

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING**  
**OF THE**  
**LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION'S COMMITTEE TO CONTINUE**  
**THE REVIEW OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY (TRPA)**  
**(Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 2, File No. 15, *Statutes of Nevada 1997*)**

**January 30, 1998**

**Stateline, Nevada**

The second meeting of the Legislative Commission's Committee To Continue the Review of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) (S.C.R. 2) was held on Friday, January 30, 1998, commencing at 9:05 a.m. The meeting was held in the Kingsbury Room of the Lakeside Inn & Casino, Highway 50 At Kingsbury Grade, Stateline, Nevada. Pages 2 and 3 contain the "Meeting Notice and Agenda."

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman Brian E. Sandoval, Chairman

Senator Lawrence E. Jacobsen

Senator Mark A. James

Senator Michael (Mike) A. Schneider

Assemblywoman Marcia de Braga

Assemblywoman Vivian L. Freeman

**LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU STAFF PRESENT:**

Fred W. Welden, Chief Deputy Research Director

Eileen G. O'Grady, Principal Deputy Legislative Counsel

M. Scott McKenna, Deputy Legislative Counsel

**MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA**

**Name of Organization:** Legislative Commission's Committee To Continue the Review of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) (S.C.R. 2)

**Date and Time of Meeting:** Friday, January 30, 1998

9 a.m.

**Place of Meeting:** Lakeside Inn & Casino

Highway 50 At Kingsbury Grade

Kingsbury Room

Stateline, Nevada

**AGENDA**

I. Introductions and Opening Remarks

Assemblyman Brian E. Sandoval, Chairman

\*II. Approval of Minutes from November 6 and 7, 1997, Meeting

III. "State of the Agency" - Programs, Budget and Staffing of the TRPA

James W. Baetge, Executive Director, TRPA

IV. Implementation of the Environmental Improvement Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin

A. California

Dennis Machida, Executive Director, California Tahoe Conservancy

B. Local Governments

Jim Galloway, Washoe County Representative on the TRPA Governing Board

Don Miner, Douglas County Representative on the TRPA Governing Board

Dick Mieldazis, Vice Chair, Nevada Tahoe Conservation District

C. Private Sector

Stan Hansen, Co-Chair, Lake Tahoe Transportation and Water Quality Coalition

Lewis Feldman, Representative of "Park Avenue Project" and "Project 3"

V. Lunch

## VI. Public Testimony

## VII. Overview of Activities and Issues Relative to Transportation in the Lake Tahoe Basin

### A. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

Richard Wiggins, Senior Transportation Planner, TRPA

### B. Tahoe Transportation District (TTD)

Kevin Cole, Chairman, TTD

Richard Hill, Executive Director, TTD

### C. Transportation Management Associations (TMAs)

Dick Powers, Executive Director, South Shore TMA

Jennifer Merchant, Executive Director, Truckee-North Tahoe TMA

### D. Lake Tahoe Transportation and Water Quality Coalition

Steve Teshara, Chairman, Transportation Working Group

## \*VIII. Committee Discussion of Future Meetings

## IX. Adjournment

\*Denotes item on which the Committee may take action.

Note: We are pleased to make reasonable accommodations for members of the public who are disabled and wish to attend the meeting. If special arrangements for the meeting are necessary, please notify the Research Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, in writing, at the Legislative Building, Capitol Complex, Carson City, Nevada 89701-4747, or call Susan Furlong Reil at 702/684-6825 as soon as possible.

Notice of this meeting was posted in the following Carson City, Nevada, locations: Blasdel Building, 209 East Musser Street; Capitol Press Corps, Basement, Capitol Building; Carson City Courthouse, 198 North Carson Street; Legislative Building, Room 1214, 401 South Carson Street; and Nevada State Library, 100 Stewart Street. Notice of this meeting was faxed for posting to the following Las Vegas, Nevada, locations: Clark County Office, 500 South Grand Central Parkway; Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue.

## **INTRODUCTIONS AND OPENING REMARKS**

Chairman Sandoval called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. and directed the secretary to call roll. All Committee members were present.

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM NOVEMBER 6 AND 7, 1997, MEETING**

ASSEMBLYWOMAN FREEMAN MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE COMMITTEE'S MEETING HELD ON NOVEMBER 6 AND 7, 1997, IN INCLINE VILLAGE, NEVADA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY SENATOR JACOBSEN AND CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

## **"STATE OF THE AGENCY"**

## **PROGRAMS, BUDGET, AND STAFFING**

## **OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY**

## ***James W. Baetge***

James W. Baetge, Executive Director, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA), provided the Committee with a handout summarizing the organizational structure and the financial status of the TRPA. Please see Exhibit A. He reported that the TRPA was recently restructured to enable it to more fully focus on the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP). An updated version of the EIP will be released in approximately one week.

Mr. Baetge introduced Jerry Wells, Deputy Director, TRPA, and Paula Bergamini, Interim Finance Director, TRPA. He announced that Mr. Wells would report to the Committee on the TRPA's present structure and work program and that Ms. Bergamini would report on its financial condition and recent accounting changes.

## ***Jerry Wells***

### **Organizational Structure and Planning Responsibilities**

Mr. Wells reviewed the TRPA's organizational structure and its planning responsibilities (Exhibit A, pages 1 and 2), covering the following points:

- The TRPA has a total staff of 47, including its Executive Director. Its organizational structure has undergone many changes over the past year in response to new regulations and directives.
- The TRPA Governing Board also serves as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency under California statute.
- The Environmental Improvement Program is a relatively new unit, with five staff members committed to the program. The positions for this program were filled with existing staff.
- In addition to the responsibilities set forth in the Compact, the TRPA is also held accountable for carrying out a number of federal, state, and local air and water quality statutes, including the Clean Water Act; the Clean Air Act; the California Clean Air Act; the Transportation Development Act; and the Safe Drinking Water Act. These are all components of the Regional Plan.

In response to questions from the Committee, Mr. Wells made the following remarks:

- Under the terms of the Compact, the TRPA was charged with developing a Regional Plan, and that plan is enforceable throughout the Lake Tahoe Basin (Basin). Local governments may develop their own plans pursuant to state law; however, those plans must be consistent with the Regional Plan.
- The purpose of entering into memoranda of understanding (MOUs) with local governments is to streamline the permitting process in the Basin.
- Prior to 1997, the TRPA evaluated most environmental thresholds every five years to determine whether or not the regional plan was effective. Air and water quality thresholds, however, were measured on a much more frequent basis, referred to as "real time monitoring." Last year, the States of Nevada and California provided funding to the TRPA to institute "real time monitoring" on other thresholds, enabling the TRPA to make necessary adjustments to its programs in a more timely manner. The TRPA's goal is to be able to review all thresholds at least annually.

