

TRPA Governing Board Meeting June 23, 2021 Public Comment Agenda Item VI. A.

Submitted by Carole Black Incline Village resident

PROPOSE: TRPA COLLABORATIVE to Manage/Maximize Positive Outcomes and Minimize Adverse Safety & Environmental Impacts of Development/Recreational Related Traffic/Parking Initiatives Along Rte 28: Rte 267 to Rte 50 Intersections

I. THE ISSUE: TRPA's RTP provides a conceptual framework for transportation planning but not all individual project details. Today's proposal touches on a small portion of this area but only as it faces the Resort Triangle and doesn't address tactics for volumes from or passing through the "Triangle" into this area. Significant development is planned or in process along Rte 28 between the Rte 267 intersection and Crystal Bay/Incline Village. In addition, the Rte 28 Corridor Overflow traffic and parking impacts remain unresolved safety and environmental concerns. Currently proposed approaches have and will likely continue to fall short of achieving a safe environment in the target geography which will be significantly adversely impacted into the future. Major mitigation hopes are pinned on multiple distinct, minimally integrated traffic/parking proposals and a proposed East Shore bike trail extension without comprehensive data to support presumed impacts.

Massive, well-documented community concern both for daily safety and evacuation situations has to date been largely dismissed, ignored, or addressed with platitudes. The "Incline Hub" has acquired a life of its own within regulatory agencies with little understanding or apparent interest in avoiding routing large numbers of tourist vehicles toward/within Incline's congested streets. Traffic/parking implications of the East Shore Express and East Shore Tahoe Trail have already adversely impacted residents and local visitors. Multiple projects/creative interventions are proposed in the Placer plan to reduce local challenges but not impacts/needed mitigation beyond the CA border. And nowhere apparently is there a comprehensive assessment of traffic/congestion impacts of multiple development initiatives in Crystal Bay. With all of this in play, we can only hope that some sort of happenstance will intervene so that there will be a chance of escape in the event of a disaster/evacuation.

II. PROPOSED INTERVENTION:

- **SPONSORSHIP:** TRPA has positioned itself as a successful "convener" to address complex issues and develop workable interventions. Current plans and proposals re this item fall short and the need for intervention is urgent NOW – TRPA has the contacts/expertise and should step forward to facilitate.

- **OPERATIONS: Convene a Collaborative to include TRPA, TTD, Placer/Washoe Counties and other applicable jurisdiction/agency representatives** with decision-making authority/accountability. TRPA to provide leadership and TRPA/TTD to staff for facilitation and support. Accurate, comprehensive data is critical. Active Community engagement/participation – including "seats at table" by concerned residents familiar with actual day-to-day issues - is imperative.

- **OBJECTIVE: Propose an integrated approach across the target region including intercepts, connections and integration with adjacent geographies. Identify immediate, intermediate and longer-term mitigation tactics/projects to address safety and other adverse (environmental, etc.) impacts along Rte 28 from Rte 267 to Rte 50 intersections with timelines and outcome/success measures.** Engaged agencies to actively support and drive timely implementation. TRPA to ensure broad implementation in partnership with agencies/jurisdictions through a variety of available levers.

Thank you for your consideration – I believe that your help and active coordination is needed!

ATTACHMENT: SOME DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Immediate Priorities: “Starter list” of suggested NOW priority recommendations for this summer:

Sand Harbor:

- Open full Sand Harbor parking and re-assess management tactics to maximize availability/usage
- Require pre-registration/ticketing for Sand Harbor access to on site parking lots and/or by transit or bike/walking. No walk-in option.
- Defer East Shore Express pending analysis of prior year impacts on IV neighborhoods, traffic and parking

Rte 28 Corridor road-side parking:

- Limit Rte 28 shoulder parking along this recreation corridor to only those few areas with wide enough shoulder to allow a parked vehicle with space for pedestrian walking alongside a parked vehicle within the designated shoulder
- Rigorously enforce parking restrictions (ticket/tow daily, continuously on high volume days)
- Publicize that no legal parking is available in Incline Village/Crystal Bay for visitors to Rte 28 sites except for the pay lots by Tunnel Creek. Publicize penalties for illegal parking including towing and/or boots.

