

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
GOVERNING BOARD

Via GoToWebinar

May 26, 2021

Meeting Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Mr. Bruce called the meeting to order at 10: 16 a.m.

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

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Bruce deemed the agenda approved as posted.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Friedrich provided an edit on page 31 under Board Comments & Questions, second paragraph, third sentence should say "Rocky Point is a low and (not end) moderate income walkable workforce neighborhood."

Mr. Friedrich moved approval of the April 28, 2021, as amended.
Motion carried.

V. TRPA CONSENT CALENDAR

1. April Financials
2. Release of Placer County Air Quality Mitigation Funds (\$86,375) for the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPD) Woodstove Replacement Incentive Program
3. Resolution of Enforcement Action: Action Water Sports and Hyatt Regency Lake Tahoe Hotel; Unauthorized placement of Buoys in Lake Tahoe, 998 Lakeshore Blvd., Incline Village, NV, Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 127-280-02
4. APC Membership appointments for the Washoe County Lay Member (to be appointed by Washoe's Board of County Commissioners on May 25), and the Tahoe Basin Fire Chiefs alternates Todd Stroup (primary) and Scott Lindgren (secondary)

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

Mr. Marshall said the Legal Committee recommended approval of item three for the settlement agreement and the resolution of violation for Action Water Sports and Hyatt.

Board Comments & Questions

None.

Public Comments & Questions

None.

Ms. Aldean moved approval of the consent calendar.

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

Motion carried.

Mr. Yeates moved to adjourn as the TRPA and convene as the TMPO.

Motion carried.

VI. TAHOE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Lake Tahoe Transportation Overall Work Program for FY 2022
2. 2021 Active Transportation Program Metropolitan Planning Organization Component Programming Recommendation

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

Board Comments & Questions

None.

Public Comments & Questions

None.

Ms. Aldean moved approval of the consent calendar.

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

Motion carried.

Mr. Yeates moved to adjourn as the TMPO and reconvene as the TRPA.

Motion carried.

VII. PLANNING MATTERS

- A. Briefing on Basin-wide Forestry Initiatives and Forest Health Activities

Ms. McIntyre and Mr. Cowen, TRPA, Ms. Noel and Mr. Lyon, US Forest Service, Mr. (Milan) Yeates, California Tahoe Conservancy on behalf of the Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team provided the presentation.

Ms. McIntyre will provide a history of forest restoration and forestry updates, Mr. Cowen will provide updates from the Fire PIT and coordination with the agencies on social media messaging, Mr. Yeates will provide an update from the Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team, Ms. Noel and Mr. Lyon will provide an update from the US Forest Service on their priority projects for the upcoming season.

Ms. McIntyre said the Washoe Tribe and their ancestors have been calling Lake Tahoe their home for at least 2,000 years. The Comstock era had a large boom in mining and with that there was clear cutting and logging in the Basin for beams to be used in the mines. That was followed by a history of almost a decade of fire suppression. Now, about 90 percent of the forest you see in the Basin are less than 100 years old and more of a homogeneous even aged stand class than ever before. The Angora Fire struck in 2007 which led to some significant changes. The Blue Ribbon Fire Commission was formed which led to the Lake Tahoe Basin Multi-Jurisdictional Fuel Reduction and Wild Fire Prevention Strategy. From that came the creation of the Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team. There's been 87,552 acres of forest have been treated to reduce hazardous fuels in the Basin. Pre Angora there were about 20,000 acres and after Angora and the creation of the Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team and the Multi-Jurisdictional Fuel Reduction they've ramped up treatment and almost quadrupled the number of acres they've been able to treat.

The Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team was formed in 2008 and comprises 21 different Lake Tahoe Basin agencies ranging from fire agencies to federal, state, the local land managers, the Washoe Tribe, regulators, and the cooperative extensions. There are two key focus areas for the Fire and Fuels Team; one is project prioritization, support, and coordination. This is where they developed the annual incident action plan which outlines all of the projects for the next season. The second focus area is the public outreach and assistance piece.

Mr. Cowen said the formation of the Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team also prompted TRPA and partners to organize a public information team (Fire PIT). The team was formed to amplify messages for the need for defensible space, fuel reduction projects, fire safety, and wildfire preparedness. The team includes public information officers from the Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team organizations but they also include non-profits, neighborhood organizers, and the University of Nevada, Reno Cooperative Extension.

The Fire PIT Team informs the public about the work of fire partners throughout region and coordinates the public information and to gain consistency of messages and their timing. They promote defensible space and neighborhood cooperation to become fire adaptive communities because public education can inspire people to take action.

In combination with enforcement programs, since 2017, 21,000 defensible space inspections have been conducted by regional fire districts, departments, and CAL Fire which is about half the Basin. They set a record in 2020, reporting 6,480 parcels inspected in one year. Last year, they shifted focus of the Fire PIT from in person special events and neighborhood meetings to online webinars, film screenings, and disseminated "How to" videos across websites and social media channels. There were more than 590 people who attended the webinars and 1,100 people attended an online film screening of Wilder than Wild. Last year, TRPA Forester, Bruce Barr shattered his own record for tree removal permits. He issued 1,100 permits and over 4,000 trees. He's worked hard to get his turnaround time on tree removal permits down to a couple of days.

This year the Fire PIT is expanding its usual wild fire awareness month to a summer long campaign with monthly themed messages, materials, press releases, and social media packages. The meta topic of the campaign that kicks off this month is home hardening with sub themes ranging from evacuation preparedness to prescribed fire. They've also had support from Take Care Tahoe which

has help shape some additional media and signage that allows the work to simultaneously stay under the Tahoe umbrella campaign as well.

The team is tentatively planning in person events this summer and has a number of great topics to help engage and educate property owners and renters in English and Spanish. Also, planning to approach neighborhood organizers again, working on the fire adaptive communities adoptions.

Part of this summer long campaign is increasing awareness through boards, commissions, and public bodies. An example of this is the resolution on the next agenda item. These public proclamations highlight the need for everyone to work together but also show leadership in the work to make the community safer.

Mr. Yeates, Acting Community Program Forestry Supervisor, California Tahoe Conservancy is providing a presentation on behalf of the Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team. Today, he'll speak about the other arm of the team, the project prioritization and support arm.

Mr. Yeates said the map on (Slide 8) was developed as a companion piece to the Basin's Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act (SNPLMA) Round 18 nomination package. SNPLMA is a program administered by the Bureau of Land Management. They sell off public land in Nevada and then the proceeds are put back into the federal program for ecological restoration projects. One of the categories is hazardous fuels and the Tahoe Basin has benefited from this category since the early 2000s.

The gray areas on the slide are projects that have been completed in the past five years. A lot of those were funded with SNPLMA money. Each color on the map is a different entity and nomination that was submitted for this round. This map paints the picture on how they plan and prioritize their work and try to get funding. There are still some gaps but the goal is that these treatments will connect to each other. The map shows how past and future projects connect to each other to provide better wildland urban interface fuel hazard reduction and safer neighborhoods. The blue area was the Tahoe Network of Fire Adaptive Communities nomination, administered by the Tahoe Resource Conservation District which is the main key piece for the defensible space inspections through all fire districts. The light green is US Forest Service Powerline Resilience corridors. The darker green is the US Forest Service planned fuels projects. The orange is California Tahoe Conservancy projects, and the lighter orange is community forestry. They're looking to implement that with the US Forest. On the east side of Fallen Leaf Lake where between the green and gray area is an open area of white which are not accounted for on this map.

(Slide 9) East of Fallen Leaf Lake the shaded green area is a project scheduled for the 2021 season on US Forest Service property. This map is a draft for the team that is producing the Incident Action Plan and should be ready to distribute in about two weeks. There is less activity on this map compared to the previous slide but these are actual projects that are happening this summer. The green depicts the US Forest Service, orange is the California Tahoe Conservancy, and in the red cross hatch is the defensible space target inspection areas. This map depicts the South Shore and each area of the Lake has a similar map.

It takes a lot of work and planning to get a map produced like this with all the projects drawn on the map. This wouldn't be possible if all these 21 agencies didn't work together so well. The Basin nominations for the SNPLMA Round 18 totaled \$42 million and have made it through the first and second group of scoring and recommendations. The Basin nominations were recommended collectively for \$35 million in funding and a number of the nominations were recommended for 50 percent funding. Last week, the SNPLMA executive committee met and they committed to relooking at the 50 percent recommendations to see if there was more funding available to bring it to 100

percent. The California Tahoe Conservancy and the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit entered into a good neighbor authority agreement with the idea of completing some community forestry treatments. Those would be the areas of blue and light orange underlay underneath the blue on the map. It will allow the Conservancy and the Forest Service to be able to do comprehensive vacant urban lot treatments on public ownership inside the subdivisions. The current way is that the Conservancy has been managing its urban lots and the Forest Service has done the same. They feel that they will be able to do comprehensive treatments that focus on both the Conservancy state urban vacant lot inside subdivisions and federally owned urban vacant lots.

Ms. Noel and Mr. Lyon, US Forest service will provide an update on priority projects, work that's being accomplished, and leadership.

Ms. Noel is presenting today on behalf of Mr. Jackson, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit Forest Supervisor. Mr. Jackson will be leaving Lake Tahoe soon for family reasons and returning to Colorado.