Mr. Wells agreed to provide Committee members with a copy of the Executive Summary of the 1996 threshold evaluation.

### **Work Program**

Mr. Wells provided the Committee with copies of the TRPA's "Program of Work FY 97-98" (Exhibit B) and covered the following points:

- The TRPA developed environmental thresholds in the early 1980s and incorporated those into the Regional Plan. The TRPA also created a Goals and Policies Plan, which included a Regional Transportation Plan, an Air Quality Plan, and a 208 Water Quality Plan. These plans are all implemented through the *Code of Ordinances*.
- Threshold attainment is an indicator of the TRPA's success.
- The work program is guided by a number of factors: (1) the budget; (2) the Compact; (3) federal and state requirements; (4) Presidential Forum deliverables; and (5) thresholds.
- The three primary components of the work program are:
  1. Regulatory programs;
  2. Remedial programs (which embrace all regulations, monitoring, studies, and actual projects); and
  3. Monitoring program.
- Whenever possible, the TRPA coordinates its activities with government and private entities to make the most effective use of time and resources.
- The work program consists of over 27 program elements, and each element sets forth objectives that the TRPA must reach in any given year. After the work program is developed, management makes staff assignments detailing accountability. Progress is monitored monthly and adjustments made accordingly.

### **Three-Year Strategic Plan**

Mr. Wells provided the Committee with copies of the TRPA's "Three-Year Strategic Plan, July 1, 1997 to June 30, 2000" (Strategic Plan) (Exhibit C). In response to questions from the Committee, Mr. Wells highlighted the following points:

- The Strategic Plan attempts to identify the prior accomplishments and future direction of the TRPA.
- As a result of the Presidential Forum and EIP process, the Strategic Plan will be modified considerably.
- The TRPA is forming partnerships with other interested parties throughout the region, maximizing resources with other agencies, and utilizing one plan – the EIP – for the entire region.
- The Strategic Plan is usually revised at the beginning of each fiscal year, and the next revision will take place within a few months. Mr. Wells assured Committee members that upon completion of the updated Strategic Plan, copies will be provided to them.

### ***Paula Bergamini***

Paula M. Bergamini, Interim Finance Director, TRPA, provided an overview of the TRPA's budget and discussed funding issues. Please see Exhibit A, pages 3 to 19. Key issues covered were:

- The TRPA's revenues are divided into General Funds and Special Revenue Funds. Special Revenues are defined as funds designated for a specific purpose. All other funds are classified as General Funds.
- Requests for contributions from the States of Nevada and California are based on the one-third/two-thirds formula set forth in the Compact.
- Budgetary constraints in 1995-1996 caused California to decrease the TRPA's baseline budget by a little over \$80,000. Therefore, Nevada's contribution for that same period was proportionally reduced, resulting in a \$121,975 decrease in the TRPA's baseline budget. To date, pre-1995 baseline budget levels have not been

restored.

- The five counties located in the Basin contribute a combined total of \$150,000 to the General Fund. This amount was set by the Compact and has never been changed.
- General Fund revenues tend to remain flat whereas costs continue to increase because of inflation.
- Both Nevada and California have suggested that the TRPA delegate more of the permitting process to the local governments so it can concentrate its efforts on other areas, such as the EIP. However, neither state has addressed the issue of the revenue associated with this function which would be lost.
- Portions of Nevada and California's contributions fund ongoing operations such as the TRPA's Legal Department and costs for outside counsel. The TRPA currently receives \$100,000 from Nevada and \$200,000 from California for its legal operations. However, legal costs have exceeded \$300,000 over the last several years, and the TRPA has been required to use General Funds in order to meet its obligations.

Committee discussion ensued regarding the TRPA's legal operations. Senator James indicated that the TRPA may find it cost-effective to develop in-house legal expertise. He also suggested that the TRPA attempt to enlist the aid of the Offices of the Attorneys General for Nevada and California. Responding, Mr. Wells noted:

- The TRPA did not have an internal legal department years ago, relying strictly on outside counsel. In-house counsel was hired in the mid-1980s to curb costs, and this strategy has worked effectively for the smaller cases. From time to time, however, the TRPA has been of the opinion that hiring outside counsel with specialized knowledge is necessary.
- Mr. Baetge, internal counsel, and the TRPA Governing Board's Legal Committee determine whether or not the TRPA has the expertise to handle cases in-house or if outside counsel must be retained.
- A Request for Proposal for outside legal counsel was issued several weeks ago. The 24 proposals received have been narrowed down to 3, and the TRPA will conduct interviews with the finalists over the next two weeks. The TRPA is primarily interested in firms with specific experience, e.g., in takings law.
- In the past, the TRPA has received assistance from the Offices of the Attorneys General of both Nevada and California. However, the TRPA is not a state agency. In addition, the TRPA has sometimes found itself on the opposing side of the Offices of the Attorneys General. For example, in 1984, the California Attorney General and the League to Save Lake Tahoe filed a lawsuit against the TRPA, alleging that the Regional Plan did not adequately enforce the environmental needs of the Basin.

Ms. Bergamini continued her presentation, covering the following points:

- The legal budget was exceeded by approximately \$50,000 last year. In the past, Nevada has required that any funds not spent be returned to the state. The TRPA is of the opinion that it would be helpful if Nevada allowed it to retain excess legal funds, providing a reserve for years when legal expenses exceed budget. In response to a question, Ms. Bergamini indicated that unused Special Funds are also usually returned.
- The EIP and streamlining programs are funded with Special Revenues for a two-year period. As the EIP is the new focus and direction for the TRPA, ongoing funding for the program must be secured. While the streamlining program will decelerate, the TRPA wishes to obtain ongoing funding for a front counter position to answer questions from the public.
- Some Special Funding contributed by the states does not follow the one-third/two-thirds formula set forth in the Compact. For example, because the TRPA has been designated as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency in the State of California, it has received some Caltrans and Transportation Development Act funds for transportation planning. These funds have not been matched by Nevada.

- The TRPA also receives grants; however, some grants are easier to accept than others, depending on the matching funds requirement.
- Approximately two-thirds of the TRPA's budget is spent on salaries and benefits. Over the past five years, staff expense, including the cost of living allowance (COLA), increased approximately 12 percent. During that same period of time, the cost of medical benefits rose 35 percent. The TRPA has changed insurance carriers numerous times and reduced health benefits to keep costs down. In addition, staff has been decreased by two full time employees since 1994-1995.

