

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
GOVERNING BOARD

TRPA/Zoom

June 22, 2022

Meeting Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Mr. Bruce called the meeting to order at 1:39 p.m.

Members present: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Bruce, Mr. Anderson (for Mrs. Cegavske), Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Hicks, Ms. Hill, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates

Members absent: Mr. Hoenigman

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Lawrence led the pledge.

Mr. Bruce turned the meeting over to Vice Chair, Ms. Gustafson. He thanked Ms. Marchetta and staff for all the wonderful, diligent, heartfelt efforts and guidance in the last 1.5 years. It's a great honor to welcome Jessica Diss as the new Nevada Governor's Appointee to the Governing Board. Ms. Diss has strong working knowledge of TRPA's Compact and the Code of Ordinances, understanding of the Basin's stakeholders and has a spectacular reputation as a team player.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Marchetta said Agenda Item Nos. VIII.A and VIII.B will be heard in reverse order.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Aldean and Mr. Anderson provided edits to Ms. Ambler.

Ms. Aldean made a motion to approve the May 25-26, 2022 minutes as amended.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Bruce, Mr. Anderson, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates

Absent: Mr. Hoenigman

Motion passed.

GOVERNING BOARD

June 22, 2022

V. TRPA CONSENT CALENDAR

1. May Financials
2. Release of Project 3 Transit Mitigation Funds (\$20,000, plus interest) for the South Shore Transportation Management Association Microtransit Service
3. Fiscal Year 2022/2023 Annual Budget
4. Salary adjustment for Interim Executive Director, John Hester
5. Twin Pines/Clear Creek Recreational Parking Spaces, 853 Stateline Avenue, City of South Lake Tahoe, California, APN 029-010-022 & 029-010-024, TRPA File Number ERSP2022-0102
6. Lake Tahoe Community College Equipment Storage Project; 1 College Drive, South Lake Tahoe, California, APN 025-041-023, (previously APN 025-041-010), TRPA File Number ERSP2022-1149
7. PAL CAP FFIF TAHOE 1, LLC (“Nine 47 Tahoe”) Mixed-Use Development 40 multi-family units; 925 square feet Office (Commercial), 941 and 947 Tahoe Boulevard, Incline Village, Washoe County, Nevada, APN 132-231-09 and 132-231-10, TRPA File Number ERSP2021-1428
8. APC Membership appointments/reappointments for the Tahoe Basin Fire Chiefs primary representative, Eric Guevin, and primary alternate, Chad Stephen and secondary alternate, Scott Lindgren, and the Tahoe Transportation District primary representative, Steve Teshara and alternate, Darcie Goodman Collins

Ms. Aldean said the Operations and Governance Committee recommended approval of items, one, two, three, and four. The May Financials balance sheet remains strong for the Agency and all expenditures are within budget. Item two which is the release of Project. 3 Transit Mitigation Funds in the of \$20,000 plus interest was recommended for approval. There are 20 different funding partners to fund this free microtransit year round system that will be operating between 7 a.m. and 10 p.m. They'll begin operating in the core area beginning sometime between July 1 and 15, 2022.

Mr. Keillor provided a presentation of the Fiscal Year 2022/23 Annual Budget. The grant funds are all balanced. Conservatively, they estimate that there'll be about a \$300,000 carryover from the previous fiscal year. There's a small deficit in the Shoreline fund but that will be covered by a fund balance. And there's about \$410,000 of bond money for building improvements which came out of the refinancing. The other item was the salary adjustment for interim Executive Director, John Hester in the amount of 10 percent increase to his base salary during this interim position. This is consistent with what they've done in the past specifically when Ms. Regan stepped in to replace Ms. Marchetta during a medical leave.

Board Comments & Questions

None.

Ms. Gustafson said that Consent Calendar items five, six, seven, and eight were not heard by any committee .

Board Comments & Questions

None.

Public Comments & Questions

Ann Nichols said for transparency it would be nice to know what John Hester's base salary is that the

GOVERNING BOARD

June 22, 2022

ten percent is being added to. Regarding the Nine 47 Tahoe Project that's really contentious in Incline Village and is inappropriate to have this on consent. It's about 500 new trips a day. It used to be a restaurant and also a gas station once. She finds that the appointment for Steve Teshara to be odd that there's so much importance now placed on the resort association and tourism and putting people in charge of transportation that are really about tourism. Mr. Teshara is on so many boards and seems to be a conflict.

Ellie Waller said she also has concerns about the appointment of Steve Teshara. She knows lots of people wear lots of hats. Many years ago in Placer County, they removed Mr. Sevison from a board, because he wore too many hats. No disrespect to Darcie Collins but is concerned that a transportation representative is not just vehicle miles traveled and threshold. It's a bigger picture and is not sure if she's appropriate for the alternate. She also takes issue with the amount of information that should be reviewed and have public comments on the Nine 947 Tahoe Project. Regarding the transition of Ms. Marchetta, she agreed with Mr. Drake and Mr. Ryan's comments. No disrespect to Ms. Marchetta and thanked her for her dedicated service but feels that she shouldn't be left there. Lastly, the same thing with Mr. Hester and what the ten percent increase amounts to. .

Doug Flaherty requested that Nine 47 Tahoe Project be pulled from the Consent Calendar because it deserves a public hearing as it is highly controversial project within the community of Incline Village, Nevada. The size of potential environmental impacts in connection with the project deserve a public hearing. The project will add human capacity, thereby posing a significant fire, evacuation, health and safety impact on the community. This item needs to be discussed in a public hearing and should not be part of the consent item. The project will cause substantial adverse effects on the Incline Village and North Shore population during a wildfire evacuation. TRPA's environmental checklist was completed in an arbitrary and capricious manner, without substantial historic monitoring data connected with air, water, noise, and traffic, including the lack of a workable public wildfire evacuation plan. The Tahoe Basin is out of equilibrium and out of harmony, as required by the Bi-State Compact. This is due to the failure on the part of TRPA to identify the true environmental cumulative impacts from all private and governmental projects over the last 15 years. Instead, TRPA offers up a sham environmental checklist which actually prevents the true identification of environmental cumulative impacts in the Lake Tahoe Basin. The size of this project represents a significant cumulative, environmental impact on Incline Village and the entire Lake Tahoe Basin. Due to its size and cumulative impact, he requested that this item be pulled from the Consent Calendar today, and request the project be scheduled for a public hearing.

Ms. Marchetta said staff doesn't feel that the environmental impacts of this need further review unless a Governing Board member wishes to pull this off of the Consent Calendar.

Mr. Marshall said this project is entirely consistent with the new Regional Plan, for which they did substantial environmental documentation, and it is entirely consistent. In fact, it is one of those projects that they're generally trying to promote as it's housing within designated areas. The environmental documents accurately assesses, compared against the monitoring that you might have heard about earlier in the Threshold Evaluation and they don't anticipate any adverse effects to TRPA standards of significance and therefore, strongly recommend that it remain on the Consent Calendar.

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Hill made a motion to approve the Consent Calendar.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Bruce, Mr. Anderson, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates

Absent: Mr. Hoenigman

Motion carried

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Meeks Bay Restoration Project Public Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report

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

Ms. Cremeen said they'll present the findings of the Meeks Bay Restoration Project Draft Environmental document. Since the last presentation to the Governing Board they've completed the environmental analysis.

Meeks Bay is located on the West shore of Lake Tahoe, nestled between Sugar Pine Point State Park and north of Emerald Bay and managed by the US Forest Service. It includes campgrounds, beach area, a snack shack, and rental cabins. The marina there last operated in 2015. Hikers can also access the desolation wilderness through the trail head at Meeks Bay, through Meeks Meadow.

The planning for this restoration project is a partnership between the US Forest Service, TRPA, and the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board. They are preparing a joint environmental document that meets the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and TRPA requirements. TRPA is managing the environmental contract and public engagement for this project under a cooperative agreement with the Forest Service. The agency team has also been working with a stakeholder group to identify issues and concerns throughout the process. This group has helped inform the alternatives you'll hear about today and identify areas of focus for the environmental analysis. The Stakeholder group includes representatives from the Washoe Tribe, property owners associations, the League to Save Lake Tahoe, Marina associations, Friends of the West Shore, and the Meeks Bay Fire District. They're also coordinating closely with Caltrans on the State Route, 89 bridge replacement project who are supportive of that project.

The public comment period is June 10 through August 9, 2022. They expect to bring the final document back to the Governing Board sometime this winter. If approved by TRPA, the Forest Service, and Lahontan, they would move into a final design and permitting phase of the project for all the restoration elements and recreation improvements on the site.

The restoration and recreation improvements planned for Meeks Bay are part of a bigger vision for sustainable recreation, and a resilient ecosystem on the West Shore of Lake Tahoe. Additionally, Meeks Bay is one of the recreation hotspots that would benefit from strategies identified in the State Route 89 Corridor Management Plan such as transit, bicycle and pedestrian connections, and parking management. They continue to coordinate with the planning team studying the feasibility of a trail that would connect Meek's Bay to the South Shore. More recently, TRPA has been working with emergency response providers, the counties, and the City of South Lake Tahoe to identify locations for centralized public safety facilities around the Lake. TRPA staff will present recommendations for citing those facilities later this summer or fall. Lastly, any recreation in shoreline infrastructure associated with this project would comply with the Lake Tahoe Shoreline Plan.

(Presentation continued)

GOVERNING BOARD

June 22, 2022

Ms. Sibr said the purpose of this project is to improve the ecological condition of Meeks Creek and the lagoon. (Slide 7) The left photo shows the area pre marina in the 1950s. The photos shows a lagoon ecosystem that has developed where the mouth of Meeks Creek comes into Lake Tahoe. Anyone that's visited Taylor Creek or Tallac Creek, you may have seen the barrier beach system that forms where the mouth of the creek moves depending upon the flows of the river and what the Lake levels are. It also develops this backwater system behind the barrier beach which is what develops the entire lagoon ecosystem. The photo on the right from 2003 that shows what it looks like after the marina was formed there. They're trying to provide a functioning ecosystem while continuing to support sustainable recreation.

Some of the specific tasks that this project is looking to do is improve the hydrologic function of the creek and improve the fish passage. (Slide 8) The photo on the left shows State Route 89 bridge over Meeks Creek. The photo also shows the three to four foot drop that is essentially a restriction for fish passage upstream. This project would replace the Caltrans bridge and provide aquatic organism passage through that area. The next is to restore the degraded habitats in the barrier beach that was essentially removed but significantly altered with the construction of the marina. There are a couple of species that are unique to the area such as the Tahoe yellow cress that grows only on Tahoe beaches. The Tahoe yellow cress is the type of a species that that thrives in those backwater lagoon environments because it is influenced by lake level. The more shoreline it has, the more habitat that it has. Along with the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout as well, being able to accommodate aquatic organism passage with this project, they're also proposing a fish management structure to be able to manage native fish introduction further upstream in the project area. There are existing projects to eradicate aquatic invasive species in the marina and this project would further those efforts as would be able to deal with any post restoration with any infestations, etc.

There are two recreation sites that are managed by different permittees; one on the north side of the Marina and one on the south side of the Marina. A major goal of this project is to maintain sustainable recreation. In thinking about the alternatives, that's what led them to thinking through some of these alternatives such as piers, etc. to try and replace some of the recreation opportunity that is impacted by the restoration activities. They want to provide sustainable recreation opportunities and enhancing interpretation opportunities. The entire area of Meeks Bay including the creek and upstream, is a site of particular importance to the Washoe Tribe. This project will work with the Washoe Tribe to enhance species of interest to them, especially for some of their rituals that they haven't been able to do with the change in the vegetation. They've had to do those in the creek which isn't ideal.

(Presentation continued)

Mr. Lewandowski will provide an overview of the alternative and summarize some of the key findings from the environmental review.

(Slide 11) This shows the existing conditions at Meeks Bay. The existing marina shown near the center in blue. There's two campgrounds; one on the north side and one the south side shown in green. The grayish brown is the existing parking areas, both paved and unpaved. The orange are day use areas and the beaches in yellow. A continuation of these existing conditions is evaluated in the environmental document which is the No Action Alternative. The impacts of the No Action Alternative are evaluated at the same level of detail as the other action alternatives.

(Slide 12) This graphic shows the conceptual restoration plan and the overall restoration approach is

consistent between all the alternatives. There is more design and engineering that would happen after completion of the environmental review but this shows the proposed features of the restoration. The marina would have to be removed, and then the lagoon would be regraded, re-vegetated and restored to that natural functioning lagoon. The sheet pile that creates an artificial channel into the marina today would be removed, the barrier beach would be restored, and the creek upstream of the lagoon would be enhanced, revegetated with riparian vegetation, and the flood planes would be restored. State route 89 bridge would be removed and replaced with one that allows for aquatic organisms to pass, and it provides more hydrologic connectivity from upstream to downstream sides of the highway. There would also be fish management structure and would be installed in the channel to manage the movement of non-native species. There'd be other habitat enhancement features like roost and nest structures and protection for Tahoe yellow cress.

There are also a number of other elements that are more or less the same in all of the alternatives. Each alternative has different bike path alignments, but they all include a multi-use connection through the project area that crosses the restored the restored lagoon on a new trail bridge, and they all include another path that more or less parallels State Route 89 around the edge of the project area. All of the alternatives include shoreline restoration. If you attended the tour today, you saw the concrete walls and the rock gabion shoreline protection at the north end of the project area that would be removed or replaced with boulders and vegetation shoreline protection. All of the alternatives include some form of paddlecraft storage which would allow people to store their private kayaks and paddle boards at the site. There are interpretive features included in all the alternatives, including an interpretive trail around the restored area as well as new signage. There are some reconfigured parking and day use elements in all the alternatives to improve functionality and access. All the alternatives would also allow some of the existing campsites to be converted to alternative campsites such as yurts.

