

GOVERNING BOARD

April 24, 2024

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
GOVERNING BOARD

TRPA/Zoom

April 24, 2024

Meeting Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Ms. Gustafson called the meeting to order at 10:33 a.m.

Members present: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Bowman (for Mr. Aguilar), Mr. Bass, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Diss, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hays, Ms. Hill, Mr. Hoenigman, Ms. Leumer, Ms. Hales (for Mr. Rice), Mr. Settelmeyer

Members absent: Ms. Laine, Ms. Williamson

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Bass led the Pledge of Allegiance.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Regan stated that there are no changes.
Ms. Gustafson deemed the agenda approved as posted.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Aldean moved approval of the March 27, 2024 minutes as presented.
Motion carried unanimously-Voice vote.

V. TRPA CONSENT CALENDAR

1. March Financials
2. Release of City of South Lake Tahoe Mobility Mitigation Funds (\$216,481.69) and Air Quality Mitigation Funds (\$183,518.31) towards construction of Bijou Park Class 1 Bicycle Trail – Greenway Connector
3. Release of City of South Lake Tahoe Operations & Maintenance (O&M) Mitigation Funds (\$21,092.06) and Air Quality Mitigation Funds (\$54,685.35) to cover the cost of CARB compliance upgrade for Two XBroom Street Sweepers
4. Resolution of Enforcement Action: Jonathan Gallegos, and Kingdom Tree Services; Unauthorized Tree Removal, 2675 Elwood Ave., South Lake Tahoe, CA, Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 031-132- 013, TRPA File No. CODE2024-0004
5. Resolution of Enforcement Action: Nader and Brigitte Panah-Izadi; Unauthorized Tree

GOVERNING BOARD

April 24, 2024

Removal, Failure to implement and maintain temporary BMPs resulting in direct discharge to the waters of Lake Tahoe, and Unauthorized Construction in the Shorezone, 255 Drum Road, El Dorado County, CA, Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 016-300-062, TRPA Project File No. ERSP2021-0568-01 and TRPA Enforcement File No. CODE2023-0090

6. California Tahoe Emergency Services Operation Authority, Paramedic Services Building Addition and Change of Use, 3066 Lake Tahoe Boulevard, City of South Lake Tahoe, California, TRPA File Number ERSP2023-1003, Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APN) 026-050-005
7. APC Membership appointment for the Washoe County Lay Member, James McNamara
8. Authorized Personnel for Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF)

There are eight items on consent, three were reviewed by the Operations and Governance Committee, two were reviewed by the Legal Committee, and three were not reviewed by any committee.

Ms. Hill said the Operations and Governance Committee recommended approval of items one, two, and three. The March financials are in line with what staff expect. The investment income has gone up about \$100,000 which is good in light of potentially some reductions from the state of California.

Ms. Aldean said the Legal Committee recommended approval of the settlement agreements for items four and five as negotiated by staff.

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Bass said one enforcement settlement was \$20,000 and the other was \$55,000. It seems like the \$55,000 was pretty erroneous with three trees over 30 inches. How do we calculate these fines?

Mr. Marshall said staff takes into account the number of violations and whether or not the violations produce harm to the environment. We have a matrix of past violations and whether or not they are in the ballpark. Some can be compared straight across. Item number five was more complicated, there were a few different factors in the degree of culpability. They negotiate from a slate of factors and look to see whether or not this is an appropriate penalty for this particular set of combination of factors. A tree violation is \$5,000 per tree which was for item number four. Number five had different kinds of violations as well as a couple of tree cutting violations and that is why the fine was higher. The Legal committee had a discussion about this one as to the different types of violations, particularly the tree violations. The tree violations were not done for scenic purposes and were done for safety reasons because they could have potentially fallen down and one of them was dead.

Mr. Bass said \$5,000 is a lot different these days compared to what it was 20 years ago. When was the last time we looked at that fee?

Mr. Marshall said we are limited to \$5,000 per day per violation. When a tree is cut and if staff doesn't think there is an ongoing violation as opposed to when for example, coverage is put down. But another consequence of tree cutting that they do where it's appropriate is

GOVERNING BOARD

April 24, 2024

some element of restoration such as replanting of trees to try and remove any benefit gained from the illegal tree cutting. A large part of their success, particularly in tree violation comes through the education and outreach that Mr. Sweet and forester Mr. Barr does with the tree cutting companies within the basin. Number four had an out of basin tree cutting company that was involved and as part of the settlement agreement they are required to attend the next seminar on what requires a permit.

Ms. Hill said the Washoe County Board of Commissioners voted for Mr. McNamara's confirmation for their Advisory Planning Commission lay member. She did not vote for his confirmation but will support that today. Ms. Simon was an amazing APC member and she thanked her for her service to the Advisory Planning Commission.

Public Comments

Ann Nichols, North Tahoe Preservation Alliance said you have \$6 million in contracts and there's no detail. It's a huge part of the budget. It's the second time I've asked for some detail on what does that mean. The other is you've got \$31 million in cash and investments which I guess you started out at a million a year when you first came into being and now you're spending about \$20 million a year. Couldn't you do something about affordable housing with this or something that would be beneficial to the community, microplastics or the lead in the lake.

Ms. Regan made a comment about this at the Operations and Governance Committee this morning. The majority of those funds on our balance sheet are either securities that we accept as part of a project, where a project upon completion inspections is done and if it's deemed in compliance those monies are returned to the project applicant property owner. And there are also mitigation funds that we hold also in trust and at the Operations committee today we released some of those mitigation funds to the city of South Lake Tahoe for efficient sweepers and for trails. Mitigation fees that are part of a project are held in trust by the Agency and then at the right time distributed by this board upon action to improve the environment in local jurisdictions where those fees are collected. As we get into the budget development process, we'll talk more about contracts.

Ms. Hill moved to approve the TRPA Consent Calendar.

Ms. Gustafson recused herself from Consent Calendar Item No. 5 Resolution of Enforcement-Panah.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Bowman (for Mr. Aguilar), Mr. Bass, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Diss, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson (except CC 5), Ms. Hill, Mr. Hoenigman, Ms. Leumer, Ms. Hales (for Mr. Rice), Mr. Settlemeyer

Absent: Ms. Laine, Ms. Williamson

Motion carried.

Ms. Aldean moved to adjourn as the TRPA and convene as the TMPO.

Motion carried-voice vote.

GOVERNING BOARD

April 24, 2024

VI. TAHOE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Draft Fiscal Year 2024/25 Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization Transportation Planning Overall Work Program (OWP)
2. 2024 Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization Public Participation Plan

Ms. Hill said the Transportation Committee recommended approval of items one and two.

Board Comments & Questions

None.

Public Comments

None.

Mr. Bass moved to approve of the TMPO Consent Calendar.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Bowman (for Mr. Aguilar), Mr. Bass, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Diss, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Hoenigman, Ms. Leumer, Ms. Hales (for Mr. Rice), Mr. Settelmeyer, Mr. Walker (US Forest Service)

Absent: Ms. Laine, Ms. Williamson

Motion carried.

VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS - TMPO

A. 2024 Active Transportation Plan

Ms. Regan said Mr. Walker, US Forest Service will be joining us for this public hearing on the Active Transportation Plan. We spoke at length at the Transportation Committee about all the various moving parts in the Keeping Tahoe Moving Initiative and the Regional Transportation Plan. Making Tahoe more walkable, bikeable, and pedestrian-friendly is a core tenet, not only of our Regional Transportation Plan, which this is going to roll up and support, but also of the overall Regional Plan for the Tahoe Basin. It was a huge push in the 2012 update of the Regional Plan.

The Compact gives us a mandate to reduce dependency on the private automobile and to look for other opportunities for mass transportation options in the basin. Getting people out of their cars is difficult. It's something we, as an agency with our partners, have been working on for decades. But what we have proven through active transportation and building a trail network and making Tahoe safer for people to not drive around is that people love it. They will get out of their cars if the facilities are here, if they are available in the winter, safe, and convenient.

TRPA has shown leadership in this space, not only in our region but in the nation. This is an area that's expensive to go back and retrofit once highway networks surround our communities to make them safe and attractive for pedestrians, rollers, and cyclers is extremely difficult. During this presentation there are projects mentioned, but this is not

GOVERNING BOARD

April 24, 2024

endorsing or approving any particular project which will be analyzed separately.

Mr. Murry provided the presentation.

Mr. Murry said active transportation here refers to any mode of travel that involves walking, biking, or rolling. Now included in this plan are electric devices. Here on the South Shore, we also have shared scooters, electric scooters, and e-bikes. When we talk about pedestrians, we're also talking about folks who use assisted mobility devices such as wheelchairs, walkers, electric wheelchairs, etc.

TRPA doesn't build projects and is not an infrastructure implementer, but we do have a large role to play, especially regionally, on how these projects get carried out. And of course, the funding and other mechanisms. The plan identifies policy goals that implementers can adopt and help us move our goals forward. Regionally, we also have the priority project identification and have a comprehensive list of projects around the basin that we'd like to get funded and implemented. We have a complete streets guideline and other best practice infrastructure recommendations that implementing agencies can draw upon for their own projects. Grant funding is probably one of the most important components of the plan as it identifies these projects.

