

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
GOVERNING BOARD

TRPA  
Stateline, NV

January 22, 2020

**Meeting Minutes**

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Mr. Yeates called the meeting to order at 10:12 a.m.

Members present: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Beyer (by phone), Ms. Berkgigler, Mr. Bruce, Mr. Cashman, Mrs. Cegavske (by phone), Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Hicks, Ms. Laine, Mr. Lawrence, Mr. Rice, Mr. Shute (by phone), Mr. Yeates

Members absent: Ms. Novasel

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Steve Teshara, Lake Tahoe South Shore Chamber of Commerce said they appreciated Ms. Marchetta's willingness to participate in the February 27<sup>th</sup> State of the South Shore Community address. There will be representation from Joanne Marchetta, Executive Director, TRPA; Jason Collin, Mayor, City of South Lake Tahoe; Barry Penzel, Douglas County Board of Commissioners; and Don Ashton, CAO, El Dorado County. The goal is to get a sense from each speaker on how things are going on the south shore with their jurisdictions and the inter-jurisdictional relationships. It will be held at the Beach Retreat Conference Center in South Lake Tahoe from 5:30 to 7:00 p.m.

Chase Janvrin, Tahoe Prosperity Center thanked everyone for their dedication and staff time on the housing program. Collaboration will be the biggest key to solving this complex issue. The Mountain Housing Council is another group working to combat the unique housing issues in the Tahoe Basin. At their meeting last week there was discussions about the accessory dwelling units (ADU). The lack of new ADUs have been created since Truckee and Placer County have allowed for them. There seems to be a belief, particularly on the California side if ADUs are allowed in accordance with the new state legislation that it will open the flood gates and they'll see ADUs with every home in town. He doesn't feel that's the case, not every homeowner wants an ADU. Because it's expensive and difficult to build in Lake Tahoe a person may not be able to get an ADU. He urged TRPA to consider that simply allowing for ADUs might not be enough. If they want to see ADUs make a sizeable difference to the housing issue in the Tahoe Basin that there will need to be an incentive. TRPA needs to allow the local jurisdictions to adhere to their state ADU policy but find a way to incentivize homeowners to build ADUs for affordable housing in the Basin. In addition, they support the event center project. The environmental analysis that's been done is thorough and complete. This project will have positive environmental and economic benefits. There be sizeable community improvements including year round jobs, a better transit system, and improved economic opportunities during the shoulder season.

## GOVERNING BOARD

January 22, 2020

Ms. Regan introduced Victoria Ortiz as the new Community Engagement Manager. Ms. Ortiz has about ten years' experience in communications and worked for the California Tahoe Conservancy in Lake Tahoe, the Adventure Scientist in Montana, the Sierra Nevada AmeriCorps partnership, and most recently the Santa Barbara Middle School. She'll be working on the Take Care program and working on the agency's social media.

### IV. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chair Mr. Yeates deemed the agenda approved as posted.

### V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Aldean said she provided her clerical edits to Ms. Ambler and moved approval of the December 18, 2019 minutes as amended.

Motion carried.

### VI. TRPA CONSENT CALENDAR

1. December Financials
2. Resolution in Recognition of National Radon Action Month

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

Ms. Laine moved approval.

Motion carried.

### VII. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

- A. Appointment of a TRPA Governing Board Delegate and Alternate to the California Association of Council of Governments (CALCOG) Board of Directors

Mr. Yeates said he's enjoyed serving as the delegate for the past year but feels this should be a local jurisdiction board member to serve. As a member of the CALCOG board it's a good networking opportunity for housing, transportation, and other issues.

Mr. Yeates made a motion to appoint Ms. Novasel to serve as the primary delegate and Ms. Gustafson as the alternate delegate on the CALCOG Board of Directors.

**Motion carried.**

### VIII. PLANNING MATTERS

- A. Housing Work Plan Overview and Presentations on State Housing Legislation

TRPA team member Ms. Fink, Ms. Purvines, Principal Planner, Placer County Services Division, and Ms. Thornton, Principal Policy Analyst from the Nevada Legislative Council Bureau provided the presentation.

## GOVERNING BOARD

January 22, 2020

Ms. Fink said there's been significant changes from the state to the community level on housing. Both California and Nevada passed new housing legislation in 2019. The local jurisdictions are looking for ways to update their housing elements and area plans. The Tahoe Prosperity Center and the Mountain Housing Council have both completed housing needs assessments and are working on housing action plans with their partners to develop and prioritize housing strategies that are most appropriate for the north shore and south shore subregions. TRPA's Local Government and Housing Committee approved a housing work plan in November 2019 to identify where TRPA could best add value in this landscape of housing activity. One part of that work plan is an educational component to the full Governing Board because they anticipate that certain products will come out that work plan that will go to the board in the form of code or area plan amendments. Today is part one of the work plan and the board will hear presentations on the legislation for California and Nevada.

Good housing policy can help meet TRPA's Regional Plan goals with more walkable, bikeable communities and reducing the vehicle miles traveled impacts. The work plan will show what other entities are working on related to housing and acknowledge where those differences are in what they're trying to accomplish and what's allowed by TRPA's code of ordinances. The work plan will look for ways to reconcile these differences within TRPA's environmental protections. Ideally, better positioning ourselves to meet our environmental threshold and Regional Plan goals.

The housing problem in Tahoe looks a little different than it does in other places. There isn't a shortage of housing in Lake Tahoe but rather a mismatch between the type of homes that the housing market is providing and the types of homes that the local workers and residents need. The South Shore Housing Needs Assessment showed that since 2010, approximately 800 homes that were built in the south shore, 75 percent of them were valued at over \$550,000. Those homes are more of second market homes. The South Shore Needs Assessment and the North Tahoe Truckee Needs Assessment showed that over two thirds of our workers are looking for homes priced for ownership at under \$400,000 and for rentals it's homes that are priced at \$1,500 or less per month. In the south shore and the Placer County portion of Lake Tahoe there's a need for about 3,600 units in this range that the markets not providing. There's also an emphasis on a need for rentals. Because this issue impacts the social and community fabric and environmental, entities from the states to the communities are getting involved. It filters through all sectors such as education, business, and the government and are all involved in these coalitions through the Mountain Housing Council and the Tahoe Prosperity Center to develop strategies to address the housing situation. Through the housing work plan process, they envision that they'll be able to identify where they can complement these strategies while remaining within our environmental thresholds and regional growth caps.

There'll be a series of workshops for the Governing Board to hear directly from other groups that are working on housing to the extent that they are working on intersects with TRPA's mandates. Staff will also be working with the Local Government & Housing Committee to bring forward a targeted package of improvements that identify the best places for us to plug in and support the Regional Plan. It doesn't preclude TRPA from moving individual pieces forward more quickly if needed. They anticipate that the work plan will culminate in July with a TRPA housing action plan.

## GOVERNING BOARD

January 22, 2020

In California there's been a sea change in state and local housing policy that's been reflected in new state laws that have an impact on local jurisdictions. The local jurisdictions are now being required to implement this state law. The way it works in the Tahoe Basin, although this new legislation isn't directed at TRPA, for people who live in the California side of the Tahoe Basin who want to build affordable homes are now finding themselves subject to two separate sets of legislation that sometimes conflicts. Through this process they want to find where they can reconcile those within TRPA's framework and allow the local jurisdictions to implement these state priorities within TRPA's framework.

Both states have prioritized new funding and mandates. On the California side as the state is developing grant guidelines, they're looking to reward jurisdictions who are meeting their housing needs and complying with these new state policies. California is requiring that local jurisdiction's meet a higher housing need to increase the amount of affordable homes. They're shifting from having to accommodate the housing need to be accountable for the housing need. In the past, local jurisdictions basically needed to show that they could accommodate a certain amount of housing. Now they're being asked to deliver on that. There's also quite a bit of collaboration between the states and the local jurisdictions on grant guidelines, data collection, and, identifying the housing need.

Ms. Thornton said the Legislative Counsel Bureau is the fulltime central non-partisan staff of the Nevada Legislature. Prior to 2019 session, she staffed the affordable housing committee that was chaired by Senator Ratti.

The affordable housing committees' primary responsibilities included conducting a study to examine the present and perspective need for affordable housing in Nevada. Over the course of six months, the study examined the affordable housing crisis in Nevada and found a shortage of affordable housing units and that 35 percent of households in the state are cost burdened. There were five proposals drafted for consideration for the 2019 legislative session, although only four were passed into law.

Senate Bill 103 has enabling language that allows local government through a process to decide to decrease or waive local fees that they could charge when developers are building affordable housing stock. The fees could include permitting fees, impact fees, sewer fees, etc.

Assembly Bill 309 authorizes the Board of County Commissioners of each county to impose a new sales and use tax that could be used for the development or redevelopment of affordable housing or any infrastructure services associated with affordable housing.

Senate Bill 104 is a data collection bill that allows the decision makers to better see what's going on in the state, so they can possibly bring forward new legislation to affect affordable housing in the future.

Senate Bill 448 creates a new affordable housing tax credit program to encourage the development and preservation of low income residential housing and for projects statewide. The proposed program is a four year pilot program which authorizes up to \$10 million of transferrable tax credits per fiscal year. Not to exceed \$40 million to be administered by the Nevada Housing division. The housing division expects an additional 600 units to be built for this upcoming year. Some of the transferrable credits can be applied to the branch bank excise tax,

modified business tax, the gain and percentage fee tax, the insurance premium tax, or any combination of those.

There were two bills that were passed that increase protections for tenants. Senate Bill 151 was sponsored by Senator Ratti which increases the time a tenant has to react to a rent notice and the time a tenant who fails to pay the rent has before they could be removed pursuant to a court order. It also limits the maximum amount that may be imposed as a late fee to five percent of the rent amount. It requires a landlord to allow a former tenant to retrieve essential personal items during a five day period after the eviction or lockout. It provides that a residential lease remains in effect if a residential property is transferred or sold absent of agreement between a new owner and the lessee.

Assembly Bill 266 sponsored by Assemblywoman Axelrod would provide a process for eviction cases to have the case court files to be automatically sealed within ten judicial days.

Ms. Purvines said a sweeping change came in 2017 to housing laws and opportunities to reduce the constraints for the development of housing. These were Governor Brown's package of 15 housing bills. They primarily focused on items such as funding, accelerating the development, holding cities and counties accountable, and preserving existing affordable housing. In 2019/20, the legislature introduced two hundred housing laws for the two year session. By the end of 2019, there were about four dozen laws that were approved. These laws were put into five categories: Streamlining the approval, regulatory relief, tenant protection, program funding, and density bonus. The accessory dwelling units had some of the most sweeping changes in California law this round. They not only approved things to begin January 1, 2020 but also put into place things that will kick in automatically January 1, 2025.

