TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

TRPA
PO Box 5310
128 Market Street
Stateline, NV 89449

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) & Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Agency (TMPO) Transportation Performance Technical Advisory Committee

PUBLIC MEETING NOTICE & AGENDAS

1:00 p.m. Transportation Performance Technical Advisory Committee	**Friday, April 3, 2026**	Join at 128 Market St., Stateline, NV or on Zoom

This agenda has been posted at the TRPA office and at the following locations and/or websites: Post Office, Stateline, NV, North Lake Tahoe Chamber/Resort Association, Tahoe City, CA, and Lake Tahoe South Shore Chamber of Commerce, Stateline, NV.

TRPA Mission

Established in 1969, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency was the nation's first bi-state regional environmental planning agency. Our mission is to lead the cooperative effort to preserve, restore, and enhance the unique natural and human environment of the Lake Tahoe Region, while improving local communities, and people's interactions with our irreplaceable environment.

AGENDA
TRANSPORTATION PERFORMANCE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Beginning at 1:00 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

3. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS – ON AGENDA ITEMS

Any member of the public wishing to address the Transportation Performance Technical Advisory Committee on an agenda item may do so at this time. Comments will be limited to three minutes per person for a maximum period of 45 minutes. This comment period is reserved for items on the agenda. Comments on other matters may be directed to the public interest comment period before adjournment of the meeting.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

	Item	Purpose	Page
A	May 29, 2024 Transportation Performance Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes	For Possible Action	5

6. AGENDA ITEMS

	Item	Staff	Purpose	Page
A	Committee structure: vacant general public representative	Michelle Glickert	Informational	N/a
B	Review of draft Transportation and Sustainable Communities Performance and Recommendations Report 1. Transit Metrics	Rachael Shaw	For Possible Action	13

	2. Active Transportation 3. Auto Metrics			
C	Set Date for the Next Committee Meeting	Michelle Glickert	Possible Action	N/a

7. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS

8. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS – ON ANY ITEM

9. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting Instructions

To Participate:

- Join in-person at 128 Market Street, Stateline, NV 89449.
- Visit trpa.gov for all meeting resources, including:
  - Agendas and detailed packets – available at least seven days before each meeting.
  - Virtual and call-in details – available at least one day before each meeting.
- For questions, contact TRPA staff at virtualmeetinghelp@trpa.gov or (775) 588-4547.
- TRPA will make reasonable efforts to assist and accommodate handicapped persons that wish to participate. For assistance, contact Marja Ambler, mambler@trpa.gov, (775) 589-5287.

Contributing Public Comment:

- **Written:** Submit comments by 4 p.m. the day before the meeting for distribution and posting in advance; later submissions may be posted after the meeting.
  - Email comments to publiccomment@trpa.gov. Include meeting details and agenda item in the subject line or write "General Comment" for non-agenda items.
  - You may also send by mail or fax to (775) 588-4527.
- **Verbal:** Public comments are taken at the start and end of the meeting. Comments must be brief, non-repetitive, and within the time limits set by the Chair (usually three minutes per speaker/group, for a total maximum period of 45 minutes). Time may not be given to others. The Chair may further limit comments to keep the meeting on track.
  - Comment on agenda items → comment period at the beginning of the meeting.
  - Comment on any topic → comment period at the end of the meeting.

Transportation Performance Technical Advisory Committee Members

Working group membership, listed below, may be expanded based on need.

- TRPA
- Caltrans
- Nevada Department of
- Transportation
- Tahoe Transportation District
- Carson City
- City of South Lake Tahoe
- Placer County
- South Shore Transportation Management Association
- Truckee North Tahoe Transportation Management Association
- El Dorado County
- Washoe County
- Douglas County
- League to Save Lake Tahoe
- General Public Representative
- US Forest Service

Julie W. Regan

Julie W. Regan, TRPA Executive Director

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
TRANSPORATION PERFORMANCE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency May 29, 2024
Zoom

Meeting Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

TRPA Transportation Planning Manager, Michelle Glickert called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

Members present or online: Michelle Glickert (TRPA Transportation Planning Manager), Dan Segan (TRPA Chief Science and Policy Advisor), Ken Kasman (TRPA Research & Analysis Department Director), Nick Haven (TRPA MPO Director), Ryan Murray (TRPA Associate Transportation Planner), Josh Schmidt (TRPA Transportation & Analytics Analyst), Kira Richardson (TRPA Senior Transportation Planner), Jaime Wright (Placer County), Gavin Feiger (League to Save Lake Tahoe), Emily Dougherty and Anush Nejad (City of South Lake Tahoe), Jon Erb (Douglas County), Dave Solaro (Washoe County), Carl Hasty (Tahoe Transportation District), Sara Van Siclen and Julia Tohlen (Truckee North Tahoe Transportation Management Association), Steve Teshara (South Shore Transportation Management Association), Catherine Chiu and Eric Royer (Caltrans), Donaldo Palaroan (El Dorado County), Chris Martinovich (Carson City MPO), Mark Wooster (Nevada Department of Transportation), and Carole Black (General Public Representative)

Additional representatives in attendance from California Natural Resources Agency, Non-governmental organizations, and TRPA staff, including Transportation Planning.