TRPA's bread and butter are that regional cohesion assuring that the projects across county and state boundaries are cohesive in their network and how they're built out as we try to coordinate jurisdiction to jurisdiction. It's a general guiding document with high level implementation. The plan also includes a monitoring and adaptive management component which is the bicycle and pedestrian monitoring protocol. We have multiple counters across the lake to collect the bicycle and pedestrian users of the trail including getting pre-imposed project counts. For example, there's a project that is going in at a specified location and before the project is implemented, we can put a counter out there. Say there are ten cyclists a day are using this particular route but once the implementer builds the low stress facility, we see 300 people a day using that route. That's helpful for not only planning purposes, but shows that folks will use these facilities if they're provided.

As the Metropolitan Planning Organization, we're tracking network performance and is something that we have to do as well as project support. When agencies take these new projects to the public for outreach, we can show how many people are using these trails or facilities. He's worked for another California agency and has been doing this bicycle and pedestrian work for almost eight years now and find Tahoe's monitoring protocols to be some of the most comprehensive.

As part of the development of the 2024 Active Transportation Plan they convened a technical advisory committee over 1.5 years ago. They attended over 25 in-person public outreach events reaching over 400 people and issued a transportation survey. The transportation survey was put out alongside the Vision Zero safety strategy. We were hearing on a number of transportation safety items that relayed beyond just Active Transportation, but we got a really good response on what folks would like to see. There were 1,200 respondents to the survey. There was also an environmental analysis, looking at the sensitive habitats and areas to make sure that our projects are not having a negative effect on the environment.

GOVERNING BOARD

April 24, 2024

The last Active Transportation Plan was adopted in 2015, with subsequent technical amendments in both 2015 and 2018. Given advancements in the active transportation field since then, the 2024 plan places a stronger focus on enhancing safety and reducing stress on the on-street network. While recommendations for class one trails are still included, the emphasis is on making on-street networks more inviting for walking and biking. One significant addition to the plan is the updated priority project list, which includes new facility recommendations and best practice guidelines for implementation. Additionally, new analyses, such as the Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress and Pedestrian Experience Index, provide insights into stress levels on roadways and pedestrian environments.

The Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress analysis categorizes roadways based on stress levels for cyclists, ranging from low stress to high stress. This analysis aims to improve safety for all road users by reducing vehicle speeds. Similarly, the Pedestrian Experience Index evaluates pedestrian environments and aims to enhance walkability, particularly in town centers.

The 2024 plan also introduces winter maintenance recommendations, addressing challenges related to snow removal and accessibility during winter months. Techniques such as sneckdowns and snow dragon snow removal equipment designed for bicycle lanes are highlighted to improve winter access for active transportation users. New facility design guidance includes buffered bike lanes, protected bike facilities, and shared-use paths. These designs aim to provide greater separation between cyclists, pedestrians, and vehicles, enhancing safety and comfort for all users. Public feedback on the draft plan was largely positive, with over 30 emailed comments received. The final plan incorporates this feedback and is presented for potential adoption by the governing board.

There are many suggestions to the new facility design guidance but the Class 2B or a buffered bike lane also encompasses the Class 4 protected bike way facility. It shows a cyclist in a bicycle lane with paint marking the lane, providing about 2 feet of separation between the automobile travel lane and cyclists. This buffer reduces roadway stress, enhancing safety. Additionally, there are planter boxes representing a protected bicycle facility, providing vertical separation between vehicles and cyclists. The planter boxes can be removed in winter for easier snow removal. While South Lake Tahoe piloted similar approaches with mixed results, the presence of planter boxes kept cars out of bike lanes, reducing stress for cyclists and potentially enhancing safety for all road users. Buffered bike lanes have been proven to reduce vehicle travel speeds, contributing to overall safety. Moreover, Tahoe boasts shared-use paths, enhancing regional connectivity. The plan includes suggestions for more shared-use paths, marked with icons for cyclists and pedestrians, clarifying usage areas.

Feedback on e-bikes on shared-use trails led to lane markings delineating usage zones, promoting organization and safety. Signs indicating trail sharing rules further enhance user understanding. Reducing roadway stress allows repurposing of travel lanes for bicycle facilities, creating dedicated space for pedestrians and separating faster-moving cyclists onto buffered lanes. This approach enhances mode separation, a key aspect of the plan's design philosophy.

The plan was released on February 27th, 2024, and remained open for feedback until March 27th, 2024. Over 30 email comments were received, and the Advisory Planning Commission provided a recommendation for plan approval to the Governing Board. Feedback from

GOVERNING BOARD

April 24, 2024

various transportation and advisory boards was largely positive, with enthusiasm for the plan's contents. Attachment B to the staff report details the edits made based on feedback, culminating in the final plan presented.

Presentation: [Agenda-Item-No-VIIA-2024-Active-Transportation-Plan.pdf](#)

Board Comments & Committee

Mr. Bass said you talked about the missing links and the significant number of people who visit Emerald Bay. Is there any planning or discussion about creating a more pedestrian-friendly link between Kiva and Emerald Bay? Something similar to how someone would get to Kiva or Camp Richardson.

Mr. Murray said he doesn't have all the specifics on that project, but I'm aware of ongoing discussions involving the land partners responsible for its implementation.

Ms. Caringer said we're just beginning the environmental review for potential segments to Emerald Bay in collaboration with the Forest Service and state parks. It's part of the next phase following the implementation of the overall corridor plan that was finished a few years ago. We'll be scoping out which parts are most crucial to move forward with next.

Mr. Bass said it looks like South Lake and the casino corridors are highlighted in green on the map, which is great but there's a significant gap along Pioneer Trail through the Stateline corridor. Through US 50 revitalization what was part of what would have fixed some of that and now US 50 revitalization is being proposed to end at the California Stateline. This leaves a crucial gap for pedestrians and cyclists. This needs consideration since it's a heavy pedestrian area. What is the plan and should it be the US 50 revitalization extending it past the Stateline connecting to Pioneer Trail.

Mr. Murry said there are multiple community revitalization projects that have been ongoing for quite some time. While one project may conclude at the Stateline, there are discussions and projects in progress to address the corridor specifically, either by rerouting Lake Parkway or enhancing pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure along US 50 on the California side. Additionally, there's a bicycle improvement project underway on Pioneer Trail this summer, indicating ongoing efforts to address stress levels in that area.

Ms. Regan said that area is indeed well known for its walkability and bikeability. The original US 50, also known as the loop road project, and the community revitalization project that was approved by this board some years ago, included a mainstreet management plan through the corridor, aiming to address the unsafe conditions present. While the city has made significant strides in areas like lighting, complete streets, and landscaping, there remains much more work to be done, especially given the current rescope of the project.

Mr. Bass' point about the future evolution of the project is crucial, particularly in addressing these critical needs.

Mr. Bass said ending the project at the stateline seems inadequate, considering the significant benefits that both sides of the state could enjoy. Given the project's history, where a considerable portion of the funding likely originated from California, it seems

GOVERNING BOARD

April 24, 2024

illogical to halt the improvements at the Stateline, depriving pedestrians of necessary enhancements.

Ms. Hill said my constituents often express concerns about biking, and I'm sure you've heard similar feedback from many Incline Village residents. The dilemma facing local governments, which hopefully TRPA can assist involves the transition of e-bikes from multi-use trails to the roads. It's a complex issue, requiring careful management to ensure safety while maintaining infrastructure. There's a push and pull dynamic, with cyclists hesitant to move onto roads where they may feel less safe. This is a dilemma and while she doesn't have all the answers, I believe technical assistance from entities like Washoe County could be invaluable. Unlike the roads in the Reno-Sparks area that Washoe County maintains, incorporating bike-friendly measures into rural county roads presents unique challenges. Additionally, snow removal on trails is another area where we need improvement. While Washoe County has made strides, there's still much work to be done. I'm hopeful that TRPA can support us in identifying funding opportunities and providing technical assistance.

Ms. Aldean said the network recommendations on page 182 include an updated map of the corridor crash analysis. Does this analysis extend to all users? Ms. Hill raised a valid point about ongoing user conflicts on multimodal pathways. It's challenging to collect that data because many times there's no response from emergency personnel or official reports. Addressing these user conflicts is crucial, and one solution could be physically separating lanes to ensure pedestrians feel safe and cyclists can navigate freely without having to dodge around pedestrians.

Mr. Murray said to clarify, does the collision analysis include incidents where a cyclist hits a pedestrian? No, it does not. Our analyses rely on available data, and if an incident is not considered serious, it may not be reported. We're collaborating with Vision Zero strategy process and first responders to find better ways to capture this data. They're working with Caltrans and NDOT to make that data better.

Ms. Aldean asked if it could be done collaborating with advocacy groups, which could be incredibly valuable in gathering data on user conflicts. Engaging their members who actively use these facilities could provide real-time insights into potential issues. Implementing a special reporting number, distinct from 911, where individuals can leave messages detailing the segment of roadway, the circumstances leading to the collision, and any other relevant information, could indeed help in gathering the necessary data for a comprehensive Analysis.

Ms. Conrad-Saydah said we often receive comments about e-bike safety and have you had discussions with e-bike rental companies about contributing to painting or identifying different routes for e-bikes. However, exploring options for educational messaging could be beneficial. This could include outlining expectations and responsibilities when renting an e-bike, such as maintaining safe speeds and respecting pedestrians on walkways. Engaging in these conversations with e-bike rental companies could help promote safer practices and enhance the overall experience for all users.

