

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
GOVERNING BOARD

Zoom/TRPA

August 24, 2022

Meeting Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Ms. Gustafson called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

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

Members absent: Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Mr. Hoenigman

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Yeates led the pledge.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Hester said Consent Calendar Item No. 2, Nessebar Multiple-Parcel Pier will be continued to the September 28, 2022, Governing Board Meeting.

Ms. Aldean made a motion to approve the agenda as amended.

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

Absent: Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Diss, Mr. Friedrich, Mr. Hoenigman

Motion carried.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- 1) June 22, 2022
- 2) July 27, 2022

Ms. Aldean and Mrs. Cegavske submitted clerical changes to Ms. Ambler.

Mr. Lawrence moved approval of the June 22, 2022, and the July 27, 2022, minutes as amended.

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

GOVERNING BOARD

August 24, 2022

Absent: Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Mr. Friedrich, Mr. Hoenigman

Motion carried.

V. TRPA CONSENT CALENDAR

1. July Financials
2. Nessebar Holdings II, LLC New Multiple-Parcel Pier, 4950 & 4960 North Lake Boulevard, Placer County, California, Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs) 115-050-034 & 115-050-033, TRPA File Number ERSP2022-0001 (**continued**)
3. Deep Blue Water, LLC New Multiple-Parcel Pier, 26, 28, and 30 Calaneva Drive, Washoe County, Nevada, Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs) 123-041-24 (previously 123-041-13), 123-041-25 (previously 123-041-18), and 123-041-26 (previously 123-041-19), TRPA File Number ERSP2020-0123
4. Governing Board Committee Membership Appointments
5. Appointment of a TRPA Governing Board Delegate and Alternate to the Tahoe Transportation District Board of Directors

Ms. Aldean said the Operations and Governance Committee recommended approval of item number one. Revenues are at about 37 percent of budget due to the contributions by the states which are recognized upon billing as opposed to when they're received. Expenditures are approximately three percent which is well within the budget expectations.

Ms. Gustafson said item two was continued and three, four, and five were not heard by any committee.

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean asked when the new committee appointments go into effect.

Mr. Marshall said it's generally the next meeting, but the action takes effect immediately. If there's a subsequent meeting today, those would be effective immediately.

Public Comments & Questions

None.

Ms. Aldean moved approval of the consent calendar as amended.

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

Absent: Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Mr. Friedrich, Mr. Hoenigman

Motion carried.

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

Motion carried.

GOVERNING BOARD

August 24, 2022

VI. TAHOE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Authorization of request for advance allocation of Regional Early Action Planning 2.0 funds as required by the California Department of Housing and Community Development for receipt of funds to accelerate progress towards state housing goals and climate commitments through regional action

Ms. Aldean said the Operations and Governance Committee recommended approval of item number one.

Board Comments & Questions

None.

Public Comments & Questions

None.

Mr. Lawrence moved approval of the consent calendar.

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

Absent: Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Mr. Hoenigman

Motion carried.

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

Motion carried.

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

- A. Resolution recognizing former Governing Board member Mark Bruce, Nevada Governor Appointee

Ms. Gustafson read the Resolution into the record.

Mr. Bruce thanked staff and the Board for the kind heart felt words and the resolution. He's appreciative of the fact that everyone had so many thoughtful and kind things to say about him at his last meeting in June.

Public Comments & Questions

Darcie Collins, CEO, League to Save Lake Tahoe said she's worked with Mr. Bruce since he first came onto the TRPA Governing Board. She was so proud to have discussed many issues with him and feels like they made a lot of accomplishments. One of the most impressive items of progress was when they got to discuss the Event Center and the many conversations through the Bi-State Consultation efforts around transportation. It was fun to have the opportunity to be innovative, to utilize his contacts and just have the motivation that Mark brought, not just to those conversations, but everything he did during his time as a Board member.

Board Comments & Questions

Mrs. Cegavske thanked Mr. Bruce for his service on the Board and committees of TRPA and everything he's done for Lake Tahoe and the state of Nevada. He always accepted her phone calls and was very gracious. All the other things that he does are wonderful assets to what he does on a regular basis.

Ms. Diss thanked Mr. Bruce for his service, and his breadth of experience and dedication to both Lake Tahoe and the state of Nevada, she has big shoes to fill. He's built a wonderful path that she hopes to continue down and is grateful to him for that.

Mr. Yeates appreciated staff's emphasis on his calm demeanor because that wasn't necessarily his demeanor! He's grateful to him when he was his Vice Chair when Mr. Yeates was unable to chair during the Events Center. He always kept Mr. Yeates informed during that time and was very much appreciated.

Mr. Rice said since he came onto this Board, Mr. Bruce made him feel very comfortable. He was appreciative with the fact that he appreciated his stories. He appreciated Mr. Bruce's wisdom and calm demeanor.

Ms. Aldean made a motion to approve the Resolution as read into the record, honoring Mark Bruce as a former Nevada Governor Appointee to the TRPA Governing Board.

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

Absent: Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Mr. Hoenigman

Motion carried.

B. Best In Basin Awards

TRPA staff Mr. Cowen presented the awards.

An elite group of projects were completed in 2020 and 2021 that are being recognized today as the Best in the Basin. These projects and actions each exhibit outstanding planning and execution and lead the way in environmental stewardship in the Lake Tahoe Region. This marks the 30th running of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Best in Basin awards and the ceremony always provides a moment to pause and appreciate the hard work, masterful planning, and the collaboration that goes into projects happening in the region year in and year out.

Today, they'll be recognizing seven projects and then wrap up with a glimpse back at the history of the Best in the Basin awards.

Tahoe Pines Restoration and Public Access Improvement Project: Best Water Quality & Restoration Project

Partners: California Tahoe Conservancy, California Natural Resources Agency, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, the California Department of General Services, Burdick Excavation Company, Stantec Engineering, and the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California.

GOVERNING BOARD

August 24, 2022

Winning an award for water quality and restoration this year, the California Tahoe Conservancy were lead implementers on the Tahoe Pines Restoration and Public Access Improvement Project which acquired an old campground site on the Upper Truckee River at Highway 50 in Meyers. The project removed coverage and restored a section of Upper Truckee River and a critical floodplain where four creeks come together.

The project area, while once a private campground, is also in a prime location near the center of Meyers for community benefit, public access, and recreation. The Tahoe Pines project also provided a parking area with Best Management Practices for water quality, improved trails that provide full ADA access, and replaced a bridge over the river to make it a great place for residents and visitors to recreate and enjoy the river.

Brautovich Park Stream Environment Zone Restoration and Park Rehabilitation Project: Best Water Quality & Restoration Project

Partners: Douglas County, Nevada Tahoe Conservation District, Design Workshop, and IMPACT Construction.

The Brautovich Park Stream Environment Zone Restoration and Park Rehabilitation Project restored over a half-acre of Stream Environment Zone in the North Benjamin neighborhood of Upper Kingsbury Grade and revitalized a community park that was in need.

The Nevada Tahoe Resource Conservation District partnered with Douglas County on the project that removed 3,500 cubic yards of fill from a historic wetland, relocated recreation amenities out of a sensitive stream environment zone, added Water Quality Best Management Practices to the site, increased stormwater treatment for the North Benjamin neighborhood, and revitalized a unique community park. This is also an Environmental Improvement Program Project.

Incline Village Golf Course Maintenance Drainage and Wash Pad Improvement Project: Best Water Quality Best Management Practices.

Partners: Incline Village General Improvement District Public Works, PR Design and Engineering, Inc., and Cruz Construction Co.

Incline Village General Improvement District brought great sensitivity and environmental design to a project to create a wash pad for golf course maintenance vehicles that also tied in with BMPs on other parts of the golf course property.

The Golf Course Maintenance Drainage and Wash Pad Improvement Project installed exemplary BMPs that included a closed loop vehicle wash station that saves water and protects water quality.

Dennis T. Machida Greenway Memorial Trail: Best Public & Environmental Improvement Program Project

Partners: El Dorado County Department of Transportation, California Tahoe Conservancy, City of South Lake Tahoe, Lake Tahoe Community College, Tahoe Transportation District, and South Tahoe Public Utility District.

GOVERNING BOARD

August 24, 2022

Winning an award for best Public Project and EIP Project, the Dennis T. Machida Greenway Memorial Trail is a new section of the South Tahoe Greenway that is an important active transportation project. The new trail has closed gaps in the shared use path network in the City of South Lake Tahoe, connected neighborhoods, educational institutions, and local recreation amenities, incorporated innovative and sustainable project features like an elevated boardwalk structure to minimize environmental impacts to sensitive areas. The one-mile trail between Glenwood Way and Sierra Boulevard, which crosses Al Tahoe Boulevard and Black Bart Avenue expands the bicycle network and provides connections with other projects in the South Shore, including the Sierra Boulevard Complete Streets Project for which the City of South Lake Tahoe received a Best in Basin award in 2019, and new buildings and programs at Lake Tahoe Community College, the Community Play Fields and Bijou Park, and the Al Tahoe bikeway, and South Tahoe Middle School with some of South Shore's more dense neighborhoods where workers, students, and families live. The trail has been dedicated to Dennis Machida, the late, past executive director of the California Tahoe Conservancy who was an ardent supporter of biking and walking trails and who left his mark on Lake Tahoe and many people in many ways.

The Conservancy led the project, design, planning, permitting, funding, and management and is the visionary organization behind the Greenway Trail. El Dorado County's experienced transportation department managed the construction and permit compliance, the City of South Lake Tahoe provided key planning and permitting support and services and is now the keeper and maintainer of the trail, and Lake Tahoe Community College was instrumental in the Trout Creek section of trail and the epic bike bridge by executing a crucial land swap with the Conservancy and contributing voter-approved bond funds for the bridge construction.

NV Energy Resilient Corridor 4100 Project: Best Defensible space and Forest Health Project

Partners: NV Energy, North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District, Tahoe Douglas Fire Protection District, Nevada Division of Forestry, Lake Tahoe Nevada State Parks, and Nevada Division of State Lands.

NV Energy partnered with the North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District and numerous fire protection and forest agencies to manage vegetation under the East Shore power line corridor called the 4100 line. The 4100 Line project removed and thinned brush and removed unhealthy, potentially hazardous trees under power lines and up to 200 feet on either side. The project improves safety and reliability of power infrastructure and also creates a fuel break or potential control line in the basin.

In that way, the project is supported by the Lake Tahoe Basin Multi-Jurisdictional Fuels Strategy. As an exemplary EIP project, the fuel break also connects to other treatments on US Forest Service and private land and Nevada Division of Forestry treatments in the area to provide a larger landscape fuel break. The 4100 line project has so far has treated nearly 40 acres of power line corridor in North Lake Tahoe and the East Shore. Complementary projects are also underway in other parts of the basin with Liberty Utilities and the 4100 project will tackle further segments literally down the line.

Eyes on the Lake –Aquatic Invasive Species Early Detection: Best Environmental Improvement Program Project

Partners: The League to Save Lake Tahoe, Tahoe Resource Conservation District, Marine Taxonomic Services, Inc.

Moving from the forest to the lake bottom now, winning an award for best EIP Project is the League to Save Lake Tahoe's Eyes on the Lake citizen science aquatic invasive species early detection program. The League to Save Lake Tahoe's citizen science program provides training to marinas and citizens in both California and Nevada to help identify and report sightings of aquatic invasive species, especially invasive weeds that are already in the lake, so new infestations within the watershed can be prevented -a process called Early Detection Rapid Response. The League, in concert with the Tahoe Resource Conservation District have been both financially and strategically instrumental in quickly dispatching SCUBA divers from Marine Taxonomic Services to aid in the early detection rapid response process.

In 2021, Homewood Marina spotted a possible invasive weed infestation and responded through Eyes on the Lake. The Tahoe Resource Conservation District called upon divers at Marine Taxonomic Services who surveyed, mapped, and removed the infestation within one month. Overall, 1,635 surveys have been completed through the program since 2013, with eight new infestations of invasive weeds outside of marinas reported by paddleboarders with smart phones. All of these have been treated, eradicated or are under current management and surveillance. Eyes on the Lake is also now one of the tools available on the Tahoe Citizen Science web app put together by UC Davis Tahoe Environmental Research Center, the League to Save Lake Tahoe and the Desert Research Institute. TRPA's Dennis Zabaglo and Emily Frey have also been instrumental in bringing partners together.

Homewood Marina Electric Boat Charging: Best Sustainability Action

Partners: JMA Ventures, LLC, Homewood High and Dry Marina, Nautique, Superior Boat Repairs & Service, Ingenuity Electric, and the Tahoe Fund.

Nominated for a Best in Basin Award in Sustainability, the Homewood High & Dry Marina electric boat charging station is receiving this award today for its innovation in clean boating and providing the first high-performance e-boat charging facility on the lake. Advancements in battery-powered vehicles has expanded into the marine industry and electric power boats are becoming more available. The marina installed the station in 2020 to charge the first zero-emissions electric water sports boat sold in North America, build by Nautique. The addition of a charging station at the marina is helping reduce reliance on fossil fuel, reduces harmful emissions and engine noise on the lake, and, similar to technology advancements that helped the marine boating industry move away from carbureted two-stroke engines, is making way for a new generation of clean boating practices.

Thanks to the charging station, Homewood marina is now home to four high-performance electric boats, including state-of-the-art wakeboard and surf boats, with room for more. The station has so far charged up 4,550 kilowatt hours and saved 450 gallons of fuel and more than two tons of CO2 emissions.

Country Club Heights -Phase 3 Erosion Control Project: Honorable Mention –Best Water Quality & Erosion Control Project

Partners: El Dorado County Department of Transportation, California Tahoe Conservancy, USDA Forest Service, California Conservation Corps, and RAPID Construction Inc.

Achieving Honorable Mention in the awards program this year, El Dorado County and the California Tahoe Conservancy recently completed the Country Club Heights -Phase 3 Erosion Control Project.

This is the property where the old Elks Lodge used to exist and there were a lot of flooding and stormwater problems. The project improved water quality of stormwater runoff, soil conservation, and enhanced recreation in this popular area with a permeable shared used path for easier access to the Upper Truckee River.

Thank you to our judges: Kat McIntyre, TRPA; Shannon Friedman, TRPA; Beth Vollmer, TRPA; Wyatt Ogilvy, Ogilvy Consulting.

30 Years of Best in Basin Projects:

One of the reasons TRPA established this award program was because of how different Lake Tahoe is and how innovative people and partner agencies had to be in the early years of the Regional Plan. What was innovation back then is a pretty common place today, but that's the point. They are seeing few BMP retrofits be nominated in the program, partly because the knowledge in the basin is so much more widespread, but also because most of the retrofits are done. Fewer single family home projects are being nominated in the program, also because knowledge of how to work sensitively is more widespread, but also because there are local area plans and streamlined permitting so, Regional Plan compliance is seamless. These aspects of the Best in the Basin Awards are only further evidence that the Regional Plan is working. And the environmental benefits of these past award winners are continuing and compounding as well. More than 750 EIP projects are finished, but priorities are changing with the changing climate, so there may be more need for innovation.

2010 Best Restoration Project: Homewood Mountain Resort Road Restoration

Mr. Cowen took a tour of some past projects recently to see how they were doing. It was eye opening, and hope to revisit more of these with in subsequent years. Projects like this road restoration project at Homewood Mountain Resort in 2010 blew the judges away in how out-of-the-box it was with soil science. Today the area is not only healthier, it's practically unblemished.

2016 Best Defensible Space Project: Lake Valley Fire Hazardous Wood Roof Replacement Program

Lake Valley Fire Protection District was recognized in 2016 for helping 343 homeowners from Meeks Bay to the City of South Lake Tahoe and Christmas Valley replace combustible wood shake roofs with non-combustible roofing materials. In order to be eligible for a \$7,500 grant, homeowners were required to complete their defensible space.

2022 Caldor Fire Christmas Valley Homes: Best Defensible Space Project

Captain Martin Goldberg with Lake Valley Fire helped implement that grant program and nearly one year ago fought the Caldor Fire around these homes. Captain Goldberg told him on the night of the main attack, he was putting out spot fires next to some of the homes he helped with the program. That early, innovative work to reduce the threat of catastrophic wildfire gave him and others safer places from which to fight the fire and reduce the threat to the rest of the basin.

