



Mail
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449-5310

Location
128 Market Street
Stateline, NV 89449

Contact
Phone: 775-588-4547
Fax: 775-588-4527
www.trpa.org

MEMORANDUM

Date: July 21, 2010
To: TRPA Governing Board
From: TRPA Staff
Subject: "FactSheet FollowUp" for Regional Plan Update Milestone #4:
Transportation

Requested Action: Governing Board direction that the attached FactSheet FollowUp #4 (Attachment A) has accurately portrayed the results of the second Milestone in the Regional Plan Update process and should be inserted into the FactBook behind FactSheet #4.

Staff Recommendation: Governing Board members review the attached FactSheet FollowUp #4 to ensure that it has accurately portrayed the results of the fourth Milestone in the Regional Plan Update process. Staff recommends that if the Board confirms that there are no discrepancies in FactSheet FollowUp #4 and the document has accurately portrayed the results of the first Milestone in the Regional Plan Update process, it direct staff that the document be inserted into the FactBook behind FactSheet #4.

Requested Motion: The Board is requested to make a motion directing staff on how to proceed with FactSheet FollowUp #4. A majority straw vote of the Board is requested to provide staff with direction.

Background: This Transportation Milestone was the fourth in a series of Milestone discussions to be conducted as part of the Regional Plan Update process. (The Transportation Milestone includes the Transportation Element, and the Noise and Energy & Climate Change Subelements of the Goals and Policies.) It took place at the June 23, 2010, Board meeting. Each of the Milestones deals with a part of the Regional Plan Update, and each is preceded by a stakeholder process to vet the proposed policy alternatives with Agency partners and constituents.

To support the discussion at the Board meeting, staff presented the Board with FactSheet #4, which served as a summary of the stakeholder process for Transportation. It outlined the major issues identified by staff and stakeholders and provided a framework for the Board in making decisions and providing policy direction to staff. There were four major issues called out in FactSheet #4.

Staff prepared a FactSheet FollowUp to Transportation Milestone #4 to recap the direction that the Board gave to staff for each of the issues raised and voted (straw vote) at the June 23, 2010, meeting. Staff will continue to produce FollowUps for the other FactSheets after each Milestone. The nature of the FollowUp documents is to confirm and memorialize the direction given. In preparing FollowUp #4, staff listened to the

audio recording for the Governing Board meeting and accurately transcribed the exact motion made in support of the direction given on each issue.

Contact Information: If you have any questions, please contact Harmon Zuckerman, Director, Regional Plan Update, at hzuckerman@trpa.org or (775) 589-5236, or Lyn Barnett, Transportation Team Lead, Regional Plan Update, at lbarnett@trpa.org or (775) 589-5239.

FactSheet FollowUp

Public Lands, Milestone #4

What is a FactSheet FollowUp?

A FactSheet FollowUp is a set of Milestone meeting summary notes that serve as a companion to the FactSheet prepared for each Milestone. It documents each policy issue discussed in the FactSheet, the staff proposal, and direction given by the Governing Board. The FollowUp is not intended to serve as regular minutes of the meetings. These will be prepared for the Board and made available in the usual way.

What was the direction given by the Governing Board concerning Transportation policy issues?¹

TRANS Issue #1: Should bicycle lanes be constructed along all major travel routes?

Staff Proposal: In Alternative 2, Policy T-2.2 required bicycle lanes to be constructed along major travel routes. The proposed Policy language, however, drew concern from stakeholders and contained wording that was more appropriate for an Implementation Measure. (Stakeholder concerns are summarized on page 9 of FactSheet #4.) For this reason, staff proposed moving certain language out of Policy T-2.2 and into Implementation Measure T.IMP-7 to clarify direction, as follows:

Policy T-2.2: Construct, upgrade, and maintain pedestrian and bicycle facilities along major travel routes. ~~Provide for the needs of different non-motorized user groups by providing separate facilities where feasible. Where bicycle lanes are not feasible due to environmental or land ownership constraints, provide as much shoulder area as possible.~~

T.IMP-7: Pedestrian and Class II bicycle facilities (bike lanes) meeting AASHTO standards must be constructed, upgraded, and maintained where feasible along major travel routes when the edge of roadway is altered or improved. Where bicycle lanes are not feasible due to environmental or land ownership constraints, provide as much shoulder area as possible for safe bicycle passage.