Some of the new laws include that all new secondary dwellings cannot be used as short term rentals, attached accessory dwelling units are encouraged, no impact fees when less than 750 square feet, cannot be barred by homeowners associations, covenants, conditions, and restrictions can no longer preclude the development of secondary dwellings or accessory dwellings. They could still have some reasonable oversight on how they are designed but it can't be so prohibitive to restrict the development of it. Review and approval of ADU applications must be done within 60 days and must be ministerial. These are building permits and within 60 days they must be approved, or they're considered approved. There were some major changes in 2017 to the reducing of parking requirements. In 2019, the basic change was that if a parking space is removed for the construction of a secondary dwelling or accessory dwelling such as a conversion of a garage, it doesn't have to be replaced. Up to two ADUs are allowed per lot. It now can be a primary, a secondary, and a junior ADU. Primary ADUs are limited to whatever size is allowed for in the jurisdiction, a secondary dwelling unit has a maximum of 1,200 square feet or up to 50 percent of the primary. The junior ADU is restricted to 500 square feet and must be contained within the primary unit and requires the primary unit to be owner occupied. They also lessened the rules for junior ADUs that now allow for external access to that unit and a kitchen. It also cannot be restricted affordability, at this point, there ministerial and have to be approved.

The California housing density bonus law now allows for up to an 80 percent density bonus. Generally, it was 20 percent and maybe 35 percent if some of the requirements were met under the law. Now if it's 100 percent affordable with at least 20 percent can be allowed up to 120 percent of the median income, there can be an 80 percent density bonus on it. If it is within one

half mile of a major transit stop there is no density limit and allows for a 30 foot height increase. There are no transit stops in Placer County that meet the definition of a “major” transit stop which is where two bus lines meet and headways of every 15 minutes.

Senate Bill 330 addresses items such as restrictions on local controls, streamlining provisions for housing development. It does discuss the housing crisis act which limits some of the items in SB 330 to five years unless they are extended later. Lastly, a redefined application process on how they are to review residential projects going through the entitlement process. The streamlining and housing crisis act restricted the ability for a local jurisdiction to down zone, particularly when a project meets the general plan objectives. There is no moratorium, no growth control measures can be approved. No demolishing of existing housing unless the new units replace the old, automatic approval of affordable housing projects, if the housing element doesn't meet California housing needs assessment, it puts a big emphasis on local jurisdictions now getting their housing elements into compliance with state law. The floor area ratio is where they're looking to take mixed use projects that contain two thirds residential and instead of looking them on a density type ratio for the analysis it would be looked at on a square footage ratio for analysis. It cannot require rezoning if the project is consistent with the general plan. No more than five hearings which includes workshops. For Placer County that would be their Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. They do have municipal advisory committees based on the definition of the law for hearings which are included in that. They're limited to only bringing a project to five hearings with those decision making bodies. There's now a limitation in the timeline from when you say you can certify the environmental document to when you would need to approve the project. The new law requires that any residential project defined as a residential project, a mixed use project with the two thirds residential or a project that is for transitional and homeless type housing must go through a new pre application process as defined by California law. It identified these through legislation, these 17 items are the only things they can ask for in that preliminary application. Once an applicant submits their application and the county checks the boxes that everything is submitted, the time clock starts for when the applicant must submit their entitlement process and when the county must have certain approvals done. This will require them to coordinate their approvals with TRPA.

The California Environmental Quality Act has two new statutory exemptions that were added for a conversion of a hotel/motel into support of transitional housing is now exempt from CEQA. Then funding applications in support of housing projects such as no place like home are also now exempt from CEQA.

Assembly Bill 101 was a trailer bill from Governor Brown that came with a fair amount of carrots and sticks. The sticks are to hold local jurisdictions accountable as part of their housing elements. The carrot came with a substantial amount of funding to help assist with the development of housing. The funding is just now in process with the various state agencies and around mid to late 2020, they should start to see some of this funding become available to assist projects as they start development and assist local jurisdiction's as part of the planning process.

Placer County will have additional requirements as part of their housing element update. That update is required to be completed by April of 2021 and certified by the state shortly thereafter. They will be updating their current accessory dwelling unit ordinance to include the changes to secondary dwellings and add the additional requirements for junior ADUs. They've already approved the ordinance amendments to address where the impact fees are no longer required

for units under 750 square feet. They will need to update their density bonus to incorporate the new laws. They're in the process of doing the preapplication form rather than waiting for HCD and then can reconcile with the state later. The adoption of objective zoning standards where applicable is if they can adopt standards upfront as these projects are now being mandated to come through, under ministerial review they still must be found with objective standards of height, setbacks, etc. that do not require discretion in the approval. They're looking at places where they can put more objective standards particularly in the higher density and mixed use guidelines. They're in the process of reviewing inconsistencies between the zoning, general plan, and, area plans for the changes in state law. Amendments will need to be done for the Tahoe Basin Area Plan.

Of the 200 laws, some went away, some were rolled up in the bucket rules and there are some that they're still watching that could come out this year. One is Senate Bill 50 that will change some of the density around transit areas that could exceed what's already being considered under the density bonus law. There's a ballot under consideration to be taken to the public to remove or eliminate Article 34 which prohibits local jurisdictions from developing affordable housing without-going to a vote of the people, but it does require voter approval of the voters in California in November. There is also one related to rent control and others related to density bonus and housing production database that will be coming this year.

Ms. Fink said in response to these new rules that are coming forward, this is prompting us to reexamine some of TRPA regulations and where we can reconcile them within TRPA's framework. Some of the rule changes that you've heard about are more procedural so they're related to permitting and are those we feel are simple and can be handled at the local level and others are technical differences with TRPA code but are likely consistent with the 2012 Regional Plan. Some of the rule changes get at core issues such as coverage, scenic, and lot size. Several of the local jurisdictions already allow accessory dwelling units on parcels greater than one acre through their area plans but in the rest of the basin on the California side they are not allowed on parcels greater than one acre. That's something that we'll need to look at and work through the Local Government and Housing Committee. We'll use this work plan process to identify where TRPA can add value to the housing work going on around the Basin and then come back to the board with a TRPA housing action plan in July 2020. This does not preclude us bringing forward code changes that may need to be prioritized in the near-term.

Presentation can be viewed at:

[Agenda-Item-No.-VIII.A-Housing-Presentation-.pdf](#)

#### Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Cashman said with respect to California legislation, are there any provisions for a local option that allows jurisdictions like Lake Tahoe who may have overriding concerns with respect to some of the legislation to allow for some sort of local option.

Mr. Marshall said there's some language regarding the Coastal Commission but that's not directed local jurisdiction's, it's if you're within the coastal zone and they've recognized certain situations, and that's an environmentally driven one that there may be some adjustments. While these laws apply to local jurisdictions, they don't apply to TRPA and is why we're trying to resolve

## GOVERNING BOARD

January 22, 2020

this disconnect between what local jurisdictions are mandated to do and what is permissible under TRPA's ordinances.

Mr. Cashman said clearly there's conflict.

Mr. Marshall said yes.

Ms. Aldean said typically TRPA's rules and regulations are preeminent but to the extent that there's a disparity between California and Nevada. If we loosen our regulations to accommodate certain items in California, are those going to be equally applicable in Nevada?

Mr. Marshall said this is something the Local Government & Housing Committee should address. Generally, when we're talking about basic rules they're equivalent throughout the basin. A question is do we need to maintain the rule regarding being one acre or over to have a second unit accessory dwelling unit. That directly conflicts with California rule and we know that local jurisdictions have been seeking relief from that through area plans on the California side. Is that something that should be done basin wide. There are a couple of different ways in which we can get at some of these things and is a good policy question that needs to be addressed.

Mr. Hester said Ms. Fink is working with Ms. Novasel, chair of the Local Government & Housing Committee to look at some of these items ahead of the housing action plan at the committee's meeting in February. From there they'll bring items to the Regional Plan Implementation Committee. Because the local jurisdiction's need to work on these things faster than if we waited for the entire housing action plan. The committee will be wrestling with some of those items sooner than later.

Ms. Aldean said in this California legislation, is there a recognition of the fact that there are conflicts between TRPA's rules and regulations and what's being proposed in California to provide some relief to the local jurisdictions if in fact the two can't be reconciled.

Mr. Marshall said no. We're trying to push and delegate to local jurisdictions the ability to issue residential permits. That was one of the themes of the Regional Plan Update. Since the deadlines are coming so fast, the local jurisdictions have to process these permits and essentially issue a local jurisdiction permit on the California side, but the delegation no longer functions because they cannot issue a TRPA permit. They have to then kick that back to TRPA, then the one stop shop goes away. This helps illuminate why we need to address the more central conflicts. For example, we can't compromise on coverage unless there's some significant work on getting rid of coverage limitations on lots. But density is something that's not critical in that same way to the operation of the Regional Plan. Or seeing accessory dwelling units on lots less than one acre.

Ms. Berkbigler said some of these new laws in California are clearly mandatory to the municipality and they appear to conflict with what we have here. Since TRPA makes rules that apply to the basin, can we make them so they can do them under state law but it's not mandatory for Nevada under TRPA law. Although there mandatory in California but in Nevada they're not necessarily going to want some of those laws, particularly rent control, etc. She asked if it was possible when the changes are put in to make it so it could be done in Nevada, but it's not mandated.



## GOVERNING BOARD

January 22, 2020

Mr. Marshall said the Compact directs TRPA to make general in applications. The device they use to make differences is in the area plans. The problem is that TRPA doesn't always want to be in the business of continually having to update and redo area plans. It's not a nimble process. They need to find creative ways that they can use the regional and application standard for the code and Regional Plan but not imposing those California policy judgements on Nevada.

Ms. Marchetta said there are some things that TRPA has never regulated so we wouldn't get into rent control or those kinds of issues. The local jurisdictions in California can address those and TRPA wouldn't attempt to reconcile everything that California has done to the basin. TRPA is specifically looking at areas where there is direct conflict with our rules.

Ms. Laine referred to Assembly Bill 68 and 881 regarding the accessory dwelling units and the ministerial actions. Now until TRPA adjusts its regulations, could a local jurisdiction that has a memorandum of understanding with TRPA that issues those permits under TRPA's regulations, not do anything for 60 days and then it would automatically become approved.

