

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

Via GoToWebinar

March 24, 2021

**Meeting Minutes**

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Mr. Yeates called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

Present: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Bruce, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson Mr. Lawrence, Mr. Yeates

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Yeates deemed the agenda approved as posted.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Aldean said she provided minor clerical edits to Ms. Ambler and moved approval of the January 27, 2021 minutes as amended.

IV. Item No. 3: Discussion and possible recommendation on amending the existing nitrate deposition threshold standard (AQ14) to a per capita VMT standard to reduce reliance on the automobile, reduce GHG emissions, and promote mobility.

Item No. 4: Discussion and possible recommendation on amendments to the implementing Goals and Policies of the Regional Plan to accelerate attainment of the per capita VMT standard and implement the Regional Transportation Plan, including the Regional Plan Chapter 3 (Transportation Element) and Chapter 7 (Implementation Element) to attain the per capita VMT standard and implement the Regional Transportation Plan.

Item No. 5: Discussion and possible recommendation amendments on revisions to the transportation project impact assessment and air quality mitigation fee (Code Chapter 65.2), including related amendments to Chapters 2, 3, 22, 34, 39, 50, 65, 82, and 90 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

TRPA team members Mr. Segan, Ms. Glickert, and Ms. Sloan provided the presentation.

Ms. Marchetta said transportation can be hard to understand because it's a complex system that has a lot of moving parts and many implementors. Today's presentation will help everyone see how all the pieces fit together. They're aligning all the parts of the Compact system; the threshold goal, which is the top of the pyramid and the plans that implement the goal, the project assessment, and the funding targets. This is being done for the first time ever to better achieve an integrated land use and transportation vision that is set out in the Regional Plan. This is a vastly improved and far more coherent system because the regulatory system which is now thresholds, plans and project assessment is married to a set of funding strategies to implement everything. We're on the precipice of something big which you'll see later in a board presentation on the approximate 150 threshold standards.

## REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

March 24, 2021

It's been one of the top priorities since 2015 to update and bring current those thresholds that they adopted 40 years ago which some of them no longer provide meaningful guidance for the programs and management. All prior adopted thresholds did one of two things; either prevented something bad or they're intended to restore something lost. None of them until now have been oriented to creating something new which is a necessary desired outcome in implementing the Regional Transportation Plan.

They're recommending the first new threshold in 40 years in a new category for sustainable Tahoe. Like the clarity threshold, it sets the desired outcome that is an integrated land use and transportation system for Tahoe and is the desired outcome for the built environment. This new threshold addresses and delivers on the Compacts directive to reduce the reliance on the private automobile by making more efficient use of other transportation modes. Without this change, they've been trying for years to motivate multi millions in investments in land use and transportation projects by penalizing a few annual residential allocations if they don't reach the vehicle miles traveled goals. The new 25 year threshold goal is linked instead to adaptive change every two years with regulatory implementation milestones of the Regional Transportation Plan every eight years. It goes further to improve and align every level of the transportation system to the others to meet that threshold goal.

Mr. Segan will present on how the new threshold depends on meeting those interim progress milestones that implement the Regional Transportation Plan and how they tied the success of those milestones to finding new transportation funding. Ms. Glickert will outline that we didn't just take the Regional Transportation Plan as it stands. This next 2020 RTP has tailored improvements to better implement the transportation system and meet that new threshold. Even though Tahoe's growth is capped so that new and redevelopment accounts for a very small increment of new VMT; less than seven percent. Ms. Sloan will present on the redesigned project assessment and mitigation tools to ensure that development has no unmitigated new VMT. Every project is going to pay a fee to help fund a larger set of transportation programs and larger projects are going to have to add on the ground transportation mitigation. The package not only better implements the regional vision of the Regional Plan and Regional Transportation Plan but today's changes fully meet and over achieve on important statewide policies and standards in Nevada and California. It's important to understand that we are required to implement certain California policy in the role of the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization and as the California Regional Transportation Planning Authority.

The plan meets and exceeds statewide greenhouse gas reduction targets for the transportation sector for both the new Nevada Climate Plan and California Assembly Bill 32 that set GHG reduction targets. Those targets for the transportation sector are set by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) for each metropolitan planning organization. They almost doubled the CARB's greenhouse gas reduction target with the strategies that are now included in the Regional Transportation Plan. Secondly, they more than meet California's policies in Senate Bill 375 for implementing that greenhouse gas reduction for land use and transportation statewide. A decade ago, California required metropolitan planning organizations to integrate land use and transportation by creating walkable, bikeable, transit oriented development in town centers that would reduce VMT. TRPA is the only metropolitan planning organization in the state that uses regulatory authority to shift the legacy land use pattern and create that Compact development. Over time, that's coupled with transit, trails, and technology improvements so people drive less. All those sustainable communities implementing strategies and incentives of

## REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

March 24, 2021

SB 375 are adopted into the Regional Plan and Regional Transportation Plan and are the poster child for that sustainable communities across the state of California.

There's a third new California statute Senate Bill 743 which was passed to implement the greenhouse gas reductions of the Sustainable Communities Strategies, Senate Bill 375 at the project level. All California local jurisdictions now have to use SB 743 to analyze and mitigate projects for greenhouse gas reduction to avoid two sets of differing requirements. TRPA aligned their project analysis to it and have made targeted adjustments to best reflect Tahoe's projects. TRPA's approach has been similar to SB 743 for decades, now they've aligned both of them. When they implement today's package, they are not only going to meet what the Compact requires better but they are also going to meet and exceed the state policies; AB 32, Nevada's Climate Plan, the Sustainable Communities, and land use standards for Compact transit oriented bikeable and walkable development of SB 375, and that's the project assessment methods for greenhouse gas reduction under SB 743.

No one seems to be questioning the transportation vision for the future but they are still working on a few details of how advocates think they should get there. Some advocates favor different strategies for systems change. Some favor a harder handed regulation as being the best motivator of coordinated action and systems change. Others favor incentives and encouragement with accountability being the best motivator. When it comes to funding the Regional Transportation Plan to achieve the threshold, the Environmental Improvement Program for over 25 years has proven to be the very best model. EIP funding can't be regulated into existence, it is only voluntary partnerships and coordinated agreements that work to leverage new funding when it's needed. That's what the ongoing transportation funding initiative with the two states, local governments, the private sector, and other advocates will achieve. They are confident that they can get to that new funding consensus and have made that success a performance standard. It is a regulatory trigger but they've left all the flexibility available for how they build that partnership that's needed to get to that commitment of new funding. That's voluntary partnership with accountability much like the existing Environmental Improvement Program. What they know from 50 years at TRPA is this mix of regulation, incentive, and funding partnerships and they've combined all three into today's recommended approach. There's been endless debates with different advocates about what the right mix of strategies is to deliver this new transportation system structure and its implementation. Over the past three or four years there's been hundreds of meetings and thousands of hours of explanation, input, and adjustments and feel they've set the right mix and used the right tools in the right part of the system to achieve the different desired end.