Michelle Glickert, TRPA Planning Manager, welcomed all attendees to the third meeting of the Transportation Performance Technical Advisory Committee.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Transportation Performance Technical Advisory Committee minutes for the April 22, 2024, meeting were approved.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS ITEMS

A. Review of high-level transportation metrics to track implementation of Vehicle Miles Traveled reduction and achievement of other Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Goals (Discussion and Possible Direction/Action)

DRAFT

Michelle Glickert introduced herself for the record and welcomed attendees to the third meeting of the committee. She stated that the committee convenes biennially to review transportation performance metrics, develop recommendations, and inform the regional transportation performance report. She explained that the current report would contribute to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) / Sustainable Communities Strategy update, which occurs every four years. She noted that the RTP update process officially began the previous month, aligning with the committee's current work. She stated that the primary focus of this portion of the meeting was to review transit-related metrics and updates in the draft report, present proposed recommendations, and gather feedback to refine language in real time. She emphasized that the goal was to ensure alignment before advancing recommendations to the Governing Board.

The committee reviewed the transit section of the draft transportation performance report, focusing on both updated metrics and proposed recommendations. Recent data shows that winter 2023–2024 transit ridership has surpassed 2017 baseline levels, indicating strong recovery; however, the system still falls short of established performance targets, particularly in achieving desired service frequency and coverage. Many areas around the basin remain underserved, with most routes operating closer to hourly service rather than the 20-minute headways needed to meaningfully influence travel behavior. Evening service also remains limited, though microtransit is helping to fill some gaps on both the North and South Shores. Transit is improving but not yet at levels needed to significantly shift travel behavior.

Discussion of recommendations emphasized the need for increased and more flexible transit operating funding, improved integration between fixed-route and microtransit services, and greater efficiency in the use of limited resources.

Members also highlighted the importance of prioritizing transit in regional funding programs and addressing workforce housing challenges, which were identified as a significant barrier to expanding service and maintaining reliable operations, particularly during winter conditions. While workforce housing was described in the report as a "secondary" consideration, staff clarified that all recommendations carry equal weight and that the designation reflects indirect influence on performance metrics rather than importance. The committee agreed that clearer language distinguishing direct and indirect impacts would improve the report.

Additional feedback underscored the need for stronger marketing and public awareness of transit services, noting that recent service improvements have not been effectively communicated to users. Members recommended incorporating outreach strategies into efficiency-related recommendations. The committee also supported refining transit performance metrics in future reports to better capture microtransit service characteristics,

DRAFT

such as wait times and service hours, and emphasized the importance of improving data collection, including stop-level ridership and travel time data.
Overall, the committee expressed general alignment with the direction of the transit recommendations, with suggested refinements to improve clarity, communication, and effectiveness as the report advances to the governing board.

Committee Member Comments:

Anush Nejad asked if there would be any quantitative performance measures for ridership, such as reliability, travel time, so that we can monitor this annually to see if we're meeting our goals.

Michelle Glickert responded that there was agreement on the need to move in that direction. She stated that staff would continue to assess available data and improve data collection to better evaluate transit performance, including reliability. She noted that reliability should reflect actual service delivery, such as cancellations and adherence to schedules, rather than scheduled times alone. She added that future discussions could explore these metrics in greater detail.

Anush Nejad asked whether a baseline existed to measure performance improvements over time.

Michelle Glickert responded that complete datasets, such as stop-level ridership and systemwide travel time data, were not yet available from all agencies. She stated that current baseline metrics focused on ridership and coverage, and that expanding to include travel time and reliability was a future goal.

Gavin Feiger suggested that it is a good goal for the next report, or in the RTP, to establish a baseline.

Jaime Wright brought up how disruptive construction season is to transit operations, and that is why ridership was chosen as the primary metrics. She said it is unfair to evaluate the system based on delays when a lot of that is out of the control of the operators and holding operators to a reliability metrics is not realistic thing in Tahoe just given the context and constraints.