Mr. Lyon, Vegetation Management Staff Officer of the Forest Service LTBMU. (Slide 12) list some of their projects such as the Lake Tahoe West Restoration Project which is approximately 19,920 acres proposed to be treated on the West Shore. They're anticipating having a decision made in 2022 and to begin preparing restoration activities in 2022, release contracts and start implementation in 2023.

There are two utility corridor projects. Liberty Utilities owns all the power infrastructure on the California side of the Lake and NV Energy owns the same type of infrastructure on the Nevada side. The Forest Service is working with both utility companies to reduce fuels along the power line corridors and improve forest health. One planning decision was with Liberty Utilities for the Liberty Utilities Resilience Corridors Project. They're implementing the Montreal Thinning contract project along Pioneer Trail this year. For the NV Energy project they are working on making a decision in 2022. However, implementation is not going to wait until 2022. Currently, they are using their existing authority which is the masters special use permit to do fuels reduction work along the NV Energy Resilience Power Corridor. Some of that work is occurring along the 4100 line which runs from Incline Village to Glenbrook.

Also, there's the South Shore Hazardous Fuels Reduction project which utilizes the same categorical exclusions category as the NV Energy and Liberty Utilities projects to treat up to 10,000 acres, including up to 3,000 acres of mechanical treatments. The South Shore decision is focused around Heavenly towards Fallen Leaf Lake and then south towards Meyers. That decision was for 3,737 acres of treatment and is being implemented now.

The Forest Service has an urban forestry environmental assessment from many years ago and are refreshing to make sure it's current and applicable. There's good coordination between the Forest Service and the California Tahoe Conservancy to better manage their urban lots to address forest health and reduce fuels in proximity to the wildland urban interface defense zone in the community.

The past nine months have been good for prescribed burning. The Forest Service tries to accomplish about 1,000 acres of burning every year and varies depending on the wildland fire season. If they divert resources to address the wildland fires then they don't have resources to do as much prescribed burning or sometimes the risk is too high. This year they did approximately 1,124 acres. There's a burn pile back log in the Basin and this took a pretty good chunk of that, perhaps more than 20 percent of the back log.

The categorical exclusion for the South Tahoe Liberty Utilities and NV Energy projects was granted in the Water Infrastructure Improvement for the Nation Act of 2016. It's a special authority that's only

here in the Tahoe Basin and allows for up to 10,000 acres of treatment, including 3,000 acres mechanically. The South Tahoe project is 3,737 acres, the Liberty Utilities project is approximately 6,700 acres, and the NV Energy project while the decision has not been finalized, it's approximately 5,330 acres proposed.

This categorical exclusion has facilitated more rapid planning. Instead of doing an environmental assessment that might take more than one year, they can do a categorical exclusion which often take just months. For that they make a single decision and then offer multiple contracts off of that planning decision. An example is the Montreal thinning that's happening along Pioneer Trail.

In order for the Forest Service to increase the pace and scale of restoration, this forest has gone from an average of about 4 million board feet removed from the forest every year to about 11 million board feet. They have to reach out to a lot of partners through a lot of partnership opportunities. Some of the partners are the National Forest Foundation, Great Basin Institute, the utility companies, and a whole host of partner agencies.

They utilize the Good Neighbor Authority which allows them to partner with the state, county, and tribal governments to work on federal lands and adjacent lands. Some examples are the Nevada Division of Forestry where they have a project near Incline Village and the California Tahoe Conservancy, the community forestry project. The Stewardship Authority allows for non-federal partners which is a broader group of potential partners comes with a 20 percent match requirement. That Stewardship Authority partners are typically Great Basin Institute where they are doing projects for them in the South Tahoe area, the National Forest Foundation with whom they are working with on the Liberty Utility corridor projects, the Washoe Tribe working to restore Meeks Meadow. They also utilize the Whiten Authority to treat non-federal lands and partner with the California Tahoe Conservancy and the City of South Lake Tahoe. An example for that is the treatments that are occurring around the Airport. There are a number of other participating challenge cost share, and other types of grants and agreements. They also work with the state parks local fire departments, the Tahoe Resource Conservation District, El Dorado, Placer, Douglas County, and others.

Ms. McIntyre said she received updates from the Nevada Tahoe Resource Team on priority work they are going to be accomplishing this season on the Nevada side of the Basin. The Bon Pland hazardous fuels reduction project is located in Lake Tahoe Nevada State Park. This is an important fuel break that should be implemented this summer with the proposed ending in 2021. The project was appropriated at \$250,000 from the US Forest Service, Lake Tahoe Restoration Act funding. Another project to highlight is the Marlette Summit hazardous fuels reduction project which is 100 acre fuels reduction project within the Lake Tahoe Nevada State Park. This planned treatment area will help modify fire behavior for wildland fire progressing from the south and west to the east upslope towards the Marlette Basin. Lastly, in terms of urban lots, the Nevada Tahoe Resource Team reported that they have 500 urban lots consisting of approximately 232 acres in the Nevada side of the Basin. Greater than 99 percent of these parcels have had fuels treatments at least once. Fifty-three percent of those parcels have received two treatments and 40 percent of the parcels have received three to six treatments. Currently, all urban lots are in maintenance mode for fuels management and forest resilience which will enhance community adaptability going forward.

Governor Newsom proposed a \$2 billion dollar investment this week in wildfire and emergency preparedness. If it were authorized it would be the largest in state history in terms of funding going towards wildfire and emergency preparedness. This would do great things in terms of pace and scale of restoration. It highlighted that approximately 1,400 fire fighters have been hired on for CalFire this season. This funding would go towards fuel breaks, fuel treatments, and new equipment for CalFire in general.

There is a Forest Management Work Force Development Seminar series that has been occurring regionally. This has been running through the Lake Tahoe Community College and is to continue the work in developing pathways to identify job skills needed, training, and curriculum to development a forest management work force in the Basin, provide best management practices approach for developing industry pathways, and brainstorm solutions to improve diversity, equity, and inclusion in the industry.

Lake Tahoe West is a large landscape restoration project of approximately 60,000 acres on the West Shore of Lake Tahoe. It is cross jurisdictional so it includes the Conservancy's, State Parks, Forest Service lands and is a suite of holistic restoration; forest thinning, prescribed burning, watershed and stream restoration activities, and biomass utilization. They are currently working through the planning phase of this project but doesn't mean work is not occurring on the West Shore currently. Lake Tahoe West was put forward as a way to begin to treat the larger more general forest but there are restoration projects that are occurring within the wildland urban interface and defensible space zones.

The three lead agencies are continuing work on refining the proposed action project description for Lake Tahoe West and will soon be moving into drafting alternatives for the environmental document. The agencies are engaging with the consultant to develop an analysis work plan on how best to coordinate the triple document preparation and analysis amongst the three agencies. The Forest Service will be conducting field surveys this summer to gather additional data to support resource area analysis and are hoping to have a finalized document in 2022.

What's next for the Forest Health & Wildfire Committee, the Governing Board, and Lake Tahoe West: Currently, they are scheduled for the summer 2021 for the Forest Health & Wildfire Committee to have a presentation from the University of Idaho and the Pacific Southwest Research Station on initial findings from the erosion analysis regarding the TRPA code update.

Presentation can be found at:

[Agenda-Item-No.-VII.A-Forestry-Briefing.pdf](#)

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Hicks thanked Ms. McIntyre for all her assistance. All of the agencies that have responsibility over fire safety and fighting fires have been swamped in the past year. One of the things that has suffered is that they've had to divert attention from some of these long term projects that are important to forest health in the Basin and to fire safety. TRPA and the other agencies had represented that we hoped to have these environmental reports finished this year so they could start in 2022 but have been set back a year. He encouraged all the agencies to finish the environmental final documents to keep this project moving on Lake Tahoe West.

At the next Forest Health & Wildfire Committee they'll discuss the update on the proposed ordinance amendment to increase the amount of the slope on which mechanical thinning may be done. They're planning a presentation from consultants and will be back to the full board when that's done. He thanked all the participants today for their time and work on this.

Ms. Aldean said it seemed that all of the fuel reduction partners are institutional and asked if there are any private sector partners involved, especially with respect to removal of live trees that might be available for milling. We're currently suffering from a severe lumber shortage and prices have increased.

Mr. Yeates with the California Tahoe Conservancy said currently the members of the team are the land managers and the public agencies that administer the projects. A lot of the implementors are private vendors and contractors. A lot of this money that is coming into the Basin that is being put towards fuels work not only goes to internal agency crews, but they also don't have enough resources to do everything so a lot of this money is capacity building and putting people to work. A lot of the planned projects that were list on the map that he shared during his presentation will be private vendor projects.

Mr. Lyon, US Forest Service said there are not significant private lands to contribute to the number of trees heading to the mills. However, they have partners like Great Basin Institute who are working on the landscape and they offer contracts to private sector contractors. Now, there is so many materials going to the mills that some of the purchasers are having difficulties with getting a purchase agreement signed with the mill. There are a lot of black or burned logs going to the mill so the green trees are often sitting and contractors are occasionally asking for an extension of their contracts because the mills won't take them. It's not the volume of material that's going to the mill that's driving high lumber prices, it's other market forces.

Ms. Aldean asked for an update on biomass disposal. She's aware that there's been difficulties of getting a consistent supply of materials. Is that still a significant part of this effort to avoid, if possible, the burning of materials and perhaps compromising the air quality?