(Slide 14) This site plan shows Alternative One. This alternative includes an approximately 300 foot pier in the middle of the northern side of the project area. That's a boating pier that would allow people that launch their watercraft elsewhere around the Lake to come up tie off to the pier temporarily and access to sites. It does include one boatlift that would be used for an emergency services boat that would be there permanently, and otherwise it wouldn't provide permanent mooring. This alternative would also involve the demolition of the motel style units that are on the north end of the Meeks Bay Resort right on the beach. They would be replaced with new cabins that are further back from the beach, and that would allow for more restoration of the shoreline right there and provide access to more of the beach for the public. Alternative One would maintain approximately the same amount of parking and the same number of campsites as are there today with maybe some minor changes through the reconfiguration. It would include a widened State Route 89 bridge that would allow for the highway as well as a multi-use path on the same bridge.

(Slide 15) Instead of the 300 foot long boating pier that was in Alternative One, Alternative Two includes a 100 foot pedestrian pier and would not allow access for motorized watercraft. It would be something that people could walk out on, swim off of, launch kayaks, and general access to the Lake. Like Alternative One, this would maintain approximately the same capacity for parking and for camping. It has slightly different configuration of day use areas and internal pedestrian circulation. It also has a separate trail bridge near State Route 89. It has two separate trail bridges; one through the restored area and one parallel to State Route 89.

(Slide 16) Alternative Three doesn't have a pier but it does have a paddlecraft launch or a non-motorized boat launch on the south end that's intended to be a small approximately 30 foot floating structure that can be moved with Lake levels. It's not intended to increase paddlecraft use necessarily or prevent launching elsewhere but it's really intended to provide an accessible launch point that can provide access for paddlers of all abilities. With this alternative the campgrounds would be expanded.

GOVERNING BOARD

June 22, 2022

The campground on the north side of the creek would be expanded by up to ten additional campsites, and the campground on the south side would be expanded by up to 12 additional campsites. The parking on the south side would also be expanded with 14 additional parking spaces, and it would be relocated further away from the beach and closer to the highway with the drop off area and 88 parking spaces closer to the day use area. This one, like Alternative Two would have two trail bridges crossing the creek rather than a widened highway bridge.

Those three alternatives were developed through a long series of workshops with a stakeholder forum group that Ms. Cremeen mentioned earlier. Once developed, these alternatives were vetted with that stakeholder group through a series of public workshops. They also got a lot of input on the features of the alternative through an interactive website. There's been a lot of input on these alternatives and certainly a lot of different viewpoints but there were a few themes that kept coming up again and again through the stakeholder and the public input. While some people favored expanded recreation facilities the majority of the input really favored no or very limited new development. There wasn't a lot of support for new piers or expanded campgrounds. There were certainly some concerns about the loss of the marina, but there was almost universal support for the restoration itself. People saw that there was a need and supported the overall goals of the project. They also heard a general desire to keep the south side in particular, as a quiet destination for beach use, swimming and paddling. Also identified was the need to improve emergency access to the Lake to provide evacuations and potentially a fireboat to respond to Lake accidents or shoreline fires. The planning team considered all of this feedback and developed a preferred alternative for the project.

(Slide 18) Staff believes that the Preferred Alternative presents the best approach to achieve the project objectives, minimizing environmental impacts and respond to that public stakeholder and Tribal input. The Preferred Alternative does not include a pier because there wasn't really a lot of support for recreational pier. There were some concerns that they heard about scenic impacts and boat traffic impacts in the swim area and boat noise and other things associated with the pier. There was a desire for increased emergency Lake access but that's being addressed through a separate planning process. TRPA is working with emergency service providers to identify the ideal location for additional emergency access the Lake on the West Shore so a pier at Meeks Bay isn't needed to provide that emergency access. This alternative also includes the paddlecraft launch on the south end of the site to provide that accessible facility for paddlers of all abilities. Like Alternative One, it includes the relocation of the motel style cabins on the north end which would be torn down and replaced with new cabins further inland. The total overnight capacity for the cabins wouldn't change but that would allow for more of that natural shoreline stabilization and restoration in the areas where those cabins are right on the beach now and would open up more of that beach area for public use.

The Preferred Alternative would maintain the existing camping capacity, more or less, it could be slight increases or decreases with some reconfigurations of the campground to improve access and privacy between the sites. Like all the alternatives it would also provide some alternative camping such as yurts. This Preferred Alternative would also provide a little bit more parking capacity. It would add 14 spaces parking spaces on the south side, but it would leave the parking lot in the same place that is today and not relocate it further from the beach like Alternative Three. The Preferred Alternative would also include the widened highway bridge along State Route 89 that would accommodate both the highway and the multi-use path, just like Alternative One.

(Slide 19) Shows a comparison of the alternatives and the differences between the alternatives really relate to whether there's a pier or an accessible paddlecraft launch, whether the existing lodges or hotel style units would be relocated away from the Lake, whether campgrounds and parking areas are expanded, and the number of separate trail bridge is crossing the creek.

Key findings of the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement: There's a lot of information in the EIS but today's focus will be on those areas where the environmental review found the project would have beneficial effects and those areas where it found that there would be

significant adverse effects that could not be mitigated.

The analysis found that the Preferred Alternative would have numerous beneficial effects, and is not too surprising, because this is a restoration project. The analysis found that the Preferred Alternative would improve recreation access with improvements to trails, a pedestrian circulation, parking and day use within the site. The Preferred Alternative would also have long term benefits to aquatic habitat and fish movement due to the restored creek and lagoon, and the replaced highway bridge. It would improve water quality, and soil conditions by restoring the creek, reducing motorized boating activity in the vicinity of the creek mouth and reducing land coverage much of what much of which would come from restoring soft coverage where parking occurs today. The preferred alternative would reduce boat noise in the project vicinity with the removal of the marina, and it would also implement portions of the Regional Plan, Corridor Management Plan, and the Regional Transportation Plan by restoring the creek and providing a new multi-use trail connection.

One of the adverse effects relates to the effects on motorized boat use. The restoration of the creek and lagoon would require them removal of the marina. During the alternatives development process they looked at lots of different approaches to try to keep some portion of the marina, or even create a small marina on the site, while also restoring the lagoon. After looking at those it just wasn't feasible to maintain the marina in this location and restore the creek in lagoon. The environmental document does recognize that the marina is an important recreational resource, especially for those individuals that live nearby and moor their watercraft there. These slips account for about six percent of the moorings that are currently available to the general public on the Lake and they account for about 11 percent of the existing publicly available moorings on the West Shore. There are two different ways to look at the effects of removing these slips.

The effect on the Lake as a whole there really isn't a significant impact, and that's because the Shoreline Plan caps the total number of moorings that can be placed on the Lake and the EIS includes a mitigation measure that would ensure that these removed slips go back into the pool of potential moorings that are available to be constructed at marinas and this would ensure that the total number of moorings that can be placed on Lake Tahoe over time would not change. Over the long term the number of public moorings would remain consistent with the Shoreline Plan and the EIS. But they can also look at this just in terms of its effects on the boater on the West Shore. Even though the removal of these slips would not decrease the total capacity for moorings on Lake Tahoe, it could have a localized effect, as the slips in Meeks Bay are removed and additional slips could be constructed in the future elsewhere around the Lake. The EIS took a conservative approach and called this localized impact significant, and there's really no way to ensure that new mornings would be made available in the project vicinity and so the environmental document takes a conservative approach, and it called this localized impact significant and unavoidable for the purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act.

There was one other significant, unavoidable impact related to referred alternative, and that has to do with construction noise for the State Route 89 bridge replacement. The replacement of the bridge may require overnight construction and is intended to reduce the total length of the construction period and reduce the amount of time the traffic would be disturbed, but it could exceed the noise standards or create a substantial increase in noise during that construction period. The EIS includes a mitigation measure that would minimize the amount of construction that happens overnight. It would limit things like jack hammering and pile driving, and those loudest construction activities to daytime hours can also include some additional construction best practices. But even with those noise reductions it was so likely result in a significant increase in nighttime noise for nearby residents during the periods of active construction. The environmental document identified this temporary impact as significant and unavoidable.

There's one additional significant impact that cannot be mitigated, and this one does not apply to the preferred alternative, but only applies to Alternative One and it has to do with the scenic impact of

placing a new 300 foot pier at a TRPA designated scenic recreation site where there's no existing pier today. (Slide 24) Shows a simulation of that 300 foot pier that's included in Alternative One when viewed from the beach on the north end of the project area. This alternative would place a new structure in an area where there's currently unimpeded views of the Lake and there's really no way to mitigate the visual impact of that pier as it's viewed from the beach looking out at the Lake while still in achieving the objectives of that pier which needs to be 300 feet to allow for motorized boat access under various Lake levels. Again, that significant impact applies only to Alternative One and not to the Preferred Alternative.

This is now the beginning of the public common period that goes through August 9. They'll have another virtual public workshop on June 27. There'll be opportunities for people to learn about the project and ask questions. Information can be found on the project website www.meeksbayproject.org.

Presentation can be found at:
[Agenda Item No. VI.A Meeks Bay](#)

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Faustinos said she's stayed at the Meeks Bay cabins. She asked why the parking lot was left between the camping area and the shoreline and not moved closer to the road on the Preferred Alternative. As a camper, looking at parked cars wouldn't be her preference.

Mr. Lewandowski, Ascent Environmental said they looked at Alternative Three with the relocated parking as well as the Preferred Alternative which keeps the parking where it is. It was a bit of a trade-off. The benefits of relocating the parking would provide some noise buffer for the campground, move it away from the highway, provide easier access from the campground to the beach and better views towards the Lake from the campground. But the trade off and the reason it wasn't included in the Preferred Alternative is because that would involve more disturbance with additional tree removal to put the parking lot in the relocated spot. There would be additional cost and then it was really a trade-off with the day users who come and park and want to get to the beach would benefit from having the parking area a little bit closer to the beach where the campers would benefit from having the parking further way. There are more day users that they use the site and was another factor in trying to maintain that convenience for the day users. It was a balancing act, and there's definitely rationale for both approaches.

Ms. Faustinos asked if there was consideration given to basically wrapping the parking around the camping area so there would be some sites closer to the shore. It does seem like there could be some design alternatives that might accommodate both.

Ms. Sibr, Forest Service said she was definitely advocating for having some of the parking moved back. They got quite a bit of input related to having the parking as close as possible to the day use site. Ms. Faustinos had a good point and said there's probably some sort of an option for a little bit in between there. One of the things that's a little bit difficult when they go into the National Environmental Policy Act with multiple alternatives is that these are conceptual designs. While they're talking about the big topics of having something closer or farther away, there are some permutations in there that could work for both of those that they don't have illustrated at this point at this level of design. She thinks that could be something that could be worked into that Preferred Alternative design as well.

Ms. Faustinos said with climate change and trying to reduce heat impacts, having some kind of cool pavement would be a priority. She understands those things are typically more expensive but it's important to look at those designs for the long term. They need more trees and don't need to cut them down unless there is an overriding reason for it. Having that unobstructed view is really desirable. In terms ingress and egress for school buses in trying to get more people to the Lake in this particular area. With the Tribal interests and educational experience, lends itself to a lot of great interpretive

education and the more that they can try to accommodate large buses to bring school children in would behoove all of us.

Ms. Conrad Saydah echoed Ms. Faustinos' comments, especially the cool pavement and considering how to potentially minimize the parking that's also right next to the restoration area. She feels if the parking lot were further away that it would help filter the runoff before it hits the restoration area during a storm event. It seems like that also would provide an environmental benefit. They would need to weigh the cost of benefits of tree removal for filtering that water versus leaving things as they are. But if there's an alternative where you could move one of those parking areas back and leave the other one where it is, just anyway to minimize that border with a parking area in the restoration area. Over time and even as we go to electric vehicles there's still going to be deposits and runoff going from that impervious surface into the restoration area in the Lake. This presentation helped her visualize all the alternatives and hear about the amount of work and outreach put into this.

Ms. Novasel said today's site visit to Meeks Bay was on a new Tahoe Transportation District electric bus. During the presentation, it was mentioned that there was a localized impact with the moorings that was difficult to minimize or mitigate. Is there a reason why they couldn't specify moorings to go back in that area so that it wouldn't have that localized impact?

Ms. Cremeen said they discussed that and thought from an implementation standpoint down the road it might be difficult to track all of those moorings and define a boundary for West shore for example. So, it isn't something that they wanted to do at this point, not to say that they couldn't, but it was more complicated to try and restrict where moorings were placed. That mooring pool is for marinas that do environmental improvements and as those come online, they're available for more moorings and would be lake wide so that would be happening lake wide over time.

Ms. Novasel said this marina is obviously going above and beyond in that it's not there anymore and she would hope that they would give some consideration that the fact that they've lost their marina altogether. She suggested that if there's a way to do that, it might be something that would help to minimize that impact upon the boaters because this has been a large impact on them. She spoke with Meeks Bay Fire District years ago when this project was first being talked about and they were concerned about the public safety issue. Seeing it on the top three or four of concerns raised from stakeholders identifying a need for improved emergency response. Driving through there today, they saw a lot of dead trees and there's not been a lot of thinning in that area. The Fire District would like to have something closer to them than what is around that area. She asked if they've had a conversation with Meeks Bay Fire District since she's talked to them and have, they said yes, no problem with this new study.

Ms. Cremeen said yes, they've been included in the conversation and are on board with an alternative location. The working group has been looking at the quadrants around the Lake and discussing where the best location is to be more centralized. Her understanding is that it's off the table it Meeks Bay and they're looking at a location at the South and North Shore's.

Mr. Hester said TRPA staff led by Mr. Stock convened a group from around the Lake that are looking at public safety facility sites for every county and the City of South Lake Tahoe. Staff will be bringing an action plan to the Governing Board in late summer or early fall with Fire Districts support for sites. Then the Fire Districts can seek funding then move onto permitting.

Ms. Novasel asked if they've found another alternative area around the West Shore.