Until today, there was a 40 year old vehicle miles traveled standard that's never been related or tied to in any way to the implementation of Tahoe's transportation vision in the Regional Transportation Plan. Today's recommendations are a total remake, that 40 years later, they can align the desired outcomes with the plans, projects, and the funding that's needed to deliver a first rate Tahoe transportation system that serves the needs looking ahead.

Staff is requesting an affirmative recommendation to proceed with package as presented and any direction to refine details by April for a final decision.

Mr. Segan said the threshold standards are central to everything that TRPA does which is the Compacts directive for the Agency to establish threshold standards, establish the goals, to

## REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

March 24, 2021

maintain a Regional Plan that achieves those goals, implement that through permitting and compliance, implement it proactively through the Environmental Improvement Program, and implementing through partnership and collaboration through areas outside of TRPA's control.

Given the importance of these threshold standards and that they drive both the contents of the Regional Plan and the investments of the Environmental Improvement Program partners, some may think they would spend a lot more time talking about what the threshold standards are and ensuring that they are aligned with what TRPA is trying to do.

There's a threshold standard that protects Canada Goose habitat. There are none related to wildfire, there are 22 standards related to vegetation and forest health management but none of them relate to wildfire. There are standards that relate to the protection of habitat for deer but none that establish goals for the transportation program.

They've let their plans get ahead of the goals and have got complacent in their duty within the Compact. And instead of updating the goals themselves and in the absence of that they've allowed others to redefine the goals for them. The vehicle miles traveled threshold is a standard for nitrate deposition, established to promote clarity of the Lake and reduce algal growth over 40 years ago. Through that time period, it's been redefined by others to mean various other things that it was never intended to be. The update that's being proposed is probably something that should have been done over 20 years ago. When the 2001 Threshold Evaluation first identified that the relationship between NOx emissions and VMT was changing in such a way that rendered the original intent of the standard moot. If they didn't do it 20 years ago, it should have been done after the 2012 Regional Plan Update to better align what was being done there. They've been planning for more sustainable communities and trying to promote them both within the Regional Plan and the Regional Transportation Plan for over 20 years. Instead of updating the goals to measure progress against an appropriate measure, they've tried to measure progress towards those goals through other measures. They've tried to repurpose existing measures and say that those were the measures of progress.

There's been a lot of ground work done not only on this threshold standard but on the entire system of threshold standards. A lot of conversations have taken place over the past four years with partners at the Tahoe Science Advisory Council starting with what seemed mundane such as what types of standards should be a threshold standard, what types of measures are more appropriate for other parts of the system, and how should a threshold standard be written. All of that work laid the foundation for the Governing Board to adopt a new definition of threshold standards and new requirements for threshold standards just over one year ago but also the foundation for asking for support for adoption for the first new threshold standard under that framework.

Starting in 2017 is when they identified VMT to be one of the first threshold standards to move through this process they convened a group to review the purpose of transportation measures. They worked through refining not only what a threshold standard was but then adopting that into the Regional Plan and threshold standards. Then refining the goal for the process they convened a technical advisory group to help work through the target setting process for this threshold standard.

The Compact directed to start with identifying the goals for which you want to drive the

partnership to work towards and establish a threshold standard to drive action towards that goal. The existing threshold standard was motivated by concerns over NOx emissions, loss of clarity, and the overall health of the Lake. This process was started by defining what are those things that we care about today. There were three goals to drive the standard setting process that the committee endorsed about six months ago. Those were the goals of increasing mobility within the region, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and reducing dependence on the automobile fulfilling that Compact directive from over 40 years ago.

Those three items in general are something that are frequently referred to as sustainable communities or a core pillar of creating more sustainable communities. There are communities and states all over the country that are seeking to create a more sustainable community for the residents and environment. Every one of them has landed on that there needs to be better coordination on land use and transportation systems. That is a result of a reflection on the past. For years, they've allowed land use decisions to drive the investments and the transportation systems. There's been new outlet malls built on the outskirts of town and then a new four lane highway to get people there. New subdivisions have been built in the suburbs and then expanded the roadway network to get there. As this process repeated itself all over the country, people started to look at the results and reevaluate the entire wisdom of what was happening of letting the land use decisions drive the transportation investments. They realized that repeating this process again and again was not happier people but more people spending more time in their cars driving to work and the next thing that was built for them. This was a broken cycle of building somewhere, expand transportation infrastructure to get a person there. The Tahoe region is fortunate enough that they opted out of that cycle a fair time ago by deciding to stop building subdivisions in the region and to stop expanding the roadways. Opting out of the endless cycle is only one part of the equation.

Once you opted out of the cycle, you need to start to fix the problems that you've created through that cycle in the past. The solution that everyone has landed on is better integrating the land use and transportation planning and doing both at the same time and not let land use drive transportation. It means that they start to provide more options for people and encourage people to use those other options. The Regional Transportation Plan is how more options are provided for people and how you nudge them to use those additional options through programs such as paid parking and greater access to information. Once you've provided people with additional options, you need to put more people in positions where they can take advantage of the options that have been provided and start to travel in ways other than the automobile. Ms. Sloan will provide more detail about the refinements to the Regional Plan that will help achieve these goals. The Regional Plan was updated in 2012 and was an era where people were thinking about how we better coordinate land use and transportation policy. The Regional Plan has its roots in the same thinking that informed a whole suite of cities and states around the country that were getting serious about this idea. California Senate Bill 375 required metropolitan planning organizations to integrate land use and transportation planning so they could reduce emissions, build more environmentally friendly communities, more sustainable development, and allow people to spend less time in the automobile. The Regional Plan encouraged more density in the town centers, including density and coverage requirements, transfer incentives, all of which had an eye towards focusing people in the areas where better transportation options could be provided.

Because they're not the first to looking at creating a more sustainable community, they're also

not the first to think about how best to measure the success. The measure being proposed today, the threshold standard is benchmarked in VMT per capita which is favored by many because it's a simple measure. VMT per capita is the average number of miles that each person in the population travels over the course of the day. This is the same measure being used by Senate Bill 375 and is one of the core pillars of Senate Bill 743 that implements that. A reason why it's favored is because it so well captures the interaction between land use and transportation planning and the success of that.

One of the reasons that it captures that is that it responds exactly as one might expect to the old model of land use planning driving transportation planning. It also responds how they expect to the new model where there's better coordination between transportation and land use planning. Also where they are putting new people within the population in places that they are closer to the destinations that they want to be so they can drive less and take other modes such as transit, walking, or biking. Rather than VMT going up it's now gone down and have succeeded in getting people out of their automobiles.