Governing Board Direction: Based on technical recommendations from the Advisory Planning Commission (APC), the Board took a straw vote and unanimously accepted staff's proposed changes to Transportation Policy T-2.2, provided the

¹ Milestone Meeting #4 was held on June 23, 2010, at the TRPA Offices, Stateline, NV.

words, “along major travel routes,” are replaced with the words, “consistent with the TRPA Bike and Pedestrian Plan.” Therefore, the final version of this Transportation Policy now reads:

Policy T-2.2: Construct, upgrade, and maintain pedestrian and bicycle facilities ~~along major travel routes~~ consistent with the TRPA Bike and Pedestrian Plan. ~~Provide for the needs of different non-motorized user groups by providing separate facilities where feasible. Where bicycle lanes are not feasible due to environmental or land ownership constraints, provide as much shoulder area as possible.~~²

The Board also unanimously accepted the changes recommended by staff concerning Transportation Implementation Measure T.IMP-7.³

TRANS Issue #2: How should TRPA facilitate maintenance of bicycle paths and sidewalks?

Staff Proposal: Staff recommended that maintenance assurances be in place before projects are permitted. For this reason, staff proposed to modify Transportation Policy T-2.8 as follows:

Policy T-2.8: ~~All jurisdictions must m~~Maintain the use and condition of all sidewalks and bike facilities over time, including snow removal for facilities in urbanized areas or along transportation routes with high use year-round.

Staff also proposed to add the following new Implementation Measures to Alternatives 2 and 4:

T.IMP-17: TRPA will require a maintenance plan before issuing a permit or funding for any bicycle and pedestrian facility. Maintenance plans shall specify dedicated long- and short-term funding for the life of the project.

T.IMP-18: Up to 25 percent of Air Quality Mitigation Funds may be set aside for operations and maintenance of completed or future EIP projects.

Governing Board Direction: The Governing Board took a straw vote and unanimously accepted staff’s proposed modifications to Transportation Policy T-2.8, as further modified by technical changes recommended by the APC. The final accepted version, therefore, is as follows:

Policy T-2.8: ~~All jurisdictions must~~ Where feasible, mMaintain the year-round use and condition of all identified sidewalks and bike facilities over time, including snow removal for facilities in urbanized areas or along transportation routes with high use year round.

² Staff modified wording, and wording added by the Board, is shown in *italics*. New wording proposed by staff is underlined, and deleted wording is ~~struck through~~. New wording approved by the Governing Board is double underlined, and deleted wording is ~~double struck through~~.

³ The APC did not address T-IMP.7 in its clarifying questions and technical advice to the Board.

The Board also unanimously accepted the changes recommended by staff concerning new Transportation Implementation Measures T.IMP-17 and T.IMP-18, with the following technical modifications to T.IMP-17, as recommended by the APC:⁴

T.IMP-17: TRPA will require a maintenance plan before issuing a permit or funding for any bicycle and pedestrian facility. Maintenance plans shall specify ~~dedicated~~ a strategy for long- and short-term funding for the life of the project.

TRANS Issue #3: Should TRPA encourage waterborne transportation systems as an alternative to automobile travel in the region?

Staff Proposal: Staff proposed to amend Policy T-5.8 and Implementation Measure T.IMP-8 within Alternative 2 (as shown below) and remove them altogether from Alternatives 3 and 4.

Policy T-5.8: Encourage waterborne transportation systems as an alternative to automobile travel within the region using Best Available Technology to minimize air quality impacts ~~to the maximum extent feasible. Coordinate waterborne services with, and provide access to, other public and private transportation systems.~~

T.IMP-8: Provide North-South waterborne connections and connections between communities at Lake Tahoe. Coordinate waterborne services with and provide access to other public and private transportation systems.

Governing Board Direction: The Governing Board took a straw vote and unanimously accepted staff's proposed modifications to Transportation Policy T-5.8 and Implementation Measure T.IMP-8, as further modified by technical changes recommended by the APC. The accepted versions are as follows:

Policy T-5.8: ~~Encourage~~ Consider waterborne transportation systems as an alternative to automobile travel within the region using Best Available Technology to minimize air quality impacts ~~to the maximum extent feasible. Coordinate waterborne services with, and provide access to, other public and private transportation systems.~~

T.IMP-8: ~~Provide North-South waterborne connections and connections between communities at Lake Tahoe. Coordinate waterborne services with and provide access to other public and private transportation systems.~~

⁴ The APC did not address T-IMP.18 in its clarifying questions and technical advice to the Board.