Mr. Lyon, Forest Service said biomass remains a large component of the activities. A lot of the biomass that leaves the Basin goes to Loyalton. Some of that use to go to Honey Lake but Loyalton is better and closer opportunity. Some of it occasionally goes to Ampine in Amador County. They are moving as much as possible, however, biomass remains a challenge on the landscape. They have to subsidize the haul of biomass it doesn't pay for itself.

Public Comments & Questions

Steve Teshara, Sustainable Community Advocates thanked the board for its attention on this subject. He's had the opportunity to work with the Tahoe Basin Fire Chiefs and the Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team for over a decade. It's remarkable all the work that they've done with all the partners and the involvement of the private sector.

1) Resolution in support of the Lake Tahoe Basin Wildfire Awareness Campaign: May – October 2021

Mr. Cowen said being involved with public information teams around the region promoting fire safety, communicating about red flag warning days, and some of the prohibitions already announced this year about charcoal use and camp fires in campgrounds. The Wildfire Awareness campaign this summer is going to be critical and the Governing Board support is appreciated by the team.

Mr. Bruce read the resolution into the record.

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean said every time we consider and adopt a new area plan or revise one, evacuation plans are always a common source of concern by commenters.

Mr. Cowen said staff continues to work with fire district partners on assisting with their evacuation planning efforts but doesn't have an immediate update.

Ms. Aldean suggested that a status report on evacuation plans and how many have been adopted by local jurisdictions.

Ms. Marchetta said it's the law enforcement agencies that work together on those evacuation plans. They have those plans actively in place and work with the fire districts on this. There are evacuation plans in place but it's law enforcement that takes the lead in developing those plan.

Public Comments & Questions

None.

Ms. Aldean moved to adopt the Resolution in support of the Lake Tahoe Basin Wildfire Awareness Campaign, May – October 2021.

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

Motion carried.

B. Briefing of TRPA Sustainable Recreation Initiative including regional collaborative partnerships

Ms. Regan said sustainable recreation and tourism is a critical priority for the Tahoe Basin. As part of her doctoral studies at the University Nevada, Reno she's been evaluating this issue from a global perspective. We're not alone in the challenges that we are facing. One in ten jobs world wide were in the tourism sector pre-Covid. This is one of the world's largest industries and is the case at Lake Tahoe. Destinations throughout the globe including Tahoe are struggling with some of the challenges of balancing environmental concerns with economic pressures and community quality of life concerns. Tahoe is more than three times smaller in land mass than Yosemite National Park and we get three times more visitors. Ms. Chaplin will talk about how we've partnered with the private sector in addition to all the other public land management agencies which Ms. Self will speak to in her presentation.

Ms. Self, TRPA and Ms. Chaplin, Lake Tahoe Visitors Authority provided the presentation.

Ms. Chaplin, Lake Tahoe Visitors Authority said in March 2020, the LTVA seized all destination advertising and commenced social media and website messaging around staying home and safe. Even going as far as saying "The mountain you love needs you to love it from afar." We couldn't keep them away. It was counterintuitive for a destination marketing organization to tell visitors to stay away. They continued safety caution Covid protocols and no travel, essential travel messaging through 2020. Summer/Winter advertising and events were cancelled. LTVA staff time turned towards education about the Covid travel behaviors including the influx of visitors particularly from the close in drive markets when work went virtual and schools closed.

They understood that the northern California market considers Tahoe its backyard and escape from shutdown claustrophobia was prevalent. Even during the peak of Covid, drive up market visitors flocked here. Collaboration took priority and they participated with agencies like TRPA and others around the Lake to understand their role. If there was one positive thing that came out of Covid was the close relationships and laser focus on Covid management and recovery that took place around the Basin and states. They often sit at the table together but we don't "make the table." This was the beginning of making the table to understand what we could come around. We came together around one mission, one goal which was to keep the communities safe and sustain the economic impacts they were anticipating.

The LTVA shifted funds to reinforce safe travel and respectful travel messaging. They supported billboards with Take Care messages and participated in safe travel campaigns with Incline Village and the Carson Valley. They learned that our destination was more desirable than ever and the conversation started to turn towards mitigating the impacts. We observed this revenge travel concept and observed not only the repeat visitors but also new visitors with little regard for the environment. Single use containers from restaurants allowed only to go service and this exacerbated the trash issue.

Stepping back a few years to pre-Covid, organizations like the visitors authority began evolving into what we called destination marketing and management organizations incorporating the recognition and the responsibility for sustainable tourism. When Covid hit, they were pushed into the deep end feet first into the shift. It's appropriate and necessary for them to participate in management and education of the visitors. In order for them as a region and stewards of this destination and a place we call home, we need a shared vision. Without it, we continue to creep back into our silos all doing good work but not necessarily with the amplification necessary to shift to the sustainable and acute stewardship model.

With the formation of the sustainable tourism and recreation council, the LTVA is excited to participate with financial resources towards this vision. Once they land on the vision, the LTVA will build strategy around it and continue its evolution in partnership management and attraction of not necessarily more visitors but the right visitors; ones who are looking for enrichment, inspiration, and ultimately stewardship that support the efforts that we all engage in today. It will be exciting and rewarding work. We can build the table we sit around to create the vision. We can pat ourselves on the back with this vision and march forward with a plan of action but so recently observed with the recent difficult decision to cancel an event, some say is the consummate American patriotic tradition, it will take courage and solidarity of purpose by all of us who have engaged and pledged commitment towards the vision.

Ms. Self will provide an overview on what TRPA's involvement is in this process. She told the board how formattable the leadership of TRPA has been during the last year and how appreciative they are of that movement and inclusion in this process.

Ms. Self said with the USDA Forest service, TRPA has been leading the sustainable recreation and tourism coalition.

(Slide 2) Scrolling through social media, you often see photos like this one depicting an intimate experience surrounded only by the natural beauty of Tahoe. This could be you. When you speak with partners and the community about their expectations of outdoor recreation, it's often not too far off from this: the expectations are that they envision a world class destination with breathtaking beauty, access to some of California and Nevada's best trails and waterways, and experiences that leave a lasting impression and perhaps fosters the next generation of stewardship. The reality, however, our community and visitors experience can be quite different from those expectations. The busy areas are getting busier faster, and that shoulder season we all crave is getting narrower and narrower.

While most global tourism destinations are struggling to get visitors and rebound from the Covid-19 pandemic, Lake Tahoe's visitation and outdoor use through 2020 did not take a hit. In fact, overall visitation to Lake Tahoe in 2020 was comparable to previous years. While most lodging and the local businesses felt the burden of the shutdowns, our outdoor spaces continued to see high use and there were unprecedented visitation surges during non-peak times such as mid-week and during that shoulder season that we weren't ready for. All this was despite full forest closures, one of the most extreme wildfire seasons in California's history, and stay at home orders.

One thing is certain, visitors are going to keep coming to Tahoe. The allure of accessible, outdoor activities and the impacts from climate change (like wildfires and heat waves) has and will continue to drive more and more people to Lake Tahoe.

Trends can be unpredictable. But we have a sense of what we may expect.

- Post-COVID-19 tourism and outdoor recreation use and first time users to Tahoe will likely continue to climb.
- The drive market and especially day trips for the Tahoe-Truckee region will remain high.
- There will continue to be high visitation to forest and wilderness areas where infrastructure is limited or non-existent.

And we've all seen that staffing, funding, and available transportation options are not keeping pace with demand.

What does this high use mean for Tahoe? Based on experience, that can be summed it up in two words "trash and traffic". The challenges we are facing now around recreation and tourism are all too familiar. These existed prior to COVID, but the pandemic last year seemed to put all of these issues into a pressure cooker. Our recreation sites are at the brink of becoming unmanageable. It is the peak pressures and surges at our hot spots like beaches, Emerald Bay, and the east shore that make the headlines and garner the attention of our communities. As Ms. Marchetta mentioned recently in her op-ed; Amazing places like Tahoe can be "loved to death" unless we step up and take action.

That is what partners are doing. The pressures put on the region from COVID were our catalyst. Tahoe's \$5 billion economy is undeniably based on tourism. Partners agree that the time is now to be intentional about our approach, to "see the whole picture" of how visitation is impacting Tahoe's environment, the economy, the users experience, and our communities before it's too late. Today's presentation will share all the work partners are doing to better prepare and respond to Tahoe's destination management challenges that we've all been hearing so much about.

In the words of Daniel Cressy, USDA Forest Service, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit. "Partners want to see near term 'wins' or those immediate actions as we build a longer-term vision and tackle the big systemic and cultural shifts."

There is a recognition that we have made great strides in planning for infrastructure. The Regional Transportation Plan that the board just adopted is a prime example of that. The plan envisions connected technology, a 15 minute transit service between recreation hot spots and urban centers, and specific strategies to move people to-from and around the region.

So in the equation of "trash and traffic" that is one piece of the puzzle. The void we have in visitor and destination management now is how do we go about (collectively) fostering the good behavior of 15 million visitors? Pick up after yourselves, be good stewards, and if that hot spot is too crowded, pick another spot to enjoy. This is what we are trying to address. TRPA is both learning and leading on this front but are not doing it alone.

TRPA became one of the founding signatories of the global Future of Tourism Coalition early last year. This coalition established guiding principles for destination communities to reduce tourism impacts. Another significant leap forward is the on-going coalition building that is happening. Beginning in March of 2020 Tahoe-Truckee partners banded together like never before to essentially become a visitor management strike team.