Gavin Feiger clarified that instead of reliability as a metric to hold operators accountable, it could be valuable data to collect, plan around, and use to look for trends.

Nick Haven responded that improvements, such as signal preemption or dedicated bus lanes, or some way to solve this problem, could be explored.

Gavin Feiger also emphasized the need for more information sharing when buses are expected to run late.

DRAFT

There was consensus between Michelle Glickert, Gavin Feiger, and Jaime Wright that reliability of the transit network could be evaluated more as a secondary metric or used as a tool but shouldn't be a metric that transit operators are held accountable to when it's not realistic.

Carole Black asked if outlier times could be considered, in addition to average or median travel time. She emphasized the need to for more interventions to reduce construction delays, recommendations for process improvements that would minimize delays, and metrics to track impacts. She asked if we are seeing enough information about what the outliers are, how bad the outliers may be, and if we can propose or implement interventions to try and affect not only the averages but also the distribution, especially on the upside outlier side.

Michelle Glickert responded that we should be able to do that, and report on the outliers, particularly if the transit agencies have data on these days.

Jaime Wright mentioned that construction coordination between agencies in the Tahoe Basin and Caltrans and NDOT used to be more extensive pre-covid. There was more coordination for agencies like Placer County to advocate for construction to be shifted to night time to avoid day-time impacts. This coordination is starting to come back, with the TMAs have playing a huge role in getting Caltrans back around those tables, but how do we get back to more coordination, with the DOTs listening to us as a region more?

Eric Royer mentioned there are a lot of limitations as to what's achievable when it comes to creating a construction zone that's feasible, for example roadway width, the topography and terrain in the Tahoe Basin, and the lack of alternative routes. He mentioned that night work isn't possible in some places where there are noise restrictions, such as a highway through a largely residential area, such as locations on the West shore and East shore, so daytime work is the only option.

Michelle Glickert agreed on continuing coordination.

Carole Black recognized that while efforts are made, construction zones could be more aggressively optimized and looking at metrics to see if there's anything else we can do.

B. Provide guidance on program policy and project modifications necessary to attain and maintain the Transportation and Sustainable Communities Threshold Standard (Discussion and Possible Direction/Action)

Michelle Glickert introduced the active transportation section of the draft report, noting that recommendations are informed by performance metrics, outreach conducted through the Active Transportation Plan, and prior committee discussions

DRAFT

Updates to this section were described as minor but more refined, with some recommendations separated to provide clearer emphasis rather than being grouped together.

Active Transportation Recommendations include prioritizing Active Transportation in Regional Grant Funding, emphasizing investment in projects that improve safety, and reducing the Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) on bicycle and pedestrian networks. LTS is identified as a key new performance metric, with acknowledged need for continued improvement. Focus will begin in town centers, where complete streets projects can have the greatest impact. Continued emphasis on winter maintenance of infrastructure of year-round wayfinding improvements. The goal is to ensure that the infrastructure is both usable and easy to navigate for residents and visitors.

Ms. Glickert said there is a need for more accurate mode share data. Potential strategies include enhancing on-the-ground surveys and refining data collection methods for better reliability. It was noted that North Shore currently has stronger data. Strengthening the trip reduction element in the code of ordinances. The objective is to encourage shifts away from single-occupancy vehicle use and support employer-based transportation demand strategies.

Monitoring travel time on active transportation networks could expand performance analysis to include travel time along key bike and pedestrian corridors. Key considerations include shared-use paths (e.g., Class I facilities) may experience congestion during peak seasons and conflicts between users (pedestrians, cyclists, e-bikes, scooters). Design challenges include stop signs due to driveways that reduce efficiency for through travel. The purpose is to identify where improvements are needed, such as, infrastructure upgrades, separation of travel modes and enhancements to move users faster. Pedestrian improvements highlighted, including more intuitive and complete crosswalk configurations (e.g., reducing multi-stage crossings).

Committee Member Comments:

Gavin Feiger was supportive all of the recommendations. He mentioned the trip reduction ordinance has been in the code forever and has not been enforced as it's too complicated right now, so simplifying that and getting it enforced would be fantastic. In the last RTP it is one of the highest VMT reduction potential things we could do, so I'm very supportive of that. Same with the monitoring travel time, it's similar to transit where to help planning and any potential recommendations we could make, your example of having to cross the highway three times, you can drive halfway across town in the time it would take to wait for the crosswalk as a pedestrian.