Mr. Lawrence said he's familiar with the site and can picture what they're talking about. He remembers a scoping meeting about a year ago on this and thanked everybody that worked on this to address a lot of the comments that were originally coming up on this project. He doesn't have an opinion on this but asked why the pedestrian pier wasn't in the Preferred Alternative. He understood the 300 foot pier

GOVERNING BOARD

June 22, 2022

with the scenic impacts maybe being kicked out. There's not a lot of opportunities for people to get out on the lake unless you rent or own a boat. It seems like the recreational or pedestrian pier would be a nice recreational amenity but understands that there might be some trade-offs. He didn't follow why that was kicked out when it seems like it would give extra recreational benefit without having the scenic impacts.

Ms. Sibr, Forest Service said it was clear that there was not universal love for the motorized pier and the impacts that came with that. But the pedestrian pier does have fewer impacts and they thought about whether or not it would be worth including the pedestrian pier in the Preferred Alternative. There were a couple of reasons why they didn't include it, but there's not one huge overriding reason why they didn't. In developing that fourth alternative, they took the pieces that people liked more. There is less of a visual impact with the pedestrian pier but does still have a visual impact. It's not significant and unavoidable from a National Environmental Policy Act standpoint but from the sort of public perception standpoint there is no pier there now and it would be a new pier. Then with that pier not serving the function of having the motorized access, then it is sort of just this recreational feature that wasn't necessarily replacing the opportunity that was lost from the marina. But while it does provide a new opportunity it just wasn't enough of an impetus for them to feel like they had an enough support for that feature in the Preferred Alternative. In addition, the Washoe Tribe, both from the permittee standpoint and from the Tribal standpoint, were not extremely supportive of the pedestrian pier as well.

Mr. Lawrence said he doesn't feel strongly one way or another but feels like it could be a missed opportunity.

Ms. Cremeen said they were a little surprised that they didn't get a lot of support for the pedestrian pier. Many of the comments is that they didn't want anything.

Ms. Sibr, Forest Service said for the stakeholder group while they do have representation of the "public" from the permittees that are representing the general recreating public, a lot of the stakeholder members are either second homeowners or folks that live in the area, or have sort of a vested interest, they're not the casual visitors who just come camp at Meeks Bay. She believes that there is a little bit of a difference in sort of the approach of those. They'll see what comments we get from the public related to the pedestrian pier.

Ms. Aldean said she was one of the advocates for the pedestrian pier when they were discussing these conceptual designs. She mentioned during the tour this morning that there's a segment of our population that don't want to get into the water from the beach, they don't have access to a boat and it's a shame to deny them that sort of opportunity to enjoy Lake Tahoe from a different perspective. She encouraged them to look at perhaps combining, if possible, the pedestrian pier with the paddle board launch and maybe it can be a multi-purpose facility that could accommodate people in wheelchairs, using walkers, or people that are not very mobile to get them out on the Lake. That can also be coupled with using a portion of that for the launching of non-motorized vessels.

Ms. Sibr, Forest Service said one of the few benefits of doing an EIS/EIR/EIS document is that they can do a little bit of picking and choosing of the alternatives if that doesn't create any unforeseen impacts that were not analyzed in the document. They decided to go through the activity of creating a fourth alternative based upon the input that they had received.

Ms. Aldean asked if Caltrans is going to allow the use of the existing bridge to continue and are they going to be building another bridge parallel to the existing bridge. How are they going to do that without closing State Route 89? Working at night is fine, but there will be a time when traffic probably won't be permitted.

Ms. Sibr, Forest Service said they don't have exact design specifics yet for the bridge itself or for the

GOVERNING BOARD

June 22, 2022

order of operations for construction. What they've done in the environmental document is tried to provide the largest number of options and analyze the impact from those options for construction. Options could be for them to demolish half of the bridge and allow half of the bridge to remain open. For example, they've included some mitigations that if they are going to take out the entire bridge and there is going to be a closure of State Route 89 that would be in short duration and there would be some type of emergency egress. For example, the other pedestrian bridge interior to the site would be constructed first, and then that could serve as emergency egress. There's a number of different options in the environmental document to allow the greatest flexibility for both construction and design.

Ms. Aldean asked if that included the building of a bridge parallel to the existing facility so that traffic is unimpeded during construction, or is that not one of the considerations?

Ms. Sibr, Forest Service said there's not an option to build it next to it. The new bridge is wider if the bike path is included. By taking out half of the existing bridge then they could start on the other side and have that one jet out a little bit farther. There's not any plans to build a new bridge next to it on either side and then take out the one that's there. It has to fit somewhat in that space where the existing bridge goes.

Ms. Aldean asked if that is from a logistical standpoint, or from an environmental standpoint because they want to minimize disruption.

Ms. Sibr, Forest Service said it's both.

Mr. Rice said his question has to do with the public safety access. It would seem that with the pedestrian pier that an emergency vessel could get in there and tie onto that to remove an injured person. It seems that the fastest access for many places on this Lake are by water. Without having the pedestrian pier, how would they access a victim on the beach?

Ms. Sibr, Forest Service said that's currently the situation out there because the boat ramp is non-operable and they don't have a boat that operates out there. It would essentially be a continuation of the existing condition, for example, the Preferred Alternative. Regarding the comment about the pedestrian pier. Speaking specifically to Meeks Bay Fire District, they had talked about would be the required needs for ingress and egress from the site by a boat. Their comment at the time was that they would need some type of a lift in order to provide a safe rescue from the boat. Because currently they can drive up onto the shore and take someone out that way, too, which is similar conditions to what Mr. Rice referred to. At that time, they were not interested in providing some type of emergency ingress and egress from a pedestrian only pier. They were interested in having a motorized pier with a lift specifically.

Mr. Rice said experiencing rescues, he doesn't see where a lift would be that necessary. Most of the boats on the Lake are capable of coming up to pier and extricating someone and getting them off to a paramedic ambulance rapidly.

Ms. Sibr, Forest Service said having the pedestrian pier certainly doesn't hurt that. But as far as if there is a boat, they could come up to it, but the pedestrian pier doesn't provide the place to store the boat, or the ability of the Meeks Bay Fire District personnel to be able to access the boat to then use the pier, she believes was their concern but doesn't want to speak for them.

Mr. Rice said it would seem that the El Dorado County boat would probably be servicing that area and it's well equipped and doesn't see why they would need a facility to tie up for any length of time whatsoever. South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado, and Placer County, all of the surrounding communities have excellent facilities for emergency personnel in those situations. He would like to see some access to this area and it seems to him that a pedestrian pier would be "what the doctor ordered."

GOVERNING BOARD

June 22, 2022

Mr. Anderson said the one area that he has concern about is that there's no motorized watercraft availability in this area. There was a marina that held upwards of a 100 vessels at one point with a ramp. Since the closing of this marina in 2015, has there been an outcry for access of motorized watercraft? Secondly, what is available outside of the Meeks Bay area for the residents in that area for access for their watercraft?

Ms. Cremeen said the Yacht Club was one of their stakeholder groups as well as the Marina Association, and they were advocating for some kind of a marina to remain. That was looked at as an alternative but wasn't going to work with the restoration project. They understand the need for the restoration and that they'll lose some of these moorings. There are places to moor at the West Shore; Obexer's and Homewood which might have a waiting list and they would ultimately return these slips to the overall pool. Since the initial conversations, they haven't heard a lot of outcry or pressing of the issue. It seems like it was earlier on and now understanding that the needs for a full restoration. They haven't had a lot of requests to continue looking at different options for the Marina.

Mr. Friedrich said this is a nice example of where the strongest environmental alternative lines up with overwhelming public input. Following up on the recreational motorboat access, given the next topic today is the Aquatic Invasive Species. In addition, there's the testing in the Tahoe Keys. As long as there is spread from boats in the Tahoe Keys and elsewhere, it's probably not wise to add new receptor points for those AIS and is another reason to go with the Preferred Alternative and not put a new pier there for boating. Are there any plans to add electric vehicle charging stations in the parking lot?

Ms. Sibr, Forest Service said they don't specifically have that called out but that's one of those things that they don't necessarily have to call that out in the National Environmental Policy Act document. It could be installed at the time they do the construction. The Forest Service is willing to look at the option for some of those electric vehicle charging station programs.

Ms. Novasel said El Dorado County Air Quality Control District is always looking for areas within El Dorado County to put those charging stations because they receive a lot of grants through State and Federal programs.

Mr. Friedrich said another factor is to consider where the parking area goes in relation to the electrical infrastructure. Maybe more along the road moving the parking lot back might be an easier place to interconnect to electrical power for those stations. Certainly if a new parking lot is being developed, they'd want to lay in the conduit at the time of construction. Even though it's not directly analyzed, it would be a related consideration.

Ms. Gustafson said it's her understanding at least at some point in the past those moorings were available for campers for short term use. They weren't all leased and one of the issues she sees throughout our marinas on the West and North Shores is that they get gobbled up with people that can afford a very large price tag on a buoy or a mooring. Those did provide this sort of public temporary use for others who want to come and enjoy the Lake. If they're considering moving them, she wants a condition that they provide some of these for those shorter term visitors to the area who be camping or have a less expensive manner to be able to use and get out on the Lake. She believes that they used to allow the campers to rent them for a week at a time.

Ms. Sibr, Forest Service said it depended upon what the Lake levels were in the marina and how many slips they had rented out. It was generally a couple of dozen that were available for the use of the campground.

Ms. Gustafson said that might be something to think about as they look at moving those moorings to ensure that they continue to have accessibility for all income levels.

Public Comments & Questions

Jennifer Quashnick, Friends of the West Shore said they've been a member of the stakeholder forum for the past several years and they appreciated the efforts of the staff from all the agencies. This started out one proposal geared towards motorized and over time, they have done an amazing job of taking input from the public. Friends of the West Shore have done surveys and at all the meetings they ran polls, and there's overwhelming support to have this unique non-motorized opportunity to maintain the existing scenic beauty. They're thrilled to see the Preferred Alternative had taken most of the things that had the most support and put them in together. There's some concern with some of the discussion about motorized activity there or a pedestrian pier because there has been overwhelming public support for the Preferred Alternative as it's laid out. She encouraged everyone to look through the documents and past stakeholder meetings. She thanked staff and those who worked on the environmental analysis. They had asked for a lot of information about recreational use and distinguishing between the different types. For example, how many people enjoy this area from a motorized recreation perspective, and how many from a non-motorized? Also looking at day users versus campground users. A significant amount of this information has been included in the document. They appreciated that the different types of users have been taken into consideration. They've asked for that in the past and maybe not been so happy when it seemed like those weren't balanced very well. In this case, they've done a lot of that research and determined that most people access that area and appreciate it for its non-recreational opportunities.

Elle Prax, Tahoe Chamber said they are in support of the Meeks Bay Restoration project and the objectives outlined in the Preferred Alternative. She also commented as a community member to share her appreciation on the efforts that have been made in updating the public and ensuring that the information is available and digestible from the website, the public coming period and the upcoming workshop. She appreciated it as a younger resident who is learning to become a better steward of Tahoe.

Kirk Robinson said his family owns the cabin that is just south of Meeks Creek on the west side of State Route 89 and probably the private residence that is closest to all the work that's going to happen. He's not a member of the stakeholders committee or forum, but has attended all the meetings, and he was pleasantly surprised by the positive experience. Going through that process, he felt that the staff and the contractors were listening to all the perspectives that were presented by those that were speaking to the group. In general, he supported the Preferred Alternative. The key points being the beach lagoon restoration and the fact that there's no pier. Some people were asking about it, and the general sense that he got was people didn't want any sort of pier because once you put one in, it was kind of the slippery slope that's going to lead back to more power boats. The general perspective was let's make this a center for non-motorized recreation in the Tahoe Basin which is a wonderful idea because it isn't just the beach area but is also the access to the Desolation Wilderness and a nice loop trail in the Meeks Meadow that people can enjoy without having to rev up a motor of one sort or another. What they're doing here is looking at what Meeks Bay can become but not taking it back to what it was. Power boats are present around the Lake and if there was a small location where they were not present, it would attract a lot of people. He wondered why rebuilding a marina is considered a No Action Alternative, especially when it's been out of operation for seven years. He feels that they can avoid that. Other senses he got from the committee were to keep the big RV's for camping on the North side where they pretty much are now and limit the South side camping to tent camps. One concern is when camping and parking is expanded, they lose the natural and open areas that are there. You can put a parking lot just about anywhere but on the other hand there's that nice separation between the South campground and the beach area. They walk through there all the time going to the beach and it's nice to not be confronted with campgrounds and cars. They supported the efforts of the Forest Service and TRPA have put into this and look forward to working with them in the future.

VII. PLANNING MATTERS

A. Briefing on Transportation Funding Initiative

Ms. Marchetta provided an overview.

This upfront context is to understand the problem and the implications at the heart of the problem which is what this briefing is about. The Tahoe Bi-State Compact establishes Regional Transportation planning and implementation governance. TRPA wears several hats in that governance structure. TRPA is the Region's Land Use and Transportation Planning Agency under the Compact, and since a bi-state action in 1999 they are also the designated Federal Metropolitan Planning Organizational (MPO). Under both of those authorities they are required to establish and adopt Regional Transportation Plan, not only as a requirement for the Compact but is also a requirement for Federal law, as the Tahoe MPO and State law to receive funding from California as the California Regional transportation Planning Agency. The TMPO refreshes our Regional Transportation Plan every four years and the most recent one was adopted in March 2020; another will be due in 2024.