Mr. Murray said while direct conversations with e-bike rental companies haven't occurred, he's worked with advocacy groups like the Tahoe Area Mountain Biking Association (TAMBA) and the Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition to address e-bike safety through educational

GOVERNING BOARD

April 24, 2024

materials and campaigns. Collaborating with these groups has been valuable in promoting awareness of e-bike classifications, rules, and etiquette on trails. Additionally, organizations like Take Care Tahoe/Tahoe Fund have been proactive in creating engaging messages to encourage courteous trail use. These efforts, while not directly involving e-bike rental companies, have contributed to promoting safer practices among e-bike users.

Ms. Regan said in the past TRPA has been part of the Pathway Partnership initiative with various stakeholders like the Tahoe Fund, Forest Service, and State Parks. It's evident that efforts have been made to address trail safety and user education.

Ms. Conrad-Saydah suggestion of potentially implementing a small fee on e-bike rentals or sales to contribute to a fund specifically for signage and educational campaigns. This could be an effective way to ensure that those benefiting from e-bike use also contribute to initiatives aimed at promoting safe and responsible trail usage.

Ms. Gustafson said the parks districts get involved in operating the trails. It's clear that education is a key component in addressing trail safety concerns related to e-bike use.

Mr. Walker said the Forest Service currently does not have any trails open to e-bikes and is going through a planning effort to evaluate what trails on the national forest would be suitable. One of the trails most commonly used by e-bikes on the national forest although not authorized is the Pope Baldwin scenic trail. Their communication with the bike rental companies has been where they can appropriately use them. They work on education and engineering and then follow that up with enforcement.

Ms. Faustinos said the discussion about signage and the importance of consistent usage of symbolism is crucial for making trails more enticing and user-friendly for the general public. Having appropriate signage at every point along the trail can greatly enhance the overall trail experience. She also highlighted the idea of implementing scannable codes that provide accessible trail information, such as trail length and difficulty level. This kind of common language would be incredibly useful for trail users to make informed decisions about which trails to explore. She expressed her appreciation for the phenomenal job done by the staff in putting together this comprehensive analysis. The detailed maps and stress level assessments are fascinating and demonstrate a commitment to improving trail safety and usability.

Mr. Hoenigman asked if they've looked at initiatives such as One Tam in Marin County where the national parks, state parks, the national forest, state forest, the county water districts, and the local communities banded together to create One Tam where all the signage is shared. We have so many different entities, it's mind boggling.

Ms. Regan said they've coordinated with One Tam who came to TRPA about six or seven years ago to look at our Environmental Improvement Program as a mode of that public, private, federal, state, local nonprofit tribal partnership. Sharon Farrell, Deputy Director of the Golden Gate Park Conservancy was a key driver of that working with the water district and bike shops.

Mr. Murray said ensuring consistency and cohesion in wayfinding signage is indeed crucial for trail navigation. Recognizable and standardized signage, such as those iconic US Forest

GOVERNING BOARD

April 24, 2024

Service signs, helps users easily understand directions and locations regardless of their location along the trail.

Mr. Hoenigman asked if we are putting together a lasting partnership to streamline trail management and coordination among various entities, it's an ongoing effort.

Mr. Murray said these partnerships have been in progress for years, and TRPA has been involved in guiding and facilitating discussions on how best to manage shared issues.

Public Comments

Ann Nichols, North Tahoe Preservation Alliance is glad to see that the stress level color was changed for Crystal Bay Hill from low to high stress. But you neglected to change the pedestrian stress level. If you're driving, there is no way to give the bicyclist three feet of distance. We need to have someone on the north shore do the review for TRPA to ensure consistency because there is a disconnect. It would also be nice to have something done for winter. There's a lot of money for these projects, wouldn't it be great to see all that money put towards the environment such as the lead cable in the lake, microplastics, and invasive species, etc. It's disappointing to see it's all about trails and attracting more and more people, which could be the problem.

Helen Neff acknowledged the hard work of the transportation planning team and their efforts in generating reports and conducting public outreach. Implementing these plans and integrating them into future developments will be crucial for improving transportation infrastructure and pedestrian safety. She has concerns about the Nine 47 project and their potential impact on pedestrian experience highlight the importance of thorough consideration and improvement in future endeavors. Hopefully, future projects will address these concerns and incorporate the recommendations outlined in the transportation plans.

Mr. Bass made a motion to adopt a finding of no significant effect as set forth in Attachment D and TMPO Resolution 2023 -__ to approve the TRPA 2024 Active Transportation Plan.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Bowman (for Mr. Aguilar), Mr. Bass, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Diss, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Hoenigman, Ms. Leumer, Ms. Hales (for Mr. Rice), Mr. Settelmeyer, Mr. Walker (US Forest Service)

Absent: Ms. Laine, Ms. Williamson

Motion carried.

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

Motion carried-voice vote.

VIII. PLANNING MATTERS

- A. South Tahoe Public Utility District, Solar Power Project, 1275 Meadow Crest Dr, South Lake Tahoe, California, TRPA File Number ERSP2023-1088, Assessor's Parcel Numbers 025-041-012, 025-051-27, 025-061-030, 025-061-031, 025-061-032, 025-061-033, 025-061-035, 025-071-022

GOVERNING BOARD

April 24, 2024

Ms. Regan said this is history in the making for the Tahoe Basin. This could be the largest solar array in the basin. TRPA has had solar panels on the roof for a number of years and roof top solar has been spreading around the basin despite the snow and challenges that go with it. We've made a commitment as a basin to pursue our goals for climate, but this is a game changer.

Ms. Ryan, South Tahoe Public Utility District and Mr. Stockham, Stockham Consulting provided the presentation.

Ms. Ryan said the South Tahoe Public Utility District's as the largest energy user in the Tahoe Basin and Liberty Utilities' largest customer, the South Tahoe PUD has been grappling with escalating costs. We're committed to integrating renewable energy into our power portfolio. This solar project has been in the works for nearly 5 years, originating from the Solar Energy and Economic Development (SEED) Fund Sierra collaboration of public agencies. After a rigorous request for proposal process, Staten Solar was selected as our development partner. They'll design, build, and own the proposed one-megawatt solar facility, which will be located on district property and exclusively power our wastewater treatment plant.

The South Tahoe PUD's primary goal is to protect Lake Tahoe by providing cost-effective wastewater services to the South Shore community. This solar project aligns with our environmental and financial objectives. It will cover one-third of the power needs of our wastewater treatment plant, reducing our reliance on the grid. Moreover, it prepares us for future battery storage integration and significantly reduce carbon emissions. Financially, the project is designed to maximize solar production while providing cost-saving benefits, with an estimated savings of \$5 to \$10 million over the agreement's 28-year term.

It's a one-megawatt ACRA, sized to generate 1.339 megawatts DC of power. In its first year, it's expected to produce over 1.9 million kilowatt hours of clean solar power. The ground-mounted array will occupy 3.3 acres, with a 100-foot buffer area to minimize tree impact. It will be located on district property, strategically chosen for optimal solar production and minimal disruption to wastewater treatment operations. Access will be via a 450-foot-long road within the treatment plant, leading to a fenced area surrounding the array. Helical piles will be used for foundation, minimizing ground disturbance, and provisions are in place for snow management during extreme weather conditions.

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Conrad-Saydah asked if the power from the site go directly to the wastewater treatment facility or will it be wheeled into Liberty and then back to you?

Ms. Ryan said it is a behind the meter project. It will feed into their side of the power meter but it's a net metering project. Any excess power generated that isn't immediately needed at the wastewater treatment plant will flow into the grid.

Ms. Aldean understands the benefits to this project in terms of cost defrayment for electricity users. However, there are also unintended consequences. Articles in Forbes magazine raised concerns about the disposal of solar panels containing toxic materials like lead and cadmium. Was there any consideration given to the disposal of panels when they

GOVERNING BOARD

April 24, 2024

degrade or are damaged?

Mr. Stockham said we discussed this issue in detail. Solar panels are a global issue, and recycling technology is evolving rapidly. The contract with Staten addresses maintaining the site's operational condition and addressing degradation problems promptly. Proper disposal at the end of the panels' lifespan is also mandated. Should there be site mitigation during removal? Yes, there will be site restoration following the removal of the array. The environmental benefits of this project far outweigh the risks.

Ms. Aldean suggested having a commitment from the company installing the panels that if they significantly degrade, they will be immediately removed. Some of the materials in the panels can leach into the ground if they get damaged, leading to environmental concerns. It would be reasonable for the STPUD to request this commitment to avoid being held responsible for environmental degradation.

Ms. Ryan said the contract with Staten as the owner addresses the issue of maintaining the site in operational condition and dealing with degradation problems in a timely manner. Staten also has an incentive to ensure that the panels are in good repair because damaged panels would not produce power at the committed levels. Additionally, at the end of the 28-year contract, if the district decides not to take over the array, Staten is obligated to remove all panels and dispose of them properly according to regulations in place at that time.

Ms. Conrad-Saydah asked if site mitigation is included in the contract at the time of removal.

Ms. Ryan said yes, that was a condition of the agreement.

Ms. Conrad-Saydah said 30 years of this solar power versus 30 years of dirty natural gas or fossil fuels, you need to look at the impact of both. If we continue our consumption and demand as is, we're dealing with toxins no matter what. We need to reduce consumption in the first place and creating homes that are more energy efficient and reduce consumption overall.

Ms. Aldean agreed but asked if there was any thought to putting a layer of some sort of impervious material underneath the panels to avoid any leaching into the soil.