Eric Royer mentioned that Caltrans has a few projects in the pipeline that can go a long way to some of these. There is an upcoming bicycle safety project on highway 50 that will add lighting for the bike path, the bike lanes, as well as pedestrian hybrid beacons for additional crossings of Highway 50 and a new traffic signal, which will also provide another location for pedestrians across our way 50. As far as crosswalks on 3 legs versus 4 legs, typically, those are going be found at locations where, due to the pattern of travel at the location, the traffic

DRAFT

signal operates as a split-phase signal, which has the local streets moving on separate phases. And in those cases, you wind up creating much more delay to put in a pedestrian phase on each of those local streets if you do that, because of the nature of the coordinated system on highway 50, or any coordinated traffic system for that matter.

Michelle Glickert asked if this committee takes a report that says we want to prioritize peds and bikes at certain intersections and we take that to our board, can we find a middle ground with Caltrans to make those improvements.

Eric Royer responded that is a policy decision that he is not prepared to make himself. He said that he previously modeled the Sierra Blvd & Highway 50 intersection, analyzing different signal phasing and crosswalk options. Every option came up with far more delay and more vehicle emissions than having three crosswalks. The delay for the pedestrians that use the intersection may be inconvenient, but simply by the numbers, there is far more vehicle traffic.

Ryan Murray responded that the idea with the Pedestrian Experience Index is not to hold Caltrans to every intersection and to make four crosswalks at every intersection, but to at least look at it. He recognized there a certain assumptions made with present vehicle and present pedestrian counts, but if the pedestrian experience is greater and they (the pedestrian) don't have to make two or three crosses to get to their destination and can cross once at a convenient location, that can encourage people to walk instead of drive which can then reduce those vehicle volumes and increase pedestrian counts.

Eric Royer added that the South Tahoe Middle School is one of the locations where a pedestrian hybrid beacon will be installed. Caltrans is adding a traffic signal and three pedestrian hybrid beacons on Highway 50 which will provide more crossing locations.

Anush Nejad emphasized the need to evaluate intersections with MUTCD and make sure it's a safe crossing. In general, he doesn't recommend crosswalks at uncontrolled locations and would like this recommendation to focus on only controlled intersections and signalized intersections.

Carole Black asked about considering the categorization of the width of multi-use trails as a secondary metric, as many of the trails around Tahoe don't seem to meet minimum width recommendations. This could be a sub metric categorizing the percentage of trails and the location of trails that meet the minimum width of recommendations, while also considering crashes.

Ryan Murray responded that the Active Transportation Plan includes specific recommendations, and TRPA is supportive of going as wide as possible for multi-use paths.

Carl Hasty asked if the recommendation of evaluating the code of ordinances for active transportation could also be applied to transit recommendations.

Michelle Glickert responded that recommendation #4 in active transportation could be duplicated in the transit recommendations.

DRAFT

Michelle Glickert introduced the auto recommendations, tying back to the regional plan policy and RTP policies and goals, and TRPA's mission of reducing reliance on the automobile. The April meeting spent a lot of time discussing average travel time and that median travel time is more meaningful to track performance on our roadways.

Ms. Glickert emphasized the importance of coordination of information on construction projects and that effective population, which considers visitor population in addition to full-time residents, is considered and continually updated. She mentioned that we have more current information from NDOT and Caltrans that could be used to update the VMT threshold baseline with the most recent data.

Ms. Glickert mentioned the recommendation on the creation of a multimodal level-of-service index. This recommendation was to look at everything holistically rather than in silos of transit, auto, and active transportation separately. She said we want to keep an eye on the research and see if that's something worthwhile and makes sense for Tahoe.

Ms. Glickert introduced the last one recommendation, to evaluate other methods for estimating regional mode share. She said that TRPA has been looking at big data and travel surveys, which are valuable but very expensive.

Gavin Feiger mentioned that California kind of decided that having a bad level of service is not necessarily bad, as congestion isn't necessarily a bad thing in some cases. So thinking about the very first one, reducing dependency on private automobile, one of the best ways to do that is actually is congestion. He mentioned that he doesn't necessarily want to make it harder to get around, but how are we going to use this information and what are we going to prioritize with it.

Eric Royer asked about the bicycle level of traffic stress criteria in the Oregon Procedures Analysis Manual. He asked if there is a goal as to what that level of stress would be attainable? Michelle Glickert responded in the report, you'll see various levels where we, I think we have 4 or 5 levels of stress. And we talk about how we want to improve and kind of get out, get away from level of stress 4 and 4.5, increasing 1, 2, and 3. Ryan Murray added that he can send Eric the appendix with the methodology.