Once the appropriate measure was identified for success, they convened a technical advisory group and held a series of meetings on how to establish a target. They discussed what's the best baseline for VMT information for the region and what's the best source of information for counting the population? In Tahoe there is a resident population of just over 50,000 which accounts for about half of the VMT. What does it tell them if they are only including those? They made a decision to consider all travelers within the region so that the VMT threshold per capita measure would account for everyone. They went through that process to establish both the baseline for VMT and then looked at the Regional Plan and the Regional Transportation Plan, the broad and ambitious visions for the transportation future. The tomorrow of a more walkable, bikeable Tahoe. What would happen if they implemented and were successful with all of this? They identified in the proposal that if they were able to do that by 2045, they would reduce VMT per capita within the region by 6.8 percent. It's an ambitious target not just because of the scale of the Regional Transportation Plan and what is trying to be accomplished there, not just because they're trying to increase transit ridership fivefold but because of its relationship to the existing targets. TRPA is a designated metropolitan planning organization on the California side and have obligations under the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to reduce greenhouse gas emissions per capita. The current adopted standard under CARB is to reduce them five percent by 2035. The proposal today reduces them ten percent by 2035 and continues the expected reductions out to 2045.

To achieve this they've identified three core elements of the proposed framework. The first is that they've established a series of milestones to evaluate progress. Every two years they'll review to promote adaptive management and then there's larger milestones. The first of which is in 2024 around identification of sustainable funding. In 2029 and every eight years after that they'll have check points where they establish how they are progressing on VMT reduction relative to where they would like to be in that period. If they haven't done any corrections in the interim, automatic triggers are done. They've also identified independence guidance as a core element of this implementation framework in a form of a single advisory body to help them oversee adaptive management towards that target. They'll be doing biannual summaries of progress every two years. Those findings being taken to this independent advisory body to provide recommendations on that two year cycle on how to modify the incentives of the Regional Plan and Regional Transportation Plan to accelerate attainment of this target. Finally,

## REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

March 24, 2021

there are triggered management responses which are actions that are taken if those milestones in step one is not being met. These are a fallback that they hope will not happen. The intention is that they adaptively manage themselves towards this target.

While there is broad agreement on the general framework, there are some remaining issues. There are two bigger pictures ones and are not the technical feedback that they've received on various parts of the proposal for how they calculate a specific number or what specific level they set something else as. These are broader conceptual things that relate to the philosophy of how they've gone about designing this implementation framework.

The first of those is around trust and trust is what happens immediately after they adopt this standard and whether or not they trust the Tahoe partnership to work towards it itself. The first milestone with a trigger in the proposal is one for sustainable funding in 2024. This is well ahead of when the Regional Transportation Plan expects sustainable funding to be online. That trigger stipulates that if funding is not in place that all projects within the region will be held to a no net VMT standard of significance.

They've heard multiple stakeholder comments that they would like to see that trigger revised in two ways: The first is a specific dollar amount in the trigger in order to have more teeth. The second is that rather than having the trigger in 2024 to no net VMT as a failure to find sufficient funding that they should start the program with all projects being no net VMT and that might motivate partners to work harder to find a funding source. That boils down to trust. They've put the trigger as something that would happen in 2024 because they've placed their trust in the partners engaged in the Bi-State Consultation for transportation funding for our region. That they are engaged in those discussions in a good faith effort to secure a meaningful amount of funding for transportation within the region and that we don't need to restrict those negotiations by setting a specific dollar amount. The same can be said for also no net VMT.

There will likely be comments today that they should consider adding no net VMT as a consequence if they miss an additional milestone. While they've acknowledged that they've included no net VMT within this proposal as a consequence they also acknowledge that it's a product of political compromise. Going to no net VMT could likely have negative consequences for implementation of the Regional Plan and could also slow threshold attainment by preventing projects that would focus development within town centers and reduce per capita VMT in the region.

The second issue relates to your relative preference for prescriptive versus adaptive management and how much you believe that we can see tomorrow's problems and their solutions today and design appropriate triggers for those. This issue manifested itself in two ways. There are triggered responses at eight intervals. Those triggers hinge on raising fees if they're off track and they decided to focus on raising fees rather than bake in a regulatory response. Additional fees will always help them achieve the targets but baking in regulatory responses assumes that they understand why they are off target today. The proposal allows the adaptive management process and the independent guidance to make those decisions, review the evidence and decide whether it's best to make regulatory changes to the Commute Tahoe Program, to the land use program, or to the parking management programs. Today, they cannot see those quite as clearly as they will in the future once they've seen how the implementation has played out.

Committee Comments & Questions

Mr. Lawrence referred to the adaptive versus prescriptive management slide. It's something that he's changed philosophy's on during his career doing environmental work and environmental mitigation. He's learned to understand that humans are not as smart as predicting the future as we think we are. It's important when we're talking about triggers and responses to have that evaluation period in the interim about what's going on. If it's not working then to understand why, or if it is working, then to understand why because something might be working due to outside factors. He asked for further information on the relationship on the adaptive management process and the technical committee. Will the technical committee in this format of making specific regulatory recommendations in the interim at these benchmarks based on what we see happening and what is the cause of that?

Mr. Segan said there needs to be more bones around exactly who is on the independent advisory committee. The proposed process is that every two years they would summarize everything that has happened within this space looking at both investments in the projects and programs of the Regional Transportation Plan. They'd also look at larger demographic trends, summarize all the VMT data and provide a report to that technical advisory body that would review what is working and what is not. That body would then provide recommendations both on how to modify the Regional Plan and the Regional Transportation Plan to better accelerate target attainment. It would be provided to the Governing Board who would have discretion over which of those to implement. The cycle is designed to have three bites at that apple between these triggered responses. He share's the philosophy on how little he knows about what he could actually design and what can be foreseen in the future. They would prefer to bake in what they think will work and do believe that they need this hard backstop in the advent that the adaptive management cycle doesn't get us there. But during those six years in between that they would have the opportunity to make those specific changes.

Mr. Lawrence believes if we are going to be more adaptive as opposed to more prescriptive up front, there has to be a robust evaluation period. So, as we have those interim benchmarks every couple of years, then part of the evaluation is not going to be whether we hit or miss the mark, but an evaluation of why we didn't hit the mark and then a recommendation about how to adapt appropriately. Sometimes it's the evaluation in the interim of why a target was not met that sometimes doesn't happen when you have a trigger and a hard response because there's no space to do the evaluation and adapt moving forward.

Mr. Segan said that is correct. They have internal concerns about whether or not this is creating additional workload or burden. One of the things that has come to light throughout this process is that the transportation team in particular is doing this analysis all of the time and is a necessary part of their jobs to better refine the projects and programs of the Regional Transportation Plan. A lot of this work is daylighting work that is already going on and getting additional input from an independent advisory body.

Ms. Aldean referred to page 92 of the staff packet. It indicates that VMT per capita more directly measures auto dependency than total VMT. But per capita VMT is based on annual miles of vehicle miles traveled divided by the total population of a state or urbanized area. She understands the applicability of the per capita VMT at a local level but it doesn't seem terribly practical to apply it at regional level. Maybe it's a matter of semantics but unless you are going

## REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

March 24, 2021

to have access to everybody's odometer, you're not going to have a precise ability to determine the number of miles that every person driving an automobile is travelling.