Mr. Marshall said no. TRPA staff is planning a conference call with the City of South Lake Tahoe and other California local jurisdictions planners and legal counsel to address this question. It's a question of what should the local jurisdictions do that has been delegated under TRPA's authority. The basic answer is the local jurisdiction will have to issue a permit for an accessory dwelling unit. It can't be built unless they get a TRPA permit. Some of the discussions are whether or not they deny the TRPA permit, but that wouldn't be consistent with state law, so it's kicked back to TRPA. For example, if the parcel size is under one acre, then TRPA couldn't approve it. They would get the mandatory permit from the local jurisdiction and wouldn't be able to build it because they couldn't get the TRPA permit.

Ms. Laine asked how Placer County is planning to address the CalHome Program funds.

Ms. Purvines said CalHome made a handful of changes to how their funding can be utilized. In addition, Assembly Bill 101 added more money to that pool of funding. For Placer County it would probably be through the first time home buyer program. They're looking at the assistance of the construction for accessory dwelling units. At this time the restrictions on the funding don't seem to be a perfect fit for Placer on that funding source. For first time home buyers, they already have programs and revolving loans for that and in the future may apply for additional funding in the future.

Ms. Gustafson said Placer County is responding to legislation because this is a crisis. The state went after all these bills because this is a complicated mess and a crisis. What she's heard from some of her counterparts outside of the basin in the Town of Truckee and Nevada County is their concern is that if we don't address this within the basin, we're pushing our employees to them and are becoming the area where we would have to solve the problems. She urged everyone to move forward on this. She appreciated Mr. Hester and Ms. Fink's involvement with the Mountain Housing Council over the past few years as they've tried to dive into how to address issues on the north shore. Placer County is looking on how they can further expand first time homeowner programs to try to see what type of ownership they can create for young employees to keep them in Tahoe and developing professional careers.

Mrs. Cegavske asked what the plan is if all the land is built out. We only have so much land left.

Mr. Marshall said what Mrs. Cegavske is referring to residential allocations. We only authorize a certain amount of residential allocations and you need a residential allocation for an accessory dwelling unit. Once that limit is hit, that's it. TRPA rules preempt any inconsistent state rules. In the Tahoe Basin there are a set of rules that override these housing rules. While we're doing this, we have multiple audiences, one important one is the legislators in Sacramento who are trying to implement and respond to the housing crisis. We need to do it in a way that we are not biting off the hand that feeds us on a number of topics. Through their exception of some of the coastal zone issues, they're are sensitive to the issue of these rules being applied in an area that has unique circumstances. Some of the ceilings that we're not planning to amend just because of the accessory dwelling units or housing ordinances, there may be other reasons why the board when we run out of these allocations may want to look at allocations to see what should be done. They're not planning to do any independent work in that direction.

Mr. Hester said when they did the Regional Plan Update in 2012 one of the mitigation measures because of the impact on housing that was identified was to change the development rights system so that we could go from one type of development to another without exceeding the overall cap. The development rights initiative did just that. For example, now you can convert from an obsolete commercial building and convert that to housing units or hotel room, etc. The overall growth cap limitation that Mr. Marshall mentioned is still there, but you can adjust to the market if there's more demand for housing and less demand for retail space for example.

Ms. Gustafson said some of the first time homeowner buyers' programs and funding opportunities that other jurisdictions have used throughout the country and in resort communities don't necessitate new construction, it is purchasing existing homes. Placer County is trying to pursue that as well. That does come with some funding needs and how they approach that is going to be critical. It doesn't have to all be new construction. If we wanted to address this crisis more quickly, it wouldn't require new construction, we would be looking at how we can implement those sort of buyout programs.

#### Public Comments & Questions

Duane Wallace, Tahoe Basin resident and Executive Director, South Tahoe Chamber of Commerce. He supported the work that's been done by Ms. Fink, Ms. Purvines, and others. The chamber suggested a bifurcated effort. When the two states that created the agency create such urgent ordinances it makes sense that this body would recognize those. It's also a national crisis. Lake Tahoe has an interesting problem because so many homes are owned by people that are out of the basin. Better than half of the homes are empty, and we don't have great density in the neighborhoods. There's an ability to create more density through the tiny homes, etc. In all his years, he's never seen such desperation from the business owners and residence in terms of housing. He's seen businesses close even though the economy is good. From a business and human standpoint there's a problem. Both states have offered the best solutions that they can, but what's standing in the way. Even with properties that are given to the developer, they can make more money building condominiums and buying their own island then they can building affordable housing. As a member of the South Tahoe Public Utility District, he pushed their board to cut their connection fees in half and waive fees for transferring in of sewer units. All these commodities coupled with properties that perhaps can be donated. The California Tahoe Conservancy has around 40,000 lots around the basin and they've identified about 17 in the South Tahoe area that can be built upon. They can create a density with height and donating of

commodities that might put a developer close to being able to make a profit. The time it takes, the commodities that have to be purchased, the rules that have to go through create an issue and they can't make a profit. The idea is for all of us to collectively find a way to clear enough of a path that someone can make a profit and build. They supported the effort and the studies that were done are accurate and the work being done is the way to go. They suggested that it be recognized that each state has their area plans and let each state have their own rules that will be allowed and please be generous.

Ed Moser said part of the problem goes back to 2003/04 when the City of South Lake Tahoe was enacting the vacation home rental ordinance. In 2004, there was a 25 to 27 percent increase in the value of homes on the south shore because it allowed for out of town buyers. We knew that this was going to prevent the ordinance from legalizing vacation home rentals and was going to prevent the City of South Lake Tahoe from creating a second and third economy. The City needed to transition from a low paying gaming economy to a mixed economic base. That didn't happen. If you look at what's been destroyed is the number of affordable, low income housing units on Kahle Drive. The 200 plus mobile home park that is now \$1 million to \$4 million dollar homes and condominiums. If you look at the numbers since the Tahoe Prosperity Center was formed in the past 15 years, the number of units that have been destroyed is astounding. That's attributed to a lack of vision both in local government and from this agency. Nothing was put in place to protect that. You start by not destroying the existing ones and also be careful of increased density. It was lack of vision that created the problem.

IX. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. Tahoe Douglas Visitor's Authority Tahoe South Event Center Draft Environmental Assessment, TRPA File# ERSP2017-1212, 55 Highway 50, Stateline, NV (Douglas County, Nevada, APNs 1318-27-002-006)

TRPA team member Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Brueck, Consultant for TRPA, Hauge Brueck Associates, and Mr. Osur, Director of Parking and Downtown Services, City of Aspen, Colorado provided the presentation.

Mr. Nielsen said in December with the applicant, Tahoe Douglas Visitors Authority, we provided a project overview where we discussed the project issues identified in the environmental assessment and heard comments from the Governing Board and public. Since that meeting the environmental assessment was completed and released to public for comment. Today's meeting will discuss the draft document and solicit comments from the board and public. This is a large and complex project. The environmental document is correspondingly comprehensive and complex, particularly regarding the transportation impact analysis. There are questions about the assumptions used in the analysis and the impact determinations made based on those assumptions. They engaged an outside consultant to conduct a peer review of the document that was subsequently revised based on those peer review comments and incorporated into the environmental assessment.

Mr. Brueck said his firm and the traffic analysis subcontractor, LSC Transportation were hired by TRPA to prepare the environmental assessment. Over the years they've worked on similar projects including the Homewood Master Plan, the Heavenly Ski Resort Master Plan, and the Boulder Bay Project. At the beginning of the environmental assessment process they prepared and circulated the scoping notice to describe the project description objectives and asked for

input on the content of the environmental assessment analysis and alternatives. The input received focused on the need for the project and the traffic and vehicle miles traveled impacts analysis. It also provided recommendations for mitigation measures and alternatives that should be studied in the environmental document.

They evaluated the proposed project from numerous scenic threshold viewpoints along US Highway 50 and other more distant locations. The analysis evaluated impacts to viewsheds such as views of meadows and ridgelines, and the quality of the built environment. For example, the quality of architectural limits and landscaping, etc. The analysis concludes that the project may improve scenic quality ratings by replacing the existing surface parking where the building will go with high quality architectural design. It will screen existing views of the Montbleu parking structure, it will underground the existing above ground utilities, and improve the US Highway 50 interface. Improvements include replacing the auto dominated parking lot with a high quality architectural building and pedestrian features.

Similar to the reported benefits under scenic, the events center would replace two acres of existing surface parking with a building and its cleaner stormwater runoff. Overall, the project would reduce stormwater runoff and fine sediment loading by replacing surface parking with a building that has clean runoff and treating stormwater onsite in new underground facilities built for this project.

There were extensive geotech studies prepared for the project. The studies document seasonal high groundwater levels from about 13.5 feet to 25 feet below the ground where the proposed foundation excavations are proposed. The building excavation goes below the high seasonal groundwater levels at the back of house that has the access to trucks and equipment going into the building. The rest of the building site doesn't intercept groundwater. The groundwater level continues to the left below the foundation and the area they're concerned most about is the right side of the photo in slide nine. The groundwater was studied extensively by geotech engineers, Welsh Hagen. The studies confirm that groundwater would be intercepted during both construction, excavation, and over the long term by the center foundation and footings. To address the issue, a site specific dewatering plan has been prepared. The water will be collected and pumped across Lake Parkway to Edgewood lands and infiltrated using sprinklers without creating saturated soils. For the long term treatment of groundwater interception by the foundation, a groundwater recharge basin is included in the project design. A condition for that basin is that it be constructed early to be used during the construction of the building. The basin will infiltrate the collected water, so it doesn't leave the site as surface flow. This basin is in addition to the one that will be built to collect and treat stormwater runoff.

Throughout the scoping process and more recent communications from stakeholders, they heard concerns about traffic and vehicle miles traveled that result from the operation of the event center. A key focus of today's presentation is on trip generation, VMT, traffic and parking effects. The event center project is a new land use. Besides the surface parking that will be removed for its construction, it doesn't replace existing uses that are on the site. In comparison, the City of South Lake Tahoe's project three development included the removal of existing land uses which helped offset the new trips generated by that project. The event center project will create new trips as the environmental assessment points out up to 1,322 new trips for a 2,500 person maximum sized event in the summer. The reason they looked at 2,500 people in the summer is that it is a self-imposed limit on the project that will be conditioned as part of its proposed approval. To meet the performance standard that's been established in the environmental

assessment for trip generation and vehicle miles traveled impacts which is a net zero increase for a summer design day, the project includes a proposal for a formal and daily paid parking program that would operate at all four casinos during the summer peak period and operation of a free micro transit shuttle service. Each of these programs would be in place daily throughout the peak summer period of June 15 through the Labor Day weekend. The analysis and environmental assessment also concluded that operation of the paid parking program and microtransit shuttle service would remove about 3,500 daily vehicle trips to and from the casino core. The trip reduction is unrelated to the operation of the event center. It results from the operation of the two programs of the paid parking and the microtransit shuttle. The paid parking and the microtransit shuttle would be in place daily during summer so would this daily reduction of 3,500 trips per day regardless of whether an event is occurring at the facility. These programs would offset the 1,322 new vehicle trips associated with the maximum size summer event. Their operation would create a net reduction in daily trips on those days when events are occurring. On days when events are not occurring, the daily reduction would be greater.