Certainly, there is much to appreciate with these award winners this year and every year. Going forward, they are shifting the Best in Basin nomination period to continue on a two-year cycle and will now also alternate with the Lake Spirit Awards to run every other year as well.

GOVERNING BOARD

August 24, 2022

Presentation can be found at:

[Agenda-Item-No.-VII.B.-Best-In-Basin-Awards.pdf \(trpa.gov\)](#)

Governing Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Novasel is proud of all the winners and is especially impressed with the electric boats and would like to see the Lake go all electric one day.

Ms. Aldean said from a BMP standpoint, their biggest challenge is long term maintenance. It might not be a bad idea when they revisit these projects if they've been well maintained for an extended period of time, recognizing those people as well to ensure that they're still functional and doing what they're expected to do.

Mr. Cowen said truly innovation is not done. They're facing climate change impacts, and the Best in the Basin awards are going to continue to recognize outstanding planning and design to protect Lake Tahoe.

Mr. Friedrich congratulated all the award winners and agreed with Ms. Novasel with the future of electric and the electric boat project. He was kicking that around when he was with Liberty Utilities a year before the project went in. He looks forward to their expansion plans and he too would love to see all the boats electric on the Lake. Then on the Dennis Machida Bike Trail, many of them remembered how hard Dennis Machida worked day in a day out. It was great collaboration and encouraged all his fellow board members to take a ride on that and help Mr. Middlebrook's vision to connect it from Van Sickle to Meyers. There's no reason it couldn't be done with the right will and funding. Extra kudos to Donaldo Palaroan with all the challenges they had during Covid and the supply chain issues.

Mr. Lawrence thanked all the award winners for their innovation and projects. It's nice to see such innovative thinking and everything they're doing for the basin. He also thanked Mr. Cowen and the team for doing this Best in the Basin award. As a board member they spend most of their day struggling over policy issues and hand wringing over some real complicated stuff. This is a good reminder that regardless of what they do here in the decisions they have to make that there are good people in the community that are doing good things for Lake Tahoe. It's reinvigorating every time they do this.

Ms. Gustafson echoed what the other Board members have said. She thanked everyone for being such a demonstration of collaboration. The only way they save this Lake and protect it is because they all come together and put aside their differences and come up with new solutions and ideas and think out of the box. It's a remarkable place to be and place in time, and if not now, when.

Public Comments & Questions

None.

GOVERNING BOARD

August 24, 2022

VIII. APPEAL

- A. Appeal of Denial of Application for Existing Mooring Buoy, 201 Lakemill Rd., Douglas County, Nevada, Assessors' Parcel Number (APN) 1418-10-710-005, TRPA File Number BUOY2022-0273; Appeal No. ADMIN2022-0022

Mr. Hicks said he has a home in the Glenbrook subdivision and consequently has an interest in this particular matter. Although, he is a nonvoting member, he will not be participating in this matter today.

Ms. Aldean said due to the fact that her family was involved with the development of the Glenbrook subdivision and the preparation and recording of the Unit Two Subdivision Maps, she'll be recusing herself from this matter today on the advice of legal counsel.

Mr. Marshall said Mr. Lawrence is also recusing himself.

Mr. Lawrence said he'll be recusing himself because of his prior involvement as the State Lands Registrar, and a previous letter he wrote regarding the status of the pier through the eyes of the Nevada Division of State Lands about ten years ago.

Ms. Williamson provided a report from the Legal Committee.

Ms. Williamson said Legal Committee wrestled with this one and are looking forward to the Board's discussion. Ultimately, they did deny the appeal and found the parcel non-littoral. She passed it over to Mr. Marshall to discuss some of the nuanced issues in this Appeal.

(Slide 3) Mr. Marshall said the Dobbins parcel is located in Glenbrook Bay highlighted in turquoise. The Dobbins applied for a buoy permit from TRPA under the 2018 Shoreline Plan. They have had a buoy in the Glenbrook Homeowner's Association (GHOA) and they have not received a permit to date from the Nevada Division State Lands or TRPA for that buoy. They applied to TRPA to get a permit for that buoy and staff reviewed the matter, and as indicated at page 249 of the packet, rejected the application on a number of grounds. The principal reason that is being discussed today is the littoral status of the parcel. In order to qualify for a buoy, except under certain circumstances when you are non-littoral, you need to be a littoral landowner in order to qualify for a buoy. TRPA defines a littoral status as abutting or joining the high-water line of Lake Tahoe. If you do not need meet that criterion, then you cannot apply as littoral parcel owner. As indicated in the staff report, it determined that they were not the littoral based on this.

(Slide 4) The red line is the high-water line, and the green line is the lakeward or western side of the Dobbins parcel. Because the Dobbins parcels lakeward extent does not reach to the high-water line, it's close but doesn't abut or adjoin, therefore, the parcel itself is non-littoral. There is another kind of issue that is floating around here, which is the presence of another parcel that is in between the Dobbins parcel and low water. (Slide 3) Shows Lot Z which TRPA recognizes in the 1978 subdivision, and which gives GHOA the littoral strip that allows them to have a littoral buoy field, and that's how they recognize and regulate the buoy field offshore of all these Lake front parcels that are to the left of the slide with the dots and boats, etc.

TRPA approved that subdivision and location of that Lot Z, therefore, that is the littoral parcel in

GOVERNING BOARD

August 24, 2022

TRPA's regulatory eyes, not the Dobbins parcel, because the Dobbins parcel doesn't extend to low water. The Legal Committee heard extensive back and forth regarding the status of Lot Z and whether or not the lot itself is littoral.

(Slide 5) This is a 2010 Bathymetric survey that TRPA relied upon for staff's conclusion to reject the application. This is before the Board today for an appeal of a denial. Staff denied the application, the applicant then filed an appeal of that decision to bring the matter before the Board. The Board reviews denials on a de novo basis. It's before the Board to determine whether or not this Code criteria are met in order to determine whether or not they're eligible for a buoy as a littoral lot. That's the grounds upon which they filed their appeal.

They'll soon see why they spent a significant amount of time hashing over details. Then Mr. Marshall will discuss the relevance of whether or not there is actually a Lot Z.

Ms. Linde, Attorney on behalf of Mr. Dobbins said she started practicing TRPA related law in 1980. Mr. Marshall will confirm that this is one of the more complex issues that she's ever been called upon to noodle through.

(Slide 5) The top blue line is what the surveyor determined comes right to the westerly point of the Dobbins parcel. It is their position that the Dobbins parcel is littoral. One of the reasons that it was denied littoral status was the presumptive existence of Lot Z. Referring to the exhibit, there's thin parcel at the water's edge, which is called Lot Z on the original subdivision map of May 1978. At the time that subdivision map was drawn, and TRPA had every reason to assume it was correct, but it wasn't because that parcel Lot Z would be within the ownership of the state of Nevada, which owned to the high watermark until July of 1979. It wasn't validly created; therefore, it wasn't validly conveyed to the Homeowners Association. Shortly after this May 1978 version of the Unit Two map was recorded, an amended map was recorded, which is shown on Exhibit 2. It goes away with all of Lot Z. Under the Nevada Law NRS 278.477 an amended map that moves a boundary is the effective new boundaries. So, the old boundary ceases to exist, and the new boundary is the binding boundary.

To deny this parcel littoral status because of the intercession of Lot Z, is not correct, because Lot Z does not legally exist. She understands that a lot of decisions by this Board have been pinned to the presumptive validity of Lot Z. They discussed that briefly and had some ideas about how the Homeowner's Association buoy field could still be pinned to a validly existing ownership claim in the Homeowner's Association because there's a strip of land in front. The Dobbins parcel comes down to a point, but the other parcels are further back. That gap there is to what she refers to in terms of what could sustain the buoy field in the absence of Lot Z.

The other point is that as it was seen on their survey that high watermark touches the point in that map which was surveyed by a very well-respected surveyor who practiced in the basin for many decades who determined that the point does touch the high-water mark. The question then becomes rather arcane, it is to what extent is 6,221, some magic touch point because they're dealing with a body of water. They're dealing with moving sand, high and low waters, and so it becomes rather arbitrary that what they saw was a small gap between the red and the green on the Bathymetric map could account for a few inches, and that would disqualify it under the staff's interpretation from the littoral status. That seems that seems inconsistent with the reality of how surveys are done. Because yes, the best Bathymetric says there was a gap between the property line and the high-water mark. Whereas, Resource Concepts map suggests, not.

They're talking about a rather vague and in all events insubstantial distance between one survey and the other. It's not as if there was enough space for an actual lot to exist to intervene between the surveyed high watermark, the point of this property and any other interest. They are here today to suggest that this property should be deemed littoral. It is a Homeowners Association buoy field and does not have an interest in upsetting that situation and there are a lot of buoys out there. An important fact is that under TRPA current regulations the ability to have one buoy per homeowner lot in the buoy field. As it is now, they are 1 of 73, but they could be 1 of 278 under that regulation.

She was hoping that everyone would keep things in perspective and to understand the effect of illegality that was present in the map when it was recorded in May of 1978, is not correct and is still illegal. The consequence to everyone else of that situation might be one thing, but it's different for them because their lot abuts or adjoins whatever that vague term is, and it's not defined in TRPA's regulation. It abuts or adjoins the waters of Lake Tahoe and is frequently under the waters of Lake Tahoe on a high-water year. That point is underwater, and photos can be found in the record. They've filed a memorandum and exhibits in June of 2010 with pictures of the property being underwater.

Presentation can be found at: [Agenda Item No. VIII.A Dobbins Appeal](#)

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Yeates agreed that the Legal Committee wrestled with this and wasn't really sure what the motion should be. He made the motion primarily to maintain the staff's decision going to the Board by denying that this was a littoral parcel. For him, he's accepting Mr. Dobbins attorneys' good point that there's a little bit of difference here between what they see or don't see. There's a part of him that thinks, boy, there are a lot of other big issues they're dealing with and could they come up with a good solution here. But there's a precedent here because this isn't the only kind of situation along Lake Tahoe which staff pointed out and that's for them to consider here. There's discussion in the packet here about well, this is kind of a shame to do this, and could end up going onto litigation. He's not inviting litigation, but at the same time, maybe this is more appropriate. Because a lot of this is a Quiet Title issue which is not before them. The issue is the littoral location of this parcel and what kind of precedent they want to establish here. It's a tough call, but it is the precedent that concerns him the most and would have him lean to support the staff's position simply because he doesn't know all that the staff knows about dealing with all these projects throughout the Lake.

Mr. Marshall referred to the 2010 Bathymetric survey that they're relying on for littoral status. The line that they're depending on is a darker blue line that just nips the corner of the Dobbins lot. Let's be clear about the representation of what that line is. That line is the representation by Resource Concepts of what the line would have been some number of years ago. It is not the current high-water line so staff could not make a finding that the parcel is littoral at this time, because that's not what that survey represents. You'll see where it references the old high watermark, not the actual present high watermark which is what this was in 2010 on slide 4 when the last surveys were done at high watermark.

From TRPA's staff's perspective, there is no evidence before them that shows a survey of work that the Dobbins parcel abuts or adjoins the high watermark. He echoed Mr. Yeates' point that this is fundamentally a question between GHOA and Dobbins as to who owns that parcel that goes from the lakeward side of the Dobbins parcel down to lower water which is a Quiet Title action. He's not trying to instigate litigation but if they truly believe that they're littoral then that needs to be satisfied in a

GOVERNING BOARD

August 24, 2022

court of law with GHOA present. Then if they establish that's their ownership down to low water, then they can come back and reapply as a littoral lot.

From the information presented to staff, there was no survey that established a high-water line at any point that was littoral that their lakeward boundary abutted and adjoined the high-water line. The Legal Committee concluded that whether or not the Dobbins parcel abuts or adjoins the high watermark at this point to make them littoral and that's where the recommendation is based on to support staff's finding that it was non-littoral and therefore not eligible for a buoy.

Mr. Friedrich said it sounds like it's close but not quite there and presumably the precedent setting concern would be what else is considered close? Is this the level of close, then are they extending the rules to this distance, and someone else comes in that's not quite as close, do they also then potentially fit, would that be the precedent setting concern?

Mr. Marshall said correct and how do they distinguish between relative degrees of closeness, is what they're getting at. Quite honestly, they've seen closer, and they've seen just as close and not as close on the hundreds of permits that staff reviews implementing the Shoreline Plan.

Ms. Linde said the effect of the invalidity of Lot Z would be to have the property line of the Dobbins parcel extend to the low watermark at 6,223. At that point, when you establish and accept the irretrievable invalidity of Lot Z, she's sure that they could have a perfunctory Quiet Title action declaratory relief action. Because the first fact that Lot Z was not validly created but that's not the ultimate fact. The fact is that the amended map erased Lot Z, and it does not exist any longer, with the result that the property line of Dobbins now extends to 6,223.

Ms. Gustafson asked if the buoy field was granted based on Lot Z of existing.

Mr. Marshall said that's correct.

Ms. Gustafson said so, if they're talking about that not being valid, they have to rethink that entire area of buoys?

Mr. Marshall said if they base their decision that Lot Z is not in fact a valid lot. He would caution them on that conclusion because of the fact that they've already approved the subdivision that created it. But that question of whether or not there is some claim that the Dobbins can make vis-à-vis GHOA, is a question that they need to settle.

Ms. Gustafson said then it could be precedent setting for the entire Homeowner's Association, correct?

Mr. Marshall said that's correct.

Ms. Gustafson said that's a very dangerous precedent around the basin because there's many of these buoy fields for condominiums or HOA's that have been approved and provide access.

Mr. Marshall said but they are created under different circumstances. It's not necessarily that this Quiet Title action creates a precedent that will undermine other situations, because a lot of those subdivision maps are unique. They share a lot of commonality.

GOVERNING BOARD

August 24, 2022

Ms. Gustafson said but they grant a certain number of buoys based on the membership or on the land mass of those HOA common areas.

Mr. Marshall said the lesser of what buoy field could fit in front of the Lot Z or the number of residences served.

Ms. Gustafson said if there was a correction down the line if Lot Z went away, that would change.

Mr. Marshall said that's kind of requiring some speculation, because they don't know exactly what it is. Ms. Linde's point is that there could be another lot remaining in front of other parcels, just not the Dobbins parcel. They would have to wait and see what a court might say about that. It's clear that there's a good percentage of Lot Z that not only runs in front of these parcels, but also hooks around and there's some part of the parcel that is upland of Lake Tahoe.

Public Comments & Questions

Mr. Dobbins is a 42-year homeowner in Glenbrook. This is the first time he's been able to witness what goes on at these meetings, and it's been very revealing in that it seems that the Board looks for reasons not to approve this application. This has gone on over the years and is very discouraging. He believes they are in the right, but it appears that the Board does not agree. Having lived in Glenbrook for all of these years and seen many people get buoys permitted. For instance, there's five or six in one area and he's always asked, how does this happen? Sometimes you feel that decisions are made based on who you know. He's never understood why they moved the buoy field in front of his house in the first place, he didn't like it, but he took it because there's not much he can do about it. The buoy field was located to the north of him. Whether they have a proper case or not, they've tried over all these years to work through TRPA, and it seems when he gets the tax bill, it states that he's lakefront, but guesses that's irrelevant to the Board. He hopes there's some equity in the Board's decision.

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Yeates made the motion to grant the Appeal.

Mr. Friedrich said he's reminded of the action that they took in May 2022 related to the approval of new mooring buoys for non-littoral HOA buoy fields and is there any relevance of that decision to today's deliberation?

Mr. Marshall said not directly. Indirectly, it might address whether GHOA might be eligible if for some reason Lot Z goes away, could they seek approval for a buoy field under the non-littoral status? Again, they would have to wait and see what happens in the future on that. But it doesn't directly affect the Dobbins application and the littoral status of their lot.

Nays: Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Diss, Ms. Faustinos, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Rice, Ms. Williamson, Mr. Yeates

Recused: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Lawrence

Absent: Ms. Conrad Saydah, Mr. Hoenigman

Motion failed.

IX. PLANNING MATTERS

A. Innovation Initiative Update

Mr. Hester provided an introduction.