The significance of their MPO status is it makes Tahoe as a Bi-State region eligible to receive Federal and State transportation funding. What exactly is the Regional Transportation Plan? In its sum total it's a \$2.5 billion plus capital investment and operations plan of Federal, State, Regional, Local, and private transportation projects and programs. When it's funded it actually implements Tahoe's Sustainable Communities vision that is in TRPA's 2012 Regional Plan which is their land use plan. That makes TRPA a unique MPO because no other MPO in the country has combined land use and transportation planning authority. The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) project list emphasizes not just transportation projects and strategies that are designed for transportation, but it also implements the Regional Plan Land Use Policy. It addresses everything from visitation, congestion, commute travel, greenhouse gas reduction as well as things like California's Senate Bill 375 policies for compact development. It results in less vehicle miles traveled. TRPA works with partners regularly to decide not only what projects need to be included on that project list for transportation but what are the highest priority projects of regional and local significance that make the most difference in reaching the goals of the RTP and the related vision of the Regional Plan.

There are many transportation plans such as the RTP, corridor plans that go to the next level, area plans that integrate transportation and land use, multi-modal plans such as transit and trails. They know the projects of highest priority in those plans, so they don't have a plan or a project problem, but what they do have is a Tahoe transportation system funding problem to implement those plans. The partnership has been working to solve that problem for many years. It's one of the most intractable in her long years of experience, because almost everybody sees funding for the RTP as needing to come from somewhere else. It was only recently, that they are moving in the direction of this being a shared regional problem to complete a regional system.

Ms. Marchetta will provide the short version of the problem statement that they're here to solve and then TRPA and Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) along with the contractor is going to walk through the framework approach that the partnership has aligned around to solve the funding problem. This is the proposed approach that they're going to represent in the final report of the 2020 Bi-State Transportation Consultation. It's also the approach of the Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. DCNR, TRPA, and TTD are going to offer this approach to the Nevada Oversight Committee in response to the Senate Concurrent Resolution (SCR8) which is a Nevada Legislative Policy

GOVERNING BOARD

June 22, 2022

Resolution that calls for support of Tahoe's transportation funding. If the region can align on what are the highest priority Transportation projects and what are potential new sources of funding for those projects. They are required to report to the Nevada Legislature on SCR8 in this interim session at a meeting on July 15.

They have a \$400 million unfunded gap within the project and programs of Tahoe's adopted Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). They cannot reasonably say that they can implement the priority projects much less the transportation system that they need to meet their regional land use, transportation, and environmental goals. Every four years, Tahoe has to adopt a an updated RTP to remain eligible for Federal and State transportation funding. The RTP has to be shown to meet specific Federal, Regional, Bi-State Compact, and State goals in order to be approved. The basis to show that the RTP meets those goals is a project list that's adopted and shows that when fully implemented they'll meet all of those required goals and targets. To show that the project list can be implemented, the list has to identify reasonably foreseeable funding sources for all of those projects and programs on the list.

In 2020, when they adopted the RTP, there was no reasonably foreseeable funding source for \$400 million of the needed transportation projects and programs and they can't say that they can implement the next 25 years of the RTP in Tahoe. The partnership has been working for several years on some kind of a shared framework to secure new sources of revenue to show that they can actually feasibly fund this \$400 million gap, and that's the topic of today's briefing.

So many times they have set out to tackle the funding needs to implement the RTP and most recently in 2017/18, together with TTD they made a first attempt at consensus. They chartered a Bi-State Transportation Consultation group to focus on transportation priorities and funding needs. It was then John Laird and Leo Drozdoff as the two Cabinet Secretaries representing Tahoe took the lead to search for some transportation solutions. What that group accomplished was that they helped work toward consensus on what were some of the highest priority projects of regional significance. And that was in aid of eventually helping locals to find funding sources for these projects.

They issued a first report which has now evolved. Again in 2020, at the beginning of the next Governor's administration's, Director Crowell and Secretary Crowfoot again convened a continuation of the Bi-State group and continued to build support for an agreed upon approach to fund those highest, most regionally significant project priorities in the RTP. They have reached general agreement on what those highest priority projects are that the new revenue, if it could be secured, would actually fund, and they've now spent the last year working with partners in every sector, Federal, State, Local, and private. Finally, to now look at the question of what new funding sources might be identified to fund those highest priority programs and projects that would satisfy that \$400 million funding gap.

During the presentation, they'll see how they went about identifying new sources of revenue, what those potential sources could be and are still in progress of trying to find consensus around the full package. Why are they working so hard to identify funding sources upfront? They have to integrate their land use policies with their transportation system around the Compacts requirement of reducing reliance on the automobile. And to know how well they are doing in achieving that goal they needed a measure of success of the 2012 Transportation and Sustainable Communities vision. They added that measure of success when they adopted the 2020 RTP and TRPA simultaneously with that adoption, also adapted a new Regional Threshold Standard in a first ever new threshold category for sustainable Communities. That Threshold Standard is designed to measure how well all these different implementers are tying together land use and transportation into a walkable and bikable transit

oriented system that reduces reliance on the auto. That standard remade a prior air quality threshold for nitrogen emissions which is no longer a regional concern, and remade it into a new mobility standard, using Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita as the measure. As a forcing mechanism for progress that new threshold set compliance triggers for new transportation funding and results on the ground to assure that they could accelerate our transportation projects toward successful implementation of the RTP. Unless they can now show new reliable sources of transportation funding by the end of 2023, the burden of reducing VMT is going to fall on individual projects. It's going to make development harder for everyone, and unless they can demonstrate that the investments have reduced per capita VMT by 2028, fees for development projects across the basin and will go up.

Mr. Spencer, Urban Economics and part of the RGS Consulting Team and Mr. Hasty, Tahoe Transportation District provided the presentation.

Mr. Spencer:

(Slide 3) Map of regional priority projects. This all flows out of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) adopted in 2021. There's a funding gap for all of these projects, and that's the genesis of this transportation funding initiative. A big share of that funding gap is in sources that can be used to match State and Federal grants. So, it's a local source, non-State and Federal source to match those grants is a big need. Another source is funding for ongoing transportation operations. There is a significant need for a flexible and sustainable source to help fill the funding gaps in these projects.

(Slide 4) Shows the \$2.4 billion plan reduced to average annual amounts shown in the pie slices. And out of that is the purple slice which represents that \$400 million/\$20 million per year over 20 year funding gap. That's what they've been looking to identify revenue sources for over the last year.

(Slide 5) That \$20 million a year funding gap and what they did in the past years is they pivoted from looking for a single revenue source to a shared sector approach as introduced by Ms. Marchetta. Taking a page out of the very successful approach of the Environmental Improvement Program which is a shared sector funding approach. They took that \$20 million and rounded it to 7-7-7, \$7 million per year for Federal, State, Local/Private. Those equal shares not by coincidence, those sectors fund the rest of the plan in roughly equal shares. They're basically allocating out the funding gap according to how folks are already funding the plan based on these reasonable anticipated funding sources. Once they identified this 7-7-7 framework through the Bi-State Consultation process in late 2021 and early 2022, they moved into implementation. Now, it's about what sources by sector are going to fill this gap.

(Slide 6) They analyzed 30 sources, revenue estimates, advantages and disadvantages, where there are legislative challenges, and implementation, etc. Today's presentation will show a distillation of all that work from last fall into what are now the priority funding sources that the sectors are going to be pursuing. This chart also breaks out the two states annual average into \$4.5 million and \$2.5 million.

(Slide 7) On the Federal side they've made great progress in a couple areas. They're working on grant requests and program details from the latest infrastructure bill are still rolling out. First, there's a \$2 million grant for the State Route 28 corridor, and through the infrastructure bill they anticipate \$700,000 additional in funding for transit operations that are not in that business as usual, part of the RTP funding plan as shown in the earlier pie chart. That would be in addition and would count towards the Federal sector contribution. Secondary, they've made a lot of progress from is in coordinating State and Federal grant requests among local jurisdictions to the Tahoe Transportation Implementation

GOVERNING BOARD

June 22, 2022

Committee (TTIC). Now, there's a process for getting all the local jurisdictions together and putting our best foot forward as a region for grant requests.

(Slide 8) California sector: They are asking for a change in the population formula that distributes annual transportation funding to match the population that the Federal funding uses for transportation funding in the basin, and they're also actively pursuing a direct \$22.5 million funding request that would be over five years and would be the State's contribution of that \$4.5 million over a five year period. They've had great success with active transportation funding for the Fanny Bridge project That was one of only five projects that Caltrans endorsed statewide. There's a lot of progress and momentum and continuing involvement from Caltrans and the Natural Resources Agency.

(Slide 9) Nevada sector: It's interesting that that the Nevada Department of Transportation Department is wrapping up their own Statewide transportation funding initiative. They're trying to identify a \$500 million per year annual shortfall. The state is facing the exact same challenges that the basin is at a statewide level. They've got an allocation of conserve Nevada bonds for the State Route 28 Corridor Project. They are seeking designation of some Environmental Improvement Program bonds for transportation projects. These requests will go before the Legislative Oversight Committee this summer is part of the response to Senate Concurrent Resolution 8 (SCR8) where they asked the basin to come forward with funding requests.

(Slide 10) Local/Private sector: At the local and private sector they have to address the fact there's five counties and a city. They're trying to figure out how to allocate that \$7 million by jurisdiction. They're also in the process of determining how to identify funding that is over and above the business as usual component of the RTP funding plan. They're trying to be clear on what's new funding as opposed to what's already in the funding plan. There's great momentum going forward with contributions to the South Shore Microtransit program and with Washoe County funding the Washoe County Mobility Plan. They also have endorsements for the 7-7-7 approach by the Placer County Board of Supervisors and the TTD Board. They're going to be digging deeper into a specific funding source called the Zonal Congestion Management fee.

(Slide 11) Zonal/Parking Congestion Management Pilot. This is being looked at as a key new revenue source for the local sector. It was identified through Bi-State process. It was one of the 30 options that that they examined last Fall. TRPA has engaged with a consultant with relevant experience to explore this option. They'll be laying out program design principles and closely consider current and planned land manager operations in coordination with the Forest Service and State Parks. They'll provide rough estimates of revenue and implementation costs and clarify any legislative challenges we might have with the implementing this option.

(Slide 12) Progress Tracking: They'll be tracking progress as they go and reporting back regularly.

(Presentation continued)

Mr. Hasty, Tahoe Transportation District said the Tahoe Transportation District is a Bi-State special district focused entirely on transportation. The TTD Board which also has some of TRPA's Governing Board members have been working on this for months. Their Board has formally endorsed the sector approach, and the primary work of the District has been on the local/private sectors and will continue to work on that as we go forward.

(Slide 13) Implementation: The Bi-State Consultation group will be meeting again in July to review the

GOVERNING BOARD

June 22, 2022

Final Summary Report and then there'll be the preparation for the Annual Federal Summit in August, at which some of this can be reported out along with a report out to the Nevada Oversight Committee on July 15. TTD will continue to support the local and private sector to get its funding sharing contributions. TTD also participates in the technical committee, Tahoe Transportation Implementation Committee (TTIC). This committee is the group of public works directors, staff, NDOT, Caltrans, TTD, everyone who implements transportation in the basin is acting together. The technical group is here to advise the TRPA Board and TTD Board as policymakers, let alone local boards on what it think needs to happen. This is how they derive the list of projects and services and will contribute to the next Regional Transportation Plan as well.

TRPA staff is also gearing up for yet another committee that this Board has created; one that's going to be helping the Agency in working on data and management framework to ensure that they're going to meet the VMT targets in the region, as well as other Regional Plan Goals. The 2023 year is definitely an important milestone year as Ms. Marchetta cited in her introduction. All of them will be working on getting this new funding online to deliver.

Looking ahead to 2024, the Regional Transportation Plan process will begin again with getting to approval in 2025 with a lot of public input and the technical group.

Presentation can be found at:

[Agenda Item No. VII.A Transportation Funding](#)

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Lawrence said the endorsements from TTD and Placer County are terrific. While the final report hasn't been finished yet for the Bi-State Consultation, the funding strategy of shifting to a 7-7-7 did go to the Bi-State Consultation group for discussion and had agreement for that strategy. It doesn't necessarily solve the long term problem of finding a singular, flexible, fungible, and sustainable source particularly for transit and operations across the basin. But the Bi-State Consultation thought it was a really good first step in identifying some needed funding targets, particularly when at least on Nevada side the bond sales might be more robust than in the past and there's Federal infrastructure dollars that are now available. Certainly, the strategy of 7-7-7 was embraced at a minimum of a good way to get started in getting some of these projects up and going.

Ms. Williamson said there are so many projects out there that sound like they would fulfill the RTP vision of a fully functional transportation system. Are there more details on how those are prioritized or phased? Shouldn't it be sort of a self-fulfilling prophecy that the ones that can be funded now should be funded first. If it were more of a phasing prioritization then once they have funding for it, doesn't that move them up the priority list?

Mr. Hasty said a lot of the projects are on that list because of that reason. They've been worked on for some time, it takes a fair amount of lead time for a project to come forward. There's been a lot of investment in a number of these projects. Some of them are the most ready to go projects that they have, and in particular with the new infrastructure funding these are why they're targeted as they are right now in order to deliver those. For example, State Route 28 for the next eight miles of trail and off highway, parking, etc. They've been working on that for years. Others on the list and with the capital program, they also want to start ramping up the next candidates. The list itself right now kind of represents both. There are also things like transit operations that funding would make a big difference.

GOVERNING BOARD

June 22, 2022

Mr. Anderson asked that if they fall short on the 7-7-7 funding in one year, will that be carried forward to the next year. Then it's no longer 7-7-7, it might be 10-10-10 or 12-12-12 going forward now into the future.

Mr. Spencer, Urban Economics said it's \$20 million per year, on average over 20 years. Some sector might come in higher one year and some sector lower. He thinks they'll be evaluating it over a multi-year average. They're not trying to nail the \$7 million by sector, by year.

Mr. Anderson said his concern is they're looking at 20 years and get your crystal ball out and see what the funding mechanisms are going to be available over the next 20 years. That is going to change significantly and whether the three different sectors are going to be able to pull their weight may come into question.