To evaluate the assumptions that came up with these numbers that were used in the environmental assessment by LSC. In response to that peer review report, LSC revised the traffic section of the environmental assessment. They added a sensitivity analysis to look at the assumptions that were used to document the paid parking and microtransit, daily trips, and VMT reductions. The sensitivity analysis considered a range of more conservative assumptions for each trip reduction factor. They looked at the factors such as overnight visitors and day visitors and the percentage of reduction that would occur for both of those. The environmental assessment demonstrates that each trip reduction factor could be reduced by up to 50 percent and a net VMT reduction would still occur on a day of a summertime event. For example, instead of a 20 percent reduction in day visitor trips from the paid parking program, the sensitivity analysis considered reducing that to 10 percent. They did that for each of those factors and they still showed that the project would not create new trips or VMT on that date. Even after the results of the sensitivity analysis and putting it in the environmental assessment they understand there's still uncertainty given the assumptions that must be used for this analysis. The environmental assessment concludes that this impact is potentially significant and requires mitigation. They prepared a mitigation plan to ensure that the net zero standard is met. It requires that the paid parking program and microtransit shuttle mitigations be integrated into and made consistent with upcoming mainstreet management plan process. It requires monitoring both before and after the projects in place to demonstrate that the anticipated trip and VMT reductions are being achieved.

In addition to those analyzes on daily vehicle trips and VMT community members voiced concerns about what would happen when a large event lets out during peak traffic periods. The environmental assessment also addresses this issue. Depending on whether an event begins or ends during the peak hour, summer operations could increase vehicle trips up to 210 vehicles during the peak hour period. The highest increase would occur if an event lets out during the peak hour. For example, and event that starts in the afternoon and lets out around 5:00 or 6:00 p.m. Resulting vehicle traffic at nearby intersections and Montbleu driveways could create traffic delays on Lake Parkway and eventually the new loop road if constructed. Mitigations have been included in the document that require traffic control during large summer events that would occur during these peak hours. The environmental assessment document said that if the loop road is constructed before the event center operation begins it would likely eliminate most of these congestion events.

Mitigation requires that the proposed microtransit shuttle system be coordinated with the existing transit service providers to better address periods of high traffic that could occur before or after events and during the peak hour.

To address concerns about adequate parking supply and visitor behavior due to changes from the free to paid parking program, the environmental assessment includes a detailed parking analysis. The event center will remove approximately 460 existing spaces at Montbleu. The analysis of the parking count data demonstrates that there's sufficient parking supply in the casino core without these spaces. However, they also document the likelihood for attendees to look for free offsite parking as a result of the new paid parking program. The environmental assessment includes requirements to work with the City and County along with the mainstreet management plan process discussed earlier. They'll develop a consolidated parking and monitoring plan to address the offsite parking issue. This requirement is similar to mitigation measures that were included in the project three approvals which also reduced existing parking.

Mr. Nielsen said transportation is a big issue with this project. We know at this point there are certainties of impacts yet some uncertainties about mitigation. They know that they'll be able to capture and infiltrate groundwater. When it comes to transportation related impacts, we're less confident when it comes to what are the long term effects of paid parking. How effective will the free transit be and will there be a net reduction in vehicle miles traveled and daily vehicle trips. It would be a good thing for the basin to see a free transit system.

The foundation for the conditions that's been developed for transportation impact will have words and phrases such as "in coordination with" and "post project traffic monitoring and adaptive management." They realize that additional detail is needed to clarify these terms and with the input received today and over the comment period they will develop greater specificity on the final conditions. With the conditions they want to specify that the event center may not create a net increase in daily vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled as described in the analysis. That will be a requirement if this proposed project is recommended for approval. It will be necessary to provide pre and post traffic monitoring to document traffic patterns and determine if traffic reduction targets are being met. They'll require the applicant to submit permanent parking agreements that are consistent with the mainstreet management plan transit circulator and parking recommendations. This is a key concern for the Tahoe Transportation District and that the event center mitigations are complimentary, and they help to implement that mainstreet management plan. There needs to be post project coordination and ongoing integration to ensure that these two efforts are complimentary. They'll require additional traffic reduction measures in coordination with the mainstreet management plan should monitoring show performance measures not being met. The Golden One transit management plan in Sacramento, California prescribed a detailed post project quarterly coordination effort with all the partners and adjustments as necessary to the traffic management plan. This is one of the concepts that they are looking at incorporating into this project.

The event center will have limited seating capacity during the high summer seasons. The maximum capacity is 6,000 but there'll be a 2,500 seat capacity from Memorial Day to Labor Day. There'll be a deed restriction recorded against the property in perpetuity. It will be approved and enforced by TRPA.

Mr. Osur said the City of Aspen started paid parking in Aspen in 1995. Four months after it was implemented it was on the ballot and the voters approved it to be kept in place by 70 percent.

## GOVERNING BOARD

January 22, 2020

They have 650 parking spaces in the downtown core, 311 parking spaces in the only parking garage, and 3,000 spaces in the residential zone. They have hourly progressive parking pricing, free carpooling to park in the residential zone if there were two or more people in a vehicle. They have special pricing for service vehicles. They have an intercept lot that is six miles outside of town where people can park for free and get on a bus that's free to get to town. Twenty percent of people parking in the downtown core are parking for free such as government vehicles, American disabilities act placards, etc. They're also continuing to grow their two mobile payment systems. The City of Aspen is busier in the summer than winter months. Aspen is 100 percent built out and do not have any parking lots in the City of Aspen. Sixty percent of the people parking in the downtown core are employees of the businesses.

His first year working on this project he proposed to double the parking prices. The goal was to reduce traffic coming into town. They wanted to have no more than 85 percent occupancy in the downtown core at any one time. By doing that, there will be one empty parking space in every block phase and will eliminate people driving around looking for a place to park. He also wanted to increase transit use, carpools, pedestrians, bicycles, and the intercept lot. He requested that the City Council approve a test period of June 15 to September 15. They would raise parking prices by 50 percent in the downtown core and enforce a four hour maximum parking. They wanted to keep the pricing in the parking garage in the downtown residential zones the same price. They brought in the downtowner for microtransit for people to get into town free of charge. They started a drive less campaign which had about 800 people who signed up for it. They also have a We-cycle which is the shared bike program.

To be successful, it's very important that they have specific rules and understanding of the data so if they wanted to increase the parking prices that much, what does success look like. He wanted to decrease core parking by ten percent and increase the revenue by 25 percent. He wanted to increase the turnover in the downtown core to do more business, decrease occupancy at the parking garage by 15 percent, increase the 400 carpools by ten percent, and increase the number of people parking at the intercept lot by ten percent. They proved that they could change people's behavior. He wanted to decrease the street parking by ten percent and ended up with a 10.61 percent increase. That was 23,992 less cars parking in that three month period. The revenue went up from a goal of 25 percent to 27.44 percent, \$210,000. The goal to increase occupancy in the parking garage by 15 percent, it went up to 15.9 percent, about 6,000 increase in people parking in the garage. When he started with the City of Aspen, the parking garage was only filled in July and August and is now filled every day of the year. There was a garage pass that allowed people to park for less money and had a goal of a ten percent increase and ended up with an 11 percent increase. The goal for the intercept lot was 20 percent increase and ended up with 28 percent more which was 7,000 more cars. The carpool pass was the only thing that wasn't as successful, he projected ten percent and ended up with 8.11 percent, about 1,300 more people. When the businesses complained that their businesses would be hurt when he wanted to raise the parking prices. Business went up 19 percent through a combination of his work and the way people did business, the economy, etc.

To have paid parking or have increase paid parking you need a multi-pronged attack to make it work. The City of Aspen brought in the downtowner to do that. They were the second city that they went into after Florida. The downtowner is part of a multi-faceted way to get people to move around town. People got out of their cars, it reduced congestion in the core, and helped with the fixed bus routes. From June 15 to August 31, 2016 they did 4,886 rides, almost 12,000 passengers, the busiest hours were from 11:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m., 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m., and

10:00 p.m. to 11:00 p.m. In 2019, the downtowner was so successful for the first three months, they went for one more year. They didn't feel the downtowner would be successful in the winter, but it was as successful as the summertime. They signed a three year contract and most recently signed a five year contract with the downtowner. They now have three five passenger gem cars and two Chevy Volts as an alternative for the gem cars. It's all on demand rides and 95 percent are app created. Four percent were driver created and one percent was phone created. They had a request from the City Council to have the phone option for those that didn't have a smart phone. Service is seven days per week, year round. The summer season goes from 11:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. and the winter season goes from 8:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. The service is free to riders and no tips requested. When they first started the downtowner, it was free with the parking revenues paying for 100 percent of the downtowner and also allowed for tips to be requested. The goal in the near future, is to have the downtowner to take over some of the smaller fixed route bus routes. In order to do that, they couldn't request tips so last year they took the tips off of the app. It did increase the City's cost with the downtowner because they increased the wage of the drivers. In 2019, there were 85,000 passengers, 47,000 rides, 11,396 rides were shared, about 9,400 hours of people driving around town. The average wait time went up to 8:39 because the success has been so good. The downtowner will send a questionnaire at his request for anyone who takes a ride. One of the questions asked is if the person did not use the downtowner, what would they use. There were 18,484 who said they would have driven a car if it wasn't for the downtowner. The number one place the downtowner serves every day is the grocery store.

Presentation can be viewed at:

[Agenda-Item-No.-IX.A-Tahoe-South-Events-Center-Environmental-Assessment-.pdf](#)

[Agenda-Item-IX.A-Paid-Parking-and-Mobility-in-Aspen\\_Event-Center.pdf](#)

#### Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean asked how the free carpool parking in residential zones is enforced.

Mr. Osur said the City of Aspen has one road in and out. There is a carpool kiosk at the intercept lot. If they have two or more people in the car, they will be given a carpool permit. Their officers enforce the residential zone all the time. In the next three months, they'll be changing the placard to a license plate recognition.