Mr. Hester said this is the second of monthly reports looking into the initiatives in more detail. This month, it is the Digital First or Innovation Initiative. A lot of the information you'll get today are more about administrative decisions they make but they wanted to be sure they were transparent with the Board about what they are presenting and planning to do and get their input because it will result in the initiation of some Code Amendments.

Mr. Stockham, Stockham Consulting will provide a presentation on permit processing improvements that the Board will be asked to endorse and then Mr. Kasman will follow with some related information on the technology and data that the Research and Analysis Department is working on.

TRPA is constantly working at the synergy between these three functions: Research and Analysis taking the lead on data and technology, Long Range and Transportation Planning Department taking the lead on policies and regulations, and the Permitting and Compliance Department taking the lead on permit processing. All those things working together create accelerated threshold attainment which is one of their strategic objectives know as pillars. Today, they're focusing on the permit processing improvements and the data and technology.

Mr. Stockham previously worked at TRPA as the Planning Manager for the Regional Plan Update. Since leaving TRPA he has been the Community Development Director for the City of Reno, where he's processed huge numbers of applications, and he and his staff have worked on all kinds of process improvements that they think TRPA can learn from. He's also worked as a consultant for applicants with the number of firms, including his own. He's now under contract with TRPA to review cases and help implement process improvements. He has a lot of experience and knowledge and with multiple perspectives that have been included in this report.

Mr. Stockham said he's been working with staff and other stakeholders to try to implement some improvements. Today he'll provide an overview of an action plan for permitting improvements.

TRPA has complicated ordinances with important environmental protection goals. But it's a very time intensive, cumbersome process to get permitting done at Lake Tahoe and they're trying to work to improve that which in turn will better support environmental redevelopment and all the positives that come along with that. Concurrently, aligning process improvements with all the technology improvements that Mr. Kasman and his team have been working on is very important because when they set these technology systems in place it's much harder and more expensive to change after the fact. They want to look at some permitting improvements, not major regulatory changes, but focusing more on efficiencies and doing that together with the technology work.

They used a collaborative process to develop the Action Plan that's being presented today. It's been ongoing coordination with staff, especially Ms. Jepson and Ms. Good who have been incredibly helpful through this process. It became clear to him that the case load and the time required to handle the permit loads that are coming through is pretty intensive. He also very much appreciated the

GOVERNING BOARD

August 24, 2022

stakeholders who contributed to this process such as project applicants, the League to Save Lake Tahoe who is going to assume bit of an oversight check and balance role in this process, and the other staff members and stakeholders who contributed. With that team they built this Action Plan step by step with initially discussing ideas, then getting more detailed, and ultimately, they are completing the Action Plan.

TRPA has an amazing planning and permit team. The sophistication is higher than you see in most places. The complexity of these ordinances is greater, but the system's been strained by concurrent factors such as Covid-19 which affected everything and remote work, and all those impacts has been disruptive. But at the same time, Tahoe saw an unprecedented real estate boom. Not just in numbers of applications but also in the complexity of those applications, and that's created strains. Then you layer on top of that all the pent-up demand from Shorezone ordinances finally being passed and being able to be processed. It's been a perfect storm of a whole bunch of additional work coming at a time when the typical administrative processes that have been used here weren't feasible with remote work, and Covid and everything else. Staff have experienced some permitting delays, overburdened and doing a lot of weekend work trying to keep up. They want to remedy that but understanding that there are budget limitations where they can't just hire 20 new people to take care of it.

They came up with six priority topics to focus on through the implementation program. The first one, efficiency, consistency, and predictability is an overarching goal, and then the others get to more specific issues.

One of the biggest things they heard is that the process can be inefficient and unpredictable. People don't know when they submit an application with great confidence that it's going to be approved or denied. There's a fair bit of subjectivity and they also don't know the timelines. An overarching goal is to try to be more predictable, consistent, and efficient. A lot of this is through the implementation of some of these best administrative practices that they see a lot in larger jurisdictions that handle billions of dollars a year of permitting. TRPA has traditionally been more of a small-town type of organization, with relatively small permitting loads. But implementing things like written procedure manuals, increased delegation, using templates, shared forms for permit documents as opposed to specifically prepared documents. Those will all help create efficiencies, and consistencies in review processes and outcomes.

The second topic involves minor things. A lot of stakeholders reported that small improvements, little permits things like that can take almost as long as a very big project. TRPA doesn't have a special minor permit category and are recommending that they create one. That would be the easier applications and review process. They have to be careful what the criteria are for those but essentially changes to allow easy things to happen more efficiently. Also looking at increasing opportunities to bundle and concurrently process different types of applications. A lot of times there are several applications you have to go through to finally being able to build house or something. Additionally, looking at Exempt and Qualified Exempt list and making some targeted expansions there. Also, they'll look at review processes, and likely recommend some additional delegation of approval authority to staff for more routine matters.

The third one involves the Code standards. This isn't about changing coverage regulations. But there are a lot of interpretations and kind of rules of thumb that have developed over the years that aren't written in Code. They are recommending some short-term Code Amendments to put in Code what those interpretations are so it's clearer what's allowed and not allowed. They're recommending near

GOVERNING BOARD

August 24, 2022

term organizational changes so that every document that's referenced in the Code is conveniently accessible in one location, and then long term this effort would be supported if they continue to look at some of the major ordinances. That is not part of this project, but he sees opportunities for example, look at the coverage regulations and better protect water quality through alternative approaches. But again, that's not part of directly related to this effort but it would be complementary.

They have several recommendations focusing on public communication and customer service. There have been some strains with remote work which isn't unusual. There's a lot more detail in the Action Plan, but the presentation is being kept at a high pretty high level.

Similarly expanding tools for staff development and training. There are opportunities to have lower-level staff members do certain functions and reviews that are currently handled by senior principal planner level staff. Through implementation of a written procedure manual that the newer staff could follow and increase delegation and training.

Everyone says you should start with a biggie and end with a biggie, and funding is a biggie. From what he's seeing in the budget information and fees, etc., the application fees do not fully fund the cost of review, so that can be a fair policy decision to make, but in an era of greatly increasing development, the overall general fund hasn't increased at the same rate as development has. The busier things get, if you don't have full cost recovery, the greater the strains become and is what the Permitting and Compliance Team has been working through in recent years. He recommended that TRPA transition to a system of full cost recovery so, the application fees cover the cost of review. Initially, there's probably no getting around continuing to add staff and doing that. But a real focus here is to make efficiency improvements in order to not dramatically increase fees in order to achieve cost recovery. Essentially, focusing on the cost of review and trying to reduce the time expense needed to review each type of application.

Longer term, another kind of supportive action that's not directly related here is doing a more independent type fund for permitting and separating that out from the general fund to a greater degree, and ultimately in busy times, if there's a system like that, they should be building up a surplus to cover slowdowns and not have to have dramatic changes in staffing levels when the normal ebbs and flows in the economic cycle occur.

This will be implemented through 12 coordinated projects to be completed in the next 18 months. The phase 1 projects focus on some of the easier, less time intensive improvements that can be done, and preparatory work staffing up for the effort, etc. Phase 2 involves a lot of the heavy lift and work should begin immediately assuming the Governing Board directs them to move forward. It will take 12 months to do administrative interpretations with written procedure manual. Some of these process improvements aren't feasible to pull together and get approved in six months. Phase 3 would start in about one year after Phase 2 is completed along with secondary priorities that will also require some time. Those items are good ideas, but maybe not quite as high priority as those Phase 2 items.

The supportive work mentioned is not being proposed to the implementation program, but continuing work on improving some of these core ordinances would be very supportive of this effort. There's only going to be so much simplification that can occur as long as they're implementing the current rules for coverage and height. They're just incredible, complex, and incredibly time-intensive to administer. Fee structure that's ongoing, kind of that concept of cost recovery. And then the work that Mr. Kasman will be speaking about continuing to enhance the Accela and Lake Tahoe Info platforms and using those

technologies to automate and improve efficiency of certain actions through technologies that are available today.

Presentation can be found at: [Digital First: Innovation Initiative \(trpa.gov\)](https://trpa.gov)

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean said obviously there are a lot of advances in technology and understands that can expedite the processing of applications, and so forth, but that personal touch and to reach a live person is essential. All of them have probably tried to get in touch with their credit card or utility company, and just keep pressing the 0 until somebody actually responds. It's incredibly frustrating not to be able to speak to a live human being. She's assuming that's not what they're suggesting here, as they move toward increased mechanization and automation.

Mr. Stockham, Stockham Consulting said not at all. Under the public communication and customer service category, they have some recommendations for staff to be more readily available in real time to answer questions. It would be through a dedicated customer service individual. Right now, the planners rotate through that role and try to juggle that with their other assignments. And, through a written customer service policy that would have clear guidelines for response times out, of office messages, etc.

Ms. Aldean said in terms of the minor permitting activities, is there any opportunity for further delegation to local jurisdictions?

Mr. Stockham, Stockham Consulting said yes.

Ms. Aldean said when permits are issued, doesn't staff ask for a deposit up front, and then bill time staff time against that amount? Then have the caveat that the amount may have to be increased to cover the actual expense of processing the permit?

Mr. Stockham, Stockham Consulting said yes, for some applications they do, for others they don't. When it gets to cost recovery some types of applications are recovering costs. Through his review work of permits, he had an addition to a lakefront home, and through the fee calculations, their fee was under a \$1,000. It was a small addition but there's just no chance that type of improvement can be reviewed against the Shoreline ordinances and things like that for a \$1,000. It's more targeted changes that they're suggesting.

Ms. Aldean asked if they would recommend that in all cases an upfront deposit be required, and then bill against it.

Mr. Stockham, Stockham Consulting said potentially, but he thinks for minor type applications that the logistics of implementing that may not be worthwhile and that there may be a fee schedule that they regularly check for additions. But they may want to add a Shoreline fee or things like that. Right now, they have a fee that's added on top if you're developing in a Town Center. But there isn't one when you're kicking in some of the scenic ordinances or other time intensive topics.

Ms. Aldean said then they're recommending something in addition to the annual inflationary adjustments in the typical rate?

GOVERNING BOARD

August 24, 2022

Mr. Stockham, Stockham Consulting said he's recommending a re-look at the fee structure and not just increasing it up a few percent each year, but actually changing the structure, because there may be applications that are overpaying. It has become very clear that there are certain types of applications that are inexpensive, but intensive to review.

Mr. Hester said they'd also like to work with Mr. Keillor to ensure that they are covering all the overhead.

Ms. Aldean asked if it were correct that they have an expedited permitting process if the applicant is willing to pay more.

Mr. Stockham, Stockham Consulting said yes, there is.

Mr. Marshall said there is an application to expedite review, which is different than outsourcing. The outsourcing review is when they hire someone like Mr. Stockham that allows the review to take place on someone else's relevant timeline as opposed to where they are in the queue with TRPA.

Ms. Aldean asked if it could ultimately expedite the process.

Mr. Marshall said yes.

Ms. Aldean said under Action 6.E it states that "Identify staff and consulting resources to help relieve the current backlog of project applications and establish teams to implement this Action Plan. She thought that staff was using Lyn Barnett which was giving applicants that that option to outsource. How is this different and is that something they're already doing?"

Mr. Stockham, Stockham Consulting said that is separate from the outsourcing. If someone is submitting an application with the regular fees the Permitting and Compliance team is pretty stacked up. There are several reviews to get to before you. That recommendation focuses on staffing up so there isn't that backlog. So, when applications come in, they can be reviewed timely. Again, it can only go so far because there's budget limitations. If budget was no factor, you'd probably be hiring six or eight additional planners.

Ms. Aldean said under Phase 2, Projects, item 6: Codifying Administrative Interpretations, would that include legal interpretations as well? It should if it doesn't.

Mr. Marshall said he's not certain what the difference is between an administrative determination and a legal determination. It's how they apply the Code. That will involve consultation with the Legal Department. Yes, it has legal input but there isn't anything that's just a purely legal interpretation.

Ms. Aldean said Legal Counsel advises the administrative process. So, through whatever administrative result will reflect that legal input.

Mr. Marshall said correct, those are all signed off by the Legal Department.

Mr. Lawrence said listening to the presentation in general regarding improving efficiencies and streamlining, it seemed like a lot of the recommendations were more in the customer service consistency kind of realm, and less about reducing project review time. To him, makes sense. It was

GOVERNING BOARD

August 24, 2022

even mentioned about having front counter help, and when he worked at TRPA, they rotated through, and he didn't think it was the best system. There was a period of time when Gary Weigel was the person on the front counter. It seemed like things got better and it sounds like it's gone back to the rotation. Looking at customer service, consistency, and getting procedures manuals in place makes a lot of sense, it will do the Agency and public well in the long run. He's a little confused on what they are trying to do with the review time and backlog. Is there a North Star that they're trying to get to and have an average review time of 30 days or a backlog of 50 or less, for example. What's an acceptable amount?

Mr. Stockham, Stockham Consulting said they're related. He's not sure there's a hard finish line goal where it's black and white. But in general, a system that when an application comes in the door, the review begins within a week, or so, would be a good place to be. What they're seeing now is that there isn't enough staff and oftentimes applications will sit several months before the review can begin. TRPA has a 30-day completeness review, plus 120 days. Some big applications will certainly continue to take that but if it's a 50 square foot addition to a house that shouldn't take an extended amount of time to get through the process. In those cases, 80 to 90 percent of the time that application is waiting for someone to be available to review it. Eliminating that wait time is a key goal.

Mr. Hester said before they got overwhelmed the way we did, and went through the Covid shift, they had worked up some performance measures based on the type of application. Something that was just a staff review would be one amount of time, something that went to the Hearings Officer would be more and something that went to the Governing Board would be more, and if it had an Environmental Impact Statement that would also be more. Hopefully, when they get to the different procedures put into manuals and different teams at different levels of complexity, they can revisit that and maybe come up with some performance measures that are stratified by difficulty of the review. That's where they're headed strategically, but they don't have those numbers right now.

Mr. Lawrence said he'd be interested knowing what the backlog is, what the average review time is, and how long do projects sit and wait, and what they trying to get to before investing a lot of resources in improving the process, because he doesn't have a good sense of that. He gets the customer service aspect and is important as far as review time. If they could define minor permits, that would be awesome. He thought that they had delegated most of those to the local governments as part of the Regional Plan Update, but it sounds like there's still a handful of minor permits that they could look into as a group or a category.

Lastly, cost recovery, as a director he gets it. It's nice to recover costs in reviewing projects, and to be able to hire staff. He's been on the other end of it working with folks like the Bureau of Management that are 100 percent on cost recovery. It works great for those that have a lot of resources. If you're a local government or a nonprofit organization, or whoever that does not have a lot of resources, and you're in a cost recovery framework your projects go to the bottom of the pile and the wait time is actually even longer than if you didn't have cost recovery. Cost recovery should be an element, but they should be cautious about going to 100 percent cost recovery without knowing what the ramifications would be for those smaller entities that need to get some good projects done.

Mr. Stockham, Stockham Consulting said part of that cost recovery recommendation is to maintain kind of targeted intentional subsidies for things like affordable housing, etc. Cost recovery or not recovering cost is certainly a policy decision. It just gets to a point of where's money going to come from and again are focusing on trying to be more efficient, and to reduce that cost review so they can

recover costs without more fees.

Ms. Hill commended staff for pulling this together and being so transparent about how they can improve. This is something she wanted a presentation on at the Operations and Governance Committee last year when she was new on the Board because she had heard from some constituents who felt like they didn't know where they were in the process. A lot of these suggestions will help on the customer end. She agreed that they don't want to be in a situation where they're putting quality or customers, or even good projects at risk with cost recovery. But certainly, if there's a way to ensure that they're staffed up to get projects through, and to be transparent on where the projects are is great and appreciated. She worked with Mr. Stockham when she worked at the City of Reno. She asked him if he touched base with the local governments. She was curious if Washoe County or any of the other counties around the Lake were able to give input on this process.

Mr. Stockham, Stockham Consulting said there was some coordination, but it was more focused on the TRPA nuts and bolts of the permitting system. There were a lot of discussions with staff and with applicants going through the TRPA process. Although there should be some side benefits for delegated permits to local agencies. He understands that not all the local agencies have taken on those responsibilities and if they can simplify some of these steps necessary for approval, maybe some additional local government delegation would occur.