Mr. Spencer, Urban Economics said the RTP is updated every four years. With every four year update, this funding gap is going to get reevaluated and the sector share approach might very well apply, but the amounts will be reevaluated, the funding accumulated to date that's gone into projects will be taken into account, so, they won't be waiting for 25 years to suddenly look back. They're going to be looking at this every four years actively and reporting in the interim on efforts by sector to identify problems where folks may be lagging behind in their efforts.

Mr. Anderson asked what about sub sectors within those sectors, because, one project may benefit one county more than it does another county. How are we looking at funding those?

Mr. Spencer, Urban Economics said they're looking at it as a basin when it comes to projects. It's very hard to say that because a project is in one county that doesn't benefit another county in the basin, because transportation is basin wide. Users of the transportation system in the basin don't care about county lines so, it's not really a benefit approach. They'll be looking at funding contributions by jurisdiction, breaking out that \$7 million into local jurisdiction goals. That's going to be an ongoing process of what someone's goal is in that \$7 million and how are they fulfilling that over time, what projects are in the queue, a jurisdiction could have one very large project in the queue coming up, that would you know fully meet that. This is not a clean, simple accounting process, this will be worked out over time in close coordination with the jurisdictions with everybody knowing that we've got this 7-7-7 framework in front of us, and these legislative hammers.

Ms. Faustinos said regarding prioritization, they all have to acknowledge for example, the bipartisan infrastructure law that just got passed, there's certain priorities for funding in that measure and would assume that they'll want to go after that. And maybe that's not going to fund the types of things that are or absolute top priority because of the availability of funding and what it's programmed for. Hopefully, in 10 to 20 years that those benchmarks they'll see the high priorities getting funded. It may be out of the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law that they're going to have to fund more charging stations, for example. It could be that they may have to tweak the priorities based on available resources at the Federal and State level.

Ms. Aldean asked for clarification on the congestion management funding mechanism and if those are the internal local toll collection systems.

Mr. Spencer, Urban Economics said that is the zonal or parking congestion management pilot. The concept is some type of fee that would be paid by any vehicle that stops within two corridors; Emerald

GOVERNING BOARD

June 22, 2022

Bay and Sand Harbor that have been identified for the pilot for the pilot. Any car that stops within that corridor would be subject to the fee. It's a way of trying to collect in one place for all folks accessing that corridor, and then building around that a very robust transit system so that you would have the option of parking before you reach the corridor and taking free transit into the corridor. This is an explicit behavioral shift mechanism that they're trying to get at because these corridors have congestion and public safety and parking issues. These are two very big pinpoints in the basin right now. They're starting with this pilot program to address that through a fee that would move folks more towards transit or active transportation such as biking, walking, etc. through these corridors and away from vehicle access through the imposition of a fee on vehicles that were to stop or park within the corridors. This will be done in close coordination with land managers, State Parks, and the US Forest Service to ensure that their plans and existing parking revenues are incorporated. The pilot is in a feasibility study phase.

Ms. Aldean said there are established parking areas at Sand Harbor, for example and she assumes that the fees they collect are used to help maintain that park. Would these fees be above and beyond the current fees that are charged for the use of that parking area?

Mr. Spencer, Urban Economics said no. This fee would replace all existing parking fees then the existing agencies receiving revenue for those existing fees would receive revenue out of the new program. It's attempting to keep existing agencies whole but make it much simpler and easier for the user.

Mr. Hasty said that new infrastructure is required in those corridor segments to get some of that parking off of the highway and the trails. That infrastructure does not come with operations and maintenance type of money. That parking is not covered by any State Park or Forest Service parking system now. As this infrastructure gets built out then the idea is to implement paid parking, and this is corridor methodology is one way of doing it as a whole rather than lot by lot. This is what they're doing right now in order to help create that revenue as well as drive behavior change which TTD is experimenting with that now with what was done with the first three miles of State Route 28 and that trail head parking is right there. They're getting some very interesting information and seeing results and people's willingness to pay on that as well.

Ms. Aldean said you need the money to build these improvements so they can charge the users to change behaviors and work themselves out of business by reducing or eliminating that source of revenue.

Mr. Spencer, Urban Economics said it's a balance. There will always be people that are willing to pay to park for the convenience but they are just trying to shift a percent of those users from vehicles to transit to improve the public safety access, congestion pinpoints.

Ms. Aldean said in terms of meeting the Regional Transportation Plan goals, is that going to be sufficient? There are a lot of people for the sake of convenience would far prefer to pay a fee to park their car but does that get them to where they need to be in order to meet the challenge before them?

Mr. Hasty said regionally, they'll have to do more but is why this pilot is so important. Ultimately, they need a regional system which is going to be doing the same thing. More than a regional system it's an inter-regional system and is how they'll meet the vehicle miles traveled goals as well as congestion goals.

GOVERNING BOARD

June 22, 2022

Mr. Spencer, Urban Economics said they're looking for this program to be scalable. By testing it at a pilot level they're looking to see how this could be scaled up.

Mr. Friedrich asked if the zonal fee would be a local contribution or where would that be credited.

Mr. Spencer, Urban Economics said yes, that'd be credited to the local private sector.

Mr. Friedrich asked if that is for the jurisdiction where that's implemented, in this case, Emerald Bay would be El Dorado County.

Mr. Spencer, Urban Economics said yes, conceivably, those details haven't been worked out.

Mr. Friedrich said and the same to other potential disincentive for driving whether that's parking fees, Basin entry fees or other fees that disincentivize driving. Those would be credited, so long as those are in turn contributed to alternatives that would be a local funding system.

Mr. Spencer, Urban Economics said correct. That would be part of the local fees generated for the local sector contribution.

Mr. Friedrich said the more they can do on the disincentive pairing with the incentive, the better. South Lake Tahoe has a survey going around as part of a transit study of their constituents for gaps in the transit system. So far, 95 percent of people report never using the bus. They had a discussion yesterday along the lines of what's free, fun, and frequent is driving as long as that's easy. Even if you paid a zonal fee to go into Emerald Bay and you can park all along the road, people are going to choose to do that. They need to look at paring disincentives whether it's a Basin entry fee, zonal fees, or much stronger parking management as part of the mix. Regarding the local cost share, is the current view that it would be likely opportunity driven. So that a regionally significant project in Placer County or City of South Lake Tahoe for example, and there's a local contribution; either a match for funding, or fully locally funded, is likely to be where the local match local contribution is coming from, or is it viewed as every year that the local jurisdictions are going to contribute their share of the \$7 million to a pot of funds that are used for whatever?

Mr. Spencer, Urban Economics said outside of the Tahoe Transportation District which has basin wide regional transportation mission primarily focused on transit. To the extent projects such as highway and other types parking projects are being implemented by the local jurisdiction. It's going to be a project by project crediting. There is no entity to receive annual contributions from the Federal, State, and private sectors that then would disperse those to the highest priority projects. That's not where you are in the basin, there are five counties and a city. This is going to be a project by project, jurisdiction by jurisdiction process with a challenge of identifying what is new money. Because the Regional Transportation Plan is already three quarters funded with reasonably anticipated revenues pre known as of 2020 when it was put together. Identifying the new money is going to be part of this process, too.

Mr. Friedrich said if there are particular opportunities coming forth with Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) and they happen to check out a bunch of boxes in a certain jurisdiction and that county makes a match towards a grant from IIJA and/or with state funding, that would be an example of a pooling of funds and in that scenario it's not unforeseeable that being opportunity driven there may be a number of projects in a certain jurisdiction that are funded the next few years that align with Federal

GOVERNING BOARD

June 22, 2022

and State priorities that the locals take advantage of and get a head start on their share over multiple years, whereas others might not have that opportunity. There would be some phasing based on opportunities that arise, and how they fit with Federal funding.

Mr. Hasty said it's kind of the nature of a discretionary based capital program which is a lot of what they're talking about here when it comes to the gap, it's the pursuit of discretionary dollars. In this case that would also be discretionary dollars at the local level.

Mr. Friedrich said it's more like \$7 million averaged, how that's parceled out over the years will not be probably an even contribution every year but will be come in with phasing and fits and starts based on opportunities.

Mr. Spencer, Urban Economics said that's a fair summary.

Mr. Anderson asked if someone stopped their car somewhere and was assessed a fee, where does that authority come from and is it standard throughout the basin or is it different for each of the jurisdictions?

Mr. Spencer, Urban Economics said for this pilot project on the California side the authority would come from the State Legislature. They are going to look into this more as part of their consulting work. There likely would be some sort of state enabling legislation. It's not considered that large of a hurdle because California has tolling and other roadway charges throughout the State funding transportation infrastructure. It's not considered a gigantic lift, at least technically or legally. On the Nevada side there's some more serious considerations related to the Nevada Constitution, and statutes specifically related to tolling. Those questions are going to be clarified as part of this process, and they'll have to keep investigating that going forward. From the work they've done to date, it's not clear.

Mr. Anderson said that was his concern considering that any type of fee increase and expansion, especially on the Nevada side, does take legislative action, and may require changes. They're not always open to fee increases in Nevada.

Mr. Rice said it would be a long lengthy process because they'd have to literally change the constitution and that doesn't happen very often in Nevada. That could be a fly in the ointment when it comes to tolling.

Ms. Gustafson said the \$400 million that they're trying to fill is a minimum, it is not the optimum. Because if they really want to change mobility, they need infrastructure outside the basin to allow people to board a bus to get into the basin without the use of the vehicle. That may also include other types of infrastructure, such as rail improvements and other things that are being looked at and studied now for connections between Sacramento, California and Sparks, Nevada. This is just a beginning point. With that, on the local slide they didn't indicate Placer County's funding which they've put \$2.9 million of general fund into transit and micromass transit this year. That was approved two meetings ago. It sounds significant when you look at a \$7 million dollar local match. Yet, they know all they're doing is providing the transit that they desperately need to give people an alternative to use of their vehicle.

She questions some of the numbers. If their area requires \$2.9 million to get them to that point, what is the true number? She understands this is a moving target, and maybe they can just build capital projects, project by project but if they really want to have a regional transit system that gets people out

of their vehicles, it's going to require sustained local contributions and/or other funding mechanisms. The beauty of the pilot if it works is those two corridors are the biggest gaps in an inner-regional transit system. If they can raise them money and use it to fill those gaps, then Placer County has a match to continue the transit to the South Shore, El Dorado County and beyond, and vice versa on the other side, going around the Lake. Remember the goal is not just projects, because it's easy to wait and phase and look for capital infrastructure money from State, and Federal but that really hard point is what are the alternatives to use of the private automobile. They're making great strides, the micromass transit that they've been doing on North Shore, 70 to 80 percent of the people have never before taken a bus in the basin. Sometimes to the detriment of their main line bus system, because everybody would rather just call up the micromass transit system and get a door-to-door service versus waiting a few minutes for the bus. But that's also on them to increase that frequency. It's an important mechanism, they're seeing great strides and great ridership of over 100,000 users last year, but it's very expensive and it needs sustained funding. There's so much more to do and even when they hear about a couple of billion dollars that doesn't include parking outside the basin, shuttles into the basin, and regional transit options.

Ms. Hill said she's excited about the prospect of linking public transportation and incentivizing it for their communities. She suggested that they do need to look at a regional approach for this. She's moved away from the basin user fee, just for the fact that they're going to be doing these pilot projects, which is really exciting and may get them to that point eventually and whatever iteration that may look like. It is going to be difficult for the accountability on the local match. She thought that's what they were doing is writing a check to the Tahoe Transportation District every year, of their local match and then that's how it would be managed until Mr. Friedrich asked the question. This is going to be difficult, because to ensure that they're all paying their fair share, and the accountability, especially if they're not in these seats, and there are different folks at the helm. They need to think about a regional strategy for true success.

Mr. Lawrence said great comments and he really appreciated Ms. Hill's comments from the local government perspective of some of the challenges of finding that local government funding and that's a real issue. He's more optimistic, because they had these very same conversations on the Environmental Improvement Program rolled out in 1997. It's like what is that local government share, how are they going to count that amongst the jurisdictions, how are we going to count the private sector, is it by Chamber of Commerce, is it by hotel, how are we going to track the states? How are they going to prioritize the projects, how do they know when they're going to get their money? The reality is that Nevada was the first to commit, maybe the last to deliver because it took a while to get the bonds sold. The Federal Government didn't commit, it was line by line and they didn't worry about how much of this is going to come from the Bureau of Reclamation, how much is going to come from the Environmental Protection Agency, or how much from the Forest Service?

In 2001, three to four years after the Summit, the Federal share came to light. What happened was the momentum of bringing everybody together around an issue recognizing that there were still questions to be answered, but that action had to be taken before every answer was there. That got everybody moving, and those other parts about how to prioritize projects or worrying about who paid what and how it all rolled out, went by the wayside. The more that we can roll up our sleeves and work together and find funding to get good projects on the ground, they'll get more success. He fully acknowledged Ms. Gustafson's point and he doesn't have the answer. For transit operations, particularly having that funding source across the region is going to be an ongoing challenge and it's got a lot of questions, politically and legally regarding polling or user fees, at least on the Nevada side. When he does talk

GOVERNING BOARD

June 22, 2022

with the folks in California, maybe they're not as vocal about it but he hears the same questions on the California side, too. Maybe they can get some momentum doing a pilot study that will then line up with the point in time where they've got some infrastructure funding. If they can get a system on State Route 28 that everybody loves, and it's got parking lots, trails, and not as congested, it will be a lot easier down the road to get that operation funding for transit once they show that system in place as opposed to wringing our hands now and saying, they need all of this now.

Ms. Aldean said given the political, legislative, and statutory realities of charging, for example, for the use of parking on property that's owned by a government entity, assuming that you're inventorying all the possible uses of undeveloped privately held properties that could be used. That would be a private arrangement with a private landowner and they're entitled to charge what the market will bear. For example, if there's a participation agreement, between the Tahoe Transportation District or the local jurisdiction and the private property owner to help to build the parking facility or a parking lot in this case and sharing the revenue wouldn't that be a kind of an approach that they might want to examine and analyze.