Ms. Aldean asked if the intercept lot kiosk is a manned station.

Mr. Osur said yes, it is.

Ms. Aldean said eventually these satellite or intercept lots need to be cumulative mitigation for all future projects. It will take some effort to locate those lots in key places. She asked what the capacity of the intercept lot is and how far is it from the downtown.

Mr. Osur said the intercept lot is six miles from downtown and by bus it's about a 15 minute ride and by car if it's busy it's about a 25 to 30 minute drive. They currently have 200 paid parking spaces, 200 spaces on recycled asphalt, and 3,000 on dirt and grass. With the X Games in town this weekend, they will fill all 3,400 spaces. They're getting a flat grant from the federal government in 2021 and will add 200 more paid parking spaces, electric vehicle stations,



## GOVERNING BOARD

January 22, 2020

landscaping, and lighting. The intercept lot is free parking and a free bus. The 200 parking spaces on recycled parking spaces are filled almost every day and the fill the 3,000 spaces for a few major events.

Ms. Aldean said due to the limited capacity of the buses, do they have to supplement with additional buses during these special events?

Mr. Osur said there is the Roaring Fork Transit Association that goes up and down the valley and around the town in which the money from the parking department supports all of the no fare transit that is done for the employee housing units. About four years ago, they switched to the bus rapid transit system. The buses go to that intercept lot every seven minutes in the summertime and in the wintertime, the ski companies and the City pays for additional buses that go nonstop to the ski areas. The wait time at the most is about five minutes in the wintertime. For the X Games they bring in buses from the Rocky Mountain National Park and other places which the ski company pays for to get the people out of that intercept lot. The ridership up and down the valley is five million people per year. They saw almost a 20 percent increase when they went to the 7 minutes versus 15 minute bus service.

Mr. Lawrence said when the City of Aspen ventured into the downtowner, they felt the need was to address the summer peak capacity and not necessarily the year round. He asked Mr. Osur for more detail on why Aspen thought it may not be necessary in the wintertime and what was the cost increase and benefits.

Mr. Osur said because there's so many more people driving in the summertime that's why they felt the downtowner would be more successful. It was so successful in the first three months they had requests from the businesses in town and the chamber to try it in the wintertime. It became almost fifty fifty for summer and winter ridership. Some of the smaller hotels do not have shuttle service so that's covered by the downtowner along with some of the Airbnb's. The downtowner cost them \$550,000 per year. The parking revenue is about \$4 million and he gives \$2 million to all of the transit, the no fare buses and the downtowner.

Mr. Bruce asked if the use of the intercept parking lot is proportionate to the amount of activity for the downtowner. When there is a full parking lot, is that when the downtowner is being used the most?

Mr. Osur said there is some correlation with that. With the accessibility of the downtowner more people are parking at the intercept lot and going to town on the free bus and then using the downtowner when they get there. The downtowner is split evenly between one third locals, one third hotel guests, and one third tourist doing other things.

Mr. Bruce said when there's a full parking lot of cars, does that account for a proportionate number of rides or is the downtowner working more in the downtown area as opposed to being influenced by the number of cars in the lot.

Mr. Osur said the downtowner has a fixed area of about 20 blocks long. For example, the X Games is at the Buttermilk Ski Resort. A lot of those people don't even go to the City of Aspen. Very few of these rides are affected by the X Games for example.

## GOVERNING BOARD

January 22, 2020

Mr. Yeates asked if the parking fees stay with his department. Do they control the fees for funding the downtown? They doubled the parking fees and that helped pay for the downtown and other things.

Mr. Osur said they bring in \$4 million worth of revenue with parking and parking tickets. The parking tickets are only 15 percent of the total revenue. Eight five percent come from people paying the meters. Two million of that goes to paying the downtown of \$550,000 and \$1.5 million goes to pay for the no fare buses going to the employee housing and around the close area of town. As they increased the fees, the revenue went up but didn't want to cut the regular bus service so by increasing the fees, it paid for 100 percent of the downtown.

Mr. Yeates asked if it was correct that he's keeping the fees that the city council agreed to.

Mr. Osur said yes, that is correct.

Ms. Gustafson asked if the parking that they're charging for is on public streets and rights-of-way.

Mr. Osur said yes, that is correct.

Ms. Gustafson said the individual hotels, ski areas, and other private interest may also have a parking fee which they would keep.

Mr. Osur said yes, that is correct. His revenue comes from parking on the city streets and parking in the parking garage.

Mr. Rice asked will this work here.

Mr. Osur said Lake Tahoe is similar to the City of Aspen and if the plan is put together appropriately, it will work here.

Mrs. Cegavske asked how that will affect the environment with the increase of Uber and Lyft who don't park but rather just pick up and deliver.

Mr. Nielsen said the analysis from the event center looked at the on demand ride shares. It was a fairly small percent and was considered in the analysis.

Mr. Osur said if there was a choice of a downtown or microtransit that is free compared to an Uber that will cost money, why wouldn't someone do the free transit.

Mrs. Cegavske said in Las Vegas the ride shares are popular. People don't care about the cost; they just want to get there faster than what some of the transportation options can deliver.

Mr. Bruce asked if there were any specific items Mr. Osur would recommend helping this plan work here.

Mr. Osur said one of the things they learned in the City of Aspen is with paid parking you can change behavior. People will look to find the free or less expensive parking and is why it's

## GOVERNING BOARD

January 22, 2020

important to have a consolidated effort when you do paid parking and it has to be everywhere, or people will go to where it's free. Even as they raised prices, they changed the behavior. Lake Tahoe is a lot more like Aspen than he envisioned. The difference being is that Lake Tahoe has mostly casino parking and Aspen has on street parking but it's the basically the same as long as you can get everyone on board to charge parking in every possible area.

Ms. Faustinos asked what happens to the employees and local workers that may want to use this shuttle system that is six miles out of town. How does it help with mitigation of the transportation needs? How does the route help facilitate employees being able to get around?

Mr. Osur said most of the employees live in employee housing. There is a no fare bus service that goes to those employee housing units along with the downtown. The majority of the employees are moving around when the tourist is not. It helps even out the workload for the downtown.

Mr. Hester said it sounds like there's three components: One is the downtown, one is the no fare that picks up employees and a little bit larger area, and then there's the intercept lot with the larger bus rapid transit.

Mr. Osur said yes, that's correct.

Mr. Lawrence said there's a traffic analysis, a peer review, and now the environmental assessment. He asked if the questions that were raised in the peer review were answered.

Mr. Nielsen said yes, they believe they were. One of the missing pieces that the peer reviewer identified was that additional justification for the assumptions. Those were addressed in two ways. One, they looked at other information about the justifications for paid parking reductions. There was a Caltrans report that was leveraged and incorporated into the environmental assessment that acknowledged that there's not a lot of quantitative information about the effects of paid parking in this study that was contracted by Caltrans last year. They also felt that it was important because of the uncertainty of some of these assumptions in the initial draft of the traffic analysis. Instead of just pinpointing a number for a specific reduction related to paid parking and the shuttle that they develop a range. A sensitivity analysis was developed that said if we cut these assumptions by ten or 20 percent, this is what the impacts are going to be. They found that you could cut those assumptions by as much as 50 percent and you would still see a reduction in traffic. They do feel that the latest version of the analysis was responsive to the peer reviewer.

Ms. Aldean referred to table 1-1, Impact and Mitigation Summary having to do with VMT. Obviously, we're anticipating some type of adaptive management plan. If the project is approved and it's operational, we're going to be looking at travel patterns and determining whether or not the approved mitigations are sufficient to offset the VMT. One of those proposed mitigations could be to require coordination of events. If there's a facility with a capacity of 6,000 and there's an Elton John concert performing at the same time there's another headliner performing at another casino, there's going to be an issue. She encouraged central scheduling to avoid those conflicts all year long.

## GOVERNING BOARD

January 22, 2020

Mr. Nielsen said there is an agreement that the event center will not compete with Harvey's Outdoor concerts but there could be other events in South Lake Tahoe. The Golden One Event Center transportation management plan post project ongoing coordination quarterly meetings with the downtown association to ensure that there's adequate planning, traffic control when there's competing events.

Ms. Faustinos said a challenge is how you implement some of these mitigation factors. She appreciated that there's an agreement to include a deed restriction for the maximum capacity of 2,500. If we could add something that says if the traffic is not reduced, maybe it goes down even more. That is a hook to ensure that the mitigation is adequate. She's pleased to hear that this has worked in other places and raised her consideration for the project.

Mr. Cashman asked if there were analysis or comparisons done to the Harvey's Outdoor Concert series.

Mr. Nielsen said the Harvey's venue seats about 8,500 people.

Mr. Cashman said there seems to be adequate parking at Harvey's for their events and not a tremendous amount of traffic congestion. Although, they do generate trips for these events. Did that inform this draft?

Mr. Nielsen said there was a survey done in 2017 during a Friday night Harvey's concert. They conducted interviews with occupants of vehicles to see how many people were in a car and where they were coming from. For example, they found that 28 percent of those attending were coming over Highway 50 Echo Summit. They also counted the parking for the four major casinos and found around a surplus of 1,000 parking spaces on a Harvey's concert night. With the event center construction, they'll lose about 460 parking spaces.

Mr. Cashman asked if that survey did an analysis of how many cars there were for the 8,500 seat arena. Typically, people attending a concert will have more than one person in the vehicle because it's not a typical daily trip.

Mr. Nielsen said the survey found it to be around 2.7 people per vehicle.

Mr. Cashman said the 8,500 is a much bigger impact than what this facility is being limited to at 2,500 during that time. It's an admirable thing to try and ensure that they don't over stress the downtown south shore area.

Mr. Nielsen said as part of that number there are also people arriving by walking, cabs, bikes, and other modes.

Mr. Lawrence said as he thinks a lot about the uncertainty of the mitigation when reviewing this project. There's been a lot of discussion about adaptive management and the term is used very loosely. Adaptive management isn't just coming in with a report but rather a strong robust adaptive management where upfront you've identified triggers and responses. He's not advocating one or the other but as we move forward that will be a consideration as he looks at the project. He wants to know what that adaptive management and monitoring will look like. If

we're looking for assurances and reducing any uncertainty with proposed mitigation actions, it will be critical and a key element.

Mr. Nielsen said the Golden One has triggers and we need to do the same thing in South Lake Tahoe if this project is approved. On page 3.5-82 of the environmental assessment it shows potential additional measures that are being considered for incorporation into this performance based approach which would represent triggers if we're not seeing the projected and required traffic reductions.

