- Participated in boat- or walking-tours to discuss Aquatic Invasive Species or Sustainable Recreation programs and challenges with TRPA staff.
- Participated in an exercise, “Win all you can”, in order to consider collaborative governance in light of game-theory
- Extracted lessons from the development of the Regional Transportation Plan, including modifications to Vehicle Miles Traveled standard

Key Themes

- The governing board are the fiduciaries of a 50 year compact. The strength and boundaries of this compact have been tested, and TRPA has evolved into better organization as a result
- Modern challenges are so expensive, complex and cross jurisdictional, that leadership must include collaboration and heavy reliance upon networks
- There are current examples of success:
 - Shoreline plan – Lake wide agreement after extensive engagement after 7 attempts to update over 30 years.
 - Events center- Collaboration and cooperation among public/private sector must continue past planning into implementation
 - Regional Transportation Plan and Vehicles Miles Traveled standard – The approval of the first RTP update in 25 years will guide transportation development in the basin for decades.
- Current priorities and extant challenges:
 - Workforce housing in and around the basin – action needed now!



- Transportation management- A quantum increase in funding is needed to implement cohesive regional transportation and transit
- Sustainable recreation – People are loving Tahoe to death and making a major logistics problem with waste and facilities management.
- All of the above management challenges are exacerbated by continuing climate change, which increases demand for Tahoe visitation
- The new management challenge: we aren't just managing for resources, now agencies, jurisdictions and communities must work together to manage behaviors!