Mr. Stockham said that would count as coverage and impede native vegetation. There is not a film or paving proposed under the panels.

(presentation continued)

Mr. Stockham is assisting as an outsource reviewer. This project was a departure from our typical review process. He collaborated closely with TRPA staff Mr. Nielsen. We conducted multiple site visits with the applicants and iterated through several versions of our findings. It's important to highlight the significance of this project, both for renewable energy production and as the first large ground-mounted solar system in the Tahoe Basin. Therefore, we aimed for a thorough yet timely review, given the project's reliance on tax credits and other financial considerations.

GOVERNING BOARD

April 24, 2024

The project requires approval from the Governing Board for two reasons: The addition of land coverage and substantial tree removal. Fortunately, our region has a robust policy and regulatory framework for reviewing such projects. This framework, outlined in the regional energy policy, encourages the development of renewable energy facilities under environmentally feasible conditions.

Key considerations guiding the review: First, it's essential to acknowledge the project's alignment with the region's climate goals, including achieving net-zero carbon emissions by 2045. Energy consumption, particularly in the city of South Lake Tahoe, is a significant contributor to greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, transitioning to renewable energy sources is imperative.

The project aims to generate 1.925 million kilowatt-hours of electricity annually, equivalent to nearly a third of the energy demand for the treatment plant. While not a massive utility-scale project, it will have a significant impact, offsetting carbon emissions and contributing to the city's renewable energy goals. Our review focused on four regulatory topics, with tree removal being the most prominent. The project requires the removal of 23 large trees and 108 additional trees over 14 inches in diameter. However, stringent approval criteria ensure that tree removal is justified and minimized wherever possible.

The site selection process prioritized minimizing environmental impact. The chosen site, nestled in a shallow basin surrounded by forest, minimizes visibility and preserves surrounding habitat.

The project has undergone an extensive process, including outreach to nearby property owners and soliciting feedback. Overall, the response has been overwhelmingly positive, with support from local stakeholders and authorities. In conclusion, based on our review, we recommend approving the project subject to the outlined conditions.

Presentation: [Agenda-Item-No-VIIIA-South-Tahoe-Public-Utility-District-Solar-Power-Project.pdf](#)

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Bass said this is an exciting project and aligns with the City of South Lake Tahoe's sustainability goals. He has concerns about snow removal. He thinks about when they'll make a panel that has a heating element to melt the snow. Is this the only type of solar array that we've seen in a snow country like ours?

Mr. Stockham said the Town of Truckee wastewater treatment facility has a solar array that is smaller than this one and doesn't generate as much power. But there are solar arrays that work in snow country at elevation. From a personal experience with solar panels on roofs in snowy areas suggests they are durable and can withstand significant snowfall. They naturally shed as temperatures rise but occasional snow removal may be necessary and is why there's a condition that they do it over snow like a ski area would. That will prevent the pollutant runoff.

GOVERNING BOARD

April 24, 2024

Ms. Ryan received feedback from Mammoth, which uses articulating solar panels to minimize snow accumulation, suggesting that the maintenance required may outweigh the benefits.

Mr. Bass asked how high off the ground are these solar panels.

Ms. Ryan said that low edge of being four feet was the tallest they could do with the supports without getting into structural challenges. The typical was two feet off the ground.

Mr. Bass is in support of this location and hopes there will be more in the future. Did they look at placing a steel frame over retention basins? If you gapped these panels, snow would fall in between them and seems there would be benefits.

Ms. Ryan said they looked at the site using it in a few different ways. There could be similar ground mounted foundations going through the liner, but it impacts the integrity of the liner. There are also floating solar arrays, typically used in water basins that are full of water and there's are not usually full of water. This is also more aggressive than just potable water situation. The vendors contacted with that kind of array were disinterested in a project where their panels could be floating in wastewater.

Mr. Bass asked what about going straight across with steel and not going through the liner.

Ms. Ryan said the basins are many acres in size and would have made the project financially infeasible.

Public Comments

Shane Romsos, Director on South Tahoe Public Utility District Board extended his gratitude to Ms. Regan, Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Stockham, and the STPUD staff on this project. He's been involved in this project for quite some time, dating back to at least 2020. This system will help improve reliability and achieve cost savings. These savings would then be reinvested into facility infrastructure, such as pipelines and water lines.

Nick Exline member of the STPUD Board of Directors and chairman of the City of South Lake Tahoe 100 percent renewable community but is speaking as a community member. Today is a day of celebration. Today is the most vetted project in the history of Tahoe. He was in on this from the beginning wanting to the city of South Lake Tahoe to go 100 percent renewable. In 2018, during my campaign for the STPUD board, I personally knocked on 3,500 doors, advocating that STPUD is going solar. Our community continued to voice support for solar. I stood alongside city council members and Lake Tahoe School District board members and rallied support from every large business entity on the South Shore to support renewable energy. Put together marches, and signed petitions. We worked as a community demonstrating incredible grassroots effort. Upon joining the STPUD board, it was not all roses and support. This project represents the culmination of our community's desires, uniting grassroots advocacy with the democratic process. The collaboration between TRPA and the city of South Lake Tahoe is a testament to our collective efforts. As we celebrate Earth Day; I urge this board to join the city of South Lake Tahoe and our community in supporting solar.

GOVERNING BOARD

April 24, 2024

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean appreciated the energy and commitment of many people here today. She'll vote yes for this project as a member of the Governing Board to support the efforts of the local community and the STPUD to realize their objective of cleaner energy production. However, she's concerned that 30 years from now these panels may end up in a Carson City landfill. Those contaminants could leach into the ground where they get their drinking water.

Ms. Gustafson believes that we are going to have innovation and how to dispose and reuse these panels before the expiration. Ms. Aldean's comments and concerns are appreciated in living with decisions of legacies of the past. Placer County just approved a large solar project that Sacramento Municipal Utility District put forward in the western part of their county and they are doing demonstration projects with the University of California, Davis agriculture and grazing and pollinators under the panels. It was amazing to look at the research going into how these can be compatible with our environment. This is a different environment with snow.

Mr. Bass made a motion to approve the required findings, including a mitigated finding of no significant effect (as set forth in Attachments A and E).

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Bowman (for Mr. Aguilar), Mr. Bass, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Diss, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Hoenigman, Ms. Leumer, Ms. Hales (for Mr. Rice), Mr. Settelmeier

Absent: Ms. Laine, Ms. Williamson

Motion carried.

Mr. Bass made a motion to approve the proposed revisions to the project subject to the conditions contained in the draft permit (as shown in Attachment B).

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Bowman (for Mr. Aguilar), Mr. Bass, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Diss, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Hoenigman, Ms. Leumer, Ms. Hales (for Mr. Rice), Mr. Settelmeier

Absent: Ms. Laine, Ms. Williamson

Motion carried.

IX. PUBLIC HEARINGS -TRPA

- A. Amendment to the Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan to add "Schools – Kindergarten through Secondary" as a special use within the Wood Creek Regulatory Zone, for those parcels equal to or greater than three acres in size

TRPA staff Ms. Brown and Ms. Weiche, Washoe County provided the presentation.

Ms. Brown said TRPA received a request from Washoe County proposing an amendment to their Tahoe Area Plan. The proposed change would allow an additional use of kindergarten through 12th-grade schools on parcels of 3 acres or larger with a special use permit within

GOVERNING BOARD

April 24, 2024

the Wood Creek regulatory zone. It has been determined to be in compliance with the TRPA Regional Plan and in conformance with the Code of Ordinances.

The documents supporting these findings can be found in attachment D through G of the staff report. This item was heard by Regional Planning Committee on March 27th and the Advisory Planning Commission on April 10th, in which both recommended approval of the proposed amendment. This item today is not a project approval, but rather a request for a zoning amendment to an area plan to add a land use with a special use permit.

The special use permit is a subsequent decision-making process with a higher level of review that requires additional documentation and noticing, as well as public hearings occurring both at the county and regional levels. There are currently two active temporary use permit holders within the Wood Creek regulatory zone that could be affected by the proposed area plan amendment. If the proposed amendment is approved, a special use permit application will be submitted and reviewed.

A review will be required for these two permit holders to continue this use. Ms. Weiche with Washoe County will provide a presentation on this proposed Tahoe Area Plan amendment.

(presentation continued)

Ms. Weiche said the request is to amend Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan, Section 110.220.275 to add schools (kindergarten through secondary use type) as a permitted use subject to a special use permit. This would apply to parcels equal to or greater than 3 acres within the Tahoe Wood Creek regulatory zones. Kindergarten, elementary, and secondary schools serving grades up to 12 are considered in this category and include denominational and non-sectarian schools.

The Wood Creek Regulatory Zone is generally located west of Mount Rose Highway, south of College Drive, east of Village Boulevard, and north of Tahoe Boulevard. It is one of 16 residential regulatory zones in the Tahoe Area Plan, primarily focused on single-family dwellings but allowing for other use types such as multi-family and public service uses. The primary vision for these zones is to maintain safe and functional residentially focused areas with development contributing to desired community character. The Wood Creek regulatory zone also includes a designated special area, established to allow public service uses on publicly owned parcels.