Ms. Hill doesn't think Washoe County has quite done that and she's pushing them to do so. She knows that the staff is working hard and hopes they understand that she appreciates all the work that they have been putting in during challenging times.

Mr. Hester said they've separated Mr. Stockham's item from Mr. Kasman's item and to make it clear they're in the process of replacing a 15-year-old version of their permit tracking software with its current version and some of the process improvements Mr. Stockham is talking about will show up in the way they implement that new version of the software. Something they want to do that's been done in Reno, Sparks, and Washoe County is that an applicant can go online and look and see exactly where their project is in the process. When he was with the City of Reno, when they first started this, people would say that staff had the information for three months, but they could go online and look at it to show that they had it for six weeks, and now it's been back at the architect, etc. It starts making the whole process more transparent, and it gets to Mr. Lawrence's comment about then they can set performance standards that mean something. He'd like their performance standards to be ones that represent how long they as staff spend working on something and recognize that some of the time it's not with them anymore and they can't control that. There are a lot of good synergies between both pieces you'll hear about.

Mr. Friedrich had a few comments about delegating more to local jurisdictions and the Memorandum of Understandings to do that. Yesterday, at the City Council meeting it came up with the Planning Department about the time and complexity of some of these reviews and with the status quo needing more support and funding for that. He encouraged them to have those conversations with the local planning departments before recommendations come back to push more out to the local jurisdictions.

Mr. Stockham, Stockham Consulting said these are essentially topics they're recommending staff focus on. They are not here in front of you with specific solutions to endorse. There's going to be a process to develop each of these improvements.

GOVERNING BOARD

August 24, 2022

Ms. Aldean said Mr. Hester used to prepare a monthly permitting progress report for the Board. Is that data going to continue to be collected and posted online, or maybe provided as an insert in the packets?

Mr. Hester said that's where they're headed. He receives a weekly report from Ms. Jepson, and they are always within the 30-day completeness review, if not, 99.9 percent. They are a little bit over the 120 with Shoreline and part of that is working out the new procedures from the Shoreline Plan. Ms. Jepson redistributes the cases if they getting to the 120 days if it's anything besides Shoreline. Yes, the Board will get more reports and hopefully they'll get to a point where they can report out on the different levels of permits.

Ms. Aldean said she's been at the local government level involved with enterprise funds, and they can be tricky. In a number of instances, the general fund had to lend money to the enterprise fund because when there's an economic slowdown, there's the same number of staff members but very little for them to do because applications aren't coming in. Obviously, they have a lot of people who are undertaking projects, but suggested to be careful about developing enterprise funds, and expecting them to raise the money to support their activities, because that is a slippery slope.

Mr. Stockham, Stockham Consulting said yes, he's experienced enterprise funds and there's pros and cons. They're not recommending an enterprise fund in the initial implementation program, it's just something staff may want to consider in the future.

Mr. Hester said one of the aspects of at least tracking it separately is that they want to make sure that if there are boom times, and they can set some money aside that then during the down times they can smooth out revenue impact. But they aren't anywhere near that yet.

Ms. Gustafson applauded the affordable or workforce housing issues, because if they want to incentivize those sorts of programs, they need to expedite and simplify that. One of the things she's heard from a lot of her constituents is only people with a lot of money in big development, hire all the right experts to get them through the TRPA process, and it's not very transparent. She has never applied for anything, that's just what she hears from people. Those people say they aren't going to bother trying to get a permit because they've heard it's just a mess. That isn't true, but that transparency, and some of the processes they're talking about will help the smaller projects and homeowners that may not comply with the local jurisdiction Memorandum of Understandings. Having that idea of an Ombudsman or more transparency on our website will help individuals play by the rules and do the right thing because asking for forgiveness is kind of a motto that goes around versus the permission, because it seems overwhelming to an individual homeowner who is trying to do what they think is simple.

Mr. Stockham, Stockham Consulting said they heard that a lot, and their hope would be that this minor application process would be simple enough that they wouldn't need to hire an expert to help with.

Ms. Gustafson said don't forget the local jurisdictions often have public works projects that are larger and more complicated and take review time. Even though there's a Memorandum of Understanding for residential, they would still have to comply with TRPA permits for the larger projects. Wrap in those technical experts for ideas that would help them get the project through, because they want to encourage those projects to address environmental issues. Especially when they're dealing with individuals who might not live in the basin and work here day to day, could go to the Department of

GOVERNING BOARD

August 24, 2022

Public Works in Auburn or Placerville or Washoe County and may throw up their hands because they're not used to having to go through that level of regulatory review. They try to make sure they understand that and understand who the technical experts are on the County staff but wrapping them into these discussions might help find additional ways to streamline.

Mr. Stockham, Stockham Consulting said they will do that. Some credit to TRPA staff Mr. Nielsen in that they had started to brainstorm on some of these improvements and he had a nice extensive list of public infrastructure projects that could have a streamlined review. They anticipate giving those consideration, if not also implementing them.

Ms. Gustafson said a long time ago, in a previous career, they talked about the Environmental Improvement Program projects or those public projects and wanting to sponsor planners at TRPA to expedite those reviews.

Mr. Hester said that TRPA staff Ms. Friedman works in the Environmental Improvement Program Department and assists with EIP projects permittees get through the process.

Ms. Gustafson said they're trying to be part of the solution and trying to offset some funds for that position, as one district.

Ms. Regan, TRPA Deputy Director said there was a workshop yesterday, where they had 30 to 40 partners for Cutting the Green Tape. Kim Chevallier, Environmental Improvement Department Manager has been working with Ms. Friedman along with many other staff members including Kat McIntyre, Forest Ecosystem Health Program Manager to work with all the partners on restoration projects. In light of everything they've been talking about at the Board with the climate crisis, and the need to increase pace and scale of restoration. The workshop had representatives from California Fish and Wildlife, the US Army Corp of Engineers, the Forest Service, and the Lahontan Water Board. They were particularly looking at the Taylor Tallac invasive weeds project on the south end of the Lake but that could apply to many other projects. Not only on the permitting side of the house, but they are also looking at improvements, partnership-wide with the 100 different implementers of the EIP, including public works. This Cutting the Green Tape is an initiative that's been championed by Secretary Wade Crowfoot in the California Natural Resources Agency. TRPA staff is engaged with all those folks looking at it at a statewide scale, too, and all these things connect.

Public Comments & Questions

Jan Brisco, Tahoe Lakefront Owners Association and consultant. She thanked Mr. Stockham and TRPA staff. They know how difficult this is, and they appreciate their time and focus on this issue. One of the things that comes to mind is that the Rules of Procedure require a monthly report to the Board on projects. Unfortunately, there are a lot of projects that she doesn't think are even being looked at. They have several of the buoy applications from phase one that have been in there for two or three years now, and they are trying to get those resolved. There have been two allocations for new moorings that have happened, and some of those applicants who've been waiting for an answer could have been taking advantage of those allocation allotments, and have not been able to get into that, since no action has been taken on their on their application. There are critical issues and am glad to hear that Mr. Hester and staff are going to be providing the Board with that information. More to the point is that files are not really accessible online. And while Mr. Hester indicated that you can go online and see where your application is, very often those aren't updated, they don't have timely

GOVERNING BOARD

August 24, 2022

information, and then they have to bother staff with their questions. That seems to be very inefficient and through Mr. Stockham's recommendations and staff's commitment, they can see that change and then all files are made available for public review.

Regarding outsourcing of applications, very often the consultant that they try to outsource with declines to review the project, so they are not always able to do that. She'd say about 80 to 90 percent of lakefront applications have to be outsourced because the time it takes through staff is nearly six months or longer in some cases. That gets to Mr. Lawrence's comments and others is that they need to focus on this and drill down to the specifics of it. They stand by and want to participate in that and try to help, because they know where the problems are from her side of the table, and hope that staff will use their expertise and suggestions in a wise way.

When you pay for outsourcing applications plus the TRPA application fees, that's basically double and is around \$20,000 to \$30,000 in some cases for a simple project. Lastly, they want the Memorandum of Understanding files from the local jurisdictions available on the TRPA website because they can't always get them from the local jurisdictions. It's almost impossible to get anyone from El Dorado County to return their calls. They spend weeks trying to get some response, and this isn't proper government, and the MOU projects are hundreds of those. They should be able to have the local jurisdictions send those files to TRPA to be included on the Accela system and TRPA website. Thank you and they are in support of this project.

Natalie Yanish, Contractors Association of Truckee Tahoe thanked everyone for all the work they do. Tahoe is very much locked in time. They have a housing infrastructure that is basically degrading because of all the permitting that are required and mitigation fees to do any sort of project in Lake Tahoe. It makes it very difficult for anyone to rehabilitate a property, and/or build a property here just because of those fees. Going to an enterprise fund is also tricky. She appreciated the comments that came from Ms. Alden about that because it does make it a little bit more complicated and unaffordable to build any sort of project here in Tahoe as far as housing issues go.

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean made a motion to endorse the Permitting Improvement Action Plan as shown in Attachment A, taking into consideration the comments made on the record today.

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

Absent: Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Mr. Hoenigman

Motion carried.

(Presentation continued)

Mr. Kasman said what Mr. Stockham laid out in the Action Plan pairs well with the work that they're doing through the Innovation Initiative. It also pairs with the Strategic Plan that talks about accountability, a high-performance organization, and accelerating threshold attainment and is what the Innovation Initiative is about.

TRPA has been using the Accela permitting software for about the past 15 years now. They just went

GOVERNING BOARD

August 24, 2022

through a process to upgrade the system and to move into a hosted environment with Accela that offers them a lot of opportunity to now enhance that software in a way that is going to change the way that they do business. The 15-year-old software had been upgraded but relied on old workflows and old processes that were hindering their ability to make some of these changes. By updating it, that will improve customers ease of use. This is a system that they use for online applications or paper submitted applications. They track their completeness, the project review, permitting, as well as inspections and construction. This is the software that they use end to end to do this and is the same software that's currently being used in Washoe County, Placer County, the City of Reno, Douglas County, and Sacramento.

There's a lot of opportunities to not only learn and use this new package, but also to learn from other jurisdictions that have been using it and build upon their success. They'll be rolling out very shortly, an electronic plan review which all of these improvements are designed to streamline their processes and to reduce that amount of time that Mr. Lawrence talked about in terms of the back and forth with applicants, how long it takes them to review and issue a permit. By using these electronic tools, they can accelerate the review times.

There's an opportunity for them to create real-time dashboards where applicants will be able to see where their application is in the process, how many days it's been in review, and be able to see where that is in terms of applicant responsibility and TRPA responsibility. They'll also have dashboards to see the overall performance. Where are they in terms of application volumes, where are they in terms of their 30-day completeness, and 120-day project reviews. As they look at layering on additional timeframes, they will adjust those dashboards to reflect that. All this information will be publicly available and can package it for monthly reports. They'll also have an internal dashboard that management will be able to view workload by planner and be able to identify where they need to maybe shift workloads around to be able to get to everything on time.

From the applicant side, there's also email and text notifications that are now available. The applicant, the property owner, and consultants will be able to receive real-time notifications on their applications.

The Digital First Initiative is all about identifying new and better ways of doing things, updating their systems and tools and looking at throughout the industry, where modernization and opportunities are to streamline and to use automation. Here they mentioned digital Code, and Mr. Stockham talked about a lot about opportunities within the Code. TRPA's Code of Ordinances is very difficult to interpret. Using those opportunities to use technology to offer examples, or to show on the ground what this looks like and bring in more of that modern view where it's not just words on the paper. But you see these code pieces in situates and see how they're being implemented in order to help guide project applicants on how to do it for their own projects. Eventually, they'll get to using digital maps and information from their systems to help applicants fill out their applications.

Again, getting to that question of the need to hire a consultant. If they can help people complete their applications, they may not need to hire a consultant unless they choose to. Getting to the point that they have their zoning information, the Code, and digital maps all available so TRPA, public, and applicants are all working off the same set of information. In many cases, they can use their technology, whether it's GIS, zoning codes, or other things to streamline the project checklist. They'll be able to have that automated and look at whether a proposed project complies with what the rule says, and if so, it can be passed through the system. If not, then it would be kicked out for further

evaluation, and would be prioritized for those planners that now have more free time and available to look at these more complex projects. It's about how do they simplify those processes as Mr. Stockham mentioned how to streamline the reviews and use automated checklists to then focus on the more complex projects that they need to spend more time on.

A key part of the Digital First Innovation Initiative is about not only digitizing all of the files in the file room and making that information available publicly through the Lake Tahoe Info platform but it's also about preserving that information. The Caldor Fire last year, was less than five miles away from this office, and that information being stored is irreplaceable. Document preservation is key their business continuity, but also unlocking that information so applicants, project proponents, property owners know what they could do on their parcel.

If this information was digitized, then they can use this Geo processing and digital tools for both regional analysis with Regional Plan changes, as well as down to the project level and help applicants fill out their applications and know what they can do. This is where planning is going. As they look at this scanning or digital preservation project, they have requested funding from the states of Nevada and California. Nevada has given them \$250,000 allocation for this project, and they have funding requests in through the state of California for matching funds. The call to action is to help support them in those in those requests so they can digitize these files and move forward with these projects. They are bringing on a consultant to do the scanning and the data entry and now just need the funding. The file room has more than 200,000 records in their file room, and the vast majority of them have not been scanned. They need to increase the scale and pace with which they're doing these projects.

Lake Tahoe Info is the central resource for information in the region. There are more than 2,100 registered users in the system today where dozens of questions can be answered. This has become the central repository for Tahoe. They have an open-source license on the Environmental Improvement Program Project Tracker that there are more than a dozen other agencies throughout the country that are now using that platform to track their projects, accomplishments, and funding. They've licensed the entire Lake Tahoe info umbrella to Puget Sound partnership for their info platform. They've been able to use a lot of their funding and leverage to then work with other agencies to extend the platform and it's been highly successful and unique public partnership.

Staff will be back with some other highlights about the Tahoe Boating app and other things that they're doing in GIS that are incredible but wanted to focus today's presentation on the permitting side of things.

Presentation can be found at: [Digital First: Innovation Initiative \(trpa.gov\)](https://trpa.gov)

Board Comments & Questions

Mrs. Cegavske asked if they had selected a consultant for the scanning work.

Mr. Kasman said they'll be doing a Request for Proposal to select a contractor.

Mrs. Cegavske said the Secretary of State's office had someone come in and do that work and recommended that they check with that company also.

Mr. Kasman said they will definitely have quality assurance and controls in place for this project.

Public Comments & Questions

None.

- B. Briefing on the Lake Tahoe Transportation Equity Study TRPA staff Ms. Smith and Ms. Flint, DKS Associates provided the presentation.

TRPA staff Ms. Smith and Ms. Flint, Regional Director of Communications and Strategic Planning for DKS Associates provided the presentation.

Ms. Smith said the Transportation Equity Study is a recommendation from the Regional Transportation Plan. It is a great study to help them achieve a number of their Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policies and to implement TRPA's mission to enhance and revitalize our local communities.

(Slide 2) Is a snapshot of the timeline of the study. They kicked it off back in February 2022 and since then they've conducted a number of different focus group meetings. They've met one on one with multiple different stakeholder groups. This week and next week they'll be hosting a couple of community workshops as well.

Ms. Smith will overview the need for the study and some of the initial analysis and the Ms. Flint will provide a presentation on the public outreach to date.

When the Board adopted the 2020 Regional Transportation Plan that there was a recommendation to conduct a Transportation Equity Study ahead of the next RTP update. The Regional Transportation Plan was a massive document, there were a lot of new advancements as part of this, including a revenue analysis, a look at innovative transportation solutions, congestion management process, public participation plan, and then as part of this RTP they also had a renewed look at environmental justice with a focus on equitable transportation solutions for the basin.

And as part of that environmental justice analysis, they identified five different community priority zones where the most transportation disadvantaged community members are located, and where they're working on prioritizing transportation investments for those zones. Those were Kings Beach, Incline Village, Bijou, Sierra Tract, and Tahoe Valley. (Slide 3) The map on the right is an example of one of those community priority zones, and that's showing what the transportation investment is supposed to look like in 2045.