In response to a question from Assemblywoman Freeman, Mr. Wells indicated that the TRPA looked at both traditional insurance carriers and health maintenance organizations that serve Nevada and California, and it chose to contract with a traditional carrier.

- Other operational costs such as contract labor, office supplies, rent, and telephone expense have increased about 25 percent in the last five years.
- A review of the total revenues, expenditures, and fund balances over a five-year period shows that as General Fund revenues have declined, the TRPA has requested more Special Funds to help balance its budget. However, most Special Revenue Funds do not cover the largest budget item, staff.
- By the end of 1998, the TRPA's fund balance will be approximately 2 percent of yearly expenditures, or the equivalent of a one and one-half week reserve.

Discussion ensued regarding the TRPA budget. Responding to questions from the Committee, Ms. Bergamini indicated that federal grant funds must be spent on specific programs and cannot be used for program administration. Given the improved economic conditions in California, the TRPA is optimistic that California may restore the TRPA's baseline funding to its pre-1994 level and possibly provide additional funds as an inflationary reserve. The proceeds from Nevada's \$20 million bond sale will be used primarily for capital improvements, not administrative costs, and will not be a part of the TRPA's budget.

Senator James suggested that Chairman Sandoval or his designee invite those California legislators responsible for making budgetary decisions to the Nevada Committee's next meeting. Assemblyman Sandoval indicated that California does not have an equivalent legislative oversight committee. Continuing, he noted that open invitations to attend the Committee's meetings have been extended to the California legislators whose districts touch on the Lake Tahoe Basin, and California State Senator Tim Leslie has attended meetings in the past. Chairman Sandoval agreed that the Committee should try to persuade at least one California representative to attend a Nevada Committee meeting and perhaps hold informal meetings with other California legislators.

Assemblywoman Freeman asked what specific action Nevada could take to address transportation and other funding requirements. Responding, Mr. Wells cited a California statute that designates the TRPA as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency. Some funding flows from that designation and is passed through to local transportation districts. In addition, the TRPA receives some funds for its time. Mr. Wells suggested that Nevada might explore establishing a similar program. Assemblywoman Freeman requested that the Committee's legal staff to research the issue of potential uses of revenue from bonds. Continuing, Mr. Wells stated the TRPA is of the opinion that both Nevada and California should implement best management practices (BMPs).

Responding to additional questions, Ms. Bergamini stated that if the TRPA were to exhaust its financial reserve, it would consider staff reductions or decreased hours because all operating expenses are already at a minimum.

Ms. Bergamini continued her presentation, covering the following points:

- About four-fifths of environmental monitoring funds are spent on outside contractors who provide environmental monitoring results.
- Funding for the TRPA is derived from the General Fund (about 50 percent) and Special Revenue Funds (50

percent); however, about 70 percent of staff salaries and benefits are allocated from the General Fund.

- In 1995-1996, the TRPA was granted a 1.67 percent COLA of \$32,015, representing Nevada's one-third share of a 5 percent COLA. The TRPA was also given a 1 percent COLA for 1996-1997, representing Nevada's one-third share of a 3 percent COLA. The TRPA received funds from Nevada in 1996-1997 to cover the 1 percent COLA plus additional funds to carry forward the previous COLA.

Between the 1996-1997 and 1997-1998 bienniums, the TRPA was not allowed to request a continuation of the previously granted COLA from Nevada because there was no match from California. In 1997-1998, Nevada again granted the TRPA a 1 percent COLA, which has been passed on to the employees. However, the TRPA's cost for that COLA includes all three years, and it no longer has the funding. It is possible that California may grant the TRPA a COLA for 1998-1999. The TRPA's budget is currently out of balance, and as it approaches the year 2000, it still has the COLA expenses going forward but not the necessary revenue.

Responding to questions regarding funding by Nevada and California, Mr. Baetge expressed concern about the lack of a clear definition as to the funds counted in the one-third/two-thirds formula for purposes of the TRPA's budget and suggested that Nevada and California need to address this issue in the next session. For example, the TRPA receives funding from California for transportation planning, but those funds are not counted in the Compact's formula. Assemblywoman Freeman suggested that the Committee make an official statement of its concerns and put it before the entire legislative body.

Senator James indicated that the Committee could be valuable to the TRPA in reaching a solution to ongoing communication problems between Nevada and California, particularly as it relates to budget issues. Continuing, he proposed the Committee devise a plan for coordinating budgetary decisions and other efforts of both states.

Mr. Wells concluded the TRPA's presentation by summarizing the Agency's key issues:

- The TRPA has reorganized its staff and revised its work program to better respond to needs of the Basin. It has developed an EIP, along with a finance plan, and is working as a partner with other interested participants toward a common goal.
- Several programs currently funded by Special Funds, e.g., the EIP, legal operations, and real time monitoring, and are becoming ongoing activities, and as such, are no longer appropriate candidates for Special Funding. The TRPA will seek to have these programs included in its baseline funding.
- The continuation of funding for COLAs previously granted by Nevada must be addressed.

## **IMPLEMENTATION OF THE**

### **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN FOR THE LAKE TAHOE BASIN**

#### **CALIFORNIA**

##### ***Dennis Machida***

Dennis Machida, Executive Officer, California Tahoe Conservancy (Conservancy), reported that the State of California is firmly committed, both from a policy and a fiscal standpoint, to the development, funding, and implementation of an appropriate EIP. In California's view, the EIP represents the expansion of an existing strategy that has been in place for the past 15 years. Over the past 12 to 14 years, California has spent approximately \$160 million to restore and preserve the environment in the Basin. California has had two prior bond acts to benefit Lake Tahoe. The first act was approved in 1982 for \$85 million. In 1996, an additional \$10 million was provided.

California recognizes that attainment of EIP thresholds will require an increase in its ongoing commitment for capital

outlay expenditures and has responded as follows:

- California Governor Pete Wilson has proposed a \$21.8 million 1998-1999 Fiscal Year (FY) budget for various activities related to EIP, an increase of approximately \$11.5 million over last year's budget. The additional \$11.5 million is known as the "Lake Tahoe Initiative," and includes funding for the TRPA, the State Water Resources Control Board, and the Conservancy. The bulk of these funds have been designated for projects.