Mr. Segan said that is a fair critic. VMT overall as a metric in a lot of the literature is acknowledged that it's not a value that they know specifically because they don't have access to everyone's odometers. But there are a number of ways to estimate VMT within the region. They worked with the technical advisory committee to consider three possible estimates. The estimate that is included in the proposal relies on the state estimates for the region from the Nevada and California Departments of Transportation. They also considered using StreetLight a form of big data as well as their travel demand model. They ultimately landed on the state reported data because it was the most stable and independent of the possible data sources.

With regard to the scale of application of the measure, it is widely applied at both the regional state as well as country wide level as a measure of how well you integrated land use and transportation planning. When they look back on the relative responsiveness of the measure that they are considering the factors that they care about. Something that concerned them about overall VMT within the Tahoe region was its sensitivity to things like visitation and macro-economic conditions that are largely outside the control of the Agency. Also, they don't necessarily reflect meaningful accomplishments in terms of provisions of better transportation options or more people taking advantage of those options. Specifically, they saw VMT within the region, VMT in the absolute sense increase throughout the 1980s as gaming gained in popularity within the region. It then plateaued as casinos started to open in Northern California and started to see a rise of gaming there, they started to see VMT decline precipitously. It probably peaked out around 2002 within the region and then remained below the threshold standard through the great recession before recovering afterwards. That doesn't reflect what they're trying to accomplish with this goal. It wasn't that our community was more sustainable during that period when we were losing jobs and businesses and it wasn't that we were providing people with more transportation options. VMT per capita controls for the number of travelers and is very responsive to how those people are getting around the region and how far they have to go to get the places they want to be.

Ms. Aldean asked if it would be more appropriate to focus on VMT within the Basin on a per capita basis generated by people who live and work in the Basin. There's very little control in the absence of toll booths at all the entries into the Basin and little control over the impact of people visiting the Basin from areas adjacent to Lake Tahoe. She appreciated the comments made about adaptive versus prescriptive management but ultimately, it's the people of the Basin who are going to pay the price if we don't meet these objectives. To a large extent because of an inability to control something that is beyond our ability to control which is people entering into the Basin from outside the region. She's concerned that the only people paying the price of not reaching these benchmarks are the people in the Basin.

Mr. Segan said it is important to distinguish between the overall goal as its been proposed which includes VMT from all travelers from within the region. It can best be expressed in trying to improve both the experience of those living and working in the community as well as those visiting the community by providing them options to do something than travel around the region within their automobile. Then how we manage towards it. They're including everyone in setting this overall target and accounting for all VMT that occurs within the region and all travelers. How we manage towards that is fundamentally breaking down the different travelling

populations and assign VMT to each of those populations and then tailor programs to each of them. The different travelling populations have different needs and respond to different types of programs.

Ms. Aldean said as long as we're not being punitive in the final analysis. If the folks who live and work in the Basin are reducing their reliance on the automobile and doing their part to reduce greenhouse gas and live a sustainable life, the Basin shouldn't be penalized for those things that are beyond our control. Will that separate analysis of per capita VMT within the Basin that's being generated by people who live and work in the Basin be the basis to determine whether or not we're achieving the benchmarks? Or is it going to be integrated with VMT per capita from outside sources?

Mr. Segan said the intention in those two year reports is to try and break down the different segments. Those are integrated into the overall target. If one of those was pulling us down, the management program is triggered on the overall target not different targets for individual sub populations.

Ms. Aldean said she's concerned about that because you can only control what you can control. We're penalizing the wrong people. If the people within the Basin are complying and doing their best to achieve those goals and yet, they're ultimately the ones who have to make a sacrifice because of things beyond their control.

Mr. Marshall said that's why they've erred on the adaptive management side rather than the prescriptive management side of these responses. Some might want them to be heavier on the prescriptive side. The adaptive management is on where the issues are out in the future. Yes, there are some triggers, the increase in fees principally, but that affects whether you're in Basin and a good portion of people doing projects. They've erred on the adaptive management side to see what's causing the increase if there is one and how do they tailor that management approach to that issue. If in Basin VMT is going down in terms of every day Tahoe people, they don't necessarily have to pay attention to that versus if it's outside visitors then they'll have to determine a response. They need to do that anyway and doesn't think it's doing it on the back of locals because the vast majority of funds and requirements will come through different sources rather than extracting it from locals which they're pretty light fingered on.

Mr. Yeates suggested that staff finish the presentation because Ms. Sloan's presentation will talk about the project implementation. They're not trying to be punitive to those that have no effect on the vehicle miles traveled problem. It is the recreational traveler that comes into the Basin that makes up 40 to 50 percent of the VMT, yet we don't have any regulatory authority over them. We make the argument that we need funding support because we're investing a big part of our VMT which we have not regulatory control over. If we had a transportation system that encouraged them to get out of their cars, that will reduce the VMT and improve the economy and the recreational experience. There are a lot of benefits as we address the transportation plan. But in the project implementation phase we are saying even based on the total cap, if we approved everything out there, it wouldn't move the needle that much on VMT one way or the other. Staff has been sensitive while putting this package together that we aren't going to punish the people in the Basin but at the same time there is more that we expect from people in the Basin. Placer County is trying to come up with ways to help fund and improve the transit on the north side of the lake but south lake needs to do more. That will come to play as

## REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

March 24, 2021

they start addressing where we are going to get the funding to carry out this plan. It's a well-balanced plan and shares Ms. Aldean's point but feels staff has addressed it.

Mr. Friedrich said this is a bridge to Ms. Aldean's question about where overall travelers increase and we're needing to trigger management responses. As proposed now, it's tied to the regional funding source in 2024. Will there be an attempt to provide a qualitative ranking of the estimated effectiveness of those triggers? For example, an assessment of which of the Regional Transportation Plan elements will produce the biggest bang for the buck, the most greenhouse gas or vehicle miles travelled reduction in a way that if they are implemented as management responses, they are most likely able to mitigate the VMT increase.

Mr. Yeates suggested that Ms. Glickert provide her presentation because these kinds of things will come out in the explanation of what's in the Regional Transportation Plan and the tradeoffs, priorities, and programs in that plan.

Mr. Friedrich said they've identified the regional funding but at what point is that tied to the implementation of the measures and assessment of their effectiveness on the ground as a mitigation measures as opposed to the funding identified? The actual implementation of the said measure and the assessment of the effectiveness of that measure in the VMT discussion.

Mr. Segan said yes, they do that at the collective project level within the Regional Transportation Plan projects. Ms. Sloan will talk about how that is done at the individual project level in terms of quantifying the benefit of individual mitigation strategies at the project level.

Mr. Marshall said if it's the overall strategies in terms of the adaptive management program, they can look at when the two year report comes out as to what is effective and what they need to do. They can add something to make certain that the recommendations given are efficient in terms of the money spent and the benefit expected.