This Transportation Equity Study is building off of the environmental justice analysis that they did in the RTP and will help them enrich the information that they have for transportation funding and project prioritization decisions. This study is incredibly important right now, because they're seeing a lot of the funding sources on both the Federal and State levels are increasingly tied to equity. For example, the Justice40 Initiative requires that 40 percent of transportation investments benefit disadvantaged communities and project applicants have to demonstrate how their projects will benefit disadvantaged communities. (Slide 4) A list of sources that are primarily discretionary competitive grant sources. They're hoping that the information they gather through this study will help Tahoe applicants be competitive when applying for this funding and ensure that they can meet their

action items under the 7-7-7 framework in the Transportation Action Plan.

(Slide 5) This graphic from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation shows that equality means that everybody gets the same bicycle and equal treatment, and equity means that everybody gets a bicycle in their size. Equity is all about meeting people where they are, and in the context of transportation specifically it's about focusing on those transportation disadvantaged communities and prioritizing transportation investments for them.

(Slide 6) Shows the communities that they're focused on as part of this study. They're focusing on outreach to this group of people in particular, because these are the people who are more likely to depend on public transit, walking, and biking because they are less likely to have access to private transportation due to a number of different factors ranging from cost, affordability of transportation services, physical mobility and accessibility limitations. They're doing a lot of outreach and trying to break down language barriers with the public members from the Spanish speaking community and Tagalog speaking community.

With a focus on those priority communities, they are looking at any and all barriers that might impact a person's access to safe and convenient transportation. They're looking at availability and accessibility of transit services, and infrastructure. They're looking at the cost of services, affordability of private transportation. They're looking at how long and how much time a person spends traveling from Point A to Point B, and how many different transfers they might have to make and how many different modes of transportation they might have to use. They're also looking at the adequacy of transportation conditions such as the pavement and sidewalk condition, perceived safety, number of sidewalk crossings, and whether or not a sidewalk is plowed. As part of the study, they're looking into emergency preparedness and resiliency because how well a transportation system operates is critical in emergency situations, like a mass evacuation from wildfire, which many of us experienced this time last year.

As part of the study, they're doing some analysis spatially to understand where our priority communities live, and what access to services looks like for them. (Slide 8) One example looking at access to healthcare services for people with disabilities. The map on the left shows the density of individuals with disabilities on the South Shore. This Census data from the American Community Survey. The darker green areas are neighborhoods with a higher density of people with disabilities. The map on the right shows the proximity to Medicare and Medi-Cal Healthcare providers. Green is closer to those providers in red is further away. This relationship is important, because people with disabilities often rely on more frequent access to medical care, and they also often rely on access to Medicare and Medi-Cal to receive that care. The further that they are away from Medicare and Medi-Cal providers exacerbates the mobility challenges that they face. Putting those two maps together, they can better understand the unique relationship between where people with disabilities are located and where they have more limited access to Medicare and Medi-Cal services.

(Slide 9) This map the darker red areas are areas with both a higher density of people with disabilities and areas that are further away from Medicare and Medi-Cal providers. In the context of this study, they would want to focus on those darker red areas for transportation services for people with disabilities. However, looking at things spatially, is only one piece of the problem, and to truly understand the issues in context, they have to engage meaningfully and regularly with people with disabilities or advocates from that community. For example, they recently met with advocates from the disabled community, and before they had met with them, they did not know anything about this

GOVERNING BOARD

August 24, 2022

dental provider. (Slide 10) That red star is located on the map is this dental provider called the Smile Shop and are the only Medi-Cal dental provider in the Tahoe Basin. Before they spoke with advocates from this community, they did not know that this dental provider is located on the second floor of a building without an elevator. Although this is a nearby provider it isn't an accessible option for people who can't use stairs. Those people would then have to go outside of the basin to access dental care. This is one of the main reasons that this study is centered around public outreach and engagement, so that we can identify these unseen barriers and work with their partners to find solutions to them.

(Presentation continued)

Ms. Flint said they are very committed and excited about working on this project because it is equity focused. It's not a backward-looking document, it's going to be a forward-looking document that builds on the policies that are already here. One of first things they did was to look at the Regional Transportation Plan as well as other documents that have been created. The purpose of their effort is to connect with these underserved and sometimes overlooked populations throughout the basin. Her team spent a couple of weeks here meeting everyone they possibly could in both North Lake and South Lake. They wanted to ensure that they were connecting with the most important communities within the area. They also wanted to make sure that they were collaborating with other efforts. There's currently a second thing that's happening here for Destination Stewardship which is all about how visitors interacting travel to here and there. They teamed with them to make sure that their engagement efforts were happening concurrently and in tandem so, they weren't doing separate things with a separate purpose. That helps them build on those additional things they're trying to get to which is leveraging the relationships that exist within the basin, and then establishing new ones. The new ones are critically important because they are looking at quantitative and qualitative data.

The qualitative data is the stories that they're hearing from people and the individual interactions that they're telling us about, based on their experience.

(Slide 13) A number of their efforts included collaboration with the Washoe Tribe elders as well as Chairman Smokey Serrell. They had a series of four specific focus groups, looking at all kinds of things from people who are mobility challenged, low income, people of color, employers, employees, and anyone and everyone that has a reason to get around the basin. This would also include recreational purposes. On top of that they set up another dozen meetings with individual stakeholders representing first responders such as Police and Fire. They're talking to individuals that work and provide homeless services for those folks that perhaps are representing seniors or students, anyone and everyone.

It was fascinating because there were a lot of consistencies in what they told them and a lot of things that they did not know such as access to parking and some other issues that they had in terms of getting around. They combined that data with what they had and they're moving forward with the set of indicators which is how they would build on this Equity Study. Taking the indicators and it needs to be something specific enough that they can draw a line to say, here's how they'll measure it. You want everyone to be happy, how do you measure that, it has to be something that's quantifiable. What's important about that is the grant programs that are happening now both at the State and Federal level, require it. They have to be able to demonstrate they're going to do it, show how they're going to illustrate their success in doing it, and then be able to memorialize that in an action report.

(Slide 14) They've had a couple of hundred surveys that went out in Spanish, English, and Tagalog.

They've also had these different meetings with the groups to be as comprehensive as possible, and then also going to place based things because there are folks that may not have a computer or cell phone.

(Slide 15) Infrastructure is the first of the six basic types of indicators they're looking at which relates to infrastructure, meaning anything that relates to the design of a road, the size, or width of a trail, whether someone can get to something based on its physical structure. It also looks at multimodal access, ADA compliance, and hand broadband will likely come into this. Broadband is incredibly important for things like resiliency which means when you've got to get out of dodge, and sometimes that happens you want to have an infrastructure network that supports that ability and connects things like traffic lights, etc. to ensure that they go smoothly. From an equity standpoint they want to make sure that it exists basin wide and ignoring some pockets and only investing in others.

(Slide 16) Engagement is a core value of both TRPA and DKS. How are you talking to people? It used to be in equity discussions that the idea was you translated your FAQ into Spanish, and you called it good, and that just does not cut it anymore. Now, they have to do is identify advocates within the community, people that they know are already working with these groups, and push information out through them and identify what barriers exist to get that information out there. In this instance, they're looking at what are the communications channels? What kind of languages does TRPA need to prepare for? Again, leveraging those community advocates and ensuring that funding is adequate in order to make that happen. They have to be able to be committed to put enough force behind an effort to make sure that the engagement is real and meaningful.

(Slide 17) The proximity of services is not only for the resident population, but also for visitors that are coming into the basin for either recreation or relaxation. It's where are these services located at? Is the service frequent enough and does the service provide safe services, what are the cost of services, accessibility for mobility challenged, are there buses to accommodate wheelchairs, is there the ability for someone that's blind to be able to hear a crossing signal, etc.

One of the items that came up in their group was training of service providers, because a lot of times these folks that are on the buses are providing a service to a rider, they may be the only person within proximity to an emergency happening at that time. Are these folks prepared to deal with these kind of circumstances?

(Slide 18) Year-Round Access: They need to make sure that there's equitable opportunities and easy opportunities to get to employment centers, access to things like healthcare, food, amenities, essential goods and services. That varies, depending on where you are in the basin. Some areas have great access to everything, and others do not. A number of their respondents talked about accessibility to elected officials and a vast majority of the folks they talked to don't feel that they have that access and feel that they are not in the process. How do you change that? There are some policies and things that other agencies have done. There's also the option to nourish or encourage minority candidates to run for office. These are all things they can think about as they move forward.

(Slide 19) Environment: Making sure that the choices and investments that are made are equitable in terms of their impact on water, fire, flood mitigation, climate change, and air quality. Again, that the habitat is protected universally throughout the basin, and not just in one area or another. This is an area that was one of the things that started the environmental justice movement in Southern California 30 years ago because of the highways going through poor air quality in some areas. It's a

GOVERNING BOARD

August 24, 2022

little different up here but it does make a difference. For example, if there are certain types of things used for snow clearing or ice reduction. What impact does that have on the water? What impact does it have on water or homes there in proximity to that?

(Slide 20) Technology means they'll be looking at equity indicators that relate to things like messaging systems. How many people have asked how many parking places are available at Emerald Bay? What is the traffic like at X, Y, and Z? What's the best route to get out in terms of emergency services and systems, alerts, or the ability to tie in signals to all be green one way to get people out of town.

They're looking at things like that from an equitable standpoint, as far as how they can get the maximum of people to and from places safely such as micro-mobility options and then intelligent transportation system.

Over the next few months, they'll be vetting these ideas with members of the public and this Board. This week they're doing two outdoor concert events. They felt that these were more conducive to getting people to stop by the booth and share some ideas than expecting them to go to a public meeting. Next week, they'll also doing the same thing with two Spanish language workshops with one at the South Lake Tahoe Family Resource Center, and one at the Sierra Community House on the North Shore.

Once they get through the Fall, they'll developing these policies based on these criteria, and then bring that back to the Board for your discussion.

(Slide 23) Proposed Project Schedule. They'll be providing to everyone a summary report that will list the comments and summary notes from all the stakeholder meetings. What's important is to document everything. For example, when you come back and you have a grant application and policies, you have the documentation that shows how you got there. Not that you just decided to do it, because this would make your score better. Make no mistake, this type of work is cutting edge right now and TRPA is one of the few agencies that are ahead of the pack on those that are going to be applying for these grants. That's true for both California, Nevada, and the Federal level. In January and February, they'll be going back in with our stakeholder meetings and will come back to the Board with a more fleshed out list of these policies. Adoption will be in the springtime of 2023.

When you hear policies or implementing policies, especially as it relates to equity, there can be a fear factor in that to what extent does it tie them to Board policies or actions that are going to be inconsistent with the Strategic Plan or inability to implement? They will work closely with TRPA staff, as well as industry leaders that they connect with to find policies that are complementary to what they're trying to achieve here. But also meets that level of an actionable item that can be tracked and work for this community, which is why it's going to be a different equity index here than it might be in Sacramento, San Francisco, Carson City, etc. The idea is that when they're complete with this, those member agencies that choose to, will be provided word document of all of the background materials, and information that was there. If you choose to move forward and establish equity policies for your own organizations, you would be able to build on that, or adjust on that to meet your needs.

Presentation can be found at: [Agenda-Item-No.-IX.B-Transportation-Equity-Study.pdf](#)

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Faustinos is pleased at the process that they've identified. It's consistent with lots of best practices in terms of community engagement, and the approaches that you need to take because you have to have varied entry points into a population. She'd like to dig in a little bit more into the staff report to understand more on what their response rates were. This is one tougher pieces of this community engagement process is that end up getting feedback from who you end up getting feedback from but understanding the demographics of that group. Was the feedback from mostly from younger folks or older folks and how do the development of their policies get impacted by who you get the information from, and how well does it set you up for the future, is important. There's a lot of processes that's going to go on from here and would like to understand better about how that's going to flow through. The real kicker ends up being how are they consistent in their practices of community engagement because that's typically not funded in a lot of spaces. You can do it for a plan but unfortunately what happens a lot of times, you lose that connection to the communities that you started developing this with because it becomes a resource issue. How are they going to operationalize that? It's important that they just don't have a one-time action and figure out how to support that that relationship into the future.

Ms. Flint, DKS Associates said regarding demographics, one of the things that they do in this study, and they'll see it in their new dashboard that TRPA will be launching shortly is look at the totality of all the demographics that they are trying to reach, then they have to be representative of each one of those demographic groups, specifically people over 65 with or without a car, with a disability, with the language, all those different people have to be represented. That's one of the reasons that they had to do so many stakeholder meetings in order to get that fabric that is consistent. This is not in the plan at this point, but what some other agencies have done in terms of nurturing those meaningful relationships and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments is doing this with applying for and received an equity, inclusion, and diversity grant. They \$3 million to fund their local community groups and stakeholders to help them facilitate meetings and push out that information. There's a lot of different ways to go at it but Ms. Faustinos is absolutely right, it becomes tricky with the funding.

Ms. Smith said another part of the study will be a review of their public participation plan which they have to update every four years ahead of the Regional Transportation Plan and DKS will be providing recommendations on how they can improve that ahead of the next RTP update.

Mr. Friedrich said this may be an overlap in your slides between infrastructure and environment. In the environment slide it talked about the equitable impacts to the environment, presumably from transportation infrastructure projects, was that the idea?

Ms. Flint, DKS Associates said it can be. It can also be if you are setting aside land for example that is going remain open space, or untouched, is all that land in one particular place, perhaps, is frequented by a more affluent population or do you find an equal commitment to preservation of land and environmental issues?

Mr. Friedrich said his question would be on the flip side on the impacts and how they're currently looking at it. The Biden Administration just put in a \$1 billion Infrastructure and Investments Jobs Act funding program to remove highways that have historically divided low-income people of color communities. How are they looking at the equitable distribution of impacts of things like highway bypasses or transit hubs both on the cost and benefit side? They've had projects that have been

GOVERNING BOARD

August 24, 2022

proposed to go through low-income neighborhoods, and not through wealthy neighborhoods. They've had transit hubs that may benefit lower income workers that are opposed by people wealthier folk, for example. How that would be brought to bear in this study and what kind of marks would be given, or evaluation criteria for those types of choices?

Ms. Flint, DKS Associates said the Tahoe Transportation District is doing one now with the mobility hub. The California Environmental Quality Act which looks at mitigations and impacts that a project has. But in this case, from an equity standpoint if you adopt policies that are specific to weighing those types of issues which are sticky, you could have policies that basically talk about things like that, and you can have them be "should" examine, or you could have them be "shall" examine and that will be a discussion that the Board will have. What happens in the past is that you'd have to look at the users, the community of benefit, community of use, and then develop a scoring mechanism or criteria that says, you need to reach such and such a level. At DKS they do a lot of cost-benefit analysis, for corridor studies, mobility hubs, etc. This is another measurement tool that would go into the mix of cost and all the other things that they normally look at. It depends on the preference of the Board as far as how far or how not far you want to take that by adopting a policy, because they can't tell them they must do it, they can only tell you that these are some options for your consideration. She anticipates that when that comes up, they'll probably want to spend a couple of meetings going through that for each one of these sections to make sure that all the Board members are on board and have had an opportunity to ask questions.

Mr. Friedrich another question would be equitable access for regional transportation. It's around 8 or 10 percent of people in the US have no access to an automobile. There's been discussion around Basin entry fee and some input has been, well, the leaders don't support it because of the equity impacts. But what about people have no car and if they're assessing a fee on people who are fortunate to have a car who have more resources than those who don't perhaps, they can make an argument that it's transportation equity to support a program to get people up here who otherwise have no way to get to the basin.

Ms. Flint, DKS Associates said they've heard that several times.

Mr. Friedrich said he would like to see that brought to the discussion because it relates to that question, for example. Looking at folks who have zero access to an automobile given that the entire system is built around that and looking at the access to the basin from that perspective and will that be included.