The proposed amendment would allow school use types on parcels larger than 3 acres within this zone, subject to a special use permit. The only privately owned parcels meeting this criterion are currently owned by St. Francis and Village Church, encompassing three separate parcels. Outreach efforts include a neighborhood or community meeting in June 2023, where public concerns were raised regarding traffic, noise, parking, environmental impacts, fire safety, and potential negative impacts on existing public schools. Subsequently, a development code amendment application was submitted to Washoe County in June 2023. In September 2023, TRPA received public comments, with approximately 36 in opposition and 55 in support of the amendment. In November 2023, the Washoe County Planning Commission unanimously recommended approval of the development code amendment to the Board of County Commissioners, who later adopted it unanimously in January and February 2024.

GOVERNING BOARD

April 24, 2024

The applicants, St. Clare's and Village Church, both wish to operate schools within the Wood Creek regulatory zone. They collaborated on the application after being informed that the use type was not currently allowed. If the amendment is adopted, the applicants would still need to obtain an approved special use permit for the school use. This process involves a site-specific review and public hearings to address potential impacts on land use, transportation, public facilities, and environmental resources. Public comments received throughout the process, totaling over 200, have been a mix of support and opposition, with concerns similar to those raised at the neighborhood meeting. No comments or concerns were received in opposition from pertinent agencies or Washoe County departments.

Presentation: [Agenda-Item-No-IXA-Washoe-County-Tahoe-Area-Plan-Amendment-to-Wood-Creek-Regulatory-Zone.pdf](#)

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean said the applicant requested a special use permit to be issued through the 8th grade rather than including high school grades. Considering this, it's possible that limiting the scope to only elementary and middle school grades might have made the project more acceptable to surrounding residents.

Ms. Weiche said it could include a condition of approval for the special use permit specific to the project and could be a way to address this concern by stipulating that the permit is only granted for schools up to the 8th grade. Conditions of approval are often used to address specific issues or requirements related to a project, and limiting the scope of the school to elementary and middle grades could be one such condition. This approach allows for flexibility in tailoring the project to address community concerns while still allowing for the desired land use. If this adjustment is deemed appropriate, it could be incorporated into the special use permit application process, providing a clear framework for the project's implementation and ensuring that it aligns with the community's expectations and needs.

Ms. Brown said TRPA lists kindergarten through secondary as a primary use under public services, with secondary typically including up to the 12th grade.

Ms. Aldean said Ms. Weiche's response is that the restriction through the 8th grade would have to be a condition imposed on the project itself.

Ms. Brown said that's correct.

Ms. Gustafson said they've received numerous comments from residents in the area with concerns.

Public Comments

Shawn Comstock, 30 year resident of the neighborhood asked who has walked our neighborhoods to see what is going on with the parcels proposed to be rezoned in the Wood Creek neighborhood? All three of our public schools are known as Science, Technology, Engineering and Math education (STEM) schools. It is a deterrent to the quiet and enjoyment of my property over the past two years underneath these temporary permits. Mount Rose Highway is our evacuation route. She shared a picture of parking on

GOVERNING BOARD

April 24, 2024

Mount Rose Highway on a Thursday afternoon. The lower parking lot at the church is full and they're parking on the highway. There is no infrastructure, crosswalks, etc. There has been a petition of over 50 people who live in our neighborhood that has been submitted to the advisory board and Ms. Hill. A wealthy family that owns a Montessori school paid DOWL Engineering to rezone our neighborhood and then the Village Church jumped on board with them. The Catholic Church is not paying for this rezoning. That would be two high schools within a block of each other. Village Church has had a beautiful nursery school that has been in our town for a very long time, and they did a great job but now they want to build it to a high school and they're on Mount Rose Highway. At the last meeting DOWL stated that there would be 186 students at these schools. At our only neighborhood meeting on June 2nd, they said 120 students, now that has risen. You talk about VMT trips, they are advertising in the North Shore, Tahoe City, Kings Beach, and Truckee. Crystal Bay Hill is a cluster for bicycles and for traffic. It will be a huge traffic increase to come to these two proposed schools on our fire evacuation route. There are no buses for either of these two schools. DOWL is a client of Washoe County for other projects. It's a dangerous place with no infrastructure to put two schools.

Tim Gilbert, Village Church applicant said we want to teach children about Jesus Christ to grow up to have a relationship with him. We want to follow the rules and be good neighbors. The preschool has existed for 25 years without a very small amount of complaints. Anytime something comes up, we bend over backwards to make those people happy. They support the proposed amendments. There's still a special use permit process that will take a greater look at the neighbor's needs.

Gia Rauenhorst, Incline Village resident and parent of a St. Clare's student. We respect the parents and a parent's ability to choose the education they want for their child. Without St. Clare's they wouldn't have the option of integrating the Catholic faith integrated into our child's education. It's disingenuous to say that the school is not associated with St. Francis, it's part of the diocese of Reno and recognized Catholic school. It's the only Montessori school in North Tahoe. They support the proposed amendments.

Will Phillips, Incline Village resident supported the proposed amendment. This is about much more than just adding schools to Incline Village. This amendment supports the core American value of religious freedoms, visa vie, school choice. Approving this amendment will allow the families of Incline Village to have a choice. To raise our children with a faith-based education which we do not currently have. There is no safety issue here, children have been in these two locations for decades with no safety issues. There's no parking issue either. The picture with the traffic issue was not related to the children and their activities at these schools. Predominantly the students are going to be from this community.

Debbie Larson, Incline Village resident for over 25 years and supports the proposed amendment. With these insightful limitations which make total sense the amendment will not adversely affect the character of the neighborhood of which St. Francis has been part of since 1965 before most of the residents were there. She understands the safety considerations but wonders how sincere those concerns are because the church has been operating there for so long with weddings and funerals, etc. The cars parked on Mount Rose Highway were happening long before the school was there. People don't park on the highway for the school.

GOVERNING BOARD

April 24, 2024

Paige Roodhouse, Executive Director and co-founder of St. Clare's Tahoe which is a small Catholic Montessori school operated with the express permission of Bishop Mueggenborg as a ministry of the Catholic Church in the Diocese of Reno. They are in support of the proposed amendments. St. Clare's is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit pre-K through 8th grade Catholic school that has been serving North Tahoe for 6 years. For the first 4 years, we operated in Tahoe Vista out of a different church, the North Tahoe Hebrew Congregation. We're a small school, serving only a total of 20 families and 42 students. Only three 3 of our family's commute from the greater area. The vast majority of our families and students are Incline Village residents. We are a licensed childcare provider, also serving the community by offering childcare for children as young as 2 and a half years old, which is critical infrastructure component for working parents. Our Montessori school enriches our community by providing access to a world-renowned education model that is based on a self-paced differentiated learning method, which is great for students with learning differences.

We charge less than half the tuition charged by the other private schools in the Tahoe area while offering financial aid to families and currently, 25 percent of our students receive full financial aid scholarships. St. Francis has been in its current location for over 50 years with far more activities involving much higher traffic than the numbers of children that St. Clare's adds to the location. After the school day and on weekends, St. Francis comes alive with ministry meetings, faith formation activities, weekend masses, weddings, and funerals.

We do have a robust over 80-page emergency operations plan fully vetted by local law enforcement and fire. We work closely with Lieutenant Pete Sewell at Washoe County Sheriff and with Fire Inspector Jeffrey Smith at North Tahoe Fire Protection District to create, implement, and review this plan. Emergency services are aware of our presence and location and are confident in their ability to respond in the event of an emergency.

Ann Nichols, North Tahoe Preservation Alliance, North Shore resident for 54 years and raised Catholic. What's missing in this argument is that this is a new use, it's not the existing Church use or child education use. It's a high school, more people, more cars and it's been shown that parents love to pick up their kids with their cars. It's apples and oranges, you're not considering this new expanded use. We changed the zoning in Incline Village for the Nine 47 project and now we're changing the zoning in Wood Creek because the church wants to do a high school. Changing the community character of an area because you want a different education which you could move and find.

Don Farrell, Elder at the Village Church supports all the positive attributes of church schools from a non-Catholic tradition for our Presbyterian school. We had a preschool at our church for 20 plus years and a wait list that's over 80 kids so our community needs more preschool capacity. But we're starting at grade school to serve parents who are currently unserved. Except for the St. Clare's school there are no Christian schools in the North Shore of Lake Tahoe. We don't think we take any kids out of the public schools because the parents who want to raise their kids with a faith-based education can't get that in the public school by law so, they go to home schooling or to home school groups. The reason our tuition is less than half of the private schools is that like St. Francis, we don't charge for the use of our facility, its only tuition based on out of pocket cash costs. We hope to have substantial scholarship funds, so nobody gets turned away. We love public schools, we're not against

GOVERNING BOARD

April 24, 2024

them in any respect. We don't take away from middle school and certainly not the high school.

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Conrad-Saydah said there's been comments about this being a decision about the freedom to attend a religious school. This is a zoning decision and doesn't want that put on us. She can't speak for others, but she supports religious freedom and the freedom to send your child to whatever school you choose, but this is a zoning discussion.

Ms. Gustafson said this use would be added to the other items under the special use category. It's important to remember as we're talking about the context. Because going back to the issue of zoning, right now, cultural facilities, government offices, local assembly and entertainment, rural sports, sport assembly, transportation routes, public utility centers, transit stations and terminals, local public health and safety facilities all fall under this same zoning. Changing this use to a special use consistent with all of those will still require a review and conditions and is not dramatically different. This is not providing additional capacity here that isn't already under all these other types of uses that could be converted.