Mr. Friedrich said perhaps that could be identified upfront in some sort of shared idea about which measures are assessed to have the most greenhouse gas or vehicle miles traveled reduction potential.

Mr. Marshall said he's not sure about the terms of upfront but in terms of their recommendation they can identify which ones they think are most effective and is what they'll be tasked to do because it will depend on why the need to make the management response.

Ms. Glickert's presentation will be on the Regional Transportation Plan and policy changes needed to bring the transportation system in line with the new VMT standard and achieve the transportation goals.

The vision is strong, there's a system that is connected within and connected to the region. It's a sustainable system that means they're connecting people and places all to reduce reliance on the personal automobile and create options while protecting the environment.

This Regional Transportation Plan vision is oriented to climate action, meeting the greenhouse gas goals, reducing the mobile source emissions, and reducing dependency on the automobile and the associated VMT. This RTP and Sustainable Communities strategies goes beyond the

## REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

March 24, 2021

California Air Resource Board greenhouse gas reduction targets for Tahoe and delivers additional greenhouse gas and VMT improvements. Mostly, it creates a full trail system and robust transit system that serves everyone and connects the region to us and maximizes the use of the roadway. This is a community plan developed with the locals illustrating the power of collaboration and this plan is helping us move forward to reaching our goals in collaboration. The plan's transportation vision stresses the connectivity and a focus on reducing auto use and expands options for the residents and visitors.

The approach to planning is to understand who is moving around in Tahoe. Lake Tahoe travel reveals different user behavior and they need to provide options for everyone. Each traveler has a unique pattern and travel options need to be designed for them. Part of the framework for transportation planning is looking at all of those people because we are a recreation destination and don't have typical weekday commutes, we have congestion on the winter access to the ski resorts, the summer months getting to the trailheads and the Lake. Visitors make up the two top tiers. At the top there's the longer trips coming in from outside the region and 96 percent of them arrive by car. This plan lays out how to increase the four percent non-auto mode share with regional park and rides, regional bus connections, and laying the foundation for free and frequent transit once they are here. The middle level is the recreation trips. That's the internal travel which is a little of the residents and a lot of the visitors going to those recreation destinations. There's 34 percent getting around by bike, by foot, and by bus. The base is the residents and employees. Those trips include work, school trips and errands. Ninety percent are completed by car so there's a great opportunity for improvements with better transit, travel management programs through the employers, and regional commuter routes, as well as van pool programs. It includes connecting the trails to provide other options to get to popular destinations such as town centers. This is also where we track the day user and is a hot topic of revenue discussions and is one section that was expanded in the plan since its release.

The adaptive management system is the framework that is applied to all user types. The plan doesn't stand on its own, they'll improve travel, reduce greenhouse gas, and VMT but the plan itself relies on other programs and policies in place. The RTP includes the goals and policies which are the transportation goals and policies of the Regional Plan. It includes a funding plan, all the projects and programs that will reduce reliance on the automobile and strategies to bring in those other significant plans and programs.

For travel demand management the travel management associations on the north and south shores are included. They're focusing on improving the travel, the traveler experience, and the travel options. Those travelers include employees as well as visitors. For trails, it's pulling in from the Active Transportation Plan. The goal is to connect the trail completely around the Lake and to popular recreation sites. It is folding in the long and short term transit plans for the two transit agencies seeking to keep local transit free and frequent. For technology, they lean on the Tahoe Basin Intelligent Transportation System Plan maximizing the use of the existing roadway with technology. The communities part of the plan pulls in the robust corridor plans, area plans, and the safety strategies. For example, State Route 89 is a good example of what is almost a miniature regional transportation plan. That sets mode share goals, connects the Tahoe Trail, and utilizes transit, and transportation demand management through parking management which are critical elements to reduce VMT.

This plan is more contemporary and focused on implementation. The planning provides a

## REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

March 24, 2021

regional approach to mobile source greenhouse gas reduction and incorporates new GHG goals of California and supports Nevada's climate strategy. Climate change is at the forefront and transportation is a part of that solution. There is broad agreement that new funding is needed for transportation and through the coordination among the Bi-State Consultation, the Tahoe Transportation District, and local government has significant momentum toward realizing new funding options.

The plan includes this as a starting point for the funding initiative underway and project priorities. These priorities have been identified through the Bi-State Consultation working with the implementation partners, private sectors, and local governments. They believe these are the projects that move the ball the furthest. This includes the second phase of State Route 28 Corridor Management Plan, State Route 89 has started a trail feasibility study, and then the Main Street Management Plan. Also included in that priority is a list of additional local and regional transit services. They leverage new technology in this plan as service models and providing transportation options including travel apps and on demand microtransit. A lot of lessons have been learned over the past few years with microshuttles. The most familiar is Mountaineer in Squaw Valley. They're folding in the private sector to this plan. Along, the implementation lines there is a transit pilot project commencing this summer connecting Reno to Incline Village, Nevada that will be utilizing the reservation system. It will provide daily service between Memorial and Labor Day. The final routes and stops are still being developed. These kinds of projects will be analyzed through this adaptive management.

The Regional Transportation sets out to increase the private sector partnership and their role. This isn't just on the transit side of the house. They're currently working with the south and north shore transit management associations to work with the large and small employers around the Basin over the next year. The Commute Tahoe program will provide information and tools to educate the employers and employees on travel options. They'll work with the employers to find the low hanging fruit so they can provide incentives to their employees.

The first phase of the program has started and over the coming year will be focused on the employer participation and will conclude with informed updates to the Code of Ordinances. The second phase of travel management will focus on the visitor recreation travel known as Linking Tahoe. It will be a one stop shop for information on transit and available parking. Some of this is underway and ongoing with the first phase of State Route 28 from Incline Village to Sand Harbor.

There'll be plan enhanced details on recreation travel that is accessed through corridor planning. The plan includes new data sources to better understand behavior which is built within the analysis and forecast for the plan. Parking management that includes pricing, managing the existing use of the roadway more efficiently, reservation systems. The pricing strategies are being piloted on the State Route 28 project. There is also the newly adopted Resort Triangle Transportation Plan and they're preparing for parking management pilots to be focused on their town centers. It's not just the big projects that they'll watch but little things like the Tahoe Backcountry Alliance who are hopeful to pick up their pilot that was started before Covid. This is a similar scaled service with vans servicing trailheads on the West Shore.

Goals and policies that support the projects and programs: In the staff packet are the recommended changes to the policies alone. They haven't made any changes to the goals that is

## REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

March 24, 2021

Attachment D in the staff report. The goals and policies for the Regional Transportation Plan are the transportation policies for the Regional Plan.

Under Environment there's been two new policies added. One focused on greenhouse gas and vehicle miles traveled as well as updates to emphasize development and implementation of the project impact analysis.