TRPA and the USDA Forest Service have been leading the Coordinating Committees virtual meetings on a weekly basis with highly engaged partners that are eager to be part of the solution. These partners include local non-profits, business owners, public land managers, visitor authorities, health

and public safety officials, local government representatives, and public information officers. We also launched a bi-weekly e-newsletter that goes to nearly 300 staff across the region to keep partners in the know.

Together we have been addressing near daily issues arising from careless and impulsive outdoor recreation, we share resources and information, align messaging, and work collectively to determine the next right step. These Coordinating Committees have also served as a model for other areas. For example, a recent collaborative put together under the leadership of Supervisor Hardy Bullock in Nevada County that was modeled after these committees.

The following are a few success stories that have come out of these coordinating committees for some of the immediate and near term actions.

During COVID, they ensured public information and messages were consistent, up-to-date, and shared across organizations and media platforms. The North Lake Tahoe Resort Association, Placer County, Lake Tahoe Visitors Authority, City of South Lake Tahoe, and the Take Care campaign nimbly morphed to help manage responsible tourism by asking visitors to “Mask Up” and socially distance. Additionally, all partner organizations within the region launched coordinated “Know Before You Go” messaging to better inform the public before they got to the region.

There was also a collaborative backcountry safety awareness week with informational videos and panel of star athletes. Attended virtually by over 450 people and has had countless views since. While many other winter destinations experienced high rescue calls with inexperienced folks venturing to the backcountry, Tahoe saw no backcountry fatalities last winter.

These are some of the tangible actions, (Slide 10). Ms. Chaplin alluded to some of the intangible things that have occurred. There is momentum building, never before have we had both the land and recreation managers, the influencers, and messengers coming together in a coordinated way. Everyone is seeing the value not only for the region but also for their own organizations and they are starting to see the silos come down.

But there is much more work to do. Again, going back to the question – how do you foster stewardship and good behavior of 15 million visitors? The answer is; we all have a part to play in this and it will take intentional, collective action to make an impact.

Partners are recognizing the unique role and responsibility each of us have in destination and visitor management. For example, for the first time since 1986 the visitors authorities stopped marketing and asked visitors to “love Tahoe from afar”. They are also seeing the role they can play in influencing behavior once a visitor is here. The quote from Marilee Movius, League to Save Lake Tahoe highlights the necessity of a cultural shift and moving away from an us vs them mentality. “What is missing....is a Tahoe ethos....there should be a culture of behavior that is engrained in visitors before they come, and how to treat Tahoe while they are here. That needs to start with our locals and our tourist industry as model behavior.” We cannot lose sight that Lake Tahoe is ours to share, but that doesn’t mean that the unfavorable impacts of tourism need to be accepted. The near term wins and “next right steps” are critical to address the immediate needs; however, without long-term management strategies we only continue to only address the symptoms and not the underlying root causes.

On Feb 25, 2021, TRPA in collaboration with USDA Forest Service, Nevada Office of Outdoor Recreation, and the Tahoe Fund hosted an executives workshop to discuss a more sustainable recreation and tourism future for Lake Tahoe. They were joined by guest speaker Greg Miller, Center for Responsible Travel, and over 65 local thought leaders. This workshop set the course for a longer

term more permanent coordinated action. We are building on our momentum and the coalition is here. Partners believe it starts with a shared vision of what we want Tahoe to be known for and what we expect of the people who recreate here. It also depends on how we organize, exploring a new economic model that values quality over quantity, and all of this this must be done with multi-dimensional insights of the private and public sector.

Taking what they learned in the workshop, they're working with partners and gathering funding to develop that shared vision and an implementation roadmap. A Request for Proposal for this process should be out within the next month.

Some of the success stories and immediate actions that continue and what the partners have been working on since the February workshop.

- Significant expansion of litter clean-ups and abatement
- Summer Recreation and Tourism Playbook
- Coordinated ambassador programs
- Regional stewardship pledge
- Parking enforcement and management
- Regional trails plan
- Formation of a data task force

They are connecting enforcement, education, reporting systems, messaging and additional infrastructure needs.

Just recently North Shore jurisdictions (including Washoe County under the leadership of Commissioner Hill), California State Parks and the Nevada Department of Transportation announced contribution of nearly half a million dollars to significantly expand the Clean Tahoe program. And there is a free litter reporting tool available to the public through app stores.

The committees also just published the Lake Tahoe Recreation and Tourism Playbook that serves as a reference guide and one-stop source of information to better mitigate the impacts of high use.

Another project spotlight, This summer there will be over 75 ambassadors posted throughout the region at our beaches and trailheads to help people understand what responsible recreation looks like. A huge kudos to the Tahoe Fund and Take Care campaign for organizing seven different groups to make this happen and providing recognizable and consistent uniforms for all 75 ambassadors. There's also a coordinated regional stewardship plan, increased law enforcement patrols and ticketing along the recreation corridors, and free or low cost transit options happening across North Lake Tahoe.

This year thanks to new funding sources of Placer and Washoe counties and the North Lake Tahoe Resort Association. The list goes on and on. So often it is the issues and pressure points that make the headlines, but the hope is that they're sharing some of the success stories and a snapshot of the amazing work partners are doing across the region and a glimpse into where we are heading.

Presentation can be found at:

[Agenda-Item-No.-VII.B-Sustainable-Recreation.pdf](#)

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Novasel said she wasn't aware of this collaboration until she reviewed the board packet. Everyone needs to be applauded for getting this collaboration together. It hits on what we've all been dealing with over the past year, the "over love" for the community and Lake. El Dorado, Washoe, and Douglas counties are very important players in this and wants to ensure they get

invited to the table too. It's critical as we're getting away from silos and collaborating but we need to ensure that all the jurisdictions are involved and aware of what's going on. El Dorado County has helped put some funding together for some of those messages going out to people coming to visit Lake Tahoe.

Mr. Yeates appreciated staff taking the leadership on this to help pull this together. It's probably the one criticism we all get as directors is when these big weekends come up. He receives emails from people about what is or what not going on here. He spent so much time on California's coast and now has spent nine years working on Lake Tahoe. There is more of a "party hardy" crowd at Lake Tahoe. It is going to be challenging to come up with ways to address public attitudes but also the shared vision that we should have for this marvelous Lake. It's also great that Senator Cortez Masto is taking a lead on recreational travel. There are opportunities here to make the changes we saw in our Regional Transportation Plan and merging that with what we're trying to do here. It's nice to see the collaboration.

Ms. Regan thanked Ms. Self and Ms. Chaplin for raising these important issues. Connecting the dots to what we've heard about in many board meetings in the area of transportation. Building off Mr. Yeates' comments about Senate Cortez Masto's Travel Act and pending legislation. We take to heart Ms. Novasel's comments, local jurisdictions are key partners and have participated in many of these working groups and coordinating committees that Ms. Self referenced earlier in the presentation. Staff will be discussing with each local jurisdiction about partnering on the Request for Proposals for a consultant to help us build that shared vision. Destinations around the world are working on new stewardship destination road maps and that is what Tahoe is embarking on and local jurisdictions will be key partners in that. The intersection at the transportation infrastructure is very strong and will incorporate a lot of these needs in some of the asks they'll be making of federal and state partners as stimulus packages are developed. It's nice for TRPA to be able to participate in this partnership as we often have that role of convening all the different parties to find solutions that work. "Our economy is our environment and our environment is our economy." There's probably no program that demonstrates that mantra more than the Sustainable Recreation and Tourism Initiative.

Ms. Aldean said in reference ambassador program. When people are recreating, some may get tired of being told what to do. These ambassadors need to be trained in a way that allows them to diffuse difficult situations. It's more than just handing out information. If they are going to be scolding people, they need to be trained in how to deal with belligerent people. This could become confrontational and wouldn't like to see any of them placed in harm's way.

Ms. Regan agreed. Covid fatigue is real from folks who have felt very constrained over the last year. Staff is working with the Tahoe Fund and many other non-profits collectively to address that. As noted in the presentation is the additional law enforcement support will be around the Lake and is something everyone takes seriously in terms of public safety. It was discussed early on that they didn't want these ambassadors to be put in a difficult position. They pondered whether they should try to get some survey opinions from folks and decided that it may escalate a tough situation and wants this to be a positive experience. These issues are happening on public lands around the United States. Every national park is facing some of these same challenges and internationally destinations are also grappling with that. Staff will provide information to the board if there's any updates.

Mr. Friedrich said on the South Shore there was a program initiated by the school district focusing on youth ambassador's with a goal of 15. It will be good summer jobs and will be focusing on diffusing conflicts. The City of South Lake Tahoe is funding \$25,000 to support this program as are other funders. It's a promising model building stewardship among youth that could be replicated

basin wide. It will need a sustainable source of funding ultimately to bring it up to scale. He's excited about this part of the overall program.

Mr. Yeates said Ms. Aldean raised a good point and appreciated what Mr. Friedrich said the City is doing. He had the experience a couple of years ago when he went out with TRPA's boat crew where you can have these kind of confrontational moments. TRPA staff is professional and have that "take care" approach when they are confronted with a situation such as someone being inside of no wake zone or driving too fast into Emerald Bay. It's more of an educational conversation and isn't just an attempt to just scold. The day he was on the boat, staff handled it so well. The kind of training that Ms. Regan is talking about is exactly this kind of stuff. The way the Tahoe Fund has put together the Take Care program is not to stifle someone's fun but certainly is to try and influence someone's behavior so it's not destructive to others. It's a balance but was very impressed on how the boating crew handled some of those situations.