Mr. Cashman said the illustration of the water table in the building contemplated that the foundation of the building is going to be on piles driven into the bedrock. He asked how the foundation and the water table will interact.

Mr. Nielsen said they've not seen the foundation details and assume that it's a traditional foundation. The foundation on the upper south end of the building will have a 25-foot wall built to allow trucks to come into the south end of the building. The interception wells will be on the other side of that 25-foot wall. They don't anticipate any portion of the foundation being pervious.

Mr. Cashman asked if it was correct that the water migrates down hill from the mountain side slope towards that building.

Mr. Nielsen said yes, that's correct. The intercepts are uphill, the water is coming off of the mountain through Van Sickle Bi-State Park and is essentially headed toward the Lake. There were some variances they saw with the data but does head towards the Lake. They also saw that with the Edgewood and the Beach Club project. Part of the planning to intercept and manage the groundwater will include the construction of a subsurface infiltration gallery that will be down slope of the building and will be separate from the stormwater infiltration chamber because the water quality of the two are different.

Ms. Faustinos asked if there are going to be any impacts to habitat by collecting more of that stormwater at that site.

Mr. Nielsen said they don't believe so. The site as it exists today is a parking lot. That groundwater is about 12 feet below that parking lot headed toward the Lake, but it would have to go through Highway 50 first. There is significant compaction and utilities under Highway 50 that create a barrier. Eventually, the water gets under there because we don't see it damming up or coming to the surface above the highway. Beyond that it heads for the golf course. By infiltrating and capturing the water roughly in the same area, they don't anticipate any additional impacts.

Mr. Yeates asked what analysis was done on the 6,000 seat facility.

Mr. Nielsen said right now the mitigation on that 6,000 seat facility would be paid parking during certain times of the year that need to be identified in the final conditions of approval. The transit stops in the Fall. They're looking at paid parking to address those impacts during the shoulder seasons which are low seasons that the event center is trying to fill.

Mr. Marshall said there may be paid parking associated with a particular event, but the analysis relies mostly on the offset, building up banked saved trips from all days during the summer season. For vehicle miles traveled they're looking at it from the summer peak time. That's what the threshold focuses on. It's not the same calculus of a year round or we don't have a winter vehicle miles traveled standard.

Mr. Yeates said if you're banking the benefits of the summer program, yet there is a 6,000 seat facility in which many people come to stateline for a large event and make a return trip it creates a lot of traffic during that particular time for the residents. He asked what the mitigation is for that because that's a significant impact on the transportation for many people who are just trying to get home at night.

Mr. Marshall referred to slide with the key issues for event day traffic-summer operations 3.5-32.

Mr. Brueck said this slide is based on a summer event. The environmental assessment also looks at the maximum 6,000 person event during off peak periods and what kind of trip creation it would have along with looking at the peak hour. Those numbers are also in the environmental assessment. They also identify the same types of increased trips from the maximum event during the winter, the same kind of increases for peak hour traffic, although the number can go up to 380 instead of 210 during the 6,000 person event. It would need to be addressed with traffic control measures in the local area. They used the trip data throughout the year to do things like annual analysis for greenhouse gas model assumptions.

Mr. Shute agreed with Mr. Yeates' comments and questions about the 6,000 person event. He doesn't feel that it's sufficient to indicate mitigation or significant standards for those events and is worrisome. We don't have intercept lots at this time and in respect to the mainstreet management plan one of the options that was thought about was to have free parking at each end of the mainstreet management area around the casinos. Then a person could use the public transit to get around the casino core. As he understands the proposal it would be legal binding agreements with all the casino operators requiring them to have paid parking. That cuts out some of the options to negotiate with some of the casino operators to have free parking in order to facilitate free transit in the core as part of the mainstreet management plan.

Mr. Hester said he doesn't feel the mainstreet management plan has been developed far enough to state that. One of the discussions with the Tahoe Transportation District is how they're going to bring the two together as they move further along with the mainstreet management plan.

Mr. Yeates said that is a concern on how this proposed project and the mainstreet management plan will align.

Ms. Laine said we have time to do what the City of Aspen did with running a program for three months and see how it goes. The League to Save Lake Tahoe was onto something one year ago. If we could get the funding possibly with a partnership from Douglas County and the City of South Lake Tahoe, we could try it and get some real data.

Ms. Faustinos said we should also consider the major holidays as part of the peak season analysis.

Public Comments & Questions

Liz Lawton, Stateline resident commended TRPA and Mr. Nielsen on the public outreach which has gone above and beyond what is normally required of an environmental assessment. The issue she has with the project is that it is a regional project with regional impacts that are going to have impacts with the increase of the 2,500 to 6,000 people coming to the basin. She has a hard time believing that the parking fee and the bus that's going to serve the casino core area is going to reduce impacts the regional congestion and the regional vehicle miles traveled that will be created. She doesn't feel that parking fees associated with the casino core is going to help reduce 6,000 more people that are going to be going to Emerald Bay or 2,500 more people that will be lining up on State Route 28 to access Sand Harbor. There'll be an increased demand to the recreation sites and infrastructure. Predicting traffic is not a science, it's not realistic, it's a concept of predicting human behavior. There's future technology and trends that may impact the way people utilize or impact the infrastructure. She challenged everyone to take a step back and ask yourself do you believe that by adding 6,000 more people to the Tahoe Basin, we're going to reduce vehicle miles traveled.

Nicole Rinke, California Attorney General's Office said their office recognizes some of the benefits that can be derived from this project for the basin. It represents some opportunities around economic development and for the community. The event center will likely be one of the largest projects approved under the Regional Plan Update. They want to ensure that the vehicle miles traveled impacts associated with the project are adequately analyzed and reduced to net zero. They appreciated that TRPA is applying a net zero standard to the project but at present they don't feel confident that the analysis that's been provided will have the adequate assurance that it will be reduced to net zero. She agreed with the comments that were made by the last speaker. Their office will be submitting a written comment that outlines their concerns with the environmental analysis. The reductions that are being claimed in the environmental assessment certainly rely upon these commitments that are being made with paid parking, the microtransit, and the reduced capacity for the event center. They're concerned on how those commitments are going to be enforced and at what performance measures and monitoring will be utilized to be sure that the commitments are fulfilled and effective. They would like to see protocols established in terms of the adaptive management that clearly outline a plan B if the vehicle miles traveled are realized there's a next step that would be triggered. There are inadequacy's in terms of the analysis and how it estimates the vehicle miles traveled that will be generated by the project as well as the vehicle miles traveled reductions that will result from the conditions that are being incorporated into the project. There are several places where there are unsubstantiated assumptions or where the analysis could be significantly improved. The analysis relies heavily as has been acknowledged on the paid parking to reduce vehicle miles traveled by the project. The estimates on how that is going to look are based on four studies that were conducted in urban areas with no studies from a resort setting. It's probably accurate that those studies do not exist. Paid parking was implemented at two of the casinos in Lake Tahoe in 2018 and there is StreetLight data available that could be analyzed to understand the impacts of that paid parking. That would be a quantitative data driven thing to consider as they look at this project. They share the concerns on whether or not the maximum 6,000 day event has been looked at adequately. The environmental assessment does include some discussion but is unclear what role that plays in the standards of significance and concerning the impacts analysis and want it better addressed. They would like more details on how the paid parking is going to work. They would like to know how the microtransit that's being discussed here relates to the circulator

that's being proposed by the Tahoe Transportation District as part of the mainstreet management plan. They don't feel that microtransit is enough, reducing reliance on the automobile requires working both sides of the issue. Paid parking will disincentive people to drive a car but there also needs to be other attractive options to get places. While the microtransit is a good step that they support, they would like to see a transit service or transit contribution added to the project to address the other side of the coin. After hearing the City of Aspen presentation that the paid parking will be a revenue generator and would be reasonable to have some of that revenue to improve transit and alternative modes in the stateline area.

Tiffany Zabaglo, Lake Tahoe Resort Hotel and member of the Tahoe Chamber board said she sees firsthand the need for an event center. It will benefit the community, the guests, and viable employment opportunities for locals. The event center will increase pedestrian friendly areas and promote workability and multi modal transportation alternatives. The event center is not a total solution but is a start. As a local, she's also experienced the traffic congestion. It's the visitors who contribute to local business success and revenues and the demand needed to provide transportation alternatives. The environmental assessment with its detailed traffic and scenic analysis and proposed mitigation measures should be certified as adequate. There are many environmental and community benefits to the proposal, it provide accommodation for formal paid parking, microtransit shuttle service will inspire action for further improvements in the area. As a 20-year resident, she's seen the benefits of redevelopment projects, the event center is necessary for Lake Tahoe to be viewed as a world class destination. The event center can provide the solution to many of our challenges and is in full support of the project.

Stacy Noyes, Lakeside Inn & Casino said the Tahoe Douglas Visitors Authority is meeting all the requirements of the environmental assessment. By delaying the project, it will mean no transit solutions. With increased revenues for the entire area, more visitation will provide a revenue stream that will be able to contribute more meaningfully so it wouldn't be just a seasonal circulator. There's a huge opportunity to utilize the components that the City of Aspen is using. It's critical and is the path forward.

John Cahill, Paragon Gaming owners/operators of the Hard Rock Casino said this has been a dynamic, positive, and thoughtful process in the review of the event center project especially regarding the ability of this project to reduce the existing summertime vehicle miles traveled and create a functional and positive experience on Highway 50/mainstreet. When the environmental assessment made findings on this subject it indicated that the projects proposed mitigation measures at minimum summertime paid parking in stateline and the implementation of microtransit from Round Hill to Bijou would result in a reduction of vehicle miles traveled. Since the initial response to these findings were seen by many as questionable to overstated. It is a credit to this process that TRPA commissioned an independent third party peer review to determine the efficacy of the proposed mitigation measures which essentially supported the finding and refined and improved the implementation. The peer review said the concern that assumptions from microtransit TTD route were not explained as to how the percentages were derived. This led to the peer review consultant recommendations of establishing a range of mode shift effectiveness assumptions which would allow the identification of the inflection point where diminishing returns occur, i.e., where vehicle miles traveled benefits disappear. This becomes the metric, the trigger for the adaptive management plan. All of the people who have worked on this project, analyzing, and trying to perfect this go to saying a process should be followed. There are people who want an environmental impact statement, it didn't hit the thresholds for an EIS. The final mitigation conditions of the project call for post project coordination with the mainstreet



## GOVERNING BOARD

January 22, 2020

management plan. Traffic monitoring in the first summer season set a baseline for volumes, post project validation of paid parking, and development of an adaptive management plan should the required reductions not be met. He's never seen a project with more collars and cuffs that gives this board total power to amend and shape this program. This project won't happen if it doesn't get approved next month. We'll miss the window to commence construction and if there's not a construction schedule that's covered by the bond issue, they cannot engage the project. He urged the support and approval of the proposed project.