Connectivity has the most robust policies that are split into modes. There is a new policy to collaborative with nearby communities that share transportation to and from the Tahoe Basin including the Town of Truckee and the Carson and Minden areas.

They've added two new policies on parking. One is to coordinate and maintain parking maximums and shared parking standards that support goals and policies of the Regional Plan. Paid parking revenues should benefit infrastructure and services for transit, pedestrians, and cyclist within the area where funds are generated. Parking pricing and management coupled with transit options is one of the strongest strategies they can employ to make people think twice about taking their car.

Safety has one new policy to emphasize improving safety data collection. It can take over one year before the data is cleared through the two states delaying the ability to address unsafe conditions.

Policies for Operations and Congestion Management: First is to make policies relevant with new shared and demand mobility services such as ride share and bike share. New policy is to coordinate policies across multiple partners by working with them to support the use of electric assisted low speed devices on paths and trails that will serve travel needs in Tahoe. It's important with the growth and e-bike use. Another new policy is to invest resources in marketing and outreach campaigns to promote the use of non-auto travel options.

Economic Vitality has one new policy revolving around access to public transit because they need to ensure that the vulnerable users without cars or unable to drive have access to services.

System Preservation: First new policy is to improve winter access which is not just keeping the roads plowed but means adding transit shelters and clearing the sidewalks to get people to use transit in the winter time. Another highlight is the inclusion of mobility hubs. One size doesn't fit all but a hub where various transit lines connect and people have shelter while they wait are needed.

### Committee Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean referred to 2.5 and some of the language that was struck includes priority travel lanes. Because of the lack of right-of-way are we abandoning the idea of creating lanes for bus travel and cars with multiple passengers?

Ms. Glickert said no. She believes that was worked in elsewhere. One of the priority projects mentioned today is on the North Shore for priority travel lanes for buses. That is a big piece of the future as well as adaptive managing lanes so we're not widening the roads but rather using those lanes in different ways. So, that's not off the table.

Ms. Aldean said she doesn't disagree in concept with the new policy regarding paid parking revenues benefitting infrastructure and services for transit, pedestrians, and cyclist within areas where funds are generated. But a lot of paid parking at least on the South Shore is privately owned. How are they going to coordinate with the casinos in the core at Stateline to suggest that those revenues beyond what's necessary for routine maintenance be used for that purpose.

Ms. Glickert said a good example of a project is the Event Center who in many ways will be doing this. The Event Center will be requiring those casinos to have paid parking. The Event Center will be providing transit so there's a connection. They don't want to overreach on private property but do want in many cases especially in the corridor management plans to have some of those revenues to stay on site to help with parking management.

Mr. Marshall said that policy is directed towards most of the public parking spaces not the private side because they don't have the ability to direct where they will use the funds.

Ms. Aldean said at least they're entering into conversations with those owners to suggest that some of that money beyond what's needed for routine maintenance might be contributed to the overall objective of increasing or improving infrastructure and services.

Ms. Glickert said Ms. Sloan will also discuss the private property side when implementing strategies onsite such as paid parking.

Ms. Sloan's presentation will be on the recommendations around the project assessment and mitigation fee updates.

This is how we intend to better implement the VMT threshold at the project level and to tie more closing these two updates to that threshold. Also, being undertaken is to streamline project assessment and align with the local jurisdictions in California also using vehicle miles traveled for project impact assessment to comply with the California Senate Bill 743. The recommendation and code changes to support these updates were put together based on a lot of analysis and work. They reflect analysis, input, and in large part the research and thinking from California and its guidance for SB 743 implementation.

Slide 30 demonstrates the importance of location to trip length (VMT) of a project. The diagram sets the foundation for identifying which projects are significant. The updates that will be done to project impact assessment and mitigation fee will better identify which projects are significant by using VMT and recognizes that location does matter. Also, in assessing the requirements on projects, that ensures support for the Regional Transportation Plan update and the implementation of the VMT threshold at the project level. As a result, the approximately seven percent of future VMT that's projected from development and redevelopment will be reduced through a process that is focused on project location and size, mitigation strategies, and fees.

There are four key updates to the proposal. One is to align the impact assessment with the projects impact by using VMT instead of trips. Second is defining expectations for all projects regardless of the status of the VMT threshold whether it's in attainment or not. Third is to

## REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

March 24, 2021

create that more straightforward, predictable, and streamlined project impact assessment process. Four, they will be updating the framework for the mitigation fee to align with impact assessment by changing calculation from trips to VMT. Work to be taken after adoption is setting the exact fee amount.

The updates will transparently determine significant impacts and mitigations, provide a streamlined review process for simpler projects, and provide detailed analysis for significance, mitigation, and determination of more complex projects. It will do this by evaluating every project using defined screening criteria, applying standards of significance based on the land use type, either through an online tool or an agreed upon analysis. Then it would be determining what kinds of mitigations are most appropriate for reducing the projects impact with VMT.

Screening Criteria: What types of projects are of a size and in a location that requires more detailed review and types of mitigations? In Tahoe there's always been a standard for this of 200 daily average trips which staff proposes retaining except translating it to VMT which is 1,300 average daily VMT. This is where it differs from the guidance coming from California which recommends using 110 average daily trips, no VMT equivalence is stated on the guidance. That is how California sets forth guidance for determining if a project has a significant effect or insignificant effect. Anything under 110 average daily trips would have an insignificant effect. Staff's recommendation is somewhat stricter than that because every project in Tahoe that generates VMT is required to mitigate. Some are required to do so with fees and others with more such as strategies and fees. In Tahoe there's no project that has an insignificant effect. The screening sets a line. Screened projects are those that are best able to mitigate their impact through paying fees. Those fees help fund implementation of projects and programs from the Regional Transportation Plan constrained project list. Non-screened projects, those that produce more than 1,300 VMT are of a size that conveniently mitigate that VMT at the project level through mitigation strategies. Those more complex projects producing more than 1,300 VMT will be asked to mitigate through strategies onsite and pay fees. Within that 1,300 VMT screen is an adjustment for projects in and near the town and regional centers. Those adjustments are proposed based on data from the 2018 summer travel survey.

The recommendation for standard of significance follows and expands on the guidance from California and those expansions are to include common land use projects in Tahoe that weren't included in that guidance which includes tourist accommodation units and recreation projects. They also adjusted the recommendation based on data needs in the region for public services. Standards of significance are the requirements for those non-screened projects that produce more than 1,300 average VMT. Those projects will be required to perform better than similar on the ground development. This standard of significance and this proposal no longer depends on whether the VMT threshold is or isn't in attainment which closes that loop hole in the current impact assessment process.

Every project that generates new VMT will be required to mitigate, some by fees and others by doing fees and strategies. Those non-screened projects producing more than 1,300 VMT will be required to do more with strategies that could include pricing parking, perhaps van pools for staff for employment type uses. The mitigation strategies and the recommendation follow that California guidance, is enhanced by current research, was reviewed by the consultant Fehr & Peers, and made recommendations for what are most appropriate for project level within Tahoe. All of those are linked to the Regional Transportation Plan and its constrained project list.

## REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

March 24, 2021

These assessments are trying to implementing that VMT threshold at the project level and advancing the RTP.

The Air Quality Mitigation Fee will be revised and renamed to the Mobility Mitigation Fee. It will change its calculation from using trips as the unit of calculation to using VMT and aligns it with impact assessment, the Regional Transportation Plan, and VMT threshold.

Before they could build out and set that exact fee and developing the implementation tools including the online tool, they needed to know what they were designing to. That is included in the recommendation today. Post adoption of that staff will finalize the mitigation fee program by developing a project list using the Regional Transportation Plan constrained project list and then setting the fee which will be done in consultation with jurisdictions, stakeholders, and development community. Staff will finalize the tool development and when completed it will also be able to assess projects for the California jurisdictions for Senate Bill 743 compliance.

A monitoring program will be developed using ongoing work and forthcoming research from partners at the University California, Davis. That research is specifically focused on providing recommendations for project impact assessment and mitigation monitoring.

This afternoon, Ms. Glickert will present on the Regional Transportation Plan at the Environmental Improvement, Transportation & Public Outreach Committee. She will also go the Tahoe Transportation Commission seeking recommendation for the RTP update on April 9. The Threshold, the RTP, and the Project Impact Assessment to the Advisory Planning Commission on April 14 seeking recommendation, and Governing Board action on April 28.

Presentation can be found at:

[RPIC-Items-3-4-5-Threshold-RTP-Fee-Update.pdf](#)

### Committee Comments & Questions

Mr. Yeates said this is a systematic change rather than just removing or moving a threshold. It's combining it with the Regional Transportation Plan that's trying to address the recreational impact on Lake Tahoe through a better transportation system that would provide alternative transportation for people to visit the Lake. The Lake Tahoe area is a big draw and we need a better system in order to be able to manage things. A no parking sign along State Route 89 along Emerald Bay is useless. There is a corridor plan for Emerald Bay but it cost money to do the work, management, parking areas, the shuttle system, etc. It's hard for us to compete with the other areas that also need transportation dollars and is why we're tying this to a funding strategy. We can't fulfill the Compacts goal to encourage people to get out of their car unless we have a better transportation system. There was a commitment made by both states to protect Lake Tahoe. That commitment in 2021 requires us to upgrade that transportation systems infrastructure to protect the Lake and maintain the recreational experience along with the revenue generated from this area for both states.

Ms. Gustafson said for example, is it correct that if a jurisdiction wants to address this on a more regional basis and implement mitigations for an entire town center through raising money from a broader group, those could be substituted in lieu of an individual project paying the mitigation fee? Can a jurisdiction submit an alternative scenario versus paying those individual mitigation

fees?

Ms. Sloan said it fits in with what is currently in the Code and not anticipated to be changed through this program. It recognizes and provides credits, recognizing where credits have been applied. In this sense Ms. Gustafson would be referring to VMT reductions. That is a continued facet of this recommendation.

Ms. Gustafson said Placer County has worked hard with their business community to get the concept of the tourism business improvement district passed, so all types of businesses are paying to potential tourism impacts of which the funding would be used for transportation and workforce housing. Both of these will contribute to VMT reductions and are part of those land use discussions especially the town center incentive. They've also worked diligently on coming up with a transient occupancy tax incentive program to help incentivize lodging downtown.

Their town centers are significantly lacking any increased lodging in downtown since the 1960s. In trying to incentivize that they are also forgiving a significant portion their transient occupancy tax collection. Trying to layer on additional fees on that new development for such a small part of the VMT to them doesn't look like a good approach instead they want to look at it regionally through this tourism business improvement district (TBID.) Because the nature of a TBID is self-assessment on these businesses to get it renewed, they're going to have to produce real actions that benefit these folks. They're looking for all the tools to keep everyone in the game and see the benefits from working together collaboratively versus project by project. This recommendation is a comprehensive relook at how after some 35 years of being involved in the Basin, they're trying to address this traumatic growth that's occurring all around us. There's been incredible growth surrounding the Tahoe Basin and understanding those impacts are not lessening the need to address the recreational travel in a comprehensive manner.

#### Public Comments & Questions

Carole Black, Incline Village resident said this is quite an impressive set of presentations and huge amount of work effort and conceptual thought. The themes to be focused on with some minor suggested changes are safety and neighborhood compatibility regarding transit in communities. Balancing and optimizing quality of life in communities and neighborhoods with business objectives, maintaining flexibility in planned interventions, e.g., mobility hubs, to match the community situation, managing development to meet community/neighborhood needs within the context of preserving the environment, and maximizing access to all potentially available recreational areas to distribute demand.

Goals: There is a safety goal that states increase safety and security for all users of Tahoe's transportation system and suggested adding "And maintain or enhance transit related safety in the communities served" as an example.

Policy 2.22 regarding mobility hub. She suggested softening the wording a little to capture the flexibility concepts that Ms. Glickert highlighted in her presentation.

Regarding Policy 5.1 around encourage community revitalization and transit-oriented development projects, etc. She doesn't totally understand the bikeable, walkable development link in California. In terms of how this is going to apply outside of town

## REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

March 24, 2021

centers but in areas where trails or access has been provided for recreational sites, she assumes that the town center development standards that were changed recently are not automatically going to be applied in those areas. She hopes not!

Regarding the project impact, she wanted to be sure that the concept of the impact, measurement, and assessment will be applied to public as well as private projects with equal rigour in terms of assessing the impact the Ms. Sloan was describing. She submitted her other comments in writing.

Jesse Patterson, League to Save Lake Tahoe said their comments today support their written comments submitted. He thanked TRPA staff for spending a lot of time with them and the stakeholders in this collaborative process. They believe that the proposed VMT package is still a work in progress demonstrates success from that effort and are largely supportive of that package.

In particular they support the collective goals of updating the VMT threshold. They agree with the VMT per capita metric, seems appropriate based on the dynamics of the travel patterns at Tahoe. The target seems reasonable but feels that it could be more ambitious but appreciated the ability to revisit that target on a regular basis. The connection to the creation of a regional funding source and having funding in place is key. Of course the allowances for affordable housing and focus on town centers as well as updating mitigation fees.

They whole heartedly support those collective goals of improving mobility reducing greenhouse gasses from transportation and reducing dependence on the private auto. We have not done super well on many of those goals particularly the last one over the decades. They agree that implementing the Regional Transportation Plan is likely how we'll achieve and maintain this new threshold in concert with implementation of the Regional Plan Update. The success of the RTP is dependent heavily on sustainable regional funding. Everyone being involved in this realizes funding is needed particularly regional funding to complement federal funding. What would motivate, accelerate an effective collaboration and the progress in doing this? They believe it's the promise of gaining something through the successes.