Mr. Bruce concurred with Mr. Yeates' comments.

Public Comments & Questions.

Steve Teshara on behalf of the Tahoe Chamber said their business organization is also on the front lines of these issues and appreciated the collaboration that's being developed which will be further developed over the coming months and years. This is a difficult issue and have helped with messaging through their businesses which have been at the front end of some of the confrontations mentioned. They pushed out the Take Care messaging and the other stewardship messaging. They are involved in a number of different ways for example, they are proud to have a seat on the Clean Tahoe Board of Directors and have supported that board's expansion to the North Shore. They participated in the February 25, 2021 workshop where Dr. Greg Miller, Center for Responsible Travel spoke. They plan to bring Dr. Miller back to speak at the Tahoe Chamber virtual Town Hall on June 18, 11:00-12:00. We're at the beginning of this and there's a long way to go. It's important to bring others to the table and supported the leadership of the Agency, the Forest Service, and others that have been involved.

Amy Berry, Tahoe Fund said they're excited about this initiative. They thanked TRPA for stepping in and what a great job that's being done by Ms. Regan, Ms. Self, and Mr. Middlebrook. One thing they've been talking about is the need to set a new table. She listened to a webinar that talked about "outreach" not being a good term. "Outreach" means I'm going to outreach to you to ask you to come sit at my table and in doing so, I'm going to ask you to assimilate to my views and my way of thinking. This initiative has no table to pull people into, we're creating a new table together and everyone has an equal voice. It's great to see the chambers and the visitors' authorities, the Forest Service, and TRPA all coming together to create something new because what we need is this new paradigm to see a shift in how we get people to behave. The workshop was day one of something that will be transformational for the region for many years to come.

Heidi Doyle, Sierra State Parks Foundation who support eight California State Parks in Lake Tahoe and Donner area for education, interpretation, preservation, advocacy, and the goal of creating positive visitor experience. As the tour operator for the historic house museums in Emerald Bay State Park, Vikingsholm and Sugar Pine Point State Park, Hellman-Ehrman Estate, and visitor centers they are focused the sustainable tourism and are excited about the various partnerships that they've worked with such as Take Care and others with this issue. They recognize the impact of this incredible visitation on the region and the importance of communication pre-visit which is just as important as that during and post visit messaging.

VIII. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. Conformity Review for Washoe County's Tahoe Area Plan and corresponding modifications to Chapters 34, 36, and 38 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances

Mr. Conger, TRPA and Mr. Young, Washoe County provided the presentation.

Mr. Conger said area plans as a planning document were first introduced as part of the 2012 Regional Plan Update. They were envisioned as a way to harmonize the Regional Plan with each jurisdictions' Master or General Plan. Since 2012 TRPA has adopted five conforming area plans. The Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan would be the sixth.

Area plans are an important component of Regional Plan implementation. They bring Regional Plan concepts and strategies down to a local level, and they allow adaptation of regulations to fit the local context. Additionally, adoption of a conforming area plan unlocks several benefits including development incentives for designated Town Centers and the ability for the local jurisdiction to assume additional permitting authority.

Washoe County has completed their adoption of the area plan and they have now submitted the Tahoe Area Plan to TRPA for conformance review. Both the Regional Plan Implementation Committee and the Advisory Planning Commission have reviewed the plan for conformance and have unanimously recommended its adoption to the Governing Board.

The Washoe County Tahoe area plan is proposed to cover all of Washoe County's territory within the Tahoe Basin. This includes the communities of Incline Village and Crystal Bay, Nevada. The plan uses the same approach as Placer County's Tahoe Basin Area Plan in that it covers several Town Centers, as well as residential and conservation areas.

In terms of development standards and policy changes, the area plan largely consolidates and updates policies from the plan area statements and community plans that it is replacing. The substantial changes being made are targeted on a few topical areas. This effort results in an area plan that aligns with the 2012 Regional Plan and focuses on new implementing actions that seek to put the updated policies into effect.

A major focus of the effort was updating and modernizing goals and policies. The area plan will also serve as a single planning document that replaces 23 plan area statements and four community plans. The boundaries and requirements for the various plan area statements and community plans are, however, being carried through as new Washoe County regulatory zones.

Perhaps the most significant effect of the area plan is that it will unlock incentives for redevelopment of Town Centers. There are three Regional Plan-designated Town Centers in Washoe County which would benefit from additional height, density, and coverage. They anticipate that these incentives will help catalyze replacement of legacy development with well-designed buildings and pedestrian-friendly site planning that also incorporates water quality improvements.

Based on feedback staff received from the Regional Plan Implementation Committee, the plan has been developed to align with other applicable local and regional plans, such as the long range transit plan and the State Route 28 corridor plan. Finally, the Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan would eliminate a longstanding conflict between TRPA's local planning documents and Washoe County's zoning. If adopted, both the county and TRPA will be operating off of the same planning document, rather than having two separate and often conflicting sets of land use requirements.

Washoe County staff worked closely with TRPA staff in the drafting of the area plan. In October 2019, the Public Review Draft was presented to the Regional Plan Implementation Committee. Feedback was then incorporated into the Public Hearing Draft which went through the county's hearing process. The Board of County Commissioners completed their review and adopted the plan along with corresponding zoning and development code changes on January 26, 2021.

TRPA staff has had the opportunity to review the area plan for conformance with the standards in Chapter 13 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Staff has concluded that the plan, as adopted, by the county conforms to the Regional Plan and Code of Ordinance standards. A checklist documenting the review is attached to the staff report.

TRPA staff also reviewed the plan to ensure that threshold indicators and compliance measures would not be negatively affected by the plan's adoption. In addition, the county worked with an environmental consultant to prepare an Initial Environmental Checklist. That checklist, which relies on analysis in the Regional Plan's Environmental Impact Statement, concludes that adoption of the plan will result in no significant effect on the environment.

Finally, the Regional Plan Implementation Committee and the Advisory Planning Commission both reviewed the plan at their April and May meetings respectively. At that time, both RPIC and APC unanimously recommended its approval. Based on this, TRPA staff recommends that the Governing Board adopt the findings, adopt the Area Plan itself, and adopt related code of ordinance amendments to Chapters 34, 36, and 38 to incorporate references to the area plan's design standards. Staff distributed an errata sheet with a revised Attachment K to correct a duplication of one of the ordinances.

Mr. Young said it's been a long road to get here but a productive road. They couldn't have been here today without having worked hard on establishing a solid foundation with TRPA.

The first presentation to TRPA was at the Regional Plan Implementation Committee in October 2019. Washoe County approved the Tahoe Area Plan in January 2021. The first reading of this ordinance was the last meeting that the Washoe County Commissioners held before they stopped holding meetings due to the pandemic. They decided since they had sent out nearly 8,000 notices twice to the community about this plan, they didn't want to move forward without the ability for the community to attend in person meetings. In January 2021, they moved forward with that second reading and adoption. Some of the issues that the community was interested in had transformed during that time.

In 2020, one of the things the community was most interested in was short term rentals. The county was in the process of developing its ordinance but it hadn't been adopted. The community was very interested in how this area plan could or should interact. The county was assuring everyone that their short term rental ordinance would address the issues. They've adopted that ordinance and feels that it may establish best practices for some people. They're in the process of implementing it now with taking in permits for short term rentals. In that interim time some of the items the community was interested in changed and became more interested in the concept of mobility hubs. Because at that first Regional Plan Implementation Committee meeting it was requested that Washoe County show on maps some conceptual locations for mobility hubs.

The Tahoe Transportation District stepped forward and put on four webinars to discuss mobility hubs and what they are, what the intent is, and what the local community, region wide, and basin wide benefit is. They feel that the community is much less concerned about what they are and now more curious about what they are.

The county hasn't waited to begin some of the implementation measures that are in the proposed plan. They've launched into the housing needs study and will be doing surveys with the community soon. They're also doing some of the implementation measures and are beginning some of the prioritization of the other implementation measures that are seen in this plan.

Highlights of the accomplishments are the one significant overarching goal that they've achieved, the five notable focused goals/accomplishments, and the four changes related to permissible uses in response to community input.

The one overarching goal is the creation of one unified approach to planning and development, based on the TRPA Regional Plan, for all of Washoe County's jurisdiction in the basin. For many years, they had a dual planning approach where Washoe County maintained its zoning classifications and approach but TRPA's plans and the Plan Area Statements are what they needed to go to. The biggest goal was to get on the same page with the TRPA Regional Plan, the Regional Transportation Plan, and all the plans that the county is interacting with.

At the second Regional Plan Implementation Committee held in April 2021, there was a question about the county's willingness to continue taking community input. Washoe County from the beginning of undertaking this effort saw the completion of this plan as a beginning point and not as an end point but rather a significant achievement. The conformance review of this plan and the final adoption finally gets them to a starting point. They developed a significant number of new relationships with TRPA and the community and intend to continue building those relationships.

Notable accomplishments: The Town Center Environmental Redevelopment that the Regional Plan is fundamentally all about is what they wanted their plan to also be about. They've adopted all of the incentives that are available in the Regional Plan; additional coverage, height, and density. In addition, they've included other items to help incentivize the town center environmental redevelopment.

They came up with something that was very useful for the greenhouse gas reduction that they are going to begin using it in their master plan update in the Truckee Meadows. The approach uses a mix on incentives and regulations but is also flexible and allows someone to choose from different strategies in order to achieve the standards that are implemented.