TRANS Issue #4: What parking management policies are needed to dovetail with environmental improvement and PTOD goals?

Staff Proposal: While TRPA staff and most stakeholders are in favor of creating innovative, new strategies to meet parking demand, the measures that staff had originally proposed were criticized as being inflexible. Staff, therefore, proposed to amend Policy T-7.2, as follows:

Policy T-7.2: Encourage parking management strategies that are tailored to the needs of each Community Plan area and consistent with achievement of PTOD that recognizes: minimum and maximum parking standards, payment in lieu strategies, shared parking between uses, on-street parking, parking along major regional travel routes, handicapped-disabled parking, bicycle parking and the implementation of localized parking management programs that focus on transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements.

Staff also proposed to remove Implementation Measure T.IMP-1 from Alternative 2 and retain it in Alternative 4. This Implementation Measure states:

T.IMP-1: Eliminate parking minimums, establish parking maximums region-wide, and set minimum standards for bicycle parking facilities.

Lastly, staff proposed the following amendments to Implementation Measure T.IMP-2:

T.IMP-2: Generate revenue from private vehicle use, and/or parking management plans as described in Mobility 2030. While each Community Plan or individual jurisdiction may develop its own set of parking management plans, Work with local jurisdictions and communities to develop area-wide parking strategies that are tailored to the needs of each Community Plan area and consistent with achievement of PTOD.
Strategies could include:

- *reduction or elimination of minimum parking standards*
- *creation of maximum parking standards*
- *shared parking between uses*
- *in-lieu payment to meet parking requirements*
- *on-street parking*
- *parking along major regional travel routes*
- *handicapped-disabled parking*
- *creation of bicycle parking standards*
- *free transit or discount passes*
- *deep discount transit passes for community residents*
- *market-rate parking charges (including parking charges based on congestion levels)*

shared lots in central areas; incentives to visitors to arrive without a car (such as reduced hotel room rates and/or overnight parking charges, free transit or discount passes, and deep discount transit passes for community residents. Market-rate parking charges, parking charges

~~based on congestion levels, or in-lieu parking fees in accordance with Urban Land Institute standards would be required.~~

Governing Board Direction: The Board, after hearing that the APC recommended that no technical changes to staff's proposal, took a straw vote and accepted the Policy and Implementation Measure changes proposed by staff in Issue #4. The vote passed with one abstention.

What was the direction given by the Governing Board concerning other Transportation policies and implementation measures?⁵

1. The Board provided direction on Noise Mitigation Measure N.IMP-21.

Staff Proposal: Staff proposed to modify N.IMP-21, as follows:

N.IMP-21: Transportation Noise – Non-attainment transportation noise corridors shall be brought into attainment at the earliest practicable date or upon refurbishing, resurfacing, and when any major work within the transportation corridor is conducted. Low noise pavement or other mitigation shall be used on transportation corridors and roadways that are out of attainment with noise standards or that contribute to noise issues in the surrounding community or neighborhoods. ~~Payment into a noise mitigation fund will not be permitted as a substitute for providing low noise pavement on highway paving projects.~~

Governing Board Direction: The Governing Board took a straw vote and unanimously directed staff to revise N.IMP-21 during the implementation stage of the RPU, and to make sure that the Regional Plan Environmental Impact Statement takes into account a full range of mitigation measures aimed at roadway noise. The Board also directed staff to reexamine the language concerning the requirement that roads be “brought into attainment” so as to not preclude other beneficial road improvements that might bring a roadway closer to attainment of noise standards.

2. The Board provided direction on Transportation Policy T-8.4.

Staff Proposal: Staff proposed to modify Policy T-8.4, as follows:

Policy T-8.4: ~~“Discourage Automobile rentals of vehicles that are not low- or zero-emission should be discouraged within the Tahoe region. Traffic mitigation fees shall be assessed on vehicles rented in the region.”~~

⁵ These items were not addressed in the APC recommendations to the Board.

Governing Board Direction: The Governing Board took a straw vote and unanimously directed staff to revise Transportation Policy T-8.4 to use positive language rather than negative language. The following changes were directed by the Board:

Policy T-8.4: ~~*“EnDiscourage Automobile rentals of vehicles that are not low- or zero-emission should be discouraged within the Tahoe region. –Traffic mitigation fees shall be assessed on vehicles rented in the region.”*~~