Ms. Hill said that's fair to say. She saw it as opportunity to look at each project individually with that special use permit. She doesn't think that the Washoe County Board would have been so open to it if it was just an allowed use.

Ms. Gustafson said any of those could also apply and could be very impactful for the same reasons. That said, I'm sure staff have heard these public comments on transportation safety, and parking. That is an ongoing safety concern with the speed and volume of traffic coming down that road and would take that into consideration when a project comes forward for a special use permit.

Ms. Conrad-Saydah heard what the current population is of the school, what is the projected increases so she can get a feel of how the drop off and pickups would change should there be a secondary school onsite.

Ms. Brown said there isn't an active application for a special use permit and deferred the question to Washoe County.

Ms. Weiche said at this point would be speculative. If they state a number of students and it's different than what they stated today at the special use permit process, nothing would be binding for any future application.

Ms. Lain, applicant representative said should this be approved it is anticipated that both St. Clare's and Village Church will be submitting a special use permit. St. Clare's is looking at a capacity of up to 60 students. Village Church is looking at a capacity of up to 183 students. These numbers were based on the capacities of the existing infrastructure. Neither, of these schools are proposing to build new structures. During the special use permit process, that conditions of approval for a special use permit include restrictions on student capacity and hours of operation. It'll be up to the applicant and applicant's representative to justify those number requests via documentation traffic study, noise compliance, parking analysis, and

GOVERNING BOARD

April 24, 2024

traffic flow, etc.

Ms. Leumer said this does not approve of a specific project. It's approving the amendment to the plan and is not about religious freedom. This could be any school religious or otherwise, that could go in.

Ms. Gustafson said also that if approved and they come forward with a project then these issues of capacity and traffic, etc. would need to be addressed like it would for any of those other uses on the list.

Ms. Regan said they have conveyed concerns about traffic and road safety to the Nevada Department of Transportation for purposes of special use permit down the road.

Ms. Hill made a motion to approve the Required Findings, as described in Attachment D, including a Finding of No Significant Effect, for adoption of the Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan amendment as described in the staff summary.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Bowman (for Mr. Aguilar), Mr. Bass, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Diss, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Hoenigman, Ms. Leumer, Ms. Hales (for Mr. Rice)

Absent: Ms. Laine, Mr. Settelmeyer, Ms. Williamson

Motion carried.

Ms. Hill made a motion to adopt Ordinance 2024-___, amending Ordinance 2021-06, to amend the Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan as shown in Attachment A.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Bowman (for Mr. Aguilar), Mr. Bass, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Diss, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Hoenigman, Ms. Leumer, Ms. Hales (for Mr. Rice)

Absent: Ms. Laine, Mr. Settelmeyer, Ms. Williamson

Motion carried.

B. Resolution recognizing the environmental and community benefits of supporting affordable housing for all

Ms. Regan said over the years, TRPA has utilized resolutions for various purposes, namely recognizing board members upon their departure or during significant policy discussions, we've presented resolutions to the board. Resolutions have been employed to bring attention to issues at the board level, alongside declarations such as wildfire awareness week or national radon month, which are crucial to our communities.

We believed it prudent to include this in the packet, recognizing its significance to Earth Week and housing, as land use impacts the environmental goals of the region and our mission attainment. It's essential for you to see ongoing work amidst the onslaught of news and community discussions, where the affordability crisis in the Tahoe Basin persists, affecting longer commutes, environmental factors, and community cohesion.

GOVERNING BOARD

April 24, 2024

At the core of this resolution is the demonstration of progress. We've attempted to quantify this through various projects and policy shifts at all levels of our community—local, state, and federal supported by grants.

Just over a year ago, this board approved the Lake Tahoe Community College Student Housing Project, now well underway, comprising a hundred-bed dormitory, a significant step for the south shore. Sugar Pine Village, with 248 affordable units, is also emerging in the city, a project facilitated by state land now transformed through partnerships into the largest affordable housing project, with occupancy expected this fall. Moreover, progress on accessory dwelling units, with 34 permits issued region-wide, is aligned with our goal of increasing affordable units. Efforts have been made to streamline processes, such as in South Lake Tahoe, where simplified plans help save costs during applications. Furthermore, we've noted progress on the North Shore, including the Domus Project in Kings Beach, which addresses housing needs in that area. Additionally, there are various policy initiatives and improvements in partner jurisdictions, focusing on inclusionary zoning and area plans. While it may sometimes seem hopeless, collaborative efforts are making headway. Addressing housing affordability is crucial, as it correlates with homelessness, a concern shared by all who care about our community and the lake. This resolution underscores our commitment to progress and collaboration. Notably, the recent designation of South Lake Tahoe as a pro-housing community by the state of California opens new funding avenues, vital for realizing affordable housing goals.

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Bass asked if we could create those housing need targets that are regional that spread across all the jurisdictions and are Tahoe specific. Similar to what California has mandated the City of South Lake Tahoe.

Ms. Gustafson said it's a policy discussion and is not in the Compact.

Mr. Marshall said that's correct.

Mr. Bass asked if we would have the authority if we decided to create the policy.

Mr. Marshall said in the Regional Plan a fair share requirement and the board decided a number of years ago to move away from what proved to be a very contentious battle over who was obligated for what amount of affordable for work force housing. Now things are viewed much more in a regional perspective with the respective states passing specific housing elements and how to address their housing needs. The board has in the past addressed fair share requirements for individual jurisdictions.

Mr. Bass said it may be interesting to revisit it at some point.

Ms. Hales said Douglas County has a relatively new county manager and a very new strategic plan and in several places of that plan, workforce housing is called out as a priority. That was one of the three points in her campaign. She expects that Douglas will be looking at workforce housing in the near future.

Ms. Aldean said Carson City has had an affordable housing provider for a long time.

GOVERNING BOARD

April 24, 2024

Ms. Gustafson said on the North Shore, Placer County has been involved with the Mountain Housing Council. We were one of the initial funders of the Mountain Housing Council 2014 and 2015. For 10 years, that group has been working with the Town of Truckee and Nevada County and the various employers to identify our needs. Those needs far exceed our Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) requirements. There RHNA requirements right now, are 435 units in Placer County, eastern area, Tahoe Basin, but we've identified far more need than that and are trying to achieve much more workforce housing especially watching people driving into the basin from Nevada during non-tourist times traveling to work.

Public Comments

Stephanie Holloway, Placer County Deputy CEO Tahoe City is excited to support this resolution. Highlighting our board's support and alignment, recognizing the necessity for workforce housing is crucial. When we talk about workforce housing or achievable housing, what we're really addressing is our workforce, the individuals essential to our region. They uphold our quality of life and support the initiatives aimed at balancing the natural and man-made environments in the basin. Whether it's businesses seeking employees, organizations implementing projects, or my own department hiring bus drivers for transportation initiatives, housing is always a central theme. It's a genuine barrier for our workforce, exacerbated by rising housing prices and fluctuating interest rates.

However, despite these challenges, we are buoyed by your support and the widespread community backing for addressing this issue. It's heartening to see the overwhelming support and engagement in this conversation. We're making strides forward. For instance, Placer County is actively advancing several projects to address the housing shortage. This month, our board relaunched the Workforce Housing Preservation Program, offering incentives for workers looking to purchase homes. We've already housed seven households through this program and have allocated an additional \$3 million over three years to bolster it further. Our Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) bid dollars are being put to good use here.

Additionally, our Lease to Locals program, a rental incentive initiative, has housed 73 households since its inception. While it serves as a transitional program, it helps individuals settle in the region, eventually leveraging other resources to purchase homes. Furthermore, we're developing a new workforce housing development incentive, focusing on encouraging smaller-scale developments to expand housing options. While the challenges are significant, our collective commitment and collaborative efforts are driving progress. With continued support and strategic initiatives, we're optimistic about the future of housing in our community.

Ann Nichols, North Tahoe Preservation Alliance said what I would like to see elevated in the resolution is exactly how much TRPA is responsible for in this effort. A frank discussion of the projects that TRPA has approved that are not supportive of affordable housing such as Nine 47, 39 Degrees east and north shores, and the Beach Club that are luxury condominiums. If it wasn't so PR and it was an honest assessment of how things are going and reciting what policies you're changing that will promote affordable housing such as getting rid of the two-step and making a limit on short term rentals. Washoe County has done nothing for affordable housing. Patting yourselves on the back is not appropriate right now.

GOVERNING BOARD

April 24, 2024

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Hoenigman said the 941/947 project included the first inclusionary housing ever in the Tahoe Basin. Ten percent of those units and a parcel of land devoted only for affordable housing were included as part of that. It's not everything, but it's the most that we've ever got, and it was the start. Producing affordable housing is expensive and it's difficult and housing has to go somewhere and that's where we run into problems because there's always someone who's impacted by it. We're all going to have to help to solve this problem.

Ms. Gustafson appreciated the resolution and sees it as a call to action to do more, not to pat ourselves on the back. There are things happening that we need to continue to support and recognize the things that aren't happening. We're committed to protecting the environment, supporting our communities and making housing more affordable.

Mr. Hoenigman made a motion to adopt Resolution 2024-___ recognizing the environmental and community benefits of supporting affordable housing for all.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Bowman (for Mr. Aguilar), Mr. Bass, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Diss, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Hoenigman, Ms. Leumer, Ms. Hales (for Mr. Rice)

Absent: Ms. Laine, Mr. Settelmeyer, Ms. Williamson

Motion carried.