The county has always had the urban bear standard. He complimented the Forestry presentation and makes him more interested in what Washoe County may be able to do in terms of the urban forestry standards. He doesn't know what opportunities there are for them in this regard but clearly from the forestry presentation today, the people, the skills, and talents are here in this region that they need to build a network of people to help them understand this and help them build some urban forestry standards. Their plan doesn't establish standards but it does commit them to building them going forward.

They've also had natural hazards standards and what they've done in the plan was to consolidate them. They cover six different natural hazards from wildfires to tsunami, seiche, and seismic standard. They've developed a map that shows which standards a parcel may be subject to in regard to the natural hazards. Everyone is subject to a wildland urban interface but not necessarily a tsunami standard for example.

The county has done a lot with the area wide BMP compliance. They've done quite a few area wide projects but have done about all they can accomplish with the area wide and need to change their focus to private parcel individual property compliance. This plan commits them to working with

TRPA to come up with a strategy for private parcel BMP compliance including incentives and regulations.

They didn't make a lot of changes to land uses and didn't approach this plan with the idea that they were going to make a lot of changes. Their significant achievement was to get to that fundamental place of conformance and consistency with other plans. They're willing to entertain further changes to land use in the future but the following were the ones that came up that they felt were important.

1. Ponderosa Ranch: Changes reflect the changing nature but continued importance of the area in the community and transformed it to represent the southern gateway to the community. Uses that are less impactful than the previous amusement park but are more supportive of the access to the lake and the area's extensive trail system that the area provides.
2. Fairway neighborhood: This is where the Chateau and golf course is that is used for snowshoeing in the winter. It was required to have a special use permit but the environmental review said it was permissible without mitigation.
3. Nursing, personal, and residential care: Memory care facilities in particular don't fit any other special model on how to fit them into a land use plan. They received comment that treating them as a traditional residential use, even multi-family use doesn't get them where they need to be density wise. Those uses may be similar to tourist accommodation units than residential or multi-family units. Through the environmental review they received the clearance to increase density for these uses.

Increased design standards for transmission and receiving facilities. It's not the cell towers itself but rather the support facilities around them. They felt there was room for significant improvement to these facilities for what is sometimes required for buffering. They developed more community sensitive standards for the facilities that support cell towers.

Presentation can be found at:

[Agenda-Item-No.-VIII.A-Washoe-County-Tahoe-Area-Plan.pdf](#)

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Lawrence thanked TRPA and Washoe County for all the work that's been done on this area plan. He agreed with Mr. Young regarding the urban forestry in that we can all learn and do more. The North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District has been one of the biggest leaders in the Basin with this and has been working with them since 1993 and have done a tremendous amount of work. He has two questions for the public comment letters received regarding the Cal Neva property and the League to Save Lake Tahoe's comment on stormwater. On page 293 of the board packet regarding building height in town centers and the question on how it would relate to the Cal Neva site? The response was that any structures constructed along the eastern and southern boundaries would need to comply with the transitional heights but not others which seems a little subjective. Is that a specific parcel? He doesn't want to get into a situation especially with the Nevada Tahoe Regional Planning Agency where they are having to work through the intent of this.

Mr. Conger said there is a transitional height standard that the county is going to be requiring of development that happens adjacent to a town center boundary. The eastern and southern portions of the Cal Neva property are adjacent to a town center boundary. The standard is specific and talks about exactly how far back it would need to go before stepping up. It would create a stepped approach to development.

Mr. Young said he's not sure of how that specific language was developed.

Mr. Lawrence said he's okay without knowing the exact number but doesn't want to have the Agency or the Nevada Tahoe Regional Planning Agency in a situation of trying to make subjective call on whether a building is along any of the borders. If it's defined by specifically how many feet from a town center then there's a certainty and would be more comfortable.

Mr. Conger said it requires a two-story limitation at the setback and for 20 feet. Additional height can be added by stepping back the third floor 10 feet from the building façade and a fourth floor can be added by stepping a further 5 feet back from the third floor.

Mr. Lawrence the League to Save Lake Tahoe made a comment that the stormwater management was a little unclear. The response is that the county has chosen not to pursue an integrated stormwater management program for the town centers instead each parcel will be responsible. That's fine but does this preclude doing an integrated stormwater management plan? Through the years that he's given Washoe County grants for stormwater for the road systems, they've always had a challenge to find space in order to treat the roads. In the town centers where's there a lot of coverage and then the roads, to get a stormwater treatment to account for both roads and private properties that an integrated approach would be needed. It's okay with answer as long as it doesn't preclude doing an integrated stormwater approach down the road.

Mr. Young said it doesn't preclude that. If that ends up being the solution for them to continue making progress than that's what they'll have to do. They've looked at how they continue to make progress. Mr. Lawrence raises a good point about where you're going to put the road runoff. They don't know what a private property strategy would like yet and how far down the road that would get them. They would like the opportunity to put that together and if it turns out that putting that together and working with TRPA and Washoe County staff that it will not get them far enough down the road then they're happy to look at other solutions. The private property approach might require an overlaid integrated approach along with it.

Ms. Hill said she spoke with Dwayne Smith, Washoe County Public Works Director about this issue and is something they're looking at developing for the county's portion of the Tahoe Basin.

Mr. Yeates is grateful for Mr. Conger and Mr. Young's comments especially in response to some of the recent comments received since the Regional Plan Implementation Committee unanimously recommended approval of this area plan.

For the new board members he wants to take a minute to go over the short term rental issue. When he was board chair, he gave this item to the Local Government & Housing Committee to address the issue. The committee held several public meetings and put together a task force of people to come up with how they would deal with the question of the short term rentals. What was clear after those discussions, for TRPA to come up with a one size fits all ordinance on addressing short term rentals seemed unreasonable and unlikely.

Mr. Lawrence came up with the idea that we put out goal posts and incentives for local governments to address the issue since they're the ones with the enforcement and is a significantly local issue. What we would try to do from a basin wide thing would run up against what the local jurisdictions were doing. The City of South Lake Tahoe was different because they had their referendum on the issue. TRPA came up with some guidance and gave the local governments the freedom to meet the way we addressed the question of short term rentals but in a way that was accountable so if it weren't done the penalty would affect their residential allocations.

At last month's Governing Board meeting approving the distribution of residential allocations Washoe County didn't get residential allocations because they didn't meet those requirements. It's not like we're not doing anything about short term rental and is unfair to say that local governments aren't either. Washoe County has adopted a short term rental ordinance and are in the process of implementing it. Staff has addressed this issue and although everyone was not in agreement, they came up with what they thought was a reasonable way for TRPA to encourage local governments to address this issue and recognize that there was no one size fits all. There are limitations on TRPA to enforce a lot of the things being requested of the Agency.

Ms. Hill thanked Mr. Conger and Mr. Young for their hard work on this. Washoe County is committing \$100,000 to look at the priorities for the next fiscal year; local transit plan, parking plan, urban forestry plan, multi-modal access to recreation opportunities, and private property BMP compliance strategies. As well as looking at beautification for the town centers. They'll be implementing those and continuing the community outreach.

Public Comments & Questions

Carole Black said she and others have previously submitted related written comments. This has been a huge effort and expects that this will be adopted today but looks forward to upcoming anticipated amendments. The presentation may have understated some significant community concerns. Zoning changes have been minimized and understated in terms of their potential impacts. She's concerned about the impact on the small communities with some of the town center standards. There's an ordinance for short term rentals but still have significant concerns. Regarding transit planning, the hub is not exactly as well accepted as may have been presented. It is good to hear that this is a beginning and not the end.

She also thanked Ms. Hill for Washoe's funding commitment to look at priorities for next fiscal year.

Major changes do result from the de facto adoption of TRPA's zoning. Where even the prior Washoe County classification was restrictive and could have been viewed as compatible.

The town center and height and some of those requirements are still of concern to folks and have not been addressed. She's not sure that we've really considered the impact on area occupancy of transient tourist and their vehicles. The data to support this is old (2015) and knows there's been efforts to improve measurement and reporting. The area plan priorities don't always address root causes or issues such as zoning changes, encouraging central development, and tourism which may create more congestion. One area or particular concern is the qualitative initial environmental checklist appears inadequate for full assessment failing to capture current and future adverse impacts regarding safety, evacuation, the environment, loss of housing supply, and neighborhood compatibility. For example, there's a recreation statement that indicates that any increase in recreation demand is expected to be easily met as well as a checked box saying that the proposal includes no increase in recreation demand. When in fact design changes encourage increased tourism creating major adverse impacts on traffic, trash, housing communities, and recreation venues. It also says possible interference with evacuation plan is not applicable, it's negated based on the assertion that more folks will ride buses but failing to consider added tourist vehicles clogging evacuation routes in lieu or after exiting other transport.

Ms. Hill made a motion to approve the required findings, including a finding of no significant effect, for the adoption of the Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan and amendments to Chapter 34, 36, and 38 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, as provided in Attachment D.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich,

Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates

Motion carried.

Ms. Hill move to adopt Ordinance 2021-___, amending Ordinance 2019-03, as previously amended, to amend TRPA's Regional Plan to incorporate the Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan, as provided in the revised Attachment K.

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

Motion carried.

Ms. Hill moved to adopt Ordinance 2021-___, amending Ordinance 87-9, as previously amended, to amend TRPA's Code of Ordinances to incorporate references to the Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan into Chapters 34, 36, and 38, as provided in Attachment L.