They believe that the no net VMT requirement should remain in place as it is today and be removed as milestones are reached. That's less disruptive because otherwise it's being removed and maybe putting it back in two years if we don't hit our targets. That's punishing failure rather than rewarding success. If we have success in getting the regional funding and reaching the goals then we have the incentive of removing of a no net VMT standard and moving into the proposed program which makes more sense.

They appreciated the presentation from Mr. Segan and comments from Mr. Lawrence on trust and adaptive versus prescriptive. They trust that there is a concerted effort to implement the Regional Transportation Plan and find the regional funding but they want the incentives there to get it done effectively and efficiently while still maintaining a way to reward success of jurisdictions that are perhaps doing better than the rest of the region. That could be worked into it and is something that should be looked to do.

They feel that some details on more specific funding targets would be helpful. It paints a clearer picture of what we're all aiming at and would be easier to have success. Adaptive and

## REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

March 24, 2021

prescriptive approaches are both necessary. They believe in adaptive management but having a clear target would make it easier for all involved to know what we're aiming at whether it's removing the no net VMT or putting it in place. We can adapt that target over time but need a clear target now on how much money we're trying to raise and should be tied directly to the projects that will be most effective at reducing VMT.

Sophie Wenzlau, California Attorney General's Office providing comments at a staff level. During the threshold update process staff has provided additional information regarding the connection between VMT and NOx. Based on this information they are no longer concerned that transitioning from an absolute to a per capita VMT standard is likely to adversely effect water quality. They are still reviewing the environmental document for the proposed update and considering its potential impacts and urge a cautious approach. They provided detailed feedback to staff on the proposed materials.

TRPA's proposal relies heavily on the generation of regional revenue to fund VMT reducing projects in the Basin. The funding target in the proposal needs to be quantified and clarified to be ongoing. As written, it's toothless. They would also like to see net zero be the standard for new development and redevelopment until the funding target is met. That is an important requirement that would motivate partners to work together to obtain funding.

While they agree that funding is key and are pleased to see the commitment to develop funding, it would be prudent to not put all of the eggs in the funding basket. They would like to see adaptive management measures stronger than the proposed mitigation fee increase, such as regulatory requirements for on the ground projects that would reduce VMT and coarse correct if the Basin is not on track to meet the 6.8 percent reduction threshold. The proposed mitigation fee increase is legally questionable and unlikely to generate much money.

Staff has emphasized that the Basin is nearly at buildout. As a result, they believe the proposal should not rely to heavily on new development or redevelopment to achieve VMT reduction. It is imperative that the program include a way to reach back to existing development through a VMT retrofit program that encourages or requires existing businesses to make changes on site to reduce their VMT generation.

They would like to see more frequent milestones and check points. While the two year advisory body review makes good sense there are only two adaptive management opportunities built into the program and its current form. Fees need to be more frequent.

They're concerned with the screening limits staff has proposed which along with the area plan exemption would exempt far too many projects from a evaluating and addressing their transportation impacts. They've asked staff to justify their proposed approach and two, at a minimum maintain conformity with the Office and Planning Research guidance. They provided detailed comments and hope to continue discussion over the coming weeks.

Steve Teshara on behalf of the Tahoe Chamber. He's participated in many of the technical and public meetings that helped develop the VMT proposals being presented today. They believe that agency staff has made a very compelling case that the existing VMT threshold related to nitrate deposition is obsolete and should be replaced. They supported the elimination of the existing VMT threshold standard which has been called for in numerous threshold evaluations.

They understand that the net zero VMT trigger would be set according to the current language in 2024. They do not support an immediate no net VMT requirement. This would be a disincentive to new and redevelopment projects and contrary to the goals and policies and directions of the 2012 Regional Plan. They support an approach that involves incentives, voluntary partnerships, and accountability. They've worked diligently with the business community to educate them and bring them up to speed on these and other transportation related proposals. This has been a particular challenge during the pandemic. He asked the Agency to tread carefully on these matters and go with the incentive voluntary partnerships and accountability approach. This allows the business community to feel like they are part of the conversation and not the target of the conversation and the rules.

#### Committee Comments & Questions

Mr. Yeates said he would like staff to work on the overall program that was presented. There are issues that were heard today from the committee and the public about some of the screening issues, additional questions about the no net VMT, and the potential impacts of that. Some of the screens used especially the 200 trips versus what's in the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) and we may want to visit with the OPR about why we treat ours differently. This systematic approach is appropriate and we need to do this. It's time to clean up some of the code issues and the Regional Plan amendment language that was pointed out.

Mr. Lawrence thanked Mr. Yeates for his leadership on this VMT issue. It's been a concern of his that the VMT thresholds and standards were not aligned with the goals which is not good planning. He also thanked TRPA staff and all the stakeholders who have worked on this, it's desperately needed. He liked the nuance of looking at travel patterns in the Basin. Historically, it struck him that we talked about travel and transportation as in Basin versus out of Basin and today's world is too complicated for that. He likes looking at it as the recreational traveler whether it's in or out of Basin. Also, looking at the workforce and even pass through traffic. He liked some of the comments from the California Attorney General's office and the League to Save Lake Tahoe in particular.

Triggers should be more prescriptive. We need to know that when we hit a trigger, we need some clarity of what that trigger will be and what constitutes hitting that trigger. His personal philosophy is that he doesn't believe in this complicated world of identifying in advance what the response is. When a trigger is hit it could be for a variety of reasons. It's important to evaluate the reasons why that trigger was hit before crafting what the management response is. He's fine with taking a look at triggers and do we need to be more clear on what that trigger is but the response needs to be an adaptive management. He recommends proceeding with the package.

Mr. Friedrich said tying into the League to Save Lake Tahoe and the California Attorney General's office comments that were related. One, the League is tying projects to the most proven effective VMT and greenhouse gas reduction projects. The ones that are estimated to have the most potential makes sense to him which mirror the California AG comments about going beyond fees and funding sources to on the ground projects as prescriptive measures. At least having them identified and ready to implement and to the extent possible measured for effectiveness will bring a lot more assuredness that we are indeed offsetting VMT if we get to

REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

March 24, 2021

that trigger. He encouraged more investigation of those points so we can respond with those measures that we think will be most successful on the ground and prove them through measurement to indeed offset VMT if we get to that point.

Mr. Yeates asked for a motion to direct staff to finalize the adoption of the package for recommendation to the Governing Board of the Threshold, Regional Plan Code of Ordinance amendments as set forth in the staff report. Also, to address the issues that were raised by the Committee and the public.

Ms. Gustafson made the motion as stated by Mr. Yeates.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Bruce, Mr. Friedrich, Mr. Lawrence, Mr. Yeates.

**Motion carried.**

Ms. Aldean asked when staff returns with a modified package that they highlight those concerns that were expressed today so they can be easily identified.

V. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS

None.

VI. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

None.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Bruce moved to adjourn.

Chair Mr. Yeates adjourned the meeting at 10:41 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Marja Ambler".

Marja Ambler  
Clerk to the Board