Rich Bodine, South Lake Tahoe Lodging Association said the board and members are in support of this project. Even if this project doesn't get done, there's still a serious issue with transportation. The environmental assessment addresses the vehicle miles traveled reductions and we need to figure out a way to reduce vehicle miles traveled. If we use the resources that we have, especially in the summer and adopt the model that the City of Aspen is using and have some satellite lots in Meyers, Heavenly Stagecoach parking lot or Heavenly Cal base could help come up with a good transportation plan from the Y to stateline and surrounding areas.

John Packard, Harrah's & Harvey's said they supported the proposed project and are cognizant of the need for a viable plan to ensure there will not be an increase in vehicle miles traveled as a result of the project. They feel the plan being proposed for both paid parking in the casino core and a new microtransit system working with the existing transit systems will have the combined effect of reducing vehicle miles traveled by a projected 12 percent. They've seen evidence from other parts of the basin that vehicle miles traveled can be reduced with a microtransit system. It can be further enhanced by incentivizing people to leave their vehicles with enforced paid parking in the core and free transportation in and around the bed base and the entertainment epicenter. Back in the day, every casino had a free shuttle service. Those systems were flawed largely due to the fact that there was little to no coordination and communications from the businesses running those services. With a coordinated microtransit system and more pedestrian and bicycle friendly infrastructure as a result of implementing the mainstreet management plan, the net reduction of vehicle miles traveled will be more significant than any other project TRPA has ever considered. The urged the support of the proposed event center.

Bob Hassett, Camp Richardson Resort and Round Hill Pines Beach Resort said the project will be the impetus to create a transportation system that will work and reduce the vehicle miles traveled. One and one half years ago, Round Hill Pines teamed up with the League to Save Lake Tahoe to help fund the pilot program for the Chariot bus. They learned a lot from that program and know what we need now with micro system. They've committed funds to help with a new system. Our community needs a transportation system that is going to work. This project is the trigger we need to get a transportation system going. Timing is important and if we miss the target on this, who knows if we'll get another opportunity.

Sonja Leonard, PCS Stateline owner of the Wells Fargo building said the Regional Transportation Plan as approved by TRPA is Lake Tahoe's blueprint for a regional transportation system that enhances the quality of life of the stateline region and promotes sustainability for its improved mobility for residents and tourist. Construction of an event center within the casino core will further develop pedestrian friendly areas where room supply exists and promotes walkability and the use of local transit. A new event center would result in a reduction of vehicle miles traveled levels that are below TRPA threshold standards. A seasonal microtransit system in alignment with a paid parking program in the casino core is desired, needed, and now deliverable. Similar transportation systems in comparable markets such as Squaw Valley have produced positive

results. The environmental assessment the most accurate data set at our disposal should be trusted. Disregarding the findings of this report will not only stall progress of much needed event center at stateline but will impede the opportunity of economic vitality throughout Douglas County. The analysis completed by the environmental assessment signifies a 12 percent reduction of vehicle miles traveled. Contributing factors to the reduction include new transit shelters, a 100 foot long transit pull off along Highway 50, a seasonal microtransit system, and paid parking in the casino core. The event center management team could also consider additional resources to further improve the vehicle miles traveled reduction percentage. Some suggestions include designation of an employee transportation coordinator responsible to working with employees to identify free transit services and boost ecofriendly practices, provide secured bicycle parking a part of the event center facility, and educating and providing tourist alternative transportation information through public service announcements, signage, and social media campaigns. As a supporter of the event center, they take the vehicle miles traveled seriously and are committed to contributing to being part of the greater solution. The cost of doing nothing is a cost that Douglas County cannot afford.

Scott McCoubrey, Stateline resident said progress lies not in enhancing what is but advancing toward what will be. He envisions free and innovative transit with an increase of bicycle use and family foot exploration. As a multi-year tourist before moving here full time he would have preferred to use free transit than paid parking in the core. But since parking was free, he drove around and parked in the core as much as possible and ended being part of the problem and not the solution. Since the event center and microtransit proposals have been successful elsewhere, we can make it work as well. He supported the proposed event center project and microtransit.

Carl Hasty, Tahoe Transportation District said the board was provided a letter from subconsultant Dixon Resources Unlimited for TTD who is preparing the parking management plan relevant to their requirement when it comes to the Highway 50 project. This is where they look to integrate this. When it comes to the conditions in the permit, they're looking for the flexibility in what will work and be applicable to this project. The project presents a tremendous opportunity for making this parking available. The parking is primarily all private, there is very little public parking and the majority of the public parking is in the City of South Lake Tahoe. How do we organize this in between the two projects, we have this opportunity for that stretch of corridor to create a parking policy that will make sense. They'll be able to provide way finding signage, etc. He agreed that a lot of the congestion and confusion around that area is people driving around just looking for parking and then whether it's paid for free. They'll continue to work with TRPA staff and the project proponents in integrating this.

Lisa DeLeon, Destination Tahoe Meeting & Events said 90 to 100 percent of the 100 to 125 groups that they manage annually, utilize private motor coach transportation services to and from the airport or origin. Once in the corridor, the groups are walking or utilizing private transfers to their offsite events or activities. Traveling to conferences, she would expect to pay for parking at an event center. Therefore, conference organizers work diligently to ensure that transportation is provided as necessary. Conference organizers are always looking into the walkability of a destination because attendees don't come with vehicles. Las Vegas and Washington, DC don't offer on demand shuttles like the downtowner that the City of Aspen has. Sporting and concert events are not the only events that are estimated in that proposed 130 events per year. Trade shows and conferences are also included in that. Regarding the 6,000 seat event, people are not arriving alone for those concert or sporting events. Often, the casinos are also organizing player events and those guests are being brought in by chartered transportation.

Sheila Boothby said she supported the proposed event center project and microtransit. If the vehicle miles traveled are better than hoped, can we increase the capacity of the events during those times where the numbers are capped? No matter what act may be brought in for a concert, the seats are still limited at 6,500.

Gavin Feiger, League to Save Lake Tahoe said the League did submit written comments yesterday. The event center is an exciting project and could deliver significant benefits to the community. Given the scale of this proposal, its location in a high visibility area, and the current status of vehicle miles traveled, this needs to be a shining example of the Regional Plan. The economic benefits of the project are compelling, and the League applauds the new transit service and the paid parking management. From what they've seen, a project of this scale has not been approved under just an environmental assessment. The things that they would have liked to see that would have been in an environmental impact statement are a public comment period with required agency responses, an analysis of project alternatives, a monitoring and mitigation plan, and more time to review the analysis and work towards some common solutions. The peer review of the traffic analysis did answer a lot of the questions, the sensitivity analysis was good, but still left a few things hanging. There's a large number of events at peak season with no mitigation that will create a big impact. There's no real response to that concern along with no response to the mode shift effectiveness. The initial analysis of the environmental assessment does leave them with concerns about the approach, the assumptions, results, mitigations, and specifically related to traffic and vehicles miles traveled. They didn't get into too much detail in their comment letter but feel like if the proponents are confident in the assessment of the analysis. We need to work on mechanisms to ensure that the design of the operation achieves the results in the analysis. It was good to see some of the monitoring and adaptive management measure mentioned in the environmental assessment and staff report. It still has a little way to go. Some of the remaining concerns that can be addressed through another mechanism besides a full environmental impact statement over this next month or two are the effectiveness of paid parking, especially if it's not year round. Looking back to the studies in the source data the studies for the paid parking of the four limited ones, all included year round paid parking. Not just sporadic or event based paid parking. The microtransit needs to be year round and in a bigger service area. If we were to charge \$20 per day for less than 80 parking spots in the casino core, that's \$500,000. There's a lot of opportunity here. There hopeful that the proposed project can be amended to provide certain benefits, specifically a monitoring plan with a self-implementing adaptive a management. The environmental assessment in its draft form doesn't have all the detail they would like to see for a project of this scale. They're uncertain that the project can deliver what the proponents are promising but are willing to work with TRPA and the project proponents to find a way that the project can deliver everything that's promised.

Carol Chaplin, Tahoe Douglas Visitor's Authority, applicant of the proposed event center said back in 2000, they purchased a yacht for charter operations. They asked TRPA if they needed a charter permit, TRPA had never written a charter permit and didn't have a definition of charter. They wrote that chapter with fueling restrictions, operation limits, etc. Again, TRPA had never written a water transit permit and didn't have a definition. They also wrote that chapter. They had similar restrictions they complied because it was the right thing to do. This chapter is more about the transportation than it is about the event center. They knew that they had homework to do and they needed to get an "A." The question is have they met scenic quality, reduced impervious surface, and agreed to attendance caps in peak seasons? Yes, they have. Have they demonstrated vehicle miles traveled reductions? Yes, they have twice. The peer review came to similar conclusions. Are they participating in the mainstreet management plan and have they

agreed to a microtransit project as a potential catalyst for a comprehensive system? Yes, they have. Will they provide jobs, rebuild an economy, firm up shoulder seasons, provide entertainment in a variety of events, and create a community gathering place? Yes, they will. This is not out of the public view, there's been public presentations and meetings with the League to Save Lake Tahoe. She's learned that staff doesn't know that the Tahoe Douglas Visitors Authority has monthly public meetings with a standing event center agenda item. They don't know her contact information or anyone else that can provide it so they could converse, collaborate, and create a shared vision. Destination marketing organizations are evolving into destination management organizations. The industry realizes its role to make the environment resilient and sustainable. They are your partners anxious to collaborate to bring solutions to this big beautiful Lake. The right thing to do is to consider the project merits under the environmental assessment and to not ambush it at the eleventh hour but to come together in sincere partnership. It's a tough sell to trust that collectively we're better together than by ourselves and that we can in February come back to you with a new chapter written and a great project to set the tone and tempo for transit and our destinations future.