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

Motion carried.

IX. APPEAL

- A. Appeal of Denial of Application for Non-Littoral Existing Mooring Buoy, 4100 Doe Avenue, Placer County, California, Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 085-161-014, TRPA File Number BUOY2021-0016

Mr. Bruce asked board members for any disclosures.

Mr. Marshall said this morning at the Legal committee there was a robust discussion regarding TRPA's requirements for the permitting of a buoy to a non-littoral parcel owner. (Slide 3) the inland parcel highlighted in teal is the parcel in question that Mr. Bryan owns and purple teardrop is the location of the buoy. Mr. Bryan is claiming that he has a right to this buoy and that it's been authorized by the Army Corp of Engineers and therefore meets TRPA requirements.

TRPA requirements focuses on Code of Ordinances Section 84.3.3.D.3 and goes to how we're considering existing buoys for permitting. A major part of the Shoreline Program was the "grandfathering" for the recognition for the permitting of existing buoys. There are two major types; one is for littoral owners and the second is for non-littoral parcel owners. Under Subparagraph A the requirements for the littoral owner are alternative. One could either show that it's been in place since 1972 or there's a permit for it with a valid permit or a lease, etc. But for Subparagraph B it's an "and." A person would have to show that it's been in the Lake since 1972 and that the parcel owner has valid authorization.

At the Legal committee, they talked about a lot about how the language in Subsection b.(ii) is relatively opaque to exactly what satisfies valid authorization. Staff had denied this so this is an appeal from an Executive Director decision. It was denied it based on the fact that the Army Corp of Engineers letter that Mr. Bryan was relying upon did not under its own ordinances and code that it operates under, make the necessary link between Mr. Bryan as a parcel owner and this particular buoy according to staff. It's getting at the ownership of the buoy in control of the buoy. Staff's contention the letter just confirmed that it was in the Lake prior to 1968 which is b.(i) but didn't satisfy b.(ii).

The recommendation of staff was to therefore affirm the Executive Directors action. Mr. Bryan disagreed with that determination and appealed. He argues that the Army Corp of Engineers does

serve the purpose of identifying valid authorization and therefore he should be granted his permit. To some degree, the recommendation of the committee split the “baby” a bit. The committee essentially recommend that the Governing Board should grant the appeal to void the denial and remand to staff the application to validate Mr. Bryan’s claim to ownership of the buoy in question and also to direct staff to clarify the requirements for permitting existing non-littoral buoys. Paraphrasing the committee’s recommendation was to go back and check to make certain that the Army Corps of Engineers letter will serve with a background check that Mr. Bryan’s claim to the buoy ownership is legitimate.

Mr. Bruce said his understanding was that the matter would go back and be an evidentiary hearing or proceeding to determine the connection between the ownership of the buoy and the letter from the Army Corps of Engineers. He agreed with focusing on this specific issue because it was unanimous at the Legal committee that this was the issue that we landed on. If the Governing Board feels differently and wants to make a vote to do something else that’s fine but feels that this is the most efficient way to proceed.

Mr. Bryan feels that the rules are being changed a little bit but is a fair person and will agree with what was discussed at the Legal committee. He noted that he has been told that moving forward the current code will still apply to his application and there will be no ownership date applied to his application aside from the fact of assigning ownership.

Mr. Bruce asked for clarification on Mr. Bryan’s comment.

Mr. Marshall said he and Mr. Bryan have had some email communication where they’ve discussed these issues and are on the same page.

Mr. Bryan said the effective date of the code that is being reviewed today will still apply to him moving forward.

Presentation can be found at:

[Agenda-Item-No.-IX.A-Denial-of-Application-1.pptx](#)

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Yeates agreed with Mr. Marshall’s determination of the Legal committee’s recommendation.

Mr. Hicks said Mr. Marshall explained that there were two parts to the conclusion by the committee. One being to send this back to staff for this reconsideration but was there also a reference to asking staff to do some work on clarifying the ordinance itself.

Mr. Marshall said the poignant comment was this doesn’t really tell an applicant what they need to bring forward. Staff would work with the shorezone stakeholder group to try and get some language to clarify what they are seeking in 3.b.(ii) that would satisfy this notion of trying to make the connection between the buoy ownership and control by the person seeking the permit from TRPA.

Mr. Hicks said by Mr. Bryan’s comment he wants to have his matter judged by the ordinances currently written not as how it might be changed in the future.

Mr. Marshall said yes, that’s correct. It’s much easier to process his application then to change this code. The code wouldn’t be in effect for 60 days after the approved change. They’ll be acting on his application per the direction hopefully within a very short time.

Mr. Hicks said he understands the situation here with Mr. Bryan and his buoy but there's obviously a littoral owner whose buoy is offshore of a littoral parcel. Is that person involved in this discussion?

Mr. Marshall said they are not typically involved from the application. It's the Homeowners association that apparently owns the parcel or is part of the offshore of the HOA pier. Staff can check with the HOA to make certain that there isn't a conflicting claim of ownership. That's what they would ordinarily seek if there was an identified parcel owner, they would seek input from the parcel owner in other situations.

Mr. Hicks asked if this action would jeopardize the right littoral parcel owner to apply for a buoy in the ordinary course.

Mr. Marshall said in general this won't. If this is recognized this will count as a buoy offshore if there is an HOA field. This may be one where there is no HOA parcel. That's been an outstanding issue for staff on how to deal with these road end congregation of buoys. There'll be some enforcement actions eventually to clean this up.

Mr. Hicks said it's an important question because if it's not a common interest community ownership and there is a private littoral owner that would otherwise have a right to place their buoy off their parcel then that person should be involved in any type of resolution. Doesn't that present an issue that should be considered?

Mr. Marshall said yes.

Mr. Bruce because this is an HOA is talking the HOA enough or do, we need to talk to the parcel owner that is littoral for purposes of the buoy.

Mr. Marshall said staff will need to make certain that the parcel owner regardless of who they are understands what is happening and has an opportunity to provide information.

Ms. Aldean asked for clarification on how valid authorization equates to ownership or how ownership equates to valid authorization. When she thinks of valid authorization, she's thinking of a permit being issued or a letter of authorization from an agency like the Army Corps of Engineers or the State Lands Commission. There's many ways to transfer ownership, personal property, through a bill of sale, reference in a deed, or a purchase agreement. Did any of that take place?

Mr. Marshall said that's what they would be looking for Mr. Bryan to provide. As of now, he's established the ownership of the parcel which staff doesn't contest and that the buoy has been in the Lake for a long time, again staff doesn't contest. Now, there looking for evidence of his control of the buoy.

Ms. Aldean said even though that's not specifically how that subparagraph is written, is it correct that we are equating valid authorization with ownership.

Mr. Marshall said yes.

Ms. Aldean asked if it were correct to our knowledge that the association who owns the littoral property has not made an application to prove up their ownership of the buoys that are in the field lakeward of their parcel.

Mr. Miller said the Tahoe Pines Homeowners Association has applied for an existing buoy field. This is a street end and an HOA designed by a subdivision. There is not actually a littoral parcel that the

HOA appears to be in ownership of. The buoy is not in front of the street end at least in the location Mr. Bryan identified, it's in front of another private littoral parcel.

Ms. Aldean asked if that is going to present any complications for the association. The map appears to have an array of disorganized buoys that she assumes are the ones that the HOA would claim appear to be lakeward of individual parcels that are privately owned.

Mr. Miller said yes, some of them are.

Ms. Aldean said we've been confronted with similar situations in the past. She's supportive of staff's willingness to go back and work with Mr. Bryan to come up with an equitable solution. But if the association is moving forward with an applicant to permit their buoy field, perhaps the applicant can negotiate something with the association to integrate his buoy into that field and still retain the right to use.

Mr. Bryan said Tahoe Pines HOA does have littoral ownership at the pier at the end of the street but there's an easement that in 1911 was going to be park. The littoral owners don't have Lake access but do own to the waterline. The two buoys adjacent to his are permitted non-littoral; one is the O'Neill's that are referenced in the California State Lands Commission letter. The HOA technically wasn't a field but the communities been there so long and been in place long before 1968.

Mr. Lawrence said he concurred with Ms. Aldean's thought of the best case scenario is to integrate it in with the overall HOA buoy field application. Subparagraph 3.b.(ii) valid authorization is highlighted and then there was discussion that valid authorization was interpreted as ownership. But then it also says from applicable federal or state agency. Is the path moving forward to find ownership information from the applicable federal or state agency or is ownership proof from the property owner sufficient to satisfy 3.b.(ii)?

Mr. Marshall said if Mr. Bryan were to present a state land agency lease or permit then TRPA would take that as a valid authorization. The problem they're having with the Army Corps of Engineer letters is that they don't make that determination as to the control of the buoy as part of their grandfathering. Staff would be seeking from Mr. Bryan the evidence to establish that he's in control of the buoy.

Mr. Lawrence said if the property owner provided proof whether it's old receipts or pictures, it strikes him that it would still be contrary to 3.b.(ii) if that ownership tie isn't from an applicable federal or state agency.

Mr. Marshall said that's the reason why there's direction to staff to clarify the language. It would be a gloss on what valid authorization constitutes.

Mr. Bruce said the way he's looking at this is that "valid" is separate from "authorization." You can have the authorization but it has to be validly authorizing you because you are the person that has the control over the buoy.