Ms. Flint, DKS Associates said yes, it will. They've had several folks that specifically discussed that, and, in some cases, it was discussed in a very forceful and energetic manner. Again, it depends on how you set it up. The policy is to look for alternatives to getting people here without taking a private vehicle that opens up a lot of real estate to figure out what the right tool is to make that happen. The suggestion that was made that if they were going to do something like Mr. Friedrich was suggesting that the funds that were generated by such an action would be used to offset the cost of public transportation to bring people in from the Nevada and California side into the basin, thus, reducing traffic, greenhouse gas emissions, and reducing overall impact on the environment.

Mr. Friedrich said while addressing inequity to those who have no car. He would love to see that perspective brought in, because he thinks the equity argument of say, a Basin entry fee is often shortsighted, not really looking at people who are in that category of no car.

GOVERNING BOARD

August 24, 2022

Mr. Rice said it made the hair on the back of his neck stand up when you say Basin access fee. Don't look for that to happen in our lifetime. Number one, Douglas County would never go for that and two, he doesn't think even as liberal as the Nevada's getting, he doesn't see that in their future at all. In the presentation the mobility hub for the Tahoe Transportation District was mentioned. He's on that Board but he doesn't know that there's been any coordination with your group, TTD, or the South Shore Transportation Management Association. Do they plan on having coordination with those agencies in the future?

Ms. Flint, DKS Association said she coordinated last night with Danielle Hughes, and continue to coordinate with her today. They're going to be looking for a lot of the same information that they are gathering for this story. DKS reached out to her and was told that they would be more than happy to share their findings and information and if there were opportunities for joint meetings or ways that they could support that effort, they're more than happy to do so.

Mr. Rice said one of the requirements for the building the Event Center was free public transportation. Are they planning on tying into that and coordinating with the different agencies around the Lake that have transportation systems to make them mesh better than they do now?

Ms. Flint, DKS Associates said that would be premature for her to tell them what kind of specific policy there might be, but certainly they would be looking for ways to maximize connections within the basin. And that goes beyond public transportation. Another item they talked about was first responders, and a better connection between the various fire stations, for example, that while they're connected on mutual aid and things like that that there could be a better connection and several of the Fire Chiefs expressed a desire to have that conversation. TRPA is uniquely suited to help provide the playing field to have that discussion. Whereas, if it comes from one or the other of the Sheriff's Department, there tends to be a little bit of an ownership issue. She thinks that happened several years ago that made it less successful. They will be looking at possible recommendations for policies that collaborate and coordinate efforts maximizing not only the financial investment but increase the ability to deliver a higher quality of service basin wide.

Ms. Hill said this was really an informative presentation and am excited to see the outcomes. She asked if they knew that they are also doing a study up in Incline Village and Crystal Bay on transportation with a private consultant.

Ms. Flint, DKS Associates said she believes they've connected.

Ms. Smith said yes, they've been in contact with Amy Cummings along with the US 50 project discussion that will be up next on the agenda.

Mr. Lawrence echoed Ms. Faustinos comments about the process that they're using which seems to be very collaborative and inclusive. He's excited to see what comes out of this. A couple of things that he'll be looking for are that there's been a lot of well-intentioned legislation regarding different things in this space, but they're not funded. And it's not something a staff person can just take on as an extra duty. Hopefully, the recommendations and policies will be mindful of that. Second, he'll be very interested to see how their study lines up with the Justice40 provisions. Some of his conversations with the Nevada Department of Transportation, and then internally with their Division of Forestry, they're wrestling with how to address Justice40. There are some projects that have a huge benefit to underserved community, but it's not necessarily in their geographic location. For example, a forest

health project could be done that might detract from catastrophic wildfire and then they don't get the smoke impacts in Reno. But they haven't been able to get that direction from DC regarding exactly how Justice40 is going to be applied to different projects, whether it's a geographic location, or if it's 40 percent of a user group, so, he'll be interested to hear as they go through this process, how they're applying these findings to how it meets provisions like Justice40.

Ms. Williamson said this was a really interesting presentation and am happy to see the public comment piece of this. One of the things they're looking for is feedback to improve TRPA's public outreach and engagement, and through their public comment, it will be interesting to hear remarks and how the public is appreciating or not appreciating the engagement efforts through this outreach. Some people, particularly after Covid might have more of an online presence. She likes that they're going places and meeting people where they're at in the community inside and outside of the basin and at different hours of the day. It's important that they're meeting people where they're at, and one thing that will be helpful to her is if they start to hear feedback on that there are particular methods or places where people are engaging more or less, because then as TRPA, they can build on that as well.

Ms. Gustafson said a lot of the North Shore residents are commuting now and aren't living in the basin. Getting out to their employers to talk about this issue is important. Because there is no more affordable housing within the basin, especially in the North Shore where they've seen a mass exodus of many of their working employees. And those who maybe don't have vehicles or are carpooling up, and how they can work with Washoe County and other areas in Nevada to help that.

Ms. Flint, DKS Associates said they met with four of the largest employers in the basin, among them being Palisades, Heavenly, and hospital system to find out what they were doing with the challenges. It was interesting, because some of them were implementing bus service because they cannot afford to put people here.

Ms. Gustafson said the school district is a critical one as well.

Ms. Flint, DKS Associates said they met with them as well.

Public Comments & Questions

Steve Teshara on behalf of the Tahoe Chamber said he seconded what Ms. Gustafson said about reaching out to employers because a lot of people don't live in the basin anymore. He also hopes that they include resorts here on the South Shore in addition to Barton Health, Heavenly, Northstar, and Palisades Tahoe because it's good for the employers to know that this is going on. Because there's going to be some issues and some outcomes of this, that they'll say they weren't aware of that. They want to be aware and what affects their workforce.

C. Briefing on the US 50 East Shore Corridor Management Plan

TRPA staff Ms. Glickert, Ms. Rosenburg, Assistant Director for Planning, Nevada Department of Transportation, and Mr. Gant, Wood Rogers provided the presentation.

The US 50 East Shore Corridor Management Plan starts on the northern end at Spooner Summit where US Highway 50 meets State Route 28 and on the southern end in the South Shore adjacent to the

GOVERNING BOARD

August 24, 2022

Event Center at Lake Parkway. Corridor management plans are a sub area within an area plan. Corridor plans are focused on their major transportation corridors. Last year, staff briefly introduced this plan to the Board. At that time, they also discussed some of the other projects going on the on the east side which included Warrior Way that may have a signal there in the future, and the Round Hill Pines entrance.

The lead for this corridor project is the Nevada Department of Transportation which are funding the development of the plan.

(Slide 2) Within the Regional Transportation Plan they identify several focus areas to help them achieve the goals of the Plan and reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled. One of those focus areas is Communities. Through corridor management plans the elements almost always include transit, trails, and technology. In those plans, they like to combine all those elements to provide safe, secure, and efficient transportation for the communities. This map illustrates how the region is divided into Corridors. Corridor Planning is basically a sub region within an area plan focused on the roadway and adjacent land uses. Through corridor planning land use and transportation are closely linked and the region's economic vitality, environmental sustainability is all supported.

Corridor Planning is a key strategy within the RTP to manage the travel within those corridors and is often where they see the congestion and parking issues exacerbated. Each management plan is unique, they provide a vision and a coordinated set of goals for land managers to work toward. Each plan concludes with specific project recommendations for future implementation. These recommendations are then fed upward into the Regional Transportation Plan and most recently into regional efforts for bringing in additional transportation funds. The US 50 East Shore along with State Route 28 and 89 are priorities identified in the Bi-State Transportation Action Plan. State Route 28 and 89 corridors have provided great insights into US 50 East Shore planning. However, this corridor plan on the East Shore is a little unique, it has several neighborhoods and full-time residents unlike the other two that are focused on recreation.

Collaboration on corridor planning is essential to success. (Slide 3) Are all of the agencies that have been coming together on a regular basis and being informed through focused one-on-ones and as the project development team for the plan is supported by a great team of consultants.

(Presentation continued)

Ms. Rosenberg said safety is their top priority on all transportation facilities and all users of the transportation system. Other goals of the One Nevada Transportation Plan include preservation, mobility, sustainability, connecting communities, and transforming economies. The US 50 corridor in the Tahoe Basin serves all these goals. It's not only a beautiful corridor but also provides a critical connection to communities and economies in and out of the basin. It provides a critical connection for tourism and recreation, but also services to support the year-round population and workforce.

NDOT views this corridor management plan not just as a study they need to do on a roadway for upcoming projects, but an opportunity for partnership to ensure multiple goals are met for multiple agencies and stakeholders. This effort, while funded and led by NDOT, has been done entirely in close partnership with the TRPA Transportation team. This team has been with them every step of the way, and the process is better for it. They've done more public engagement, and public partnering on this study than she can remember. It's important that they have a shared vision of the future of this

corridor, and that this vision include the continuation of that vital connection in a safer, more efficient, and more inclusive way.

(Presentation continued)

Mr. Gant said the limits of this specific corridor management plan is about 13 miles from Spooner Summit down to Lake Parkway. There are a lot of unique features about this corridor compared to State Route 89 and 28 and what those corridor management plans had to encounter, and a big part of that comes with the broad range of users that are represented along here. It's not just residents, commuters, and recreationalist but is also a local and regional commerce and is one the only corridors in the basin that runs multiple states all the way across and ties into the East Coast. It has a different feel, a different flavor to it, and is a different corridor compared to a lot of the other ones in the Tahoe Basin. However, it also experiences a lot of the same demands and challenges that some of those other corridors do as well. There are six study goals that have been identified to support this corridor management plan and keep them moving in the right direction. That includes improving safety and is paramount, and that is one of the key outcomes of this study is trying to improve safety in this corridor.

It also includes enhancing the visitor experience, promoting economic vitality, protecting Lake Tahoe, expanding multimodal transportation choices, which is another major focus area, and promoting and enhancing agency collaboration.

There's a lot of agencies and land managers involved in this process, and they're working hand in hand to create a coordinated study at the outset.

Public outreach has been at the heart of this, and they started off last summer with a public canvassing tour and did a similar tour again in the spring. Last summer's tour was a listening session and understanding what the community sees as some of the challenges and concerns in the corridor. Some of the feedback they heard during last summer's public canvassing tour included 62 percent of residents prioritize high speeds as being a major challenge in the corridor. They get a lot of head nods when they talk about speeding being an issue. Similarly, 56 percent prioritize the difficulty turning in out of side streets and driveways. With the speeds and the nature of the corridor itself and having to you know cross multiple lanes to perhaps get in the direction you're trying to go it's difficult to access in and out of side streets and cross streets.

As part of that outreach last summer, they did recognize early on that a lot of the feedback they were getting was from residents, so they did another survey with more recreational focus and some of the high-level feedback they got was that 79 percent of them noted the lack of safe bicycle and pedestrian facilities throughout the corridor. The second listening tour in the spring was an opportunity to start floating some initial ideas out to the public and getting feedback. Again, they followed that canvassing tour approach where they set up in short durations of time but in multiple locations throughout the corridor at different times of day and days of the week. With that, they started to get a lot more feedback, whereas in last summer's canvassing tour we had 80 total people show up at those events and in the spring, they doubled that with 170 people showing up.

They're just starting to filter out the feedback from the study and some of the concepts that they were looking to get feedback on. Some of the takeaways from the spring outreach include that most folks are in favor of reducing operating speeds out there, similar to what they heard last spring. They have

GOVERNING BOARD

August 24, 2022

the data to show that speed is an issue and people feel it too. Similarly adding turn lanes to address safety and access at those cross streets again that got a lot of head nods. Some high-level concepts were floated in the spring to look at lane repurposing and the feedback on that was very mixed. The largest concern was if there were opportunity to repurpose lanes out there, is that going to create congestion? Certainly, with some of the swings they see in use of the corridor during peak visitation periods, that's an understandable concern. There's strong support for eliminating roadside parking throughout the corridor, particularly at Zephyr Cove. Everybody that they spoke with unanimously understands the benefit of trying to eliminate on highway parking and move that to off highway locations and similarly one of the concepts that was floated during the spring was a potential for converting the State Route 28 and US 50 intersection into a roundabout, because the left turn movements there are so difficult, and that got quite a bit of support from the folks that they engaged with. And so did the inclusion of roadside multimodal improvements on US 50 south of Elks Point Road. Once you get south of Elks Point Road there are no on highway bike and pedestrian facilities, yet you see a lot of folks out there walking and bicycling because there's a lot of destinations that are connected through that that piece.

For each one of these canvassing tours, they send out over 4,200 mailers to addresses in Douglas County, and a lot of people showed up with those mailers in hand, so they know they're working. Similarly, they've also met with several HOA's and GID's. This also includes the Star Group, Barton Health, the Presbyterian Conference Center, recreation groups, and other individuals along the way.

They're looking at what they can do within this corridor and the range of solutions to address a broad range of needs and concerns out there. One of the things that they've tried to be very clear with and upfront with is there is a broad range of needs in the corridor. So, it's not just improving safety and recreation access, it's also everything from commerce to transit. The amount of needs out there outweigh the available highway right-of-way space that they have and understand that there's a balancing act and is the intent of the study to find balance amongst the competing needs throughout the corridor.

There are a range of opportunities that are under consideration as part of the spring outreach. They did roll out with some different concepts that look to reimagine US 50 and what that roadway configuration looks like, and to try to balance safety as well as other needs. That is an important component of the study but there are another range of options that they are looking at and taking into consideration through a more holistic approach and this includes expanding transit throughout the corridor and understanding that is going to be a key strategy for servicing high demand periods and recreation that they won't always have capacity for. Other strategies include expanding the Tahoe East Shore Trail and multimodal improvements as well. Again, it's a key opportunity to create those transportation choices that were discussed in the previous presentation for both residents and visitors.

Parking management strategies are huge. He mentioned eliminating the on-highway parking on US 50, but they have to create opportunities and what are those opportunities to replace that off the highway and how are they going to manage those? Because they know during peak periods, there's going to be more demand than they'll ever have capacity for. Other opportunities include enhancing recreation and visitors experience and are trying to look at that through the lens of the visitors and what can they do to make their experience better? They've been focusing on things like vista points and better access to locations like Logan Shoals.

Leveraging technology and expanding communications is also another key strategy that they're looking at which was also discussed in the previous presentation. They all know that communications are key up in the basin and depending on your venue it can be spotty at times. Closing that gap helps make these other strategies work. It's kind of a backbone piece of making all these strategies work together. Also, implementing demand management strategies which there are things that they can do to try to move the needle a little bit on what those peak demand periods look like and can they spread those out a little bit. They're trying to take an "all of the above" approach and not focus on just the highway and highway operations, all these things have to come together to create that balance.

In developing more specifically a lot of the highway solutions that they're taking a look at; the study team did identify five different study parameters. The first parameter is extending the Tahoe East Shore Trail, as an established priority in the basin and it's an important part of this study. A lot of the folks that they had conversations with kind of questioned do they really need? Is this something they should be spending time on? Their approach is this is a given they're going to move forward with it and implement it. Second, is expanding the paved roadway capacity is inconsistent with adopted policies, trying to create that balance because adding a bunch of lanes on US 50 is not the way to do it. That's another parameter they've established. Third, direct impacts primarily in the form of private property acquisition should be limited to the greatest extent possible. Again, trying to address a lot of the needs out there and not looking to take private property and work to the best possible within the public right-of-way. Fourth, multimodal strategies are key to addressing the swing and demands and the high demands that they see throughout the corridor. No matter what they do, it has to be multimodal focused because they will never provide enough capacity through other modes to make things happen. Fifth, safety and evacuations are front of mind for everybody, especially after last year.

When they're looking at potential opportunities, they are considering reconfigurations, in the most constrained sections of the corridor. They've identified some of those to be to the north as you change character of the roadway when you come from that rural feeling of US 50 coming down Spooner, you make the turn at Glenbrook, and suddenly you're in more suburban location. The area changes, it becomes more constrained, and you have driveways. They've identified that location as being an area of focus. Similarly, once you get south of Logan Shoals through Cave Rock down to Skyland is one of the most constrained areas of the corridor that they're looking to serve and balances those needs through potential reconfigurations. Lastly, south of Zephyr Cove towards Round Hill Pines is another very constrained section of the corridor. They've heard several people refer to that as dead man's curve.