The \$21.8 million proposed budget does not reflect California's total commitment to Lake Tahoe but rather the funding of programs with an EIP focus. Of that amount, approximately \$21.4 million will be distributed to the Conservancy.

Additional proposed funding includes \$150,000 for increased research and monitoring in the Basin and as well as funding of activities such as the environmental threshold review and real time monitoring requested by the TRPA.

- Further, Governor Wilson has proposed a \$95 million bond act to be brought before the voters of the State of California either in June or November of 1998. If successful, this bond will be the largest in the history of California's involvement with Lake Tahoe.
- These two funding components recognize three primary strategies:
  1. Support the planning process;
  2. Increase support for research monitoring so that more informed decisions can be made; and
  3. Make a substantial commitment to capital outlay expenditures.

Mr. Machida gave an overview of the Conservancy's authorities, funding, objectives, and structure, covering the following points:

- The California Tahoe Conservancy is a state agency with jurisdiction on the California side of the Basin. It was created in 1973 but not funded until 1984. The creation of the Conservancy enabled the California Legislature and the governors to statutorily establish a specific Tahoe program. As an added benefit, it gave California an opportunity to design a decision-making process which reflects the needs of the region.
- The Conservancy's board consists of two legislative appointees (one from each house), California's Director of Finance and its Secretary of Resources, and three local government representatives. In addition, a representative of the Federal Government serves as an ex-officio member of the board.
- Objectives of the Conservancy include increasing recreational opportunities in the Basin, improving public access, improving water quality, and preserving wildlife habitat. Almost all of its activities can be related to EIP objectives.
- A broad set of authorities has been given to the Conservancy to achieve California's interests, including the direct authority to acquire, improve, and manage environmentally sensitive lands and to make grants to various entities.
- The Conservancy is funded from bond acts (52 percent) and from the State of California's General Fund and environmental license plates (48 percent). California's Tahoe license plate program currently generates annual revenue of approximately \$250,000.

Mr. Machida gave a slide presentation illustrating programs of the Conservancy which address the issues of public access, recreation, stream environment zone and watershed restoration, water quality, and wildlife enhancement. The following points were covered:

- Four of the Conservancy's programs and 70 percent of its expenditures are directed toward water quality.
- The Conservancy completes about 30 restoration projects each year.

- Private sector businesses implement 80 percent of the Conservancy's projects.
- The Conservancy is the designated mitigation bank on the California side of the Basin. After a site is restored, the Conservancy banks various development rights and makes them available to the private sector. These development rights can then be purchased from the Conservancy. This program has enabled the Conservancy to assist in 2,700 projects, 95 percent of which were private. Approximately \$2.7 million in revenue has been generated from the sale of mitigation credits. Those revenues have been invested in property acquisition.
- Over 4,300 parcels of land are directly managed by the Conservancy.
- The Conservancy funds prescribed burning activities in the Basin. Under Governor Wilson's proposed budget, the efforts of the Conservancy to restore forest health will be doubled.

Mr. Machida discussed the Conservancy's revenue sources in response to questions from the Committee:

- California has an annual appropriation process. The life of its appropriations are three years, plus two years to expend the funds.
- Bond act funds are fully dedicated to the Conservancy. As a statutory program, the Conservancy's operating expenses are derived from California's General Fund.
- Statutory recognition of the Conservancy is important, enabling it to focus its energy on programs rather than budget issues.
- The cost of California's Tahoe license plate is \$50, with an annual renewal fee of \$40. Revenue derived from the sales of the license plates is used for bicycle, hiking, and nonmotorized trails; erosion control; and water quality efforts.

In addition, a fee of \$40 is assessed for a vanity plate. The California Legislature has specifically designated the Conservancy as an eligible entity under its environmental licensing program, qualifying the Conservancy to receive funds from the sales of vanity plates.

## LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

### Washoe County

#### *Jim Galloway*

Jim Galloway, Commissioner, Washoe County, Nevada, reported on Washoe County's EIP (please see Exhibit D). In response to questions from the Committee, Mr. Galloway covered the following topics:

- Private business is funding approximately 15 percent of the North Stateline Beautification Project. This project, as compared to other projects handled by Nevada's State Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC), has a high level of private participation. After the project is completed, businesses may be assessed for ongoing maintenance costs.
- The purpose of signage reduction in the North Stateline Beautification Project is not to increase the quality of the signs, but rather to reduce the total area of all signs by half.
- The source of all Washoe County contributions to EIP projects is TRPA mitigation funds which have been generated by local development. These funds are now being used to address problems caused by earlier development.
- Each local community in the Basin has a community plan which has been approved by the TRPA. The planning

process for developing these community plans spanned approximately ten years. All Washoe County EIP projects meet the standards of the community plans.

Committee discussion ensued regarding the level of environmental benefit to be achieved through projects such as the North Stateline Beautification Project. Senator James stated that as projects proceed, business and private property owners who benefit from these types of endeavors should contribute substantially to funding. Assemblywoman de Braga noted that the Committee needs to have a clearer understanding of funding sources to better determine an appropriate participation level for the private sector.

## **Douglas County**

### ***John Doughty***

John Doughty, Planning and Economic Development Manager, Community Development Department, Douglas County, Nevada, advised the Committee that Don Miner, Douglas County Representative, TRPA Governing Board, was called out of town on business and would therefore be unable to make his presentation. Mr. Doughty discussed a number of issues related to implementation of the EIP, covering the following topics:

- The EIP has given the TRPA a positive, environmental focus.
- The EIP lists a number of projects for Douglas County, including improvements to the intersection of U.S. Highway 50 and Kingsbury Grade and undergrounding of utilities.
- Funding of EIP projects is a major concern to Douglas County.
- While bond funds assist the counties in implementing EIP projects, they do not provide up-front administrative costs nor do they take into consideration long-term maintenance and operating costs.
- Douglas County has explored the possibility of utilizing redevelopment funds as provided in Chapter 279, "Urban Renewal and Redevelopment of Communities," of *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS). However, it is precluded from pursuing this avenue because the TRPA's guidelines allow redevelopment only within community plan areas. The three primary community plan areas in Douglas County are situated at Kingsbury, Roundhill, and Stateline's casino core, locations which provide little opportunity for residential or stream restoration projects.
- A number of special improvement districts operate within Douglas County, resulting in an overlap with the County's responsibilities. However, the TRPA continues to appeal solely to Douglas County in terms of implementing EIP projects and is unwilling to recognize the special improvement districts.
- Most EIP projects in Douglas County are located on private property. Douglas County is able to offer little incentives to private entities to implement EIP projects on their land.
- In the last ten years, less than 80,000 square feet of commercial floor area has been built in the Basin. The lack of commercial floor area limits private investment in the Basin.