Eric Royer mentioned specific examples in the manual and nuances and Ryan Murray offered to follow up and discuss all the details of the methodology further in a follow up meeting.

Carole Black suggested exploring additional metrics and strategies to support transportation solutions, including an auto stress metric and regional parking and transit integration approaches observed in other regions.

Michelle Glickert responded that it's in the regional transportation plan today, which discusses management and talking about just that is collecting people in functioning lots outside the basin and bringing them in making that more attractive.

DRAFT

Carl Hasty emphasized the importance of communication infrastructure and real-time traveler information, as well as evolving parking management strategies, considering behavior change.

Jaime Wright asked about the coordination of travel and information with gateway communities like Truckee.

Nick Haven proposed broadening the wording of the third recommendation to include real-time information on travel delay to meet the committee's comments.

Carole Black mentioned looking at other areas, such as a town in Austria that discourage driving through approaches and different kinds of levels of restriction restricting parking. There's a lot of those kinds of layers that I just and I know it's complicated here because of the multiple states and the multiple. You know, counties, etc. But I just have to think there are ways. To get at the kinds of things we've been talking about. And maybe try and push. Push our, improvements. A little more broadly, is all I'm trying to say. I'm not sure we're pushing the envelope quite as aggressively as maybe we should consider.

Michelle Glickert ended with an overview of the process and where we are headed in the future and thanked everyone for their time. The goal is to transmit the report by June 30 to the Governing Board and inform the Regional Transportation Plan in the future.

V. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

None

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Michelle Glickert adjourned the meeting at 11:35 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jessica Gillies,
Senior Management Assistant

The above meeting was recorded in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen the recording of the above-mentioned meeting may find it at https://www.trpa.gov/meeting-materials/. In addition, written documents submitted at the meeting are available for review. If you require assistance locating this information, please contact the TRPA at (775) 588-4547 or virtualmeetinghelp@trpa.gov

DRAFT

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

TRPA
PO Box 5310
128 Market Street
Stateline, NV 89449

STAFF REPORT

Date: March 27, 2026

To: Transportation Performance Technical Advisory Committee

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Transportation and Sustainable Communities Performance and Recommendations Report

---

Summary and Staff Recommendation:
This agenda item is for the Transportation Performance Technical Advisory Committee (Committee) to consider the development of the 2026 Transportation and Sustainable Communities Performance and Recommendations Report. The April committee meeting will focus on reviewing the performance metrics for transit, active transportation, and auto, and discussing draft committee recommendations.

Required Motion:
This item is agendized for possible action to allow the Committee an opportunity to provide input on the development of the report, however, no formal motion or action is requested.

Background:
In April of 2021, TRPA adopted Transportation and Sustainability Communities Threshold Standard 1 (TSC-1), aligning the vision of the RTP and Regional Plan to reduce reliance on the automobile, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and increase mobility through modes other than the automobile. Concurrent with the adoption of the threshold standard, an adaptive management framework was adopted as goal DP-5 in the Regional Plan. The adaptive management framework includes three key elements: 1) independent technical advice, 2) milestones and regular reporting, and 3) management responses if the milestones are not met.

The Transportation Performance Technical Advisory Committee plays a critical role in the adaptive management framework of DP-5 of the Regional Plan and is responsible for providing recommendations to the Governing Boards of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization on policy and programs. Every two years, the Committee prepares a report, as described in DP-5.2 and 5.3. The Committee is currently preparing the report described in DP-5.2, a Performance and Recommendations Report summarizing information related to TSC-1 and an assessment of status relative to the threshold attainment milestones.

The Committee will convene two meetings to advance the Performance and Recommendations Report. At the first meeting, the Committee will review and provide input on the draft report. At the second meeting, the Committee will consider and finalize recommendations for transmittal to the TRPA Governing Board.

Contact Information:
For questions regarding this agenda item, please contact Rachael Shaw, Associate Transportation Planner, 775-589-5267, rshaw@trpa.gov.

To submit a written public comment, email publiccomment@trpa.gov with the appropriate agenda item in the subject line. Written comments received by 4 p.m. the day before a scheduled public meeting will be distributed and posted to the TRPA website before the meeting begins. TRPA does not guarantee written comments received after 4 p.m. the day before a meeting will be distributed and posted in time for the meeting.

Attachments:
A. Draft Transportation and Sustainable Communities Performance and Recommendations Report

ATTACHMENT A

Draft 2026 Transportation and Sustainable Communities Performance and Recommendations Report:
https://www.trpa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2026-Draft-TRPA-Biennial-Report-2026-3.20.26.pdf