The overall intention is to improve safety by reducing speeds. The intention is not to create congestion but to get people to drive the speed they're supposed to be driving. But these reconfiguration opportunities also create opportunities to incorporate turning movements, turn lanes, acceleration and deceleration lanes. Since some of these areas are very constrained, they also use these reconfiguration opportunities to incorporate the Tahoe East Shore Trail.

He mentioned the "all the above" approach and transit being key to that but recognize that they have to integrate all these opportunities and strategies with transit as a key backbone. They've identified several different opportunities that they pulled out of the Regional Transportation Plan and Tahoe Transportation District Master Plan to look at which one of these can support what it is that they're trying to do on this corridor and improve throughput while also making it safe and accessible for all. And there's a range of transit strategies that are key to playing that role.

Some other supporting strategies beyond the traditional roadway infrastructure include technology and ITS and focusing on getting the word out. If they can stop additional people from coming to the basin during high congestion times, then they're not adding to that congestion, and they could solve the problem before the problem gets worse. Technology and ITS is huge for that as well as things like parking management.

Adaptive corridor management is another strategy that they're looking at. This is something that TRPA has taken on in other areas around the basin, and this is certainly another location that is applicable, as is expanding communications. Transportation demand management as well as parking management all the way down to leveraging micromobility devices. On peak weekends you see people on US 50 on those scooters and there's demand for that, and they need to respect that.

Looking at the overall study process they've developed a four-step overall process. The first step was that education, understanding what the issues and concerns are which they started with last summer's public canvassing tour. Step two is looking at potential backbone configurations and what that core piece of US 50 look like? Again, that's where they went out in the spring to get feedback from the public on. They're in step three which is refining that backbone in conjunction with supporting strategies and opportunities, and are in the middle of that right now, and getting close to transitioning over to developing the final corridor management plan and overall implementation plan.

They are transitioning over to that Draft Corridor Management Plan framework as they head towards fall. Of course, going back out to the public one more time to get feedback on those elements before they finalize the plan hopefully around the end of the year. This is just the end of this plan, as the intention is to have a long-term implementation plan. It's already started with things like the Round Hill Pines entrance, and then next year with the Warrior Way signal. The Nevada Department of Transportation has an upcoming pavement preservation project that they'll be looking to identify some easy wins out of this to incorporate into that project. The intent is to keep that momentum moving forward similar to what's been done on some of the other corridor management plans.

Presentation can be found at: [US 50 East Shore Corridor Management Plan \(trpa.gov\)](https://trpa.gov)

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Hicks thanked Ms. Glickert and Mr. Gant not only for the presentation today but the presentation that they gave to the Glenbrook Homeowners Association a week ago. As they heard earlier today, Glenbrook is a hard community to please. They were exceptional and they answered a lot of questions. Their knowledge on the subject is so extensive and it's appreciated. It is important to talk to groups out in the community not only to the full-time residents in the basin but also the short-term summer people. People hear rumors and misunderstandings of what's going to be done. It's important to get the information out to them again and again and be willing to talk to those people in the way that you do. They're doing a great job at it.

Ms. Aldean echoed Mr. Hicks comments, it was a great presentation. The issue of on highway parking along State Route 28 has always been an issue. Even if they put up no parking signs people who are desperate to spend time at the Lake will generally defy those signs. The only alternative is to create a lot of unhappy visitors by ticketing those cars but often collections are problematic. Maybe it's a monetary issue, but why haven't they put up wooden guard rails along that section of SR 28. That's not what they're talking about today, but you have to change behaviors. Even if there are some offsite

GOVERNING BOARD

August 24, 2022

parking areas, generally those are fairly limited in terms of the total number of parking spaces available to the general public, especially during peak seasons. To her, the only way to change behavior is to make those on street parking areas unavailable by eliminating them. Otherwise, she doesn't feel they're going to change behaviors. If the objective is to gently coerce people into taking transit to their destination, they've got to coax them into doing that by making what is traditionally been an area where they have parked unavailable to them. The same applies to the Zephyr Cove area. Some those shoulders in some cases are a little wider than the shoulders along SR 28 and more tempting for people wanting to park to access the beach. Please factor that into your thinking because long term it's probably the best solution.

Mr. Friedrich asked if they could speak to the role of TRPA vis-à-vis the Nevada Department of Transportation, and Douglas County, for example on the on-street parking issue. By extension, he would have the same question for Emerald Bay on highway parking. Who decides and what's the role of TRPA in making that decision?

Mr. Gant, Wood Rodgers said he can speak to the perspective of the US 50 Corridor Management Plan. It comes down to collaboration. Everything in the basin is intertwined. Then you add the Forest Service to that list. Specifically, around Zephyr Cove, a lot of it comes down to the frank conversations. They've had those and walked out in the field together as a group, including Douglas County, Forest Service, Ms. Glickert, and NDOT to understand what the issues are and what the opportunities are? What do you need as an agency to make this happen on your end and I'll tell you what I need as an agency to make this happen on my end. They've had very open conversations about that but they're getting there with identifying some opportunities north of Warrior Way and east of Zephyr Cove for those off highway parking and starting to come up with what those configurations look like. A lot of it comes down to understanding what each of the agencies need and having a frank conversation about it upfront.

Mr. Friedrich said regarding cracking down on speeding, what would be TRPA's role vis-à-vis the Highway Patrol issuing more tickets and more patrols. What are some strategies that this Board can take?

Ms. Rosenberg, Nevada Department of Transportation said speeding is their top priority statewide right now for safety. It's the leading cause of fatal and injury crashes. What NDOT has authority for is maintaining and operating the highways of the State. They're doing what they can and some of the concepts that they're developing here to encourage a different behavior whether it's parking or slowing down, they partner very closely with the Nevada State Police and Highway Patrol where appropriate. Like many state agencies, they are having some staffing challenges right now. On State Route 28 they worked with them in terms of what would it take for them to enforce this more and it was provide parking somewhere else, and they were happy to enforce it. She doesn't know that they've had a conversation with them about increasing patrols on speeding on US 50 yet, but they're happy to take that on. What they're doing is part of this study is how do they encourage people to slow down naturally rather than the enforcement approach, or in conjunction with the enforcement approach.

It's still kind of early, and as this study and plan come together and get finalized, they'll continue these conversations with their partners. If they take on some of the engineering solutions, then they need the enforcement and the education. The "e" in safety is everybody, enforcement, education, and engineering, etc. It's how do they continue to develop this corridor and operate it once the plan is

wrapped up in addition to that conversation as they're developing it.

Mr. Gant, Wood Rodgers said Mr. Friedrich is asking specifically what TRPA could do. One of the things that is key in this particular situation is speaking with a unified voice. One of the things that they've heard, and is a misconception is that NDOT is embarking upon this study and effort solely to try to incorporate bike lanes or whatever on onto to US 50, that's not the case. First and foremost, it's their first goal is to improve safety. If they're all speaking with that same voice of this is a safety focus that they can also accommodate other modes and that's part of the safety conversation, that helps bring TRPA and NDOT together.

Ms. Glickert said it's a multitude of things. It's about protecting the environment and bringing all those other goals into this planning process, not just the transportation and equity related ones and how they want transit. It's all the policies that they already have in place, that then apply here. They have policies about safety, equity, and the environment. For TRPA, it's awesome to be at the table with their partners. The Forest Service is on board with the removal of those spaces and managing that area. It's about collaboration and having that one voice and getting everyone on the same page is where they're at. And that gets back to the collaboration that TRPA brings.

Mr. Friedrich said a coordinated campaign basin wide to have everyone slow down and do what they can to support enforcement of that carrot and stick would be big step in the right direction. And to get people not to park on the road on the East or West Shore's would both big steps in the right direction, etc. He would be happy to entertain options to send a message from this Board in the future.

Ms. Regan, TRPA said their role as the Metropolitan Planning Organization is a leadership role in the basin with their partners, the Tahoe Transportation District, and all the partners that Mr. Gant illustrated in that collaborative framework. What they did in the Bi-State Consultation on transportation in the first phase of work they did a Memorandum of Understanding for the State Route 89 corridor. They also have an MOU for the State Route 28 corridor that they can bring that to bear to get law enforcement to the table. There are a lot of barriers to making this work which have been highlighted. But to summarize the "E's", education is key. They just launched a new Take Care slow down program right before the Summit. Much more will be done to engage our Take Care messaging for Tahoe for education and enforcement. The Tahoe Fund helped convene a partnership discussion around parking enforcement on these corridors, but the key question is, if those spaces aren't there where else can people park? They've had judges say they're not going to enforce tickets unless there's another option with a shuttle or a place to park. Certainly, the engineering solution, there will have to be more barricades. But all the "E's" have to work in concert to enable an outcome in the change of behavior. They're attacking it from a number of ways, but the answer is collaboration, because there's a lot of different jurisdictions involved. The Board as policymakers have a key leadership role in convening that partnership.

Mr. Rice said Zephyr Cove and Round Hill Pines have been sticking points over here on the on the East Shore. He's glad to see NDOT stepping in. There are some things that are going to happen but there's so many rumors that are going around. He's constantly getting phone calls from people asking if it was true that they're going to make all of Highway 50, one lane in each direction. There needs to be more outreach with what they intend to do and dispel all these rumors. Having acceleration and deceleration lanes are going to be very helpful. Comments that he gets are what's it going to do to the traffic? Is it going to be backed up all the way through the area of Cave Rock. There's been many instances where traffic was backed up all the way from Stateline to Cave Rock which is inexcusable.

GOVERNING BOARD

August 24, 2022

One thing he's glad to see is the signal at Warrior Way and doing away with the parking all the way from Zephyr Cove to Skyland, as well as Round Hill Pines. There are times where you can't even get your mail from the Round Hill Shopping Center because people have parked there to walk to the beach. He's looking forward to the reduction of parking on the highways. He thanked NDOT for all the work that they're putting into this.

Public Comments & Questions

Steve Teshara speaking today as both the Government Relations Director for Tahoe Chamber, and as the Chair of the Board for the South Shore Transportation Management. One gem on this good team is Karen Mullen, because she has done a lot of the work for outreach. She is very familiar with many of them in the basin and worked here for many, many years. When Ms. Mullen wants to bring the team in and talk to your Board or group, it's really effective. Mr. Gant is a great leader of the team, but Ms. Mullen has done a really good job both in terms of the Chamber, Star, and other community groups. From the South Shore Transportation Management Association perspective, they've have been supporting for many years the expanded Kahle Drive Vision Project. That shows the connections of dedicated bike and sidewalks between Stateline between the intersection of Lake Parkway and Highway 50 and Stateline all the way past the Kahle Drive intersection all the way up to Elks Point Drive. It's sort of laid out there and in TRPA's Regional Plan too.

Hopefully, the team will take that into account because that is part of what people have as an issue, because they all see people walking and riding bikes along the roadway between Elks Point, Kahle Drive, and beyond that. That's become increasingly popular, and they want to encourage people to use other modes than just vehicles. More recently both the Chamber and the TMA have accelerated their outreach to NDOT to try and get some funding for the construction of a roundabout at Lake Parkway and Highway 50 which is the Nevada side of the Highway 50 project, and then do as part of the package those sidewalk and bike trail connections. And of course, the intersection at Kahle Drive which is not appropriately constructed and knows that NDOT is very keen on that. That's part of their plea with Douglas County to help contribute the final piece of money that we need to redo Kahle Drive. There are a lot of interconnecting pieces here.

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Gustafson echoed all the comments and thanked all the partners.

D. 2022-2023 Annual Work Plan Update

Mr. Hester said this item is to provide to the Board as context for the six initiative presentations they've been receiving since the board retreat. This item is informational only today. The updates include the new Governing Board members, new staff, and addition of the programs beyond the four departments.

Today, he'll cover how this work plan fits into what they do. The work plan does focus on climate change and is throughout all of the initiatives.

(Slide 4) This is the process that they'll be working on starting in early 2023. The long-term strategic objectives or pillars, or what they look at as the long-term goals no matter what the initiatives are. The Board all set that and can adjust that if they think it's necessary in 2023. Then staff will continue with

GOVERNING BOARD

August 24, 2022

the initiatives or can change the focus of them somewhat. That then goes into the annual work plan document they have in front of them today. That also goes into when Mr. Keillor puts together the annual budget with the department heads and other staff.

(Slide 5) The big focus of the current work plan is on climate change. Across the top of this graphic, you'll see how they work through their existing regulations. They refine them, and implement new things which is the plan, do, check act. On the bottom are the three aspects of climate change planning that's evolved over the last eight or so years. He'll talk about mitigation, adaptation, and resiliency. In the center they all come together using the tools that they have for their day-to-day operations at TRPA which are the Threshold Standards, Regional Plan, Code of Ordinances, and implementing projects as the Environmental Improvement Program does.

They spent a couple of years working on the latest Threshold Standard and a new category called Sustainable Communities and that's the Vehicle Miles Traveled per capita. That's specifically and directly designed to address climate change and greenhouse gas reduction.

Some of the things they do in the planning realm include Regional Plan which has mixed use Town Centers that reduce the demand for VMT because there are multiple uses, so people don't have to drive. The Regional Transportation Plan provides for non-automobile modes of transportation or less VMT. Some of you may recall in our area plans they call for each local government to have a Greenhouse Gas reduction strategy in there. Then there's a series of climate smart code amendments that the Board will hear about in about two months that are underway right now.

The biggest thing for implementation is that the EIP added climate adaptation and sustainability as a focus area. There are projects in that category, and they'll also see reduced VMT through traffic. They'll remember the project mitigation model that they just updated with the mobility mitigation fee that used the air quality implementation fee that results in reduced VMT or neutral VMT with every project.

Climate change planning: Mitigation was the focus of the 2014 Plan that won national awards to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. That happens for example, when the states require renewable portfolios, or when the vehicle fleet gets electrified, those are the kind of things that reduce emissions. Adaptation is making changes to realize that climate change is coming. Those are items like hardening infrastructure for floods, extending piers for drought. The Board will hear a little bit about those kind of things in a couple of months. Resilience is setting both adaptation and mitigation and other actions up, so that they can resume life "normally" after an event like a flood or a fire. Resilience is what they're after and is what mitigation and adaptation is all about.

(Slide 8) This is their current standard status of greenhouse gas emissions and the trends from the inventories done in 2005 and 2010. So, they're on a good track. Transportation is a big source. TRPA is directly involved in that through the Metropolitan Planning Organization. Energy has a lot to do with what the states are mandating for electric generation by utilities. But they can also impact that by allowing things like solar collectors and battery storage and their work to electrify the fleet. Transportation works with that. They have a big role in both of those particularly transportation.

(Slide 9) California Senate Bill 32 and Executive Order B-55-18 called for California to be neutral, which means offsetting with carbon reduction projects to reduce the CO2 released into the atmosphere.

Nevada Senate Bill 254 in 2019, Net Zero which means offsetting with carbon removal that actually

takes CO2 out of the atmosphere.

(Slide 10) The last accounting was done in 2018 before Covid that compares emissions on the left to what is sequestered. Depending on how you measure, they are close or maybe have achieved that Net Zero in terms of carbon in the basin. Obviously, a lot of this they can't control within the basin.

(Slide 11) Staff brought housing to the Board in July and Innovation today. They'll hear about the other four over the next four months, and those are the pillars or strategic objectives that each one relates to.

(Slide 12) The transportation part of Transportation and Destination Stewardship or Sustainable Recreation is electrifying the fleet for example. How do they help in that? They've put together a Plug in Electric Vehicle Readiness Plan that goes from the Interstate 80 corridor down to the US Highway 50 corridor. They did that with the Tahoe Donner Public Utility District and has resulted in a lot of new stations for charging including some here at TRPA. That is how they work on the supply side of transportation by making available the option to not use a gas or a fossil fuel burning vehicle. They also do other supply things on the transportation front with alternative modes like bike lanes, etc.

On the demand side is what do the users of the system want to get to and how do you manage that? Using a water planning analogy; you don't always plan to get more water sometimes you also plan on how to help people manage the demand for that. That's what they're moving into on the transportation side when they looked at Destination Stewardship. They've figured out over the last few years, that about 50 percent of trips don't come because of the things they have managed in the past like land use and development rights, but a lot of them come because there are people that just want to come up for day visits for tourism, hiking, visiting the Lake, etc. They're working with their partners on the best ways to manage this significant component of demand, especially as areas get hotter. More and more people are coming to the basin to recreate. They have a big challenge there to work on Destination Stewardship on the demand side of the transportation and recreation model.