Responding to questions from the Committee, Mr. Doughty covered the following points:

- There are approximately 28 general improvement and special districts in Douglas County. These entities cover specific areas and vary greatly in size, serving anywhere from 20 people to 12,000 people.
- It is the position of Douglas County that the success of the EIP is dependent upon improving the economic climate in the Basin. Releasing additional commercial floor area in the Basin would encourage new development and investment by the private sector and thus improve the local economy.
- California requires that utility companies operating in that state must provide set-asides for the purpose of

undergrounding utilities. Nevada has no such requirement, and the utility companies have offered no assistance.

- When the EIP was developed, no weighting of individual thresholds was performed; hence, scenic quality is given the same weighting as water quality.

## **Nevada Tahoe Conservation District**

### ***Dick Mioldazis***

Dick Mioldazis, Vice Chairman, Nevada Tahoe Conservation District (Conservation District), reported on the activities of the Conservation District, covering the following topics:

- There is approximately \$1 million remaining from the 1986 bond act, and the Conservation District is assisting in seeking qualified projects.
- A Technical Advisory Committee has been established to review initial project proposals associated with the more recent bond act. The committee screens each proposal to ensure that it is viable and falls within the criteria of the bond act. If approved, the committee issues a detailed application for the proposal. Thereafter, projects are qualified, ranked, and funded with bond act money.
- The Advisory Committee is currently refining the application process.
- The Conservation District plans to begin working with the Division of State Lands on the new bond act during the summer of 1998. Bonds totaling \$10 million have already been sold. It is anticipated that the bond act will operate on two-year cycles for approximately four or five years to accommodate the needs of the small general improvement districts, which are not as well funded as the counties. Bond act money can be used to fund only 75 percent of a project's cost, leaving the county or improvement district responsible for the remaining 25 percent. In order for the small districts to compete for bond act monies, they must use creative financing. For example, a small improvement district could leverage a \$400,000 water quality project with a \$10,000 investment as follows: apply for 75 percent of the cost to be financed by bond act money, leaving the district responsible for \$100,000, and then apply for a \$100,000 United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) water quality grant which would require only a 10 percent match from the district.

One of the pitfalls of an EPA grant is that the money from the Federal Government is usually received after the project is finished, requiring the district to carry the project past its completion date with bond act funds and any mitigation funds from the TRPA .

(For further discussion of this topic, see later testimony provided by Pamela B. Wilcox, Administrator, Nevada's Division of State Lands.)

## **PRIVATE SECTOR**

### **Park Avenue Redevelopment and Redevelopment Project 3**

#### ***Lewis Feldman***

Lewis Feldman, Project Attorney, Park Avenue Redevelopment (Park Avenue) and Redevelopment Project 3 (Project 3), advised the Committee that due to the length of the agenda, Stan Hansen, Co-Chair, Lake Tahoe Transportation and Water Quality Coalition (LTTWQC), would be unable to make his presentation and that Steve Teshara, Co-Chair, LTTWQC, would appear in Mr. Hansen's place.

Mr. Feldman reviewed two major redevelopment projects in South Lake Tahoe, California, the Park Avenue Redevelopment Project and Redevelopment Project 3. Please see Exhibits E and F.

The two projects encompass approximately 50 acres of land immediately adjacent to the state line at South

- Shore. Park Avenue is a 34-acre project on the mountain side of U.S. Highway 50, and Project 3, almost 20 acres in size, is located on the lake side of the highway. Park Avenue and Project 3 represent redevelopment costs of approximately \$400 million, the vast majority of which will be private money.
- These projects demonstrate the private sector's commitment to eradicating the effects of undesirable, antiquated development while working with the public sector to restore the environment and create economic vitality in the area.
- Two primary municipal sources will be utilized to assist in the land assembly: (1) an increase in the transient occupancy tax; and (2) a significant increase in the property tax.

Senator Schneider inquired about the time frame for the projects and the amount of eminent domain that was exercised in assembling the land. Responding, Mr. Feldman stated that the project proponents of Park Avenue, which has already been approved, have a "handshake" agreement to work cooperatively to a 1999 construction start. Project 3 is still in the approval process and is tentatively set to begin in the year 2000. In order to keep revenue-producing properties on the tax rolls as long as possible, the land will be acquired at a later date. Based on his involvement on other South Lake Tahoe redevelopment projects, Mr. Feldman is of the opinion that less than 10 percent of the land acquisitions will result in eminent domain.

Mr. Feldman covered the following points in response to questions from the Committee:

- The City of South Lake Tahoe, California, has a redevelopment agency and a redevelopment plan area, and both Park Avenue and Project 3 fall within that plan area.
- All sewage is collected in the treatment plant then exported to Alpine County, California.
- The proposed redevelopment site currently consists of hard coverage in the 90 percent range. While there have been some recent improvements, the vast majority of surface storm water simply sheetflows into Lake Tahoe. Several thousand tons of suspended sediment and other nutrients and contaminants enter the Lake annually in this manner. The redevelopment projects will address this issue. Storm water will be captured, pretreated, the suspended sediments settled out, and much cleaner water introduced into the Lake.
- The current density in the redevelopment area will not be increased but rather replaced with new development.
- A conservative projection of the room occupancy rate upon completion of the projects is 70 percent as opposed to the current rate of 40 percent.
- An analysis of the net benefit of the project in terms of air quality is contained in Park Avenue's Environmental Impact Statement.
- The projects, along with several other partners, are participating in the funding of the Coordinated Transit System (CTS) as a mitigation measure. The CTS is expected to reduce vehicle miles traveled by 56,000 miles, resulting in air quality and traffic benefits.

## **Lake Tahoe Transportation and Water Quality Coalition**

### ***Steve Teshara***

Steve Teshara, Co-Chair, LTTWQC, reviewed private sector involvement in the implementation of the EIP, covering the following topics:

- Private entities have made major investments in redevelopment projects aimed at rehabilitating the environment

and economy of the Basin. Referring to earlier testimony regarding the North Stateline Beautification Project, Mr. Teshara pointed out that in addition contributing \$200,000 for public right-of-way improvements, private business will also be funding all related improvements to its own property, e.g., signage changes and interior and exterior facility improvements.