Mr. Hasty said the closest thing is these corridors that comes to that would be the Forest Service model of using concessionaires. So, that's potential for some of that and is part of the dialogue. When it comes to paid parking in the basin, the approach that they're taking in the State Route 28 corridor right now and kind of branding paid parking is also applicable to the US 50 project. And working with that very large supply of private parking and implementing under this kind of this umbrella brand that idea that which yes, the private sector is collecting those dollars and contributing some of that towards the microtransit that they'd be implementing. The beauty about that is it also makes the parking available to the public, which then allows them to do wayfinding the signage. That's a lot of the goal out of this besides the pilot on the largely undeveloped recreation areas is to get at this larger parking scheme in the basin to fully optimize the amount of parking that exists in this basin but is not fully employed and are part of the Regional Transportation Plan goals within that. They have several pilots going on here, and one is in a more undeveloped areas where they do need to build infrastructure. There is some potential on Forest Service lands through concessionaires. Otherwise there's kind of the approach that the TTD has been taking so far with working with partners and building it and then they're operating the paid parking right now. There's a number of ways to do it. Placer County is looking at what they can do in their portion of the basin. There's a lot of good things underway to those ends that involve the private sector as well as the public.

Ms. Novasel said the Environmental Improvement Program was a perfect example because that's where they're at. It's going to be piecemealing this, it's not a big giant thing and thinks that's where a lot of the angst comes. She's hearing a lot of angst in her community because people are looking at the big picture rather than the thought of taking this piecemeal and trying to gather what they can.

Ms. Regan said this truly is the embodiment of the Environmental Improvement Program framework. What they were hoping to get out of this conversation today was just a general head nodding that the 7-7-7 EIP framework is the way to go. As Mr. Lawrence said, they thought they'd be lucky if they could raise \$908 million from Federal, State, local, and private for the EIP in the early days following the 1997 Summit. And now here they are \$2.6 billion dollars later, as they have just leveraged, share over share and commitment over commitment. What we're trying to do with this framework is really lock arms to say they're in it for the 7-7-7, and it will be up and down over time, but the working groups will work together in a coordinated regional approach to prioritize the projects that can go forward and package them up, based on priorities at the time from a policy standpoint based on funding sector. Let's move

into implementation recognizing that they still have a lot of work to do. Roughly six million cars go through those two corridors every year around Sand Harbor and Emerald Bay. If they could be creative and try to change behavior in those corridors coupled with all the other investments that they've been talking about, we might really start to be able to move the needle.

Mr. Friedrich said as they're looking at those corridors like Emerald Bay, he wanted to flag that he thinks it's kind of out of control and a public safety issue. Families walking down the road eroding the banks. At some point they need to dive in and try things and would like to see a future discussion about what the role of this Board is, for example in prohibiting parking along that way as a way to jump start people having to use alternatives while they're looking at zonal fees. He'd love to have that come back, it's frequently raised to him when discussing sustainable transportation, that's the inverse case. It's a real nightmare and a disaster waiting to happen. Could that be a focal point as they're looking at other options to mandate some behavior change?

Public Comments & Questions

Ann Nichols said the Environmental Improvement Program is different than just taxing people for use. She doesn't see the analysis as so distinct. What's confusing is you do things to create attractions; like the trail in Incline Village and to Spooner Summit. More people are brought in and then you can't deal with the people and then you need more parking lots. We're already paying an additional two percent tax over and above the Transient Occupancy Tax in Placer County. Will they be taxed in addition to that? This is so lacking in detail, it's kind of terrifying. Is Incline Village going to become the parking lot for the East Shore? She thought that only 1.4 percent of the people use transit. Please think about this more critically.

Doug Flaherty said good luck with the zonal fee on Nevada side, this will be tied up in court for 15 years. That is so pie in the sky, he can't even believe that you're even thinking about it. Secondly, the gorilla in the room is the 7-7-7. If you go to the Legislative Oversight Committee, it's going to be misleading to them to present any of these figures that were originally developed by the Tahoe Transportation District about one or two years ago. The inflation factor alone we're probably already at 9-9-9. Quit fooling the public, and say, "Oh, we're going to figure it out later." If the TTD and their consultant can't even explain to this Board specifically what it's going to cost, how are you going to explain it to the Legislature or the people when they go to vote? Any politician that votes for any sort of an increase for this showboating of a plan is going to get voted out of office. Also, as far as the comment that that the transportation plan reduces the reliance on the auto that is arbitrary, capricious, and a crystal ball comment. You guys don't even know how many parking spaces you have in the Lake Tahoe Basin. You could use GIS and note every single parking space on a map, cut that down by two thirds and say, "You can't park here anymore." If you want to solve the transportation problem in Tahoe, as was said earlier, do transportation outside the basin. Lastly, he doesn't think you're going to get any \$80,000 Tesla driver to have any incentive to park their Tesla and get on a bus with their kids, their packs, their bikes, and whatever, and take the transit system. It's pie in the sky. The Environmental Improvement Program was 1997, people are smarter, they're more well informed, and when do you start this East Shore project, he can guarantee you are going to be challenged every step of the way. The East Shore Trail was constructed over the Lake and is an environmental disaster. There's people, dog urine, and feces, there's not enough restrooms and it's not patrolled. You guys are out of touch, you're living back in 1980.

B. Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Annual Program Update

TRPA staff Mr. Zabaglo provided a program overview of prevention, control, monitoring, and program outlook for funding, pace and scale.

Mr. Zabaglo said the Aquatic Invasive Species program is one of the highest priority programs of the Environmental Improvement Program. They're working on minimizing the devastating impacts aquatic invasive species can have on the environment and the economy. The program also includes the prevention program which they're proud of with no new invasions since the program started in 2008. It's a mandatory program with all motorized watercraft needing to be inspected prior to launch with hot water decontaminations when necessary. There's a highly trained staff working at three seasonal basin entry points in the in the boating season and moving the inspections to two ramps during the off season. Customer service and education are critical components of the prevention program for the public to see the value and understands why they're doing it. Through the control, they're looking at reducing and eradicating species where possible. They're getting localized eradication in many areas working on with action agenda that has a 90 percent reduction goal of existing species like Eurasian watermilfoil and Curly leaf pondweed with techniques such as bottom barriers and ultraviolet light.

The secret shopping shopper program ensures that the inspectors and launch facilities are following the program protocols. The EIP partnerships are critical and they cannot succeed without them. The private public partnership with the boaters, the general public, the Governing Board, staff, Legislators, and elected officials have to be in place for this program to work.

Prevention priorities: At this point last year, over ten mussel boats had come into the inspection stations. They've only seen three so far this season. They equate that to a lot of outreach. Last year, they did a lot of billboards, press releases, and work with the regional partners at the state level with what's called the Call Before You Haul Program. A lot of the mussel boats they were seeing last year, were from commercially transported boats from points east such as the Great Lakes. Now, almost all of the State Departments of Transportation web pages have aquatic invasive species requirements and information for permitting of these commercially hauled vessels.

The appointment system continues to be very popular. It's been a win-win for everyone with 70 percent of the boaters using the appointment system. It's easier for the boater to have an appointment and eases the issue of staffing. Staffing does continue to be an issue with cost of living. They try to keep the wages competitive and evaluate what their wages are comparatively. But housing is a challenge here, and so they're continuing to work with our regional partners on that issue but it affects customer service and efficacy and is something they're very concerned about. They're also investing in permanent inspection stations. (Slide 4) Lower left picture is the locations of the Spooner Summit location that they're working with the State Route 28 Corridor Management Plan and the State of Nevada but also potentially with some infrastructure funds for a permanent station. In addition, they're working with the California Tahoe Conservancy on a location in Meyers on the South Shore. That particular location might also be able to have a workforce housing component.

Warmer temperatures have been of concern and do they need to consider the longer operating season? People are boating earlier and later in the year which is a staffing pressure. Also, there's the question of whether they are susceptible to new species that weren't likely to be able to live here before. This year, they'll be assessing that risk and ensuring that they are prepared for that new threat. Control: The Action Agenda is working on a 90 percent reduction on it on existing species. (Slide 5) The

GOVERNING BOARD

June 22, 2022

green starred locations are areas where they've completed work in getting that localized eradication for the plants so Sand Harbor isn't on there or Emerald Bay with Asian clams. The orange sites are active project sites they're working on such as Taylor Tallac and Tahoe Keys Control Methods Test. In purple are the planned projects, most notably coming up next year are Ski Run Marina and some of the ponds at Edgewood Resort. One of the completed projects that was seen on the tour today was Meeks Bay where there was about four to five acres of AIS control work that was completed last year. Taylor Tallac is another one in the first step of the overall restoration of the entire area. It's important because these are naturally functioning wetlands. It's the largest one in the basin providing potential habitat for almost every native species in the basin and having that native habitat build resiliency, especially in the in the light of climate change. They are about two thirds of the way through this 17 acre infestation and will be about a three year project.

The Tahoe Keys that was approved by the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board and TRPA in December 2021 and January 2022 has had a lot of coordination since that time frame with all of the stakeholders, partners, and consultants to ensure that the implementation and monitoring could occur. TRPA is taking the active role in ensuring that third party or independent ability to assess the monitoring of all of the activities that are taking place as shown on Slide 8. All of the dots and areas represent all the monitoring that they're doing. Activity started on May 25 in some of the locations on the far left, and then the lower portions with herbicides. That took about four days to complete the different locations and then on May 31, the ultraviolet light treatments began in those pink locations. Inventive Resources has completed two of those locations. Once the barriers come down, they'll move into the combination sites. All of the monitoring they're doing is looking at herbicide degradation, nutrients, water quality, and efficacy.

(Slide 9) Is 14 days after treatment with Endothall herbicide for one of the locations. The brown Eurasian watermilfoil and the green is the native Elodea. (Slide 10) Shows a before picture of one of those channels in the pink. The herbicide treatments have been completed and the monitoring will continue throughout the season. There'll be a break in those combination sites to work in another location and then come back for a second round that will likely go through October.

Multiple contingencies and protective measures were incorporated into the design of the project: Treating when water was filling the Tahoe Keys from the Lake to ensure that positive flow inwards. Treating early when biomass was low to eliminate or reduce the potential for nutrient spikes, regardless of the treatment. All the dots as shown Slide 11 represent all of the different points sampled pretty much on a daily basis. The physical barriers are turbidity curtains at multiple locations to try to keep things from moving beyond. There were high winds in late May and herbicides were detected outside of one of the curtains and triggered a contingency plan for a dye that assessed what was happening in real-time. When that was detected, additional contingency monitoring took place at sites closer to the channel and nothing was detected beyond that. That also triggered the Tahoe Keys Property Owners Association to release divers to repair those curtains that that were impacted by those winds. During the public comment period of the environmental analysis there was a lot of concern about upland sources of nutrients. Concurrently, TRPA's Stormwater Program has been working with the Property Owners to develop a conservation landscape guide that provides opportunities to guide homeowners on more native landscapes that don't need irrigation. Also, there's about a \$125,000 in planning funds to look at regional treatment and greenscapes.

Tracking the progress is an important way to understand how they're continuing to be successful with control. The last lake-wide survey was completed one in 2018 with another one being done this year.

GOVERNING BOARD

June 22, 2022

There will also be around 70 to 80 dive transects to give them a sense of the presence and absence of AIS. This year, they're going to include a little finer level of monitoring with hydroacoustic sonar that will be able to give them treatment polygons that will better allow them to plan for projects moving forward and track how much reduction in acreage.

Currently they track progress with acres treated and that's a good indicator of work and effort but not necessarily how much they're actually reducing. For example, one acre may need to be treated three times before it's considered fully treated. They're treating three acres but it's only one acre in reduction. They're looking at adding that performance measure to the EIP Project Tracker to demonstrate the reduction in acreage. They also do the Quagga and Zebra mussel sampling to ensure that prevention is working and that the secret shopper quality control program is ensuring that the protocols are being followed.

(Slide 13) They're fortunate to have diverse sources of funding with Federal funding being the largest at 67 percent. A lot of that is the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act with some from the US Army Corps of Engineers. What's not on here is the new \$3.4 million agreement with the US Fish and Wildlife Service infrastructure money. They'll see about \$2.5 to \$2.7 million of that to focus on projects such as Taylor Tallac which is a significant investment and capital project. There'll be additional outreach with being able to provide multi-language rack cards for the prevention program including the non-motorized Tahoe Keepers program. In addition, they're looking at permanent inspection stations and a feasibility study at marinas to see if redesign can impact the ability of invasive species to live in those locations.

State funding of 17 percent comes from the direct sources that they get for the prevention program, but also grants through both California and Nevada, and then private contributions through the boater fees and the nonprofits funding for projects, either through Tahoe Fund or the League to Save Lake Tahoe. This is only money coming to TRPA, it doesn't account for other partner spending like the Tahoe Resource Conservation District that has their own budget. The need was identified to increase the pace and scale to achieve 90 percent to get more lake saving projects on the ground.

Other coordination is being done with the Shoreline Program which required certain marinas to have an aquatic invasive species management plan. They've developed a template that will be provided to the marinas to put in place either to eliminate or reduce the potential for invasives to grow or to do routine monitoring and skimming. The AIS Management Plan will be updated for early detection, rapid response, not only for existing species, but new species.

If, something were to be found, they're ready to take action. It's a multi-jurisdictional lake with lots of different players and are ensuring that they're well-coordinated. They haven't been able to travel to Washington, DC in the past several years but the Tahoe Delegation is important with all the funding that's come into play through their ability to meet face-to-face with their legislatures. With the redistricting, they'll now be a part of Congressional District Number 3 in the South Shore of California. Work continues with the boat industry. It's great partnership because they have the same customers so they want to ensure they're all working together. Boats are being advanced significantly so they want to make sure they're keeping pace with that.