- C. Technical Clarifications to the Phase 2 Housing Ordinance Amendments, specifically Code of Ordinances sections 30.4.2.B.5.a and 30.4.2.B.6.a regarding mandatory participation in a stormwater collection and treatment system to receive coverage incentives, and section 52.3.1 regarding reservation of bonus units for deed-restricted affordable and moderate housing

Mr. Marshall said staff recommended that this item be continued. TRPA received a comment yesterday from Mountain Area Preservation (MAP) that expressed concern regarding numbers of bonus units. And we want to make certain before we move forward that we have a clear understanding with them as to the accounting of bonus units to make certain that we're all on the same page. We're in litigation with MAP over the Phase 2 Housing requirements and we want to make certain that they understand our accounting system and that the numbers are accurate. A continuation will not result in any loss of opportunity for affordable housing projects or a deed restricted housing projects to move forward. The two items that we talked about are the requirement to get the bonus for coverage, you need to be tied into a stormwater collection system that's already how we interpret that and then second is the distribution of bonus units within affordable moderate and achievable. There are no projects coming forward in a short time that'll take us to work this out.

Mr. Hoenigman made a motion to continue Agenda Item IX.C.

Public Comments

Emily Setzer, Placer County appreciated the opportunity to collaborate with staff on the Tahoe Living Working Group as a region on TRPA code changes to facilitate workforce

GOVERNING BOARD

April 24, 2024

housing. We appreciate the efforts made in the Phase 2 amendments to reconsider the coverage requirements for deed restricted housing. However, for East Placer County, we're a little challenged. We are unable to utilize those coverage benefits in our region because our area only has one small active stormwater treatment area and is what is required in order to take advantage of those higher coverage percentage requirements. To design and implement stormwater treatment systems is a substantial infrastructure project that does not happen quickly and would not likely be able to undertake that at the skill needed to meet our regional housing needs.

The current coverage requirements for multi-family housing do not allow multi-family developments to be feasible in many cases and will likely prohibit the type of development we'd like to see in the future including the missing middle types of housing. Right now, East Placer needs 1,800 units up to 245 percent of area median income, which came out of the Truckee Tahoe Workforce Housing Needs Assessment. They look forward to continuing to work with the Tahoe Living Working Group in Phase 3 that would help refine coverage requirements for all deed restricted units, not just those utilizing the TRPA bonus units. Placer County does issue our own deed restrictions as well.

Alexis Ollar, Mountain Area Preservation Executive Director appreciated the and attention to the Phase 2 Housing code changes. MAP supports the 50 percent affordable housing requirement for the bonus units as well as the stormwater treatment facility clarification as presented in the staff report. We outlined these two items and additional concerns in our February 9th legal complaint filed on the Phase 2 Housing Amendments. While these changes are being labeled as technical fixes, they represent much more. They are the written assurance that Tahoe's workforce will have 50 percent of the remaining bonus units dedicated to affordable. This is significant to address and for the basin needs as more than 50 percent of the need is 80 percent area median income and less.

The other item to address is the remaining bonus units and the lack of clarity that MAP and likely the public have with what remains. We addressed this in our comment letter submitted yesterday and are asking for an accurate accounting of the units. Since the approval of the Phase 2 housing codes, the charts illustrating the number of bonus units have varied. We are asking for how many residential units have been built, permitted, and reserved out of the total 1,124 residential bonus units available as of December 24, 2018. This should include the specific development and application who has built the units or obtained the units and reservations identifying information. Additionally, we would like to clarify how TRPA labels the units as outlined in our letter. From the public perspective, the number of bonus units that may benefit from the Phase 2 amendments has been a moving target. Without clear and accurate information and accounting, it is impossible for the public to understand what will come forward in the bonus units and for the Phase 2 amendments. We're asking you to approve the critical changes before you and provide an updated and clear accounting of the bonus units.

Ann Nichols, North Tahoe Preservation Alliance said instead of fighting the public, you should listen to us because we were worried about all of this with the Phase 2 housing amendments. Sometimes we have good input that would be helpful and could avoid lawsuits. The term affordable housing, deed restricted, workforce housing is being thrown around. What does it mean? TRPA needs a definition of workforce housing, and as she understands it, that does not include achievable. But North Tahoe Community Alliance, it

GOVERNING BOARD

April 24, 2024

does. What are the definitions? She appreciated that you're relooking at things, but you are doing things on the fly. You're not clearly delineating the decisions. She'd appreciate it if more time were taken, and the public could comment on those final decisions.

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean was not in attendance for the December meeting and doesn't know everything that was stated on the record but did review the minutes. Obviously, this is to address some misunderstandings regarding the allocation of these bonus units. During our conversation, we're talking about how important it is to provide housing for firefighters, police officers, medical personnel who generally fall into the achievable category. She's concerned that we're giving three bites at the apple for affordable, two bites for moderate, and potentially no bites for achievable. She's afraid that we're not giving sufficient attention to that category and 120 percent of median income is not a lot of money today given inflation. We may be freezing out the very people that we wanted to assist because they are providing vital services to our community. Can we take that under advisement while reconsidering everything? We may end up with no achievable housing units using bonus units.

Mr. Hoenigman said originally, we didn't have that strict of a limit on the amount of achievable housing that could qualify for the achievable definition. But there was a lot of community concern about the lack of an income cap as well. But then we also had support for a lack of an income cap from Placer County and other counties that wanted to be able to house some of their workforce in Tahoe. The other is these mixed-use areas where we put this limitation on building multi-family units in these areas unless they were on a publicly maintained stormwater management system. That was largely from listening to groups like MAP and the League. You can't always win.

Ms. Aldean understands the concern about achievable, but she thought that it was housing units that are deed restricted achievable required at least one of the following criteria to be met. Didn't we talk about having it be either income based which is a requirement and/or you either must be employed in the basin for at least 30 hours or you have to be a retired person who's lived in a deed restricted unit in the Tahoe Basin for more than seven years. The income component was mandatory, but it was coupled with one of those two other categories.

Mr. Hoenigman said we do not have an income limit. The requirement is that you have to that you have to live and work in the basin.

Ms. Aldean said achievable housing units that are deed restricted achievable require at least one of the following criteria. She'd amend it to say that you include that income category, but then you couple it with one of these other two requirements. That would address the concern about a wealthy person living in a deed restricted unit for years and so they can remain, or they work 30 hours per week, and they are also eligible regardless of their income.

Ms. Gustafson said they should have a discussion on that because North Shore with the cost of housing and our concerns. When you get into anything beyond the deed restricted at affordable, as we do now with our affordable housing, they have to prove their income every year. Anybody they are helping buy a home which is where we really saw that need,

GOVERNING BOARD

April 24, 2024

we don't want to be going back year after year. As long as they're working for a local employer and they're willing to agree to a deed restriction that they will sell to somebody who's also going to work for a local employer, we're not worried that they may be a doctor who progresses through their career, or they may be a firefighter that becomes the chief because they are living with that deed restriction. They can't buy out of it without paying a significant amount of money back into the system. It's worthy of a longer discussion.

Ms. Aldean said we keep talking about the evils of the two-step subdivision process. But that enables some of these affordable housing units to be sold to people who qualify financially. And homeownership is something that everybody dreams of. She doesn't look at this two-step subdivision process only benefiting the wealthy, it can also benefit affordable housing occupants.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Bowman (for Mr. Aguilar), Mr. Bass, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Diss, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Hoenigman, Ms. Leumer, Ms. Hales (for Mr. Rice)

Absent: Ms. Laine, Mr. Settelmeyer, Ms. Williamson

Motion carried.

X. REPORTS

A. Executive Director Status Report

Ms. Regan said what a great way to celebrate Earth Day with history in the making, with the South Tahoe Public Utility District's project approved today. We are going to discuss some issues regarding our climate, a smart code, and some other matters about mixed-use improvements for our development standards here at the basin at the Regional Planning Commission. We're also looking at improvements to protect wetlands, the Tahoe Yellow Cress and endemic species here in Lake Tahoe, as well as setting standards to control invasive species.

It's been about one year since the City of South Lake Tahoe put a ban on single-use plastic water bottles, particularly small ones, took effect in the basin. That's groundbreaking locally, and "Drink Tahoe Tap" is something we've been discussing for a long time. We're going to continue promoting the best water on the planet in Lake Tahoe.

We had Tahoe Truckee Earth Day last weekend, and our team was out in force at these events. We've got South Lake Tahoe at the college this weekend, and we'll also be participating with the Washoe Tribe at their Earth Day festival in Carson City coming up on May 4th.

Ms. Regan recognized Ms. Ambler, Ms. Campbell, Ms. Faylor, Ms. Gillies, Ms. Horowitz, and Ms. Huston for Administrative Professionals Day.

Nominations are being taken through May 17th for the Best in Basin. We're in the 31st year of projects. We do that every two years where we recognize projects for outstanding environmental design.

GOVERNING BOARD

April 24, 2024

Hundreds of people are coming from across the country to the National Outdoor Recreation Conference the week of May 6th to the Tahoe Blue Event Center. The conference includes 26 local Tahoe speakers. Opening remarks by Herman Fillmore of the Washoe Tribe and she'll be a keynote panel on Destination Stewardship and talking about the destination stewardship plan that we are very busy implementing here in the basin. This is an opportunity for the national spotlight to look at Lake Tahoe, where we share the challenges that many of you have heard today in public comment. Recreational destinations across the country are experiencing the same challenges that we are.