Steve Teshara, Lake Tahoe South Shore Chamber of Commerce said there's been some suggestions that it was a weeklong opportunity to comment on the environmental assessment. It is a 30-day plus period. He's confident that many of the comments and concerns that were heard today will be incorporated. They've reviewed the draft environmental assessment, transportation analysis, and the scenic quality evaluation. They also note that there are project alternatives which seem to be missed by some folks. They've also reviewed the Dixon Resources parking management comments which they feel will be very helpful. They support the proposed action alternative and will be submitting written comments. They appreciated Mr. Nielsen's comments today to talk about the pre and post monitoring. It is hard to predict human behavior. It's essential to understand that we need to get out and try these things for the benefits they will have in the community. They support the collaborative efforts by the agency staff and board to use the next period of time to strengthen and clarify the environmental assessment to address the written and verbal comments that have been made. On behalf of the chamber as a member of the South Shore Transportation management association, the newly expanded board who met for the first time on 17<sup>th</sup>, they're excited about the opportunity to have this be a trigger and stimulus for the microtransit service. The staff report and environmental assessment specify that the microtransit vehicles should be 20 to 25 passengers. Microtransit vehicles are smaller, similar to the pictures shown by the City of Aspen. These microtransit vehicles do not require the driver to have a commercial driver license which changes the cost structure and makes providing the service more affordable. The benefits of this project are transformational. The other item that would be transformational is the One Tahoe transportation funding initiative. They've gone on for many years in this community flogging individual projects to solve a giant region full of problems. We need to stop doing that. It would be transformational to have free transit throughout the basin including water borne transit. This will be a step in the right direction but let's not try to solve every project in the region based on this one project even though it is a project of scale.

Ed Moser, South Lake Tahoe resident said he agreed with the traffic study comments made by Ms. Lawton where she stated, "Additionally I've seen my projects to fruition and have realized that traffic studies are make believe." He said he's not opposed to building this but is opposed to all the extra-curricular activities and how they'll be mitigated. Ms. Laine and the city council voted on Tuesday to give the Crescent V Center \$50,000 to help enforce their parking. You allowed the shops at Heavenly Village to be permitted. There are dozens of shops there and no

parking spaces had to be provided. Look at how things are really going to be mitigated and the realities here, and they're vast. He wouldn't take any consultants word for anything because it's all imaginary numbers. In the past, he's proposed the jitney's that hold a smaller amount of people rather than the large buses that may only have a few people on it at a time. Paid parking in itself will not reduce vehicle miles traveled. There is mitigation needed here and more than an environmental assessment is needed.

Lew Feldman on behalf of the Tahoe Douglas Visitor's Authority said when they have achieved great things in this community, they have done so through partnership. What's proposed here is clearly a partnership to address both economic and environmental challenges. A prior speaker indicated a willingness to step up and participate in the microtransit funding opportunity. He feels that we'll see others step up to participate in this funding opportunity. Microtransit is one of those tools with our fixed route and paid parking that we know has helped solve the problem in other jurisdictions. This is a unique moment in time where we have an opportunity for the public and private side to replicate our partnership successes. This will bring something transformational to change behavior in this marketplace, reduce vehicle miles traveled, create economic prosperity, and jobs for those that are most at risk. In spring and fall, we cut hours for our most vulnerable members of the workforce and this is an opportunity to address that cutback and provide employment to those that need it most. We're all in this together and are on a tight timeline. He appreciated the comments from the California Attorney General's Office and the League to Save Lake Tahoe. They'll get together with these stakeholders and come back to this board with hopefully an agreed upon package of monitoring, mitigation, and implementation.

#### Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Laine said Lew Feldman on behalf of the Tahoe Douglas Visitor's Authority provided a presentation to the City of South Lake Tahoe city council a few weeks ago that was very well received by the public and elected officials. They view this as Nevada stepping up to the plate and investing at the Lake in a significant way similar to what the City of South Lake Tahoe did when they built the gondola project with many partners. We're all in this together and to the degree possible, the City of South Lake Tahoe is ready to assist Douglas County.

Ms. Gustafson said there were a few comments today on human behavior. Pricing does make a difference, human behavior does respond to pricing. She managed a water system where they dramatically increased rates to ensure that they met conservation targets. It resulted in huge long term savings. Most recently they made the Tahoe Truckee Area Regional Transportation system free for two years and they saw dramatic increases during the holidays by having a free service. She's optimistic that the discussions we're having and the results from other communities will make a difference in how we use it. We have to do something different. Doing the same thing is not going to change how we deal with vehicle miles traveled and transit. Thirty years ago, TRPA didn't support intercept parking lots when she was trying to get a park and roll lot. It's good that we're talking about these things now, we have an opportunity with great partnership.

Mr. Rice said there's a sense of urgency regarding this project. They're not trying to steam roll it through, they've been talking about this project for a long time with a lot of public comment. There is a short window that they have to operate in, in which there are bonds that have to be sold. There are folks in the valley that don't feel that anything should happen at the Lake. For

Douglas County, this project is a life saver. They're losing funds from the Lake every year because of the economic blight. They've been losing tax money flowing from the Lake, traditionally Douglas County tax money from the Lake is about 40 percent of the budget. It's dwindling rapidly. The event center will enhance the services that they can provide their citizens. He hopes everyone understands the sense of urgency and if they don't start construction this year, this project may go away. He asks that everyone think about the benefits of this project and what it will bring to the Lake in a positive manner. This project will enhance their ability to protect this Lake.

Mr. Yeates said he views this like the mainstreet management plan. The loop road in itself was not going to advance their concerns about transit or other issues which is where the mainstreet management plan was created. They dealt with the fact that the housing would be built before the road was built, there would be a neighborhood amenities program, things that would give back to the community. The events center is the right location, the right use and can see it from the standpoint of this community having more opportunities as a result of the event center. It's positive and is grateful for Douglas County to propose it. He wants to ensure that the League to Save Lake Tahoe and those that are concerned about vehicle miles traveled and the impacts of additional visitors coming here are addressed. He appreciated staff's willingness to sit down and provide that opportunity to work with them on this adaptive management program in hopes that we can come up with an agreement that everyone is on board with. It has the potential to be that catalyst. We have to start somewhere.

X. REPORTS

A. Executive Director Status Report

Ms. Marchetta said yesterday morning was the first session of the reconvening the Bi-State Consultation on Transportation and has been raised to a very high priority within the basin, particularly with the leadership of the two states. The Secretary of California Natural Resources Agency and the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources in Nevada have sponsored this bi-state consultation. It's tiering off of what was adopted in the last consultation which was a ten-year action plan. It had the highest of high priorities identified in it. The action plan was valued at about \$400 million and the highest of the high priority was about half of that. Within that highest of high priority was significantly enhanced transit for the basin. Along with TRPA staff, board members, Mr. Yeates, Mr. Bruce, on behalf of TRPA, Mr. Lawrence on behalf of the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Ms. Gustafson for Placer County and Tahoe Fund attended the meeting. That meeting was energized and feels that the conversation had matured from the last round and feels that there'll be significant progress made particularly on transit and transit funding strategies with the help of a deep partnership at that table. Yesterday was also the second session of the Nevada Oversight Committee that also discussed the topic of transportation.

Mr. Lawrence thanked TRPA and TRPA staff for staffing the effort and putting together all the materials. It does seem like the energy and listening is there. It was a lot of information yesterday and the listening that occurred particularly listening to the differences on what Placer County is doing with the Truckee Area Regional Transportation and their transportation systems and the challenges of the south shore. Having a better common understanding of the transit challenges and the different authorities for which they're working under. This was a great first step. He thanked everyone for remaining engaged.

GOVERNING BOARD

January 22, 2020

B. General Counsel Status Report

Mr. Marshall said the oral argument for the Dr. Garmong litigation on the cell tower will be held on March 26, 2020 in Las Vegas. That same day, the court will hear a litigation for Dr. Garmong regarding a cell tower in Lyon County which was also dismissed on standing grounds.

Ms. Aldean asked if the Lyon County case preceded TRPA's case.

Mr. Marshall said it was about the same time period.

XI. GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER REPORTS

None.

XII. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Main Street Management Plan and other components of the US 50 South Shore Community Revitalization Project

Mr. Hester said a lot of the stakeholders are now involved with the Tahoe Transportation District's consultants on the parking management study.

B. Local Government & Housing Committee

The committee will meet on February 12, 2020.

C. Legal Committee

None.

D. Operations & Governance Committee

Ms. Aldean said the committee has been discussing how to restructure our debt. A document comparable to a request for proposal was put out to private lenders who might be interested in participating in the restructuring of our debt. They received two responses; one was just an inquiry and the other is putting it through their process. Interest rates are low and are favorable to restructuring at this time. Also, the five year contract with our auditor is expiring and staff has elected to put it out on a request for proposal rather than giving them a two year extension. The reason the two year extension was considered was because we're going through some accounting transitions and thought it might be beneficial to have a company that is intimately acquainted with our accounting system.

Mr. Bruce agreed with putting it out for competitive bidding because we've already renewed their contract once.

GOVERNING BOARD

January 22, 2020

Ms. Aldean said it's also consistent with our general policy.

E. Environmental Improvement, Transportation, & Public Outreach Committee

The committee will meet at the conclusion of the Governing Board meeting.

F. Forest Health and Wildfire Committee

Mr. Hicks said today the Regional Plan Implementation Committee considered code amendments to chapter 61 related to tree removal and prescribed fire. They're continuing to work on the schedule of getting items in place before the next fire season.

G. Regional Plan Implementation Committee

Mr. Bruce the committee reviewed and recommended approval for code amendments to Chapter 84 regarding development standards for Stream Mouth Protection Zones and Chapter 61, Vegetation Management and Forest Health, Sections 61.1, Tree Removal, and 61.2 Prescribed Fire.

XIII. PUBLIC COMMENT

Ed Moser, South Lake Tahoe resident said we keep getting compared to Colorado and other mountain towns. None of these other towns have six casinos which is part of the traffic and vehicle miles traveled problems and is never factored in. Douglas County and the casino core was supposed to contribute to the convention center at the Chateau hole in the ground through raising the transient occupancy tax. That was supposed to be about \$400,000 to \$500,000 per year contribution. Some how they couldn't sway the state legislators to help raise the transient occupancy tax. In the past, the casinos had their own shuttles to make on call pickups at the local motels. It was fast and efficient and then got swept under the rug and ended up being taken over by the transit system and then eliminated altogether. Use some of the paid parking money for the events to put the free shuttles back in service or contribute to the microtransit.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Mr. Yeates adjourned the meeting at 2:19 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Marja Ambler  
Clerk to the Board

*The above meeting was taped in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the tapes of the above mentioned meeting may call for an appointment at (775) 588-4547. In addition, written documents submitted at the meeting are available for review*