He introduced Emily Frey, TRPA's new AIS Projects Coordinator. Staff is also working with their permitting partners on understanding all the permitting needs especially as they get these more complicated projects like Taylor Tallac. As part of Secretary Crowfoot's Initiative Cutting the Green Tape for environmental projects, they are doing a case study with Taylor Tallac to

GOVERNING BOARD

June 22, 2022

improve efficiencies to be better prepared to take on some of these bigger projects in the future, and better forecast the projects that need to be put on the ground.

Presentation can be found at:

[Agenda Item No. VII.B AIS Update](#)

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean asked when they tested for veliger's.

Mr. Zabaglo said all during the summer months.

Ms. Aldean asked about how often.

Mr. Zabaglo said generally once a month, once water temperatures hit 14 degrees Centigrade which is about 55 degrees Fahrenheit is when they can reproduce. It's generally May through October. They coordinate with the State of Colorado that takes their samples at no charge. The boat crew take those samples at 13 or 14 locations throughout the Lake, including Fallen Leaf and Echo Lakes.

Ms. Aldean assumed that the sampling has already occurred for the month of May and it was negative.

Mr. Zabaglo said he'll double check to see if it's been done because the water temperatures have been pretty cold. Typically May and June would both be completed.

Mr. Friedrich said at the end of last year, it was mentioned that there was 90 percent compliance with the boat backup stations. Is there any new data in Tahoe Keys Lagoons? Also, with the new ownership at the Tahoe Keys Marina, is there any attempt to pair the herbicide work that's going on with increased awareness and having every boat owner participate where it currently exists, and then to implement it in new hot spots like the Tahoe Keys Marina or other marinas.

Mr. Zabaglo said that's being investigated with the new owners about the ability to have a backup station on the Marina side/East Channel. But on the West Channel, as far as a compliance rate, because more than two thirds of the Tahoe Keys are blocked off, there hasn't been a significant amount of boating traffic to do a true assessment of compliance with the boat backup station. Once those barriers are removed, they'll be doing additional surveying to ensure that is being met and work with their partners on additional education and outreach.

Mr. Friedrich said glad to hear that they are speaking with the new owners of the Tahoe Keys Marina, that's an important step to take.

Mr. Zabaglo said they've been very engaged, not only with us and other partners, but with the homeowners themselves. That was a contentious relationship in the past and there's it's been really good, so far.

Public Comments & Questions

None.

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

A. Executive Director, Joanne Marchetta Retirement Transition and Separation agreement

Ms. Gustafson said there was an errata published for the staff report that was in the packet.

Ms. Aldean said Ms. Marchetta has led this Agency in one capacity or another, for 17 plus years, and that in itself is commendable. Everyone she's spoken to wants to make it a priority to make this transition as seamless as possible but also to take advantage of her vast experience and knowledge, as it relates to creating an atmosphere of cooperation and collaboration. That is one of our hallmark achievements is being able to bring conflicting parties together and driving toward consensus. The Operations and Governance Committee recommended was that Ms. Marchetta officially resign as Executive Director, effective June 30, 2022. She will remain on the payroll at 60 percent, part time at her current salary with benefits until January 6, 2023 in a senior advisory capacity to work on matters as assigned by the Interim Executive Director, Chief Operating Officer, Mr. Hester. The Agency agreed to pay Ms. Marchetta's Cobra premiums from January 2023 through August 2023. The Agency will pay out accrued leave balances at termination of employment as required by law. Ms. Marchetta agreed to waive any potential claims against TRPA. In addition to that, in recognition of her long time service to the Agency and her exemplary performance as Executive Director, the Ops Committee authorized the payment of a career end as opposed to a year-end bonus in the amount of \$20,000. There is bandwidth in our budget to accommodate that bonus.

Ms. Gustafson echoed Ms. Aldean's comments and many more about Ms. Marchetta's leadership. This agreement was reached through compromise and negotiation, Ms. Marchetta's efforts to work with all of them to balance the interests for current and the future are so appreciated.

Presentation can be found at:

[Agenda Item No. VIII.A Marchetta Transition Separation Agreement](#)

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Anderson said on behalf of Secretary of State Cegavske he echoed those sentiments. The Secretary was sorry that she couldn't be here today because she's traveling out of the State. Thank you very much for your service to TRPA and the States. Good luck, they hope she's still around, so that they can glean some of her 18 years of knowledge.

Mr. Yeates said the fact that on many occasions Ms. Marchetta passed up the opportunity to get an annual bonus. She did it so others on staff would receive bonuses. She felt that was sacrifice she could make. Part of the \$20,000 is not only just the end of the career, but simply as a matter of the commitment she made to the staff. As an ex-chair, that commitment to staff really pays off big time when you're the Chair of this Agency, because they make you look good, and they cover all the issues and do such a superlative job. The transition that they had to make from not only when he had his own little hiccup, staff picked up the slack and Mr. Bruce stepped in for him as Vice Chair. He also recognized staff, especially Mr. Marshall and Mr. Nielsen on their work on the Event Center. The commitment that staff has, represents the commitment that Ms. Marchetta has to this Agency and to the Lake and our priorities. She's extremely focused at times, but that is part of keeping them on the same page and getting everyone to all to work together, it's quite remarkable. It made that transition to this virtual world kind of easy and just the equipment changes, and the way they did things. The staff

GOVERNING BOARD

June 22, 2022

being able to work at home and for the staff that have children must have been difficult. If it wasn't for Ms. Marchetta's hearing problems, they wouldn't be doing this. It's going to be a great loss and appreciated everybody's concerns about Ms. Marchetta always being behind the green curtain in one way or the other. The way she worked out this final agreement, makes it clear that Mr. Hester will make the determination of when your services are needed and hopes he takes advantage of that because there's a lot of value in what she has and what she has accomplished. He supported this transition and no matter what they do here, her legacy will live on. He's grateful for the opportunity with the time that he's been on the Board, he's learned a lot and she made the job of being a Governing Board member interesting and challenging, and we got some good stuff done.

Mr. Lawrence commended the Operations and Governance Committee. There were a lot of questions when this first came out, and they had a lot of discussions at the last Governing Board meeting about how to best handle the transition. There were some folks in the community questioning whether Ms. Marchetta staying on would be working behind the green curtain. On the other hand, he's been working in the public sector for a long time, and has gone through a lot of transitions himself, and knows how valuable it is to have that institutional knowledge particularly through a transition. They struck that balance very elegantly and great job to the team that worked and he supported the action. He worked with Ms. Marchetta before she was the Executive Director and when she was Legal Counsel through the Shorezone stuff. They've been through a lot of battles on the Nevada side together, and unless you're in the thick of it, it's hard to really appreciate just how dicey things can get. Ms. Marchetta was very strategic in her leadership and showing a path on how to tackle some issues that could have blown up the Compact and TRPA. He thanked her for her dedication to the Agency and to the two States.

Mr. Bruce said we at the Lake, the Lake itself, the trees, the birds, the fish, all are tremendous beneficiaries of her diligence, leadership, and her ability to get everybody together to collaborate, solve problems, and to keep going and to keep the energy up even when it was difficult. He's luckiest person alive and that this organization couldn't be luckier than to have had 17 years with Ms. Marchetta. He's excited about the next chapter and looks forward to remaining connected.

Public Comments & Questions

None.

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Novasel thanked Ms. Marchetta for everything. It's bitter sweet that she's moving on but happy she'll be here for a while. Thank you to the Operations and Governance Committee for their work on this.

Ms. Gustafson said having been a partner outside of this Agency before coming to this Agency, Ms. Marchetta's leadership on behalf of the Lake and especially for herself was watching her do a presentation on the Regional Plan in front of a large group and thought "My gosh! If I could ever do as well as you had done in that presentation." She's mentored all of them in many ways including the staff. They still need to meet with each other and share that commonality of human existence and is glad that she'll be around for the next 6 months.

Ms. Aldean made a motion to approve the proposed Transition and Separation Package terms for

GOVERNING BOARD

June 22, 2022

Joanne Marchetta, transitioning her to a position as senior advisor and separating her from the agency, and to delegate to the Governing Board Chair the authority to enter into final agreements consistent with the terms set forth in the Staff Report and as outlined in this meeting.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Bruce, Mr. Anderson, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates

Absent: Mr. Hoenigman

Motion carried

B. Appointment of Ad Hoc Committee to Facilitate Executive Director Selection Process.

Mr. Hester said at the Operations and Governance Committee this morning, they laid out ten steps this morning in the search process starting with the formation of the committee. Board members and select staff would get surveyed, they'll coordinate how the interviews would be done when they have the candidates, and everything in between. The schedule that was laid out was to have a new Executive Director here in January 2023 or sooner. Most of the work will happen between now and probably October then there'll be some time left for transition if it's necessary for the person to leave their existing place of employment and move here. So far, they've received one proposal and expect at least one more. They have a preliminary job description, and they've started to identify the stakeholders for the interviews for the job description. They'd like to have the first committee meeting in July.

Ms. Aldean said the first motion is for the resolution presented to the Operations and Governance Committee for recommendation to the Governing Board and Mr. Hester has summarized what the mission of the Ad Hoc Executive Search Committee will be. There was one public comment from a member of TRPA staff emphasizing the important link that the Executive Director provides between staff and the Governing Board and the request was that a member of staff be included on the Ad Hoc Committee. That is a good idea and believes everybody in Operations concurred and is something they should address prior to the first meeting of the committee in July.

The first motion is to create the Ad Hoc Executive Director Search Committee to manage the recruitment for the executive director's position for pursuant to the resolution. The second motion is the appointment of individual members to the Ad Hoc Committee proposed to be Cindy Gustafson, Shelly Aldean, Jim Lawrence, Vince Hoenigman, Bill Yeates, and a member of TRPA staff.

Ms. Gustafson said the whole process of selection of a new executive director impacts every single member of the staff, the communities that they serve, and certainly the 15 members of this Board, and trying to narrow down to a subcommittee for such an important decision is difficult. Their charge will be to involve each of you in that process, as well as hear comments from the rest of the communities at large and the staff as well. Chair Mr. Bruce had made a recommendation, and obviously with the change in his status, recommended that Mr. Lawrence serve in his place on this committee.

Presentation can be found at:

[Agenda Item No. VIII.B Executive Director Selection Process](#)

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Rice said his opinion is this is going to be a very lengthy weighty process. He wanted to know that

GOVERNING BOARD

June 22, 2022

all of the members mentioned as a potential Ad Hoc Committee members are willing to donate that much time to doing this.

Ms. Aldean said yes, she's willing to make that commitment.

Mr. Rice said he's certain that there's been a prior conversation, and everybody's agreed to it but for the record, maybe they ought to say they are all willing to do this.

Mr. Yeates said yes, he can devote the time. It's very important as they go through this process to find someone to replace the person who has done such an admirable job for the last 13 years.

Ms. Gustafson said the rest of the proposed committee members also gave an affirmative nod.

Ms. Williamson thanked them for taking the recommendation from staff into consideration. She read that public comment and thought it was a really good suggestion as well. Was the Ad Hoc Committee going to do everything and bring forward the name of who they hire or is there going to be any other board vote input or is the Ad Hoc Committee going to do everything?

Ms. Gustafson said it's her understanding that the Ad Hoc Committee is overseeing the process but not the final selection which will go to the full Board. Does the Committee narrow that down to a certain number, do they have external and internal panels, are still questions. A lot of that discussion is going to go on with this Ad Hoc Committee with recommendations and input from the Board and how they structure that process. Sometimes there's informal receptions that might involve outside constituents as well as staff and other board members. There'll be other opportunities but also ensuring that they don't have a quorum working on those details but bringing back recommendations to the full Board. Mr. Hester said that's correct. In addition, the monthly Board agenda will include a report out of the Ad Hoc Committee.

Public Comments & Questions

Doug Flaherty said he doesn't know where a lot of these folks reside but if Washoe County is not represented, there should be a representative from that county. There are pretty absent on their representation up here from their elected officials.

Mr. Lawrence said he is a resident of Washoe County and represents Washoe County and the State of Nevada on the TRPA Governing Board. He'll definitely be checking in with the local government representatives every step of the way.

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean made a motion to Adopt Resolution 2022- ___ to create an Ad Hoc Committee to manage the recruitment for the Executive Director's position.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Bruce, Mr. Anderson, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates

Absent: Mr. Hoenigman

Motion carried

GOVERNING BOARD

June 22, 2022

Ms. Aldean made a motion to appoint Governing Board Members, Vice Chair, Cindy Gustafson, Vince Hoenigman, Shelly Aldean, Bill Yeates, Jim Lawrence, and a member of staff to be determined to the committee.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Bruce, Mr. Anderson, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates

Absent: Mr. Hoenigman

Motion carried

IX. REPORTS

A. Executive Director Status Report

Ms. Marchetta said when she took this job in in March 2009, the Board asked her to speak about her vision for Tahoe and TRPA. When she stepped into this role 13.5 years ago, her goal was to turn an organization that was sputtering from the throes of the great recession and in the midst of public derision of the Angora Fire. She wanted to turn this Agency back into a great, enduring, and lasting organization that it was capable of; persistence and impact and outstanding results. She remembers saying to Allan Biaggi, who was the chair at the time “Yes, I'll agree to serve at this for 18 months, and if I've not been able to make any measurable difference by that time, I'll walk away and you can find somebody else.” It was probably fortuitous that she actually wasn't fully aware of what she was committing to or up against because otherwise she wouldn't have been willing. Now, she knows why, no other ED has lasted more than five years. She literally learned by walking on hot coals just how difficult this job is. You can't know it until you're actually in it, or unless you've been exposed in some real way to the nature of the challenge and controversy and the difficulty of what you're charged to accomplish. The experience over more than 13 years bears out the truth of the adage that which does not kill you makes you stronger. She's not leaving because she's flamed out and is not leaving everyone with pile of mess like she walked into, but she does feel like she's leaving everyone with a sound and well managed organization. She's willing to everyone a legacy of all the best circumstances, a strong organization, really well experienced people and a solid foundation.

In the search for a successor, they need to not look for someone who can save the organization instead they are going to look for a proven leader. Somebody who people will follow and believe in, trust, be accountable, and committed to preserve the core of what TRPA does. But we'd be willing to stimulate progress against that core and at the core of the responsibility is to lead in a way that keeps the partnership together. The partnership is the DNA, they wouldn't exist without it. So preserve that core value that lives in perpetuity, and they call that the partnership way.

It's now up to you to find that kind of leader that you want to carry this foundation forward in partnership with all of you. It's never just one person that accounts for the success of an organization, much less a region. Leadership matters and the character of leadership matters, and they should be looking for someone who embodies values and practices and a culture that they want for this region and Agency. What criteria can everyone all align around and then how they identify those qualities that you all agree that you seek and need? Don't underestimate the difficulty of this job, it is not one size fits all.

Lastly, she'll share some general thoughts that may be relevant for them to think about in choosing the

character of the next leader. At the last meeting, Ms. Faustinos may have said it best that it must be someone willing to lead from behind. It is classic servant leadership here, where the person will have to have the confidence and presence to represent the partnership, not any single jurisdictions interest, or their own interests, but the harmony of all interests and the unique interests that TRPA stands for which is the preservation and restoration to Tahoe's environment. Then that person needs to get out of the way and let everyone else take the credit. They're in this odd age of personality in this love affair with big egos right and it's going to be really easy to confuse a dynamic personality and a charismatic ego for the leadership character that you need. The leader they seek must be willing to pursue a personal growth story far more than a personal success story.

What she now sees in retrospect, it wasn't a driving ambition for her own personal success but it was instead this inexplicable driving passion to connect up the seemingly impossible to connect like in every venue and in every unexpected way. She recalls in her 2005 interview, Ms. Aldean asking about her about her history in adversarial litigation, and whether that suited the position here at TRPA. Her answer was that there's a grain of truth in every perspective and then you have to knit all those perspectives and all those grains of truth together cohesively. And there is no harder work in these fractured times than finding common ground. And what she brought more than anything else was not the passion of being an adversary, a lawyer but a driving passion to find common ground, to be a connector, and to connect up and find the unconnectable.

How serendipitous was it that she stumbled upon the place called Tahoe, that was like irretrievably disconnected with some of the most intractable divides in these volcanized interests and political infighting, all of which needed to be connected or reconnected. She walked into this fiery crucible of egoic dissonance that needed to be connected. So you're looking for the person who can inspire that cultural DNA of being a connector. The substance of the issues almost doesn't matter because it changes all the time. They're not a single purpose agency; one year it's housing in the next it's forestry, at the same time it's transportation, water quality, etc. So, instead the key ingredient is having people with the right cultural DNA and the collaborative values that are going to make all the difference here. Don't hire for specifically area of expertise or a specific policy goal because her resume wouldn't have made it through the cut. Hire a fanatically driven, selfless person who believes in building bridges and then give them something big to do that's going to strengthen the regional connections and the partnership and then give them bigger things needing more connection, and then repeat that again and again until you get a fly wheel and create the momentum toward this cohesive and aligned partnership.

In addition, do not forget staff. Look for someone who cares about this staff and knows how to motivate them and look after their well-being, otherwise they'll not be able to keep them. Because if all of the staff here can ever experience is divide, dissonance, disparate demands, and selfish insistence which they get a good rash of, they'll can go elsewhere for easier jobs at higher pay and better benefits. Look for a leader that's going to inspire and motivate them with the nature and the meaning of the partnership challenge here. It's not with the charisma of someone's personality. The recipe of TRPA's success is the right people operating in a collaborative culture on a passion goal to drive great partnership outcomes and it's a more powerful motivator than money and it's the respect for the values that they're here to serve. Look for someone who's self-motivated, and self-disciplined and not self-seeking, look for someone with courage and tenacity who won't shrink from something difficult or impossible and who won't give up in the face of failure or constant criticism. But the person who's going to pick him or herself up and try something else every time. It must be someone willing to build a culture where people depend on one another and depend on people willing to work in

GOVERNING BOARD

June 22, 2022

partnership to get really difficult and great things done for the good of others. Everyone now has one of the most important decisions they're ever going to make. What qualities do you want in the next executive director and how are they going to assess those qualities in the selection?

This is her last of 204 consecutive Governing Board meetings every month for 17 years. She's shown up in front of different boards, she's been through nine changes in leadership, and now ten. Thank you to all of those Boards. To those of you on this final Board and those of with the longer tenure who she knows the best, when they've been through the fire together, and the bond among them is tight and very enduring. She's appreciated and grown from the long association and mutual respect and from real friendship. She wished she could have known the newer Governing Board members better but urges them to partner with the next executive director, making it a two-way relationship, both with mutual respect, room for constructive dissonance, and the need to learn from one another at its base, recognizing that they have so much to be gained by learning from one another.

To TRPA staff, without you, none of what this Agency delivers could be accomplished. To all of you, thank you with love. It's not common to speak of love in a business context, but it's absolutely perfectly appropriate for her to speak in those terms. The greatest scholar that she's ever read on the truth of love is from Eric Fromm and he defines love simply as a relationship of care, respect, responsibility, and with that understanding that's why she can say to the staff, thank you and I love you all for everything you've done and you've given to TRPA, to her, and each other. She cares about and respects everyone and have always held her role as being responsible for our well-being and your growth, and a vision without great people, with the capability to implement it is meaningless and impossible. It is through all of you that we do the great things and accomplish great things together. To all of the Tahoe community, she deeply respects this opportunity, and has the upmost gratitude for having been able to serve. It is onward to change because change is the only thing in life that we can count on. So it is good luck, and the best of everything to all of you. Be well and stay connected.

1) Retreat Follow-Up

Mr. Hester said this is the beginning of that change that Ms. Marchetta spoke about. Staff heard from the Board about some of the things you wanted to do. Some of them are going to take some work but they've already put in the initiative leads and alerted staff to do more on initiative reports and other information. There's a housing workshop that Karen and her team will be working on next month. Staff and Chair will be working on the Board handbook. There will also be an enforcement and compliance workshop coming up. They want to set it up for the new executive director to have a retreat with you once he or she is here. He will be working with Ms. Marchetta over the next six months, and one of the things she can help on is preparing for that retreat with the board. He's an old style strategic planning guy who believes in the strength, weaknesses, opportunities, threats, political, economic, social, and technological trends.

B. General Counsel Status Report

No Report.

X. GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER REPORTS

Ms. Gustafson said Mr. Bruce served on this Board for nine years and know this transition was unexpected and not his choice as well. But these transitions occur, he's done a remarkable job, and has inspired her. With every bit of negativity, caution, and concern she can have, he is the optimist for

GOVERNING BOARD

June 22, 2022

all of us. She thanked him for his incredible leadership and service.

Mr. Yeates said he's grateful that Mr. Bruce helped him when he needed it. But also the very way that Mr. Bruce joined Mr. Shute and Mr. Yeates in John Lairds office. They all just kind of agreed, they liked to work together. It was only shortly after, when there was that kerfuffle with Nevada, and they had to tackle some big issues, and he always felt comfortable being able to call on Mr. Bruce, Mr. Lawrence, or others to ask questions. They developed a good rapport and he also felt that way about Mr. Cashman and others. Mr. Bruce helped build on that and he'll miss him and looks forward to visiting him in Reno.

Ms. Aldean said she's never worked with anyone who is as optimistic, upbeat, and collegial as Mr. Bruce. He's always quick to compliment someone who has done a good job and to encourage them to do better when appropriate. He's very inclusive and not interested in standing on the front of the stage, he'd just as soon be behind the curtain and allow other people to be on display, and those are really rather unique traits and qualities. You'll be missed and am sorry that he had to transition off the board in in such a manner and was extremely unfortunate but he's accepted it as his new reality and did it with grace and forgiveness.

Mr. Lawrence said he and Mr. Bruce will continue to work on projects together, both living in Reno. They both started on the Board around the same time and when he was appointed by Governor Sandoval, Mr. Bruce reached out to him and Mr. Lawrence was impressed by his passion, optimism, and energy that he wanted to bring to Lake Tahoe, not for himself, but for the better of the environment and community. He operated that way in every single meeting and phone call. He brilliantly was able to be a Governor's representative for two different administrations, two different political parties, that's not an easy role to fill.

Ms. Faustinos said she enjoyed being Mr. Bruce's "seatmate" for almost the first two years of her service on Board. It was always great to be able to chat with him and enjoy each other's company. That's reflective of what others have said about his personality and the way he engages with a genuine friendliness and persona that she appreciated.

Ms. Hill said coming to this Board and tackling a mobility hub that was extremely controversial, Mr. Bruce was an incredible leader to her. He listened and took her phone calls and was supportive of her being a new mom. She appreciated his gratitude in life.

Mr. Anderson said on behalf of Secretary Cegavske he thanked Mr. Bruce for his service and friendship over the years. They're both disappointed that he will no longer be serving on TRPA. He's had the opportunity to work with him on a number of commercial filings through their office and other Secretary of State type issues. A heartfelt thank you to the work that he's done.

Mr. Friedrich thanked Mr. Bruce for his service and his calm and even handed ways of facilitating and leading the Board meetings. His generosity of spirit and time is appreciated in how he reached out to him to talk about the way he saw the importance of building relations and having a cohesive Governing Board. Their retreat they did was based on those principles, and no doubt his guiding hand. It's been a pleasure to get to know him in this time they've had together and there will be big shoes to fill.

Mr. Friedrich thanked Ms. Marchetta for all of her service, and the wisdom, perspective, and loving

GOVERNING BOARD

June 22, 2022

words she just shared with everyone. As they look for a new director, in the spirit of her and Mark who really lift up the staff and have that certain leadership approach is advice that he'll keep close. He appreciated all that she has given as well.

Mr. Hicks thanked Mr. Bruce for all of his interest and encouragement when he was first appointed to the Board. Back in the day, he had some bad experiences with TRPA before Ms. Marchetta was the Executive Director. Mr. Bruce reached out to him with encouragement and guided him along. He has always been kind, polite, and complimentary of everyone and just has a real way about him. He's sorry that he's at this time of a double whammy with Ms. Marchetta and Mr. Bruce. It's a question of leadership, accomplishment, and people who not only made this organization but helped hold it together.

Ms. Novasel said it's not just Mr. Bruce's leadership as a Chair, but especially his leadership as the Chair for the Legal Committee where she has learned so much. His calm demeanor in those meetings was so important, and the way that he respected everybody's conversation, says a lot.

Mr. Rice said when he joined the Board, he replaced a Ms. McDermid who had been here for a long time. The entire Board has been receiving of him and appreciated as he was transitioning in and getting on the Legal Committee, Mr. Bruce made him feel very comfortable and welcome. Thank you for appreciating his stories.

Ms. Regan said thanked Mr. Bruce on behalf of staff, he's always looked out for staff and values her time working with him for almost a decade. He and Ms. Marchetta both embody the power of relationships and you have some incredible relationships, not just even in our region, but globally and he's always brought them to bear to help Tahoe and this Agency and they're forever grateful for that. A couple of years after the dust was still settling with Nevada and California recommitting to the Compact, she invited Bill Craven who's a very important Senate staff consultant in the California Legislature to do a lecture on campus at the University of Nevada, Reno. He came up and spoke with staff and did a lecture at UNR about his role in climate policy in the State of California. Some of the Board met him in Reno for dinner and while she worried about getting him picked up, Mr. Bruce's calm demeanor just put her at ease. They continued to cement that very critical relationship in mending the fences between California and Nevada, and he was such a key person in all that. She's forever grateful for his leadership of this Board and this Agency, and for the Lake.

Ms. Marchetta said Mr. Bruce is a truly genuine, wonderful human being, She's big on character. Maybe the reason she bonded with him was because you are the quintessential connector. It's in his DNA too. Thank you for everything you've done for Tahoe and everything he will continue to do with your generosity as a human being. Everything you've done for TRPA and everything in all the ways in which he supported her.

Mr. Hester said this is his second gig with Mr. Bruce, they were both at the City of Reno. He appreciated everything he's done. He always goes above and beyond for people to do things.

Mr. Bruce said coming off of that retreat, he felt so good about this group. It's something that a lot of people have been building on for a long time, and so the timing is good for both Ms. Marchetta and himself. He's thankful to have spent time with all of the Board members that he did and he asked for a list of all the Board members that have come and gone since the time he had been here. He thought fondly of all the different stories and the times and issues, and the battles that they had together. The

GOVERNING BOARD

June 22, 2022

retreat really tied all of that together and am excited for Jessica Diss. He knows how strong she and her family is, and what a good person she is and she'll do some fantastic things here.

Ms. Gustafson said everyone is invited to attend a celebration for another long time Governing Board member Mr. Sevison. They'll dedicating the Dollar Creek Trail to Larry and presenting him with a beautiful plaque that will be placed on the boulder to honor Larry's 50 years of public service in many capacities for this basin and for the community of North Lake Tahoe and Placer County. It will be 4:00 p.m. at Dollar Hill on June 27 with dinner following the dedication.

Ms. Faustinos said had the privilege of touring the new California Resources Agency building recently and encouraged people to visit if they're in Sacramento because there's a great neon replica of Lake Tahoe which is an art form in the main hallway. She congratulated Ms. Regan and the team that Tahoe In Depth this month and said it was a fabulous read.

XI. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Local Government & Housing Committee

No report.

B. Legal Committee

No report.

C. Operations & Governance Committee

No report.

D. Environmental Improvement, Transportation, & Public Outreach Committee

No report.

E. Forest Health and Wildfire Committee

No report.

F. Regional Plan Implementation Committee

No report.

XII. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

None.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Rice moved to adjourn.

GOVERNING BOARD
June 22, 2022

Ms. Gustafson adjourned the meeting at 5:58 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Marja Ambler". The ink is dark and the signature is centered on the page.

Marja Ambler
Clerk to the Board