Housing is to have viable communities. People need to be able to work and live there, and they need people to be able to teach at our schools, work in our stores, etc. They need all those for those reasons, but also as relates to climate, one of obvious problems is that if people don't live where they work is there's a commuting problem more greenhouse gas emissions, and a more congested transportation system.

TRPA is aligning the Environmental Improvement Program around the climate. Cutting the Green Tape study is all about increasing the pace and scale of the EIP projects. You've also heard about funding and they're working on a Memorandum of Understanding with the Forest Service for the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act funds. They've expanded their engagement to landscape level networks to learn about the best practices, and possibly add to the knowledge base on best practices.

There's been a lot of work done on the Thresholds over the past few years. Currently, staff is updating the framework. They are working with the Tahoe Science Council to look at what are the input measures, for example, and how are they performing street sweeping? What are the output measures like? How well is that reducing sediment? And what are the outcomes they're after such as the Secchi depth clarity? Much better than the way they used to do Thresholds, instead of saying a standard has to fit in a category, they now have categories that are tagged because there are a lot of things that apply to multiple categories. It's more systemic type approach to Thresholds.

The priority categories are Watersheds and Water Quality, Forest Health, Biodiversity, and Air Quality. The others that they still have to work on are Recreation, Scenic, Noise, Soils, and Sustainable Communities per capita VMT standard. Innovation is about processes, policies, and technology and how they use that all that together.

(Slide 18) The core activities are most of the thing's staff is doing that the Board doesn't always see. They are the things that they have to do by the Compact or required by funding entities. Staff won't be coming to the Board with these types of items. About 90 plus percent of the permits they process, they don't see. They don't see the boat inspections; they don't see a lot of things staff works on. These 51 core activities listed in the Work Plan plus the initiatives are carried out by the entire Agency. There are about 68 staff because in the summer they add two to three monitoring staff and two to three boat crew staff.

That's the majority of their Work Plan and wanted to recognize the talented and hardworking staff that you don't see all the time.

Please contact him with any questions or comments. This will be useful as they go through the initiatives and vector towards the next Strategic Planning update in 2023.

Presentation can be found at: [Annual Work Plan](#)

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Yeates said our General Counsel is usually involved in just about everything they do. Whether it's enforcement or that they're going to speed up the permit process, change codes, etc. This all has to go through Legal. They talk about climate change in our policies and how it will happen. Mr. Yeates has a legal degree, but it was trying to do stuff that he had to do with his State Attorney General hassling over every step that they did on a threshold thing and had it not been for Mr. Marshall helping him negotiate with them, it would have taken forever. Mr. Marshall deals with six counties, one city, and two states and they're different. One of the things that was said to him when he was appointed to the Board was the people in Nevada think you're a crazy environmental lawyer, and Nevada is a little bit different. Ms. Berkbigler used to remind him a lot that they just don't do that kind of stuff in Nevada. The point is that one of the things that Mr. Hester says that this is going to help Mr. Keillor develop the budget for next year, and he thinks they're woefully underfunded when it comes to Legal. They are lucky that they have someone like Mr. Marshall right now. He doesn't know that there'll be another person like him and certainly you may not have as the next executive director, a lawyer which Ms. Marchetta was. You may have someone that's focused on other policy issues that will rely heavily on the General Counsel and advising him or her as to how do these policies link with all this other stuff. The kind of stuff that a County Counsel does for Placer County.

If they want to change fundamental policies, so they can do more workforce housing, that's a lot of work and a lot of work out of a legal department to do that. Every time they have a Shoreline enforcement problem it goes through Mr. Marshall. There needs to be more than one Mr. Marshall. There needs to be attorneys that he will train and that are divided up among Planning, Permitting, Transportation, and Shoreline/Shorezone. He does it all, but that's not fair. When Mr. Keillor puts together the next budget for both states need to say they need a more robust Legal Department, and this is why and they make the pitch because for the future of this Agency, they need to have a lot more attorneys.

GOVERNING BOARD

August 24, 2022

Mr. Marshall said there's a larger message to Mr. Yeates' point. Whether it's him or any other staff, they're working at capacity. If they want to do a lot of the other innovative things that Mr. Hester has talked about, it's not just himself. It's indicative of larger issues that they're going to have that the Agency has struggled with for a long time. Some of you that are involved with other state and local agencies have this in different forms as well. It is a reconciliation of what their objectives are and what are their resources to do that. If you want to have certain objectives and you want to keep talented staff, then they need to provide the necessary resources.

Ms. Gustafson said that's an excellent point and when she looks at their County Counsel's office, or at the complexity of the issues here, the County has subject matter experts throughout the County Counsel's office for the various departments with a legal team of around 30.

Mr. Friedrich said the City of South Lake Tahoe adopted what he calls the strongest renewable energy resolution in the country, a 100 percent renewable at all time periods connected to their local grid. Is there an action that the Board could take that would help prioritize those kind of mitigation measures with projects in the basin. For example, if there's a conflict between scenic and rooftop solar, the Biomass ban, or if there was coverage for battery storage. Is there any legislative kind of policy initiative that they would take to help them in those situations to prioritize meeting climate goals?

Mr. Hester said yes, Mr. Stock and one of their student interns did a survey with stakeholders for what sort of climate smart amendments do they need for the Code. A lot the things he mentioned such as Biomass, Solar Collectors, and Scenic were brought up in that survey and it's going to be presented to the Board in October.

Mr. Friedrich said in his view, one of their biggest exports could be knowledge of the relationship between climate change and the degradation of Lake Tahoe. They hear it all the time from the scientists as the biggest threat. No matter what they do here, it's a global problem, but they can inspire people to be part of the solution where they live. They could see what they're doing here in Tahoe and take action where they live. When you visit Monterey Bay Aquarium or the San Diego Zoo, or other places, it's very clear the link between the climate and those ecosystems.

He would love to see some inclusion in October of how they can really ramp up that connection where everywhere you go, you not only see the solutions, but your help to make that link and given tools to be part of that solution at home, because in the end of the day that's something they could really contribute to the larger effort to turn the tide on this.

Ms. Hill agreed that they need to figure out how to staff up so we can meet all these initiatives.

Mr. Rice said being on the Legal Committee, he's had privilege of working with Mr. Marshall on many occasions. If they can't clone him, then maybe they could go out and get some assistance for him.

Mr. Marshall said he's had some of those conversations internally and it's a budget decision. Right now, it's a finite set zero sum. It's where they want to put those dollars and so far, they haven't hit any major legal road bumps. At some point, he'll no longer be doing this so, they've been thinking about what that means for the Agency, and how to transition into something else.

Ms. Gustafson said Ms. Williamson had to leave and was going to call back in to make some comments on this. In case she doesn't, she wanted to echo Mr. Yeates' comments. She shared those same

concerns about Legal Counsel and adding to that.

Public Comments & Questions

None.

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Gustafson said they all appreciate Mr. Marshall's efforts. The organization of this plan and the areas other than Legal were well covered and strategized, and they look forward to working on those initiatives. She appreciated that the Board is getting more involved in looking at the long range of where they're headed and preparing themselves to have input on these topic areas.

X. REPORTS

A. Executive Director Status Report

Mr. Hester introduced new staff member, Rachel Shaw, Assistant Transportation Planner. Ms. Shaw has done some great work over at the City of South Lake Tahoe, among other things, she worked on the Complete Street Project.

Mr. Haven said Ms. Shaw is the newest member of the Long Range and Transportation Department and her focus will be on transportation.

Ms. Shaw said she's been in South Lake Tahoe for about 1.5 years working with the Tahoe Resource Conservation District, and then with the City of South Lake Tahoe.

Mr. Hester said for about two decades TRPA has sponsored an environmental scholarship fund. They've granted 29 students over the years in the amount of \$13,550. This year, they gave two scholarships of \$750 each to Jacqueline Avery from North Tahoe High School and Talia Tofanelli from South Tahoe High School. Talia's quote to them was "The earth is what they all have in common. I don't want to protect the environment; I want to create the world where the environment doesn't need protecting." These are motivated, young people who want to spend their careers working in the environment. They're honored to give them these scholarships. If you'd like to contribute, make out a check TRPA with a memo for environmental scholarship and send that to Victoria Ortiz.

1) Tahoe In Brief – Governing Board Monthly Report

Mr. Hester said Board members were provided with the Tahoe In Brief monthly report. If you have any suggestions or comments to improve this, please let him know. Staff has switched from working on a quarterly report that's retrospective to this which will give the Board more information on what's coming up.

Executive Director Report (continued)

Ms. Regan said in addition to welcoming Ms. Shaw, TRPA has had two extraordinary interns this summer: Olivia Craig and Kamryn Kubose. They both have worked on many of the items that you've been seeing the summer on the Equity Study, Corridor Planning, and Long Range Planning issues.

GOVERNING BOARD

August 24, 2022

This year was the 26th Annual Summit sponsored by US Senator Rosen. A lot of work goes into those summits behind the scenes that no one ever sees, and it really is a huge leadership role for TRPA to coordinate with their Congressional offices, with the many staffers from the Federal, State, and Local levels, as well as their partners.

Recently, they did presentation for staff, because they have a lot of new staff that didn't really understand the summit tradition. The first Summit was done with President Clinton and Vice President Gore in 1997. This made the cover of the Tahoe Daily Tribune and a big expose in the Reno Gazette Journal with a recap of all the issues which are eerily familiar today such as Forest Health and Transportation and some new ones like climate change and invasive species. She thanked staff for putting together the Environmental Improvement Program report which was in the Summit bag. They report every year on the partnership of the EIP and the accomplishments from the year before. They also had a big milestone with the Bi-State Consultation on Transportation, co-chaired by Mr. Lawrence and Secretary Crowfoot convened that partnership which is a continuation over the course of many years, and were able to celebrate that in this document to identify the plan forward for funding framework.

B. General Counsel Status Report

Mr. Marshall said an item that's particularly relevant since they were talking about US Highway 50 today is the Tahoe Cabin v. Nevada Department of Transportation and the Federal Highways Administration litigation over the Round Hill Pines Project that named TRPA in this litigation. They brought on new counsel and TRPA is now being dismissed out of that action. It is still progressing with the lawsuit against Federal Highways for the National Environmental Policy Act violations.

There was another interesting Nevada Supreme Court case that came out last week on a Douglas County Homeowners Association. They have Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&R) that said their homes could only be used for residential uses and the litigation was over the question of whether Short Term Rentals can be banned as a result to that kind of limitation to residential use. Which they hear a lot about when people come to the Board and talk about STR's. The Supreme Court found that STR's are within the ambit of residential use. There wasn't any particularly special language in those CC&Rs, in that it was generally like other CC&Rs used primarily for or exclusively for residential uses, as distinguished from purely commercial uses and STR's are kind of a combo or can be. That was an interesting development that they saw in state law.

XI. GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER REPORTS

Mr. Hicks said the Forest Health and Wildfire Committee hasn't met in several months. He suggested staff schedule a meeting to provide the committee on upcoming topics and things that they can do in the forest health area. They've spent the past few years modifying and updating both the ordinances, but there's other things that they need to do. Each committee member should give some thought to topics of interest things that they should be addressing.

There are a lot of grants of Federal money that have come through in recent legislation and would interesting to know how much of that can they steer into forest health projects in the Tahoe Basin. Is there anything that they as an Agency can do to either help identifying those funds or getting them to the right agencies?

GOVERNING BOARD

August 24, 2022

Ms. Gustafson said there's so much work going on in innovation in our nonprofit sector, and they might be interested to come to the Forest Health Committee, and whether it's the Tahoe Fund, or even the Community Foundation. Obviously, biomass is a big issue.

Mr. Yeates said the work between TRPA staff and the California Tahoe Conservancy staff would be an ideal situation for some kind of workshop or a presentation. For example, he's been wondering what's happening with Tahoe West and the restoration work that's going on from the Caldor Fire. There's a lot of timber is being cut and there's a lot of bare land. He's read in the New York Times and the Sacramento Bee that California is prime for one of these, massive super storms except this time the storm will stay and would be nasty with all those bare hills up there. He agreed a presentation would be nice. On the Thresholds he knows they're thinking about how to adjust some of the thresholds to address the changes they have to make in their goals in forest health.

Mr. Hicks said he appreciated that. Staff knows who is involved in these issues and who is knowledgeable about them.

Ms. Novasel said every one of her constituents was evacuated during Caldor Fire and affected every square foot of her district. Today, the Forest Service had a group from the Senate that went to Sierra at Tahoe. While at the Summit luncheon, Secretary Crowfoot said he would be interested in hosting a meeting with the new Executive Directors of TRPA and the California Tahoe Conservancy.

Ms. Aldean said they received some preliminary input from Steve Worthington at Prothman Group regarding the search for the new Executive Director. As of yesterday, they had one completed application, but they did have a couple of other qualified interested professionals. People tend to procrastinate in submitting applications. The deadline for applications is September 11th. Prothman conducted a TRPA stakeholder survey and the top soft skills that were identified for the new ED, included someone who is collaborative, communicative, a good listener, strategic in their thinking, and flexible in their decision making.

Mr. Friedrich said they City had the Recreation Center groundbreaking a couple of weeks ago. The Lake Link Microtransit has had a good start. It's a free service that runs until 9:00 p.m. on weekdays and 10:00 p.m. on weekends. A lot of the local jurisdictions have pitched in for that pilot and hope to build on it. The Sugar Pine Project is moving forward hopefully with a groundbreaking this fall for the first 78 units. Yesterday, at the City Council, as some of you know, the city took a position not in favor of diverting Highway 50 through the Rocky Point neighborhood. They're moving forward with an affordable housing project on the land that was in that proposed alignment next to 7 Eleven. Yesterday, they voted to move forward with developers of the Aspens at South Lake Tahoe, RMI and Noven for 100 percent affordable housing project on that property. The City is currently in negotiations with them for the terms of that. That is one where they'll be very interested in density coverage, and height flexibility.

Ms. Gustafson said Placer County received a report from Meadow View Place, which is just outside the basin, and unfortunately, they still have vacancies in their two- and three-bedroom units. They've been open for six months. While they have a crisis, what they've learned on North Shore is that they don't have enough people that earn so little that they qualify for the tax credit type of affordable housing and is why they're working so much on these programs that are achievable housing. It puts a huge burden on the local jurisdiction to raise that kind of money to make that difference in the tax credit financing. Something to consider as they move forward on other things, they can do to help

GOVERNING BOARD

August 24, 2022

those types of programs and help the local jurisdictions, or plead for a different AMI, since their wages up here is so much higher than Sacramento.

XII. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Local Government & Housing Committee

No report.

B. Legal Committee

No report.

C. Operations & Governance Committee

No report.

D. Environmental Improvement, Transportation, & Public Outreach Committee

No report.

E. Forest Health and Wildfire Committee

No report.

F. Regional Plan Implementation Committee

No report.

G. Ad Hoc Executive Director Search Committee

No report.

XIII. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Steve Teshara, Citizen at-large of the region said wanted to take a moment to mark the passing of Larry Hoffman. Mr. Hoffman was very much a regular player at TRPA back from the days of the 1984 Regional Plan, the litigation, the consensus process, the 1987 Regional Plan, a staunch champion for private property rights and an advocate for many projects in front of the Governing Board. Larry was certainly a key mentor for him as he grew up in his career at Tahoe and we were all saddened to learn that he recently passed away. After he left Tahoe, he was an incredible world traveler in a small RV, literally around the world, and some of them used to get emails from Larry describing his various adventures around the world. He was a wonderful person, very involved at Tahoe, the North Shore, and Placer County. Donations can be made in Larry's honor to the Sugar Pine Foundation. Mr. Teshara made his yesterday. Rest in peace, Larry Hoffman.

Ms. Gustafson said she'll send out his obituary as well as the link for donations. Mr. Hoffman furthered a lot of people's careers through his guidance.

GOVERNING BOARD

August 24, 2022

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Gustafson adjourned the meeting at 3:28 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

Marja Ambler
Clerk to the Board

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