- Residential property owners can participate in the EIP by installing BMPs on their property.
- The State of California has pledged \$80,000 to be used toward updating the 1974 "McDonald Smart Report," an analysis of potential revenue sources available to local communities for environmental and related programs, provided that \$20,000 can be raised locally and the funds are expended by June 1998.
- Many businesses, individuals, and community groups are participating in the LTTWQC. They provide leadership and resources to support legislative initiatives on behalf of the Basin. Mr. Teshara cited as an example the numerous meetings he has attended in Washington, D.C., at the expense of his employers.

Chairman Sandoval questioned whether the implementation of BMPs on residential properties was required or merely recommended. Responding, Mr. Baetge stated that the retrofitting of about 30,000 properties is mandated under the Regional Plan, representing a private investment of approximately \$50 million to \$60 million. The TRPA is able to assist property owners.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

### ***Craig Hartman***

Craig Hartman, a private citizen and East Shore recreationist, of Carson City, Nevada, reported that several East Shore recreationists have been attending the Nevada Department of Transportation's (NDOT) Erosion Control Master Plan meetings. All the agencies have agreed to expand the two existing East Shore parking lots located on land owned by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, build a parking lot across from Bliss Pond, and build parking nodes at the entrance to the Dreyfus Estate. A letter from the Committee in support of Carson City's grant request would be helpful.

Mr. Hartman also spoke in opposition to a possible Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) shuttle bus service along the East Shore this summer. Mr. Hartman is of the opinion that last year's shuttle service demonstration project was a failure, wasting taxpayer money and antagonizing recreationists by forcing them to utilize a sporadic shuttle. He indicated that a majority of recreationists are of the opinion that taxpayer dollars would be put to more efficient use in support of a "lake lapper" transit system.

### ***Don Kornreich***

Don Kornreich, Supervisor, Nevada Tahoe Conservation District, of Incline Village, Nevada, provided the Committee with a handout (Exhibit G) and made the following points:

- Only 25 percent of the areas of Incline Village and Crystal Bay, Nevada, were included in the community plans, precluding significant portions of those communities from consideration in transportation planning efforts.
- There is a large demand for more commercial floor space in some portions of the Basin.
- Mr. Kornreich appealed to the Committee for its help in assisting local entities to raise their share of the funds necessary to meet their EIP thresholds.

Assemblywoman Freeman stressed the importance of community support to the success of any proposed legislation which would enable local communities to raise taxes. Mr. Kornreich acknowledged her concerns and stated that he is of

the opinion that the Nevada Legislature should provide the framework which would allow the assessment of additional taxes, but that final decision-making should be made by a vote of the county commissioners or the people.

### ***Pamela B. Wilcox***

Pamela B. Wilcox, Administrator, Nevada's Division of State Lands, reviewed a map provided by the TRPA which showed land ownerships in the Basin. Both Nevada and California have scattered ownerships of subdivision parcels that have been retired from development which were not shown on the map. Ms. Wilcox invited Committee members to visit her office if they are interested in viewing a map which shows the 500 parcels of land that Nevada has acquired.

Ms. Wilcox reported on Nevada's role in the TRPA's EIP implementation effort. State agencies are working with the TRPA to develop a list of priorities for which Nevada will be responsible. These projects will be shown in the final EIP. Various funding options are being explored, but no final decisions have been made. Bonding will be a last option. At the Committee's March 13, 1998, meeting, Ms. Wilcox will provide detailed funding requests for the 1999 Legislative Session.

Referring to earlier Committee discussion regarding the 1996 bond act, Ms. Wilcox provided the following information:

- The bond act, which was approved by the voters in November 1996, is being implemented by Nevada's Division of State Lands. Bonds totaling \$10 million were sold late in 1997.
- Nevada's Division of State Lands is currently accepting applications and will begin issuing grants in early March.
- The bond act provides that the counties and NDOT are eligible applicants for bond funds. Nevada's Division of State Lands has requested that the counties work with their general improvement districts to implement projects.
- Grant recipients will be allowed to take a flat 3 percent of project costs for administrative expenses.
- A Technical Advisory Committee has been created to review conceptual level preapplications so that grant applicants will not be required to spend time and money developing details until they are assured of project approval.

Continuing, Ms. Wilcox reported that revenue from Nevada's Tahoe license plate program will be administered by the Division of State Lands. These funds will be used for the preservation and restoration of the Basin's environment.

Ms. Wilcox provided the Committee with an overview of all Division of State Lands programs. Please see Exhibit H. She highlighted differences between the Nevada and California programs. The California Tahoe Conservancy is a statutory program and as such its operations are a part of California's baseline budget. Most of Nevada's programs, however, exist by virtue of uncodified statutes, and when the funding sources have been exhausted, the programs will, to some extent, end.

### ***Juan Palma***

Juan Palma, Forest Supervisor, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, U.S. Forest Service, updated the Committee on the status of the Federal Government's EIP implementation efforts. He asked that the Committee assist him in recruiting interested parties to serve on an advisory committee formed pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA). Mr. Palma also requested that the Committee make it as easy as possible for members of Nevada's fire community to be involved with their federal counterparts, for example, by easing travel restrictions so that Nevada employees may participate in meetings outside the state that are scheduled with little advance notice.

### ***John Doughty***

John Doughty, Planning and Economic Development Manager, Community Development Department, Douglas County,

Nevada, provided a brief summary of Douglas County's EIP projects, including the Round Hill Mall expansion and the Stateline drainage plan. He reported that Douglas County is involved in a number of discussions with private parties regarding possible drainage improvements to U.S. Highway 50 and Kingsbury Grade. In addition, Douglas County is investigating the feasibility of establishing a conservancy and land bank.

Continuing, Mr. Doughty outlined numerous concerns of Douglas County regarding the operation of the TRPA, covering the following topics:

- A number of project proponents have complained that the TRPA is not responding within its own time lines.
- Douglas County has concerns about the TRPA's structuring of streamlining agreements and code revisions and has chosen not to enter into a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the TRPA for the review of residential projects. Douglas County's decision is based in part on its position that in addition to reviewing residential projects, it must also have authority to review a portion of — if not all — commercial projects as well.
- While the EIP provides a positive focus for the TRPA, it is Douglas County's position that the TRPA may be overstepping its authority in certain instances, such as with the issue of affordable housing. Douglas County is of the opinion that the answers to affordable housing include transit improvements which would enable people to live outside the Basin, while the TRPA focuses solely on solutions within the Basin.