Ms. Regan announced that Mackenzie Cook is TRPA's new Invasive Species Outreach Coordinator. This is not a new position. It just used to be housed at the Tahoe Resource Conservation District.

We've been receiving a lot of comments about Zephyr Cove. The Forest Service renewed the permit with Aramark, and they are considering changes to the Zephyr Cove Resort. They are taking over Zephyr Shoals which is adjacent to Zephyr Cove Beach. That was the site of terrible trash last summer, specifically on July 4th, and it is now under their management. They had a community meeting and are looking to make changes there. TRPA has submitted a letter to the Forest Service some of our desires and the need for compliance with our Memorandum of Understanding and Regional Plan.

We talked about Motel 6 last month and today the Operations and Governance Committee recommended approval for a release of mitigation funds and \$3.5 million of mitigation funds went to the Motel 6 acquisition.

Also, we've heard a lot of comments over the last year on fire evacuation. We've all shared that urgent need for evacuation planning and we won a federal grant called the Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative Efficient and Cost-Saving Transportation (Protect) Grant in the amount of \$1.7 million to improve our evacuation preparedness, and regional coordination, as well as our communications infrastructure. We're in the very beginning stages, but a big shout out to our staff Ms. Richardson and Dr. McIntyre and many others who worked very hard to put this application together.

Last month she mentioned the Lake Tahoe Reservation Act. She'll provide the actual numbers that are in the budget when you hear stories in Washington about possible government shutdown and are we going to get a budget deal or not? She was pleased that Commissioner Hales was able to join Team Tahoe in Washington DC. We had a record amount of participation talking to our members of Congress and staff to raise the profile of Tahoe on Capitol Hill. The breakdown of the \$30.9 million that we will be receiving may be less than \$30 million because of the water infrastructure for fire protection. The in the 4th bullet says up to \$10 million and so year over year that varies, and it's only been about \$1 or \$2 million in the past. At the very least, we're going to get more than \$20 million and potentially up to \$30 million in those various categories.

The term earmarks, congressionally designated funds and projects were also included in that budget deal and Tahoe did very well and we have \$5 million to continue implementing the State Route 28 corridor. Secretary Aguilar has been very passionate about improving that corridor for safety, water quality, and the recreation experience. The Tahoe Transportation District and a whole host of partners including the Nevada Department of

GOVERNING BOARD

April 24, 2024

Transportation and many others are working on that. There's research money for the Desert Research Institute water infrastructure money for the South Tahoe and North Tahoe Public Utility District. We're still working to get the restoration act extended another 10 years so that we can keep those funds coming.

Items tentatively scheduled for the coming months are in May, the strategic planning session. May will be a two day meeting with day two at Stanford Camp at Fallen Leaf Lake. If the Regional Planning Committee makes a recommendation on the very critical environmental thresholds, those will go to the board in May. A lot of you have asked about microplastics. In May, the science community will provide the latest state of knowledge around microplastics. We'll also be kicking off the Regional Transportation Plan with the briefing and also bringing our climate dashboard. In June, staff will be bringing a forest health update. And Homewood is bringing forward a forest health hazardous restoration project permit that will be decoupled from their master plan which we are awaiting a revised application for their project and master plan revision. The climate code will come back and then in June you'll also be looking at our work plan and budget.

B. General Counsel Status Report

Mr. Marshall said we have three challenges (two outstanding) for cell phone towers; The Garmong case was dismissed and now they are potentially seeking review in the Supreme Court. We should be getting their petition for a writ of certiorari soon. The Eisenstecken litigation over the Ski Run tower is sitting the District Court in Sacramento in Federal court awaiting a decision. Yesterday we received an order of judgment in our favor in the Miller case, which was a challenge to the increased depth of excavation of the Ski Run cell tower. Mr. Miller has a period of time in which to appeal to the Ninth Circuit.

The other case is the Supreme Court's decision in the Sheetz v. the County of El Dorado. It's a very narrow legal issue as to does the Nolan Dolan Nexus and rough proportionality standards apply to legislative impact fees. The Supreme Court decided unanimously that it does but they didn't decide whether or not the actual fee in question had a close enough nexus and rough proportionality to make it constitutionally and remanded that back to the California courts. This morning, the Legal Committee discussed the potential impact on fees. He doesn't see any immediate concern. We'll watch as that line of cases is developed through the lower courts to see how when Nollan Dolan is applied to legislative fees as opposed to project-specific impact fees. Whether or not there's a change in that analysis and is there something that we need to do in terms of our mitigation fees.

The Sheetz case does raise the question in general about takings cases. Something that the court has decided in three takings cases in the last couple of weeks which two are not relevant to TRPA and won't report on them. When he joined the Agency, we were facing five or six takings' cases. Through the good works of our own council, the California Attorney General's office and then the Nevada Attorney General's office, we're able to defeat all those and prevail in all those cases or settle the ones in which we might have some vulnerability. Maybe because of the composition of the Supreme Court, there seems to be a renewed interest in pushing takings litigation. Although we may have disagreements with some of our partners like the California Attorney General's office, for example, they provide us with critical background and backing when we get to these taking cases. And they have done a pretty amazing job in the past with their own work and with TRPA in partnership.

GOVERNING BOARD

April 24, 2024

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Conrad-Saydah asked if we are still waiting to see if the Supreme Court will take the case on the cell phone tower.

Mr. Marshall said it's the Garmong case. They got an extension to file their original petition to ask for Supreme Court review. For the most part, the Supreme Court decides their docket and they have yet to file their petition, but they requested an extension of time to file it. We assume that they're going to file something. The chance of that being granted is relatively small given that it doesn't appear to be an issue regarding like a split in a circuit or any great constitutional issue.

Ms. Aldean said the tower is built and what remedy would be available to Mr. Garmong?

Mr. Marshall said generally in these kinds of review cases, the remedy is to remand for another decision point. He doesn't think in his claims there was no particular deal killer such as you can't make that finding. It was whether or not there was an evidentiary basis to make the finding. Staff would present again the decision as to whether or not to approve the cell tower. The board could say no that the cell tower can't be there and then we'd have to figure out how to bring it down. The tower's already been built, and he didn't seek conjunctive relief before it was built.

Ms. Aldean said it hasn't fallen down on his house as he was postulating it might. Maybe it still causes him angst and consternation when he walks by it but those were the alleged direct impacts on him.

Mr. Marshall said correct.

Ms. Aldean said the bigger issue is some people think that the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is the most captured agency at the federal level. With the emergence of 5G there is a preponderance of evidence to suggest that electromagnetic radiation is a potential health problem. Are there any other cell tower applications in the queue?

Mr. Marshall asked Ms. Huston if the total number of cell tower permits captured any applications that might be in the queue.

Ms. Huston said no, that was just permits through October.

Mr. Marshall doesn't have a ready list of applications. We haven't seen that many new cell towers, most of what we are seeing are 5G antennas that are put on buildings. Staff can get you the information if we have any pending applications.

Mr. Bass asked if they'd looked into where new cell towers could be built taking into consideration co-location and preplan where they can be in the Tahoe Basin. The national parks must do something similar when Verizon, AT&T, and T-Mobile want to converge on a national park.

Mr. Marshall said there was an effort, some years ago to try to, primarily on the South Shore

GOVERNING BOARD

April 24, 2024

but maybe including the basin to come up with a map. One of the biggest issues was the individual cell tower companies or service providers were reluctant to give out their proprietary information regarding where they may pursue a cell tower location.

Ms. Regan said we had a community wide coalition that was looking at that and couldn't get it done. TRPA looked at it as part of our overall work plan last year and did not have the resources to do a big planning initiative for that. The demand has diminished but there may be some active conversations at local jurisdictions, but we haven't had those big applications coming through. We're still monitoring it and still in touch with our partners in the community that is looking at that but doesn't think there's anything new to report at this point.

Mr. Bass said it seems like the land use authority has the ability to force them to co-locate. They don't like that but it's an important issue and maybe something that we should look at.

Ms. Regan said TRPA does have co-location policies in place.

XI. GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER REPORTS

Mr. Bass asked about a future policy discussion to have TRPA look at a plastic bottle ban across the basin. Being that it's Earth Day and the City of South Lake Tahoe's one-year anniversary and about to enforce the plastic water bottle ban. Our strategic retreat could be a time for it.

XII. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Local Government Committee

No report.

B. Legal Committee

No report.

C. Operations & Governance Committee

No report.

D. Environmental Improvement Program Committee

No report.

E. Transportation Committee

No report.

F. Regional Planning Committee

No report.

GOVERNING BOARD

April 24, 2024

XIII. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Evan Dreyer, Tahoe Lead Removal Project organizer who is working on a community effort on taking out the eight plus miles of inactive lead cables that stretch from Baldwin Beach to Rubicon Bay. We originally started as neighborhood effort writing letters to AT&T and their legal representation. We were very excited when they said they would remove it. Even though they had to pull out of that deal, thank AT&T for everything they've done to secure the permits, which includes a permit from TRPA. They're trying to carry this project forward with the same third party engineering firms. We're going to look at extending the permit, either that's already been granted or get a new permit in the months ahead. Thank you for caring and having leadership about this issue. We have 470 people that have signed our petition to get this out.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Conrad-Saydah moved to adjourn the meeting.

Ms. Gustafson adjourned the meeting at 3:25 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.