Transit:

- Extend TART routes to reach Sand Harbor from the north and publicize this as the preferred route for visitors coming from/through the North Lake Tahoe regions;
- Offer micro-transit shuttle (pilot) service for IV/CB residents and overnight guests to/from Sand Harbor and East Shore Tahoe Trail and to/from TART stops for trips elsewhere along the north shore; prohibit TART pickups in Incline Village/Crystal Bay for passengers headed to Sand Harbor/East Shore Tahoe Trail
- Offer shuttle service from Mt Rose ski area lot/Reno and Spooner summit/Carson/South Lake directly to Sand Harbor and East Tahoe Trail entrance near Sand Harbor
- DO NOT APPROVE TEMPORARY PERMIT for East Shore Express as currently proposed. Its prior safety, traffic, environmental impact performance has never been fully evaluated and there is much community concern

B. Intermediate/Longer-term Priorities:

Rte 28 Corridor Projects:

- In addition to currently planned modest parking expansions along the Rte 28 Corridor, reassess and expand proposed added parking capacity at every feasible site, particularly at Spooner junction area with a soon timeline
- Create online space reservation/vehicle window display pass for allowed parking spaces along Rte 28 corridor and couple this with ticketing/towing for non reserved vehicles (see recommendations in Placer County plan)
- Expand and publicize public access site options including trails/easily accessible maps, etc and requirements
- Keep Rte 28 corridor parking lots open four seasons to allow for hiking, biking, snowshoeing, etc access without dangerous road-side vehicle parking

IV/CB Parking/Transit:

- Abandon any plans for expanded parking to accommodate incoming visitor vehicles traveling to Rte 28 Corridor recreation sites in the IV central area. For traffic/parking/evacuation safety the requirement should be that these vehicles must be accommodated either in intercept lots with passenger arrival in IV area via transit service or have pre-reserved parking at a site along the Rte 28 corridor.
- Identify and implement vehicle intercept lots with transit connections in multiple areas: NLT Resort Triangle/Kings Beach area; Reno/Mt Rose; Carson/Rte 50/South Tahoe area. Implement pre-reservation requirements for intercept lots and transit from them to Rte 28 Corridor venues
- Expand IV/CB micro-transit as indicated to minimize in town vehicle trips/parking as well as vehicle trips to the high volume Rte 28 corridor sites (East Shore Tahoe Trail and Sand Harbor)
- Create Transit Hub or Hubs in IV with direct access to Rte 28 for Transit Service Transfers/Passenger boarding/departure. Limited adjacent or nearby services might be provided e.g. bike rentals/storage but no added visitor vehicle parking drawing more recreation destination vehicles to IV central congested area.
- Consider expanding paid parking with required pre-reservation at the Tunnel Creek area if feasible
- Integrate planning effectively with Kings Beach efforts

RPIC Meeting 6.23.2021 Public Comment Agenda Item 3 Housing/Development Code

Submitted by Carole Black Incline Village Resident

Some proposed TRPA Code changes/amendments are worrisome to me and other residents in my area who live in already crowded settings tightly bounded by lake on one side and mountains on the other with extreme weather at times and evolving environmental challenges and risks. We wonder:

- Surely some affordable and workforce housing is needed. Yet, if 2 ADUs are allowed on smaller than one acre parcels with minimal set-backs and no restrictions to clearly ensure targeted use = actual use, how will we be sure that designated gaps are addressed rather than the creation of more and more mini-hotels (STRs)? Current proposals do not require that these will not become STRs with more overcrowding, more adverse STR impacts, and no improvement in the affordable/workforce housing situation.

- If central areas (nominally called town centers but which may really be just small village clusters) are further built up using purchased coverage and limited set-backs so that parcels are largely covered by buildings, where will snow melt/rain run-off go? No space for soil absorption. Perhaps run-off down driveways and streets directly into the lake, carrying debris and chemicals as well?

- Re mitigation, how confident in development proposal VMT projections? I continue to wonder how one project proposal I reviewed estimated fewer VMTs despite proposing more than 100% increase in hotel rooms, 100% increase in parking spaces and assorted new condos and added retail space. If VMTs were going to decrease, how would the vehicles for the added parking spaces arrive?

- And what about evacuation? I do know that prior presentations and discussions indicated that evacuation capability/capacity has been a concern. When a thunder storm caused mass exodus from Sand Harbor one day a summer or two ago, Rte 28 in Incline became a parking lot. And this predated the recent growth in population, STRs, and development in process and planned. I have asked this question repeatedly – I am told “xxx” or “yyy” is dealing with it, yet no details or specific plans. Help!!

So, my question today is ... Where is TRPA in tying these adverse trends together into a safe cohesive comprehensive plan that adequately protects residents, visitors and the environment? These proposals include concerning gaps. Please note: this IS NOT opposition to constructive ideas for needed affordable and workforce housing – rather IT IS a plea for comprehensive overall planning as you address important housing and development issues to avoid further collateral adverse impacts of over-tourism and over-development.