## **OVERVIEW OF ACTIVITIES AND ISSUES**

### **RELATIVE TO TRANSPORTATION IN THE LAKE TAHOE BASIN**

#### **TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY**

##### ***Richard Wiggins***

Richard Wiggins, Senior Planner for Transportation and Air Quality, Long Range Planning Division, TRPA, briefly highlighted transportation projects in which the TRPA is involved, including the North Stateline Beautification Project and sidewalk projects in Incline Village, Kingsbury Grade, and along U.S. Highway 50 in the City of South Lake Tahoe. He also summarized TRPA staff activities, including management of the Cave Rock Cultural Resources Protection Management Plan; participation in the Erosion Control Master Plan for State Route 28 which is sponsored by NDOT; and coordinating the development of parking improvements along the Eastshore Drive National Scenic By-Way.

Mr. Wiggins reported that the TRPA is the federal grantee of \$2.5 million for the South Shore Coordinated Transit System. It is also assisting with implementation of a \$1.5 million transit center on a 64-acre site in Tahoe City, California. In addition, the TRPA is seeking \$15 million from Caltrans and the California Transportation Commission to construct the Echo Summit Barrier and Water Quality Project.

The TRPA is of the opinion that three basic challenges impede transportation efforts in the Basin.

- Funding often comes with limits on how the funds may be spent. For example, California highway funds will pay for curbs, gutters and sidewalks on U.S. Highway 50, but not landscaping or water quality treatment outside the right-of-way which is needed to treat roadway runoff. To deal with this issue, the TRPA must seek new sources of revenue that have no strings attached and at innovative financing.
- The TRPA's access to transportation planning and program funds is limited to \$102,000 annually. Subsequent to the Presidential Forum, the TRPA and its partners initiated efforts to have the Lake Tahoe Basin designated as a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), a designation which would significantly increase availability of planning funds. The MPO status would also entitle the TRPA to additional transit administrative, capital, and operating funds.

- The Basin needs to reduce its reliance on imported oil and convert to cleaner, cheaper fuels. With the assistance of Jim Brandmueller, Transportation Projects Manager, Nevada State Energy Office, the TRPA has submitted an application to the U.S. Department of Energy for a Clean Cities designation of the Basin. If approved, the Clean Cities designation would provide a forum for private and public sector representatives of the alternative fuels industry to meet and explore issues relating to the implementation of alternative fuels at Lake Tahoe.

## **Tahoe Transportation District**

### ***Kevin Cole***

Kevin Cole, Chairman, Tahoe Transportation District, provided the Committee with a summary of the TTD's accomplishments, administration, background, funding, and operations. Please see Exhibit I.

### ***Richard Hill***

Richard Hill, Executive Director, TTD, discussed the TTD's East Shore Beach Shuttle program. The shuttle started out as a demonstration project with three separate land managers (the U.S. Forest Service; Nevada's Department of Transportation; and the Division of State Parks) in three different jurisdictions (Carson City, Douglas County, and Washoe County). Washoe County funded the project. During its second month of operation, the TTD eliminated a half mile of parking and served 1,100 passengers. The TTD conducted a passenger survey, and the results indicate that a majority of passengers were of the opinion that the shuttle provided excellent service and contributed to the health of Lake Tahoe.

In response to questions from Assemblywoman Freeman, Mr. Hill stated that the full route length of the East Shore Beach Shuttle was 11 miles. Mr. Hill indicated that the TTD plans to continue the East Shore Beach Shuttle if it is able to attract adequate funding.

## **TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATIONS**

### **South Shore Transportation Management Association**

#### ***Dick Powers***

Dick Powers, Executive Director, South Shore TMA (SS/TMA), overviewed the background and activities of the SS/TMA. He provided the Committee with four handouts detailing the SS/TMA's purpose and programs. Please see Exhibits J, K, L, and M. Mr. Powers covered the following points:

- TMAs are community-based organizations formed to create solutions to transportation issues. The SS/TMA is governed by a 16-member board which consists of 6 members from the public sector and 10 members from the private sector. Please see Exhibit J.
- Over the years, a great deal of transportation planning has taken place in the Basin. The TMAs utilize the results of these past planning efforts to identify viable projects and secure funding for implementation.
- In 1994, the SS/TMA introduced its trolley program. Please see Exhibits K and L. This program has grown from two trolleys transporting 21,500 passengers during a 77-day period in 1994, to four trolleys serving a ridership of 72,307 passengers during a 91-day period in 1997. In addition, the SS/TMA used a tram to launch an Emerald Bay route in 1997 and served 6,000 passengers. The cost of operating the trolleys and tram last summer was \$210,000. Past funding sources were the TTD (\$50,000), Douglas County (\$25,000); Eldorado County, California (\$18,000); private sector (\$72,000), and fare box revenue (\$45,300).
- The primary concern of the SS/TMA is lack of funds. It is facing potential loss of funding from the TTD and reduction of funding from Eldorado County. In addition, the trolley program is encountering capacity problems during peak hours. In response to a question from Chairman Sandoval, Mr. Powers stated that if the SS/TMA is

not able to resolve the funding and capacity issues, it may be necessary to reduce the number of days and hours that the trolleys operate and to eliminate the Emerald Bay route.

- The SS/TMA is the lead agency in implementing the Coordinated Transit System (CTS) project. The CTS is a merger of most of the transportation systems operating on the South Shore, including the public systems operated by Douglas and Eldorado Counties and the private systems managed by the casinos. These transit organizations will be centralized into one common system with a common look to achieve efficiencies of operation. The CTS will utilize Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) technology to provide a service which moves people more efficiently and quickly than a private automobile. Please see Exhibit M. Private funding of \$1 million will provide start-up operating funds for the CTS, and the Federal Government has contributed \$2.5 million in capital funds.