Ms. Aldean said a valid authorization could also be a recognition by a federal or state agency that they have been given substantial proof that the buoy belongs to the applicant. Because it doesn't specifically refer to permit. It refers to authorization. Is that a valid interpretation?

Mr. Marshall said yes.

Public Comment & Questions

None.

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Yeates made a motion to grant the appeal with the additional language provided by Mr. Marshall to clarify the process.

Mr. Marshall said the appropriate motion would be that the Governing Board should grant the appeal to void the denial and remand to staff to validate Mr. Bryan's claim to ownership of the buoy in question and to direct staff to clarify the requirements for permitting existing non-littoral buoys.

Mr. Bruce asked if "validate" means confirm the "validation of."

Mr. Marshall said yes, he used that word specifically to connect it to the regulatory purpose.

Mr. Yeates confirmed the motion as read by Mr. Marshall.

Mr. Beyer said his comments were clarified by Ms. Aldean's comment. It seems to be the sticking point of the wording of undefined or very vague definition of valid authorization which is causing the confusion. What does that mean? Valid authorization should be one, two, three and you're saying be a federal or state agency but we're not making it perfectly clear what information that applicant has to go and retrieve to make that clear. Going the direction of the motion is the right direction.

Mr. Bruce said given that the motion is pending is there any additional language that you need to pursue the potential review of this by staff or is it good enough just to give you direction.

Mr. Marshall said the direction is good enough.

Mr. Friedrich said in this particular instance pending the larger review of this language by the shorezone group, the resolution of this appeal will be decided based on proof of ownership. Is this correct that we're interpreting "authorization" as "ownership"?

Mr. Marshall said yes, that's correct.

Mr. Friedrich said that's not his understanding of what that word means. But that was the direction of the committee, and to not hold up this particular appeal pending the larger clarification of this language to move forward. He asked why that was decided to move forward and not have this pending the more general resolution of that language.

Mr. Marshall said generally it's because he can't give an exact timeline of when they'll be able to bring forward that shorezone code amendment. Those tend to be controversial with lots of different perspectives so during the interim staff will take this as a direction from the board as how to apply this code provision and will be in particular for this pending appeal.

Mr. Friedrich feels that "authorization" is a document giving permission or authority. It's not a document providing ownership proof.

Mr. Yeates said the reason we're doing this is because the way that 3.b.(ii) is set up to require this applicant to provide some kind of valid authorization. He's in a catch 22 because this buoy never

required a permit or any authorization. It's been identified by the Army Corps of Engineers as being there and connected to that property. Mr. Bryan showed some items in the Legal committee that suggested he paid taxes, etc. So, let's proof that up and does that satisfy this current situation? He feels that they were all in agreement that we should fix this ordinance because it's not clear what future applicants would have to provide so we're comfortable that the buoy would meet both requirements for a non-littoral buoy owner.

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

Nays: Mr. Friedrich

Mr. Lawrence said he's very uncomfortably voting yes on this to honor the Legal committee. But he'll be taking a very hard look at what the Agency decides is valid authorization when it comes to ownership.

Motion carried.

X. REPORTS

A. Executive Director Status Report

Ms. Marchetta said Mr. Conger who is one of our long range planning staff who has been with us for a number of years will be leaving us for family reasons. She thanked him for his time at the Agency and that he has been such a pleasure to work with. He's a team player and exceptionally solid planner. When he first came here, he was very quiet and kept to himself and slowly he's come out of his shell and is one of our highly well respected colleagues on staff. On behalf of all of our staff and board we wish him well. We've enjoyed and respected working with Michael!

TRPA sponsors an environmental scholarship program every year and is supported by voluntary donations. It is one of several ways that we support the next generation of those who are interested in understanding and connecting their lives to environmental work. When young adults are applying to college often times the first and most formidable obstacle is often the financial price tag of admission to higher education. For nearly two decades, TRPA has helped to ease that financial burden by offering environmental education scholarships to local high school students. TRPA created this fund in 2004, it awards small scholarships to Lake Tahoe seniors who are pursuing an environmental career. Since its inception, 27 students have awarded a total of almost \$12,000. The scholarships are granted based on need, academic merit, and the students desire to pursue a career in an environmental field. The funding for these scholarships comes from the very generous TRPA Governing Board and Advisory Planning Commission members as well as staff contributions. Last year, we received record donations, more than double the previous two years combined. If after hearing about this years awardees your inspired to contribute, please make a check out to TRPA with a memo to the environmental scholarship by June 30, 2021.

Ms. Ortiz thanked all the board members who have donated in the past. This year's two impressive students who were each awarded \$500 scholarships.

Brandon Salas of Incline Highschool comes from a Bolivian immigrant family and will be the first generation college student in his family. He plans to study mechanical engineering at the University Nevada, Reno to develop new technologies that address climate change and resource scarcity. His dedication to community service, ROTC, and assisting his family while maintaining a stellar academic record shows his capacity to excel while also balancing multiple obligations. We know that his

persistent hard work, leadership, and maturity is going to make a positive difference in the world and delighted to support him on his educational journey.

Koson Verkler, North Tahoe Highschool plans to study forestry and fire ecology at the University of Montana. He credits his Tahoe upbringing for calcifying a deep love for the outdoors. His commitment to protecting the environment and communities by becoming a wildland fire fighter came through very clearly in his application. His excellent academic record in conjunction with extensive volunteer leadership and sports activities shows his ability to focus and achieve his goals. Koson plans to hike the Tahoe Rim Trail this summer before leaving Tahoe.

If you are interested in contributing you can write a check to TRPA with a memo for the environmental scholarship by June 30, 2021. Please mail it to the attention of either Victoria Ortiz or Marja Ambler.

B. General Counsel Status Report

Mr. Marshall said he'll be working with staff on new shorezone code amendments. In addition, there are no developments in the litigation load to report.

XI. GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER REPORTS

Mr. Lawrence said the states Capital Improvement Projects bill came out today and does include their \$8 million request for the Environmental Improvement Program bonds for Lake Tahoe over the next two years. It still needs to be voted on but is moving forward.

Ms. Williamson said Ms. Aldean asked during the fire presentation about emergency management planning. Nevada authorized public safety outage management or power shutoffs for the Lake Tahoe Basin in times of high wildfire risks. The Public Utilities Commission did approve an emergency management plan for local fire districts, local law enforcement, and telecom communications providers with what to do if the power is out in terms of emergency planning for evacuation and wildfire threats. It's actively in the amendment process in front of the PUC right now as well. As we head into fire season, if we get those proactive deenergization of the power lines there are plans in place on how to safely evacuate and communicate with the power outages.

XII. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Local Government & Housing Committee

No report.

B. Legal Committee

No report.

C. Operations & Governance Committee

Ms. Aldean said the committee will be reviewing and making a recommendation on the final 2021/2022 at their next meeting.

D. Environmental Improvement, Transportation, & Public Outreach Committee

Mr. Lawrence said the committee will be meeting today at the conclusion of the Governing Board meeting. Staff will provide the committee with an update on the transportation funding initiative.

E. Forest Health and Wildfire Committee

Mr. Hicks said there will be a committee meeting in June. At the request of Mr. Friedrich the committee will have a preliminary discussion on biomass projects. The City of South Lake Tahoe has an interest in some type of facility.

F. Regional Plan Implementation Committee

No report.

XIII. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Carole Black said her comments relate to the Boulder Bay Project in Crystal Bay with and plans for other nearby properties resulting in concerns about traffic, particularly evacuation capacity/capability.

In what she could, the Boulder Bay Project was approved by TRPA in 2011 with traffic studies and EIS projecting that VMT and traffic impact would be decreased. The developer reportedly committed to a follow-up traffic study after 5 years. After being on pause for years and is now moving forward again. It seems truly remarkable that given the scope that was proposed that TRPA approval projected a decrease in traffic with this project.

In addition, this small area along State Route 28 includes Cal Neva; closed for years but also planning redevelopment and other vacant/boarded up properties some across the state line in California and all which will presumably plan some enhanced development.

In addition to likely daily traffic jams, the possible evacuation routes from Incline Village and Crystal Bay in the event of fire. There are three: One goes through Crystal Bay State Route 28, one goes towards route US 50 in Carson and the third goes over State Route 431 towards Reno. She understands that State Route 431 would be closed to allow for arriving fire emergency vehicles.

With all of this potential or actual redevelopment clogging State Route 28 through Crystal Bay, Incline Village and Crystal Bay residents and visitors would be left with only one egress route towards Carson City. And there is no room for a parallel Crystal Bay through traffic diversion road as planned in South Lake Tahoe. Possibly boat options? But overall, she fears the situation could be dire.

She understands TRPA viewed Boulder Bay as a flagship “town center” project. But there has been no comprehensive area-wide traffic study which is urgently needed given the many in process and likely planned projects being considered in this small already congested area adjoining a major and critical thoroughfare. Full evaluation and mitigation of public safety implications is critical. She urged TRPA to convene appropriate parties to facilitate, sponsor, perform a comprehensive study of all the possible projects planned in that area and traffic and evacuation implications. May be the Boulder Bay developer could perform an additional traffic analysis. They were supposed to do something in five years and even though he hasn’t built too much it’s been more than five years. Or maybe involved counties and agencies could be tapped.

Thank you for your consideration and anticipated intervention in support of resolving important safety concerns for residents and visitors. Accurate current analysis and planning will also better protect the environment.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Rice moved to adjourn.

Chair Mr. Bruce adjourned the meeting at 2:00 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