



NEVADA LEGISLATURE LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE FOR THE REVIEW AND OVERSIGHT OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY AND MARLETTE LAKE WATER SYSTEM

(Nevada Revised Statutes [NRS] 218E.555)

DRAFT MINUTES

March 8, 2024

The second meeting of the Legislative Committee for the Review and Oversight of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and the Marlette Lake Water System for the 2023–2024 Interim was held on Friday, March 8, 2024, at 1 p.m. in the Tahoe Room, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada.

The agenda, minutes, meeting materials, and audio or video recording of the meeting are available on the Committee's meeting page. The audio or video recording may also be found at <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Video/>. Copies of the audio or video record can be obtained through the Publications Office of the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) (publications@lcb.state.nv.us or 775/684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT IN STATELINE:

Senator Skip Daly, Chair
Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod, Vice Chair
Senator Melanie Scheible
Senator Robin L. Titus
Assemblyman Ken Gray (Alternate for Assemblyman Rich DeLong)
Assemblywoman Angie Taylor

COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESENT VIA ZOOM:

Assemblywoman Angie Taylor

COMMITTEE MEMBER ABSENT:

Assemblyman Rich DeLong (Excused)

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU STAFF PRESENT:

Alysa M. Keller, Senior Principal Policy Analyst, Research Division
Christina Harper, Manager of Research Policy Assistants, Research Division
Heidi Chlarson, Chief Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division

*Items taken out of sequence during the meeting have been placed in agenda order.
[Indicate a summary of comments.]*

AGENDA ITEM I—CALL TO ORDER

Chair Daly:

[Chair Daly called the meeting to order, and welcomed members, presenters, and the public to the second meeting of the Legislative Committee for the Review and Oversight of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and the Marlette Lake Water System.]

Today, the Committee will be receiving presentations mainly focused on transportation issues in the Tahoe Basin. We are also honored to be receiving a presentation from Chairman Smokey regarding Washoe Nation's interest in the Tahoe Basin.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all of our staff, Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) Legislative Police, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) for setting up the tour, various things made everything run smoothly this morning before we got here. I would also like to give our newest—almost Member, as soon as he gets approved by the Legislative Commission, we do not have Assemblyman DeLong anymore. We now have Assemblyman Gray—I would like him to take an opportunity to introduce himself at this meeting, what district you are from or any other comments you would like.

Assemblyman Gray:

Assemblyman Ken Gray from Dayton. I was a prior County Commissioner before getting elected to the Assembly. I sat on the Carson Water Subconservancy District for about six years. I am honored to be a part of this Committee.

Chair Daly:

Will the Secretary please call the roll? [Roll call is reflected in Committee Members Present.]

[Chair Daly reviewed meeting and testimony guidelines.]

We will be limiting our first period of public comment—so we can stay on track—to one half hour and then we will receive the rest of the second period of public comment at the end of the meeting.

We have a full agenda this afternoon. I would like to remind presenters to please do their best to keep within the time limits provided for their presentations—not accounting for questions.

AGENDA ITEM II—PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Daly:

This is the first public comment period. Two minutes, please begin.

Pamela Tsigdinos, North Lake Tahoe Resident:

I would like to remind you that you are TRPA's only oversight Committee, nothing equivalent exists in California. I would like to underscore how critical your watchdog role is. Of this agency's 71 people and 15-member Governing Board, only six hold elected positions. The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency has a direct impact on Tahoe's 55,000 residents, but

at most, we can only vote two agency folks in or out of office. In the first meeting, we heard a Dick and Jane presentation from the Executive Director and Governing Board. Considering what you did not hear addressed, what you did not hear is compromised water quality from increasing microplastics, new invasive species, and algae pollution. This is our drinking water. There is a record amount of trash from over tourism, growing air pollution, and public safety dangers. We heard nothing on plans to address wildfire dangers or extreme weather. Priority one is safeguarding the Lake, the land, and the people. The TRPA is not a tourism agency, a housing agency, or an economic development agency yet it spends money, time and resources there. It is not a taxing authority, but it is looking to become one. In 2024, the most important priorities remain the same as those outlined in 1969. Yet this agency is failing the environment. With each presentation today ask yourself—please—does this harm the Lake, the land, and public safety? Without a healthy Lake and safe environment nothing else matters. Thank you. (Agenda Item II A)

Brett Tibbitts, Tahoe East Shore Alliance:

When is the Lake and its health going to be front and central at these meetings? The Lake is one of the most polluted lakes in the world when it comes to microplastics. But you will not hear about that today—one bit. Julie Reagan told you at the January Oversight meeting that the TRPA has to, “harmonize all of its goals that there is no order to it is priorities.” There you have it. Ms. Regan and the TRPA do not understand the most fundamental and basic rule of governance. It is impossible to do everything well. You must prioritize. Today you will hear about tourism from the same people that have been running tourism for decades with the same dismal results. The casino core is dying before our eyes. Restaurants are closing left and right. Drive down the 50 and it is a mass of boarded up shops and restaurants. Yet tourism numbers are greater than ever. Unlike a decade ago, a high percentage of tourists are now day trippers and leave their barbecues, clothes, and garbage on the beaches when departing. Do you think the tourism boards will discuss this today or show you the photos? Do you care? Will there ever be any serious attempt to set and enforce functional limits for the number of people that each beach can handle on a daily basis from an environmental standpoint? Nevada’s Department of Transportation (NDOT) and TRPA will present their traffic plans. They will tell you it is all about safety and eliminating accidents, but it is not. Nevada’s Department of Transportation could solve the accident problem today if it would add traffic lights, stop signs, and limit the speed to 35 miles per hour from Round Hill to Cave Rock, but they refuse. Worse yet, both NDOT and TRPA refused to seriously consider wildfire evacuation needs and emergency vehicle response times in safety calculations. (Agenda Item II B-1) (Agenda Item II B-2) (Agenda Item II B-3)

Chair Daly:

You are at your two minutes. Thank you very much. If you have anything more, you can submit it in writing. If you could free up the chairs for the people behind you, that would be appreciated.

Ronda Tycer, Incline Village Resident:

I have been an Incline Village resident the last 34 years. In 2004, TRPA made a finding of no significant effect when they approved the Compact amendment to allow short term rentals, which they called vacation rentals to be an allowed residential use. In 2004, they made this finding based on their analysis that compared the activities associated with a vacation rental to that of a typical single-family home. Quote, “Many, if not all, of these activities are the same and nuisances can and are generated by local residents just as they

are by people using a vacation rental. In so far as the impacts of a single-family home to the environment are the same as those potentially created by a vacation rental, there is no significant effect," unquote. Let us look at some of today's headlines. "New York is breaking free of Airbnb's clutches. This is how the rest of the world can follow suit" unquote. "Historic Italian tourist spot Florence, Italy seeks to ban STR (short-term rentals) amid housing crisis" unquote. "Wall Street's Airbnb's now the majority" unquote. Bigger players increasingly hold a more significant share of units listed on Airbnb. AirDNA found that only 38 percent of Airbnb's active listings were owned by someone with just one listing. It is time to rethink STRs in the Tahoe Basin. It is no longer a residential use. It is a commercial use and should be considered such in TRPA's regulations. Thank you. (Agenda Item II C)

Chair Daly:

Thank you. Next.

Ellie Waller, Douglas County Resident and Former North Tahoe Resident:

The 2020 Lake Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan, soon to be updated, is an unfunded priorities list of the RTP (Regional Transportation Plan) that totals over \$400 million, the next 20 years or a \$20 million annual gap in known revenue sources to achieve the desired RTP priorities and benefits. Benefits for whom? The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD), who you will be hearing from today, are struggling to find the golden goose. Many of their objectives and projects tie into NDOT projects requiring shared funding with NDOT having their own resource problems. Connecting the dots of all the entities that have been relied upon to make the planned recommendations, from Basin-wide nonprofits to economic consultants, is an arduous task to follow. Trust but verify, who deem these organizations the experts that can address unique, I emphasize unique, this place called Tahoe. They all have something in common, plans. Yes, plans that require extraordinary sustainable funding resource solutions. Tourist visitations have increased substantially with thousands of vacation home rentals that did not exist 20 years ago with the advent of increased social media. There are notably more day trippers because of inflation and the recent Pandemic. Tourists are less respectful of the jewel of the Sierra as evidenced by trashed beaches. We have been called NIMBYs—noise, the vocal minority—and loud and angry because we do not agree with all these business and development community plans and utopian Basin-wide funding strategies. This is a bit insulting to people like me and others. We need to be heard, not disrespected and expected to happily tax for the sake of more recreational and transportation plans with no near-term horizon implementation. We want tourists to enjoy the jewel of the Sierra, but at whose expense? (Agenda Item II D)

Dana Tibbitts, Tahoe East Shore Alliance:

I would like to address today the very real problem of evacuation in the Tahoe Basin. The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's refusal to take wildfire evacuation seriously is a growing threat to our Lake communities. Their efforts to impose road diet constraints on our primary evacuation route for public safety reasons completely ignores the real safety threat from wildfire. Our tech team ran a series of simulations for a four lane U.S. 50, assuming a Caldor-like fire scenario starting out near Meyers. All four models show a massive loss of life with approximately 90 percent of all vehicles and their occupants lost under best case scenarios. Obviously, a road diet would mean death for thousands more than the 120,000 lives lost in this simulation. Let that sink in. This analysis was conducted by Bob Byrne, former Chief Technologist for Raytheon Space and Airborne Systems Business Unit. Still, TRPA continues to shortcut or bypass altogether comprehensive environmental

impact reports and the roadway-by-roadway evacuation capacity assessments required for every new project. Instead, they rely on checklist approvals and rubber stamp detours to push through large scale projects that anticipate massive increases in tourism for already overtaxed infrastructure. This is a travesty of TRPA's original Compact. As a consequence, we have a profusion of untested zero vision developments popping up around the Lake at an alarming pace with the flimsiest of environmental analysis and token reviews. This is unacceptable and it should concern this Committee very much. How not to be Lahaina? I highly recommend you take a look at our simulation report. It will be available online. (Agenda Item II E-1) (Agenda Item II E-2)

Robert Aaron, Private Citizen:

Thank you to the Legislative Committee and Bureau, all of your staff, and the TRPA staff. I appreciate all of you. I have a motto: learn something, know something, do something. I am here representing and supporting all children of all ages. That includes you, you, you, you, you, you, you, you, you, you. I identify as them, all of the children. First off, in Ms. Regan's own words—the Executive Director of the bi-state TRPA—adding additional perspectives about the findings of that study. Did any of you read the study that was sent to you? Thirty-eight bodies of water around the world were studied. We came in third place of the most polluted in microplastics. They okayed all this crap right here on all these towers—10,000 pounds per tower. This stuff falls off. This was right next to the firemen's area where they wrap their hoses. We are absolutely concerned about the implications for human health as well as the Lake's vulnerabilities to microplastics. Lake Tahoe has been solving tough problems through science driven policies for years. Furthermore, this is what she states, expanding our understanding of microplastics in the environment, how they travel, their sources, and their impacts is a critical next step to take to make sure Tahoe does not fall victim to the global problem. Man, we are in third place. This is what it turns into. The plastic post is fiberglass wrapped PVC. I sent the materials to a lab; it has got lead in it. This stuff has lead in it. Verizon is guilty. The TRPA Board members and the ones who okayed this are polluting drinking water for 12 million people. You all drink it. We are all going to be gone before any of this is figured out and all the pollution and the killing of all of the people are happening. We are all going to be long gone. (Agenda Item II F-1) (Agenda Item F-2) (Agenda Item F-3) (Agenda Item F-4) (Agenda Item F-5) (Agenda Item F-6) (Agenda Item F-7) (Agenda Item F-8) (Agenda Item F-9) (Agenda Item F-10) (Agenda Item F-11) (Agenda Item F-12)

Chair Daly:

You are at your two minutes. Thank you very much.

We are going to stop with the public comment and go to the phones at 20 minutes. It looks like Kyle is the last one in our first phase here. You are next.

Peggy Borland, South Lake Tahoe Resident:

I moved to South Lake Tahoe in 1972. The clarity of the Lake at that time was more than 100 feet. Over the past 52 years, under the environmental protection of the TRPA, Lake clarity has declined and today hovers around 60 feet. This is not a success story, in spite of claims made by the TRPA. Those of us who make Tahoe our home have had a front row seat to the decline of the Lake and the overuse of the entire Basin. We have seen large development projects approved that were calculated to reduce sediment coming into the Lake and improve clarity. \$2.8, I am going to say that again, \$2.8 billion have been spent and invested to improve the Lake and yet Lake Tahoe is the frequent subject of alarming

scientific findings about microplastics, invasive species, and negative environmental news reports regionally and nationally. It seems every week, every month, there is a story about Lake Tahoe. Those of us here today have come from all around the Lake. As resident witnesses to the Lake's decline. We believe Lake Tahoe needs better stewardship and environmental oversight. An honest examination of the TRPA's policy and implementation failures is urgently needed to reverse the further decline of the Lake. Your role in achieving this objective cannot be overstated, and I thank you for your efforts in that regard.

Amanda Milici, Board Member, Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition:

I am here representing the Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition and countless Lake Tahoe residents who rely on or prefer active modes of transportation such as biking and walking. First, I want to express gratitude for the Nevada Legislature's investment in Tahoe's active transportation networks and non-automobile infrastructure systems. These investments are crucial for Lake Tahoe's pristine environment and our community's vitality. I am also here today to emphasize that we have an opportunity to improve crucial gaps in our active transportation network. For example, the Zephyr Cove Beach Resort is a popular destination for locals and visitors in South Lake Tahoe. However, the bike path from town currently terminates at Round Hill Pines Resort, and we need to fill the gaps so residents and visitors can arrive safely on bikes. We all know how many car accidents occur on Highway 50, so it is easy to imagine the horrifying experience of biking this stretch of road. Nevada's Department of Transportation's currently proposed Highway 50 East Shore Corridor Management plan does nothing to improve cyclist safety or facilitate the experience of arriving at Zephyr Cove without a car. I would like to remind the Committee that biking is a right and not a privilege. Biking is not just a hobby. It is a critical need for many. Some residents lack car access and for others, biking is their preferred mode of transportation for health, enjoyment, and sustainability. Nowadays, some people may view public roads as largely a place for cars. However, this viewpoint is misguided. It ignores the beautiful history that in the early 1900s, it was actually bicyclists who first advocated for paved streets and new roads. When you make or influence decisions in Tahoe, I hope you consider not just the loudest voices in the room but hundreds of quiet voices, who bike instead of drive, who need and deserve this infrastructure. This investment would not only benefit the community, but it will also contribute to a less congested and more sustainable Tahoe. Every person riding a bike could be one less car on the road. Thank you for your time.

Nick Speal, President, Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition:

I wanted to thank this Committee and the TRPA for its support of active transportation networks and infrastructure. As we try to protect the environment, protect Lake Tahoe and all we know and love about that, we need to reduce the reliance on the private automobile. I like to commend these agencies on their work towards expanding bike lanes, expanding bike paths, investing, and expanding public transit. I live without a car full time here in Lake Tahoe and so do a number of people in the community, especially marginalized folks. I think access to public services—getting around—transportation without a car is an equity issue; I really appreciate your support of expansion of that accessibility. This takes funding and it takes courage. I appreciate the commitment to progress for a safe and accessible place to live.

Kyle Davis, The League to Save Lake Tahoe:

I am here today on behalf of The League to Save Lake Tahoe, better known by their motto, Keep Tahoe Blue. The League is proud to have always been a partner in protecting the Lake and working with a number of different entities in order to accomplish our shared goals.

The League has been a part of multiple bi-state consultation processes where California and Nevada work together in order to solve really important issues like regional planning and transportation. We have always been a strong supporter of the Lake Tahoe Compact and by extension, the TRPA and the work TRPA does. It is important to manage the Basin as a whole because the environment in the Lake Tahoe Basin is all connected and does not know state lines. We do this, and we manage that environment, through the environmental thresholds that are written into the Compact. These thresholds allow a balance between development and protection of the Lake. All this land use planning and the rules that we put into place, that TRPA propagates, and the local governments in the area, are geared around meeting these thresholds, whether we are talking about the regional plan—which I participated in the update to that back in 2012 and then has been adjusted since then—that is a process that is geared towards meeting those environmental thresholds which is incredibly important for us to accomplish. That is done through area plans through those local governments as well. Now, the biggest challenge that we see is transportation and working on implementing a regional transportation plan and having what we need in place so we can reduce vehicle miles traveled in the Basin. We can improve the visitor experience and save the environment at the same time. The League has always prided itself on being a partner with the local governments, with the agencies, with the federal governments in these areas, as well as other organizations that are working towards the betterment of Lake Tahoe. We look forward to continuing to work with this Committee throughout this interim as we develop new and innovative ways to fund the challenges that we know are in front of us and find ways to protect the environment.

Chair Daly:

If you have more, you can submit in writing.

At this time, we will go to the phones. We will take up to five calls. If we do not have five callers, we will take up to five total calls in person. Phones are next. If we have five calls, we will take those and then we will end the first period.

Broadcast and Production Services (BPS):

To provide public comment please press *9 to take your place in the queue or raise hand on your Zoom window to take your place in the queue.

Melissa Soderston, Director, Tahoe Forests Matter:

Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you regarding the ongoing negligence of the TRPA. My name is Melissa Soderston, Director of Tahoe Forests Matter, a local community action group dedicated to ending the unscientific thinning and fuel reduction projects ongoing in the Tahoe Basin. I am calling in today to give voice to those in the Tahoe Basin who have none of their own, who are magnificent and at-risk members of this vast ecosystem. It is long overdue for the TRPA to answer for their abuse towards this community and to the Lake Tahoe environment itself. Lake Tahoe has a higher concentration of microplastics than some garbage patches in the ocean. We have no functioning public transportation and highly trafficked roadways. We have no comprehensive evacuation plan. We have outdated data sets and ancient EIRs (Environmental Impact Report). We watch our vital forest being decimated by logging which not does nothing to protect our community and harms all of our national climate goals, not to mention our tourism-based economy. Would you want to visit a Tahoe Basin devoid of dense, healthy forests? Improper and incomplete EIRs and a complete disregard for both NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) and CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) are the name of

the game. We have watched workforce housing be bulldozed for luxury condos. At the same time, TRPA pushes massive zoning changes for their underwhelming definition of affordable housing. Workforce housing was bulldozed for luxury condos on Kahle Drive with one of the worst egress roads in the Tahoe Basin. Kahle Meadow is home to the endangered Tahoe Yellow Crest, now in imminent danger for these luxury condos, requiring the movement of 600,000 cubic tons of dirt, filling in a pond traditionally home to beavers, and significantly restricting a marsh area vital to filtration for Lake Tahoe. This project is particularly egregious but very indicative of their general lack of concern for the environment. How can we possibly allow exemptions to our most basic environmental laws here in Lake Tahoe, a destination known and loved around