## **Truckee/North Tahoe Transportation Management Association (TNT/TMA)**

### ***Jennifer Merchant***

Jennifer Merchant, Executive Director, Truckee/North Tahoe Transportation Management Association (TNT/TMA) presented an overview of the TNT/TMA's activities (Exhibit N), covering the following points:

- The TNT/TMA was formed in 1990 to serve as a liaison between tourist-related businesses and the government to find solutions to the transportation challenges that result from tourism. It is governed by a 12-person board with regents representing ski areas, business advocacy organizations, geographic regions, and local government. The board has recently added one seat for a Basin representative to be named by the LTTWQC.
- The primary focus of the TNT/TMA is project implementation. While the types of programs vary, all meet one goal: improving mobility in and around the Tahoe-Truckee resort triangle. Programs include summer traffic management in Tahoe City that aids traffic coming from the West Shore, a winter program which focuses on the three major ski areas, and a program to coordinate yearly road construction projects with Caltrans and NDOT.
- In addition, the TNT/TMA has worked with the Tahoe Area Regional Transit (TART), which is operated by Placer County, California, to provide a new link from Tahoe City to Truckee, California.
- The North Lake Tahoe Resort Association (Resort Association) was formed to reach solutions to problems brought about by tourism. Although located in Placer County, the membership-based Resort Association reaches out to Incline Village; Crystal Bay; Zephyr Cove, Nevada; and South Lake Tahoe. The Resort Association, with the help of the TNT/TMA and the community, successfully campaigned to increase the transient occupancy tax by 2 percent for a period of six years in order to fund infrastructure improvements. In addition, the Resort Association is currently attempting to create a regional North Lake Tahoe Transit Authority to assist in funding a portion of the region's transportation goals. The TNT/TMA is facilitating discussions regarding how, through joint power agreements and other mechanisms, Crystal Bay and Incline Village might also benefit from this authority.
- Future goals of the TNT/TMA include:
  1. Expansion of its summer trolley service from Stateline into Incline Village and also along the West Shore of Lake Tahoe down to Emerald Bay to connect into the SS/TMA system and the proposed East Shore Shuttle;
  2. Working with the Regional Transportation Commission in its survey of Crystal Bay and Incline Village residents regarding public transportation;
  3. Working with the Incline Village General Improvement District (IVGID) to develop a scope of work for its Incline Park transportation study;
  4. Establishing an airport shuttle to connect Lake Tahoe's North Shore to the Reno Tahoe International

Airport; and

5. Negotiating with ski areas and lodging suppliers to build a coordinated ski shuttle system.

- As the TNT/TMA's services expand, so too will its funding requirements. Financial participation from the State of Nevada would ensure that traffic management, transit services, and the appropriate related infrastructure will continue to meet the region's demands.

## **LAKE TAHOE TRANSPORTATION AND WATER QUALITY COALITION**

### ***Steve Teshara***

Steve Teshara, Co-Chair, LTTWQC, provided an overview of the diverse transportation elements serving the Basin, covering the following key points:

- The LTTWQC is a coalition of tourism, skiing, gaming, property rights, environmental, and community organizations which works as an ad hoc group to build consensus and solve problems in the Basin. It has been effective in providing advocacy at the federal, state and local levels.
- When the Compact was initially formed, it was intended that the TTD's primary funding mechanism would be a sales tax. This proposed tax required approval of the Lake Tahoe portions of all counties within the Basin. The tax proposal was defeated by the voters twice in the 1980s. Over a period of time, grass roots organizations — TMAs — were formed to address transportation management issues.
- While the TMAs face issues unique to their respective areas, they all need the TTD's operating authorities with the local government.
- Two voting members from the private sector were recently added to the TTD board.
- The TMAs have been able to secure some private sector funding; however, the TTD has encountered funding difficulties.
- Ultimately, the TMAs and the TTD are all seeking funds to solve the transportation issues facing the Basin. If it is not possible to attain one umbrella tax approved for the region, the same goal may be achieved by building funding sources in each area.
- The MPO designation is critical to future transportation planning efforts in the Basin as it would provide access to additional funding.

## **COMMITTEE DISCUSSION OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

Chairman Sandoval announced that the Committee's next meeting will be held on March 13, 1998, at the North Shore. Fred W. Welden, Chief Deputy Research Director, stated that the Committee would be soliciting written recommendations at its next meeting. Mr. Welden offered his assistance to interested parties.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Exhibit O is the "Attendance Record" for this meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Furlong Reil

Senior Research Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblyman Brian E. Sandoval, Chairman

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

### **LIST OF EXHIBITS**

Exhibit A is a document titled "TRPA Organization Chart," provided by James W. Baetge, Executive Director, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA), Zephyr Cove, Nevada.

Exhibit B is a document titled "Program of Work FY 97-98," provided by Jerry Wells, Deputy Director, TRPA, Zephyr Cove, Nevada.

Exhibit C is a document titled "Three-Year Strategic Plan, July 1, 1997 to June 30, 2000," provided by Jerry Wells, Deputy Director, TRPA, Zephyr Cove, Nevada.

Exhibit D is a two-page document titled "Environmental Improvement Program," provided by Jim Galloway, Commissioner, Washoe County, Nevada.

Exhibit E is a document titled "Park Avenue Development Plan," dated June 13, 1996, provided by Lewis Feldman, Project Attorney, Park Avenue Development and Redevelopment Project 3, South Lake Tahoe, California.

Exhibit F is a document titled "Redevelopment Project 3," dated May 14, 1997, provided by Lewis Feldman, Project Attorney, "Park Avenue Development Plan" and "Redevelopment Project 3," South Lake Tahoe, California.

Exhibit G is a memorandum from Don Kornreich, of Incline Village, Nevada, to Nevada's Legislative Committee To Continue the Review of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) (S.C.R. 2), dated January 30, 1998.

Exhibit H is a document titled "Division of State Lands, Tahoe Programs," dated January 29, 1998, provided by Pamela B. Wilcox, Administrator, Division of State Lands, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Carson City, Nevada.

Exhibit I is a memorandum from Kevin Cole, Chairman, Tahoe Transportation District, Zephyr Cove, Nevada, dated January 30, 1998, with attachments documenting the creation of the TTD.

Exhibit J is a brochure titled, "SS//TMA, South Shore Transportation Management Association," provided by Dick Powers, Executive Director, South Shore TMA, South Lake Tahoe, California.

Exhibit K is a brochure titled "Nifty 50 Trolley, Tahoe by Trolley," provided by Dick Powers, Executive Director, South Shore TMA, South Lake Tahoe, California.

Exhibit L is a document titled, "1997 Tahoe Trolley statistical information," provided by Dick Powers, Executive Director, South Shore TMA, South Lake Tahoe, California.

Exhibit M is a document titled "South Shore Transit," provided by Dick Powers, Executive Director, South Shore TMA,

South Lake Tahoe, California.

Exhibit N is a brochure titled "North Lake Tahoe and Truckee Transit, Shuttles, Buses and Trolleys," dated winter 1997/1998, provided by Jennifer Merchant, Executive Director, Truckee/North Tahoe TMA, Tahoe City, California.

Exhibit O is the "Attendance Record" for this meeting.

Copies of the materials distributed in the meeting are on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Carson City, Nevada. You may contact the library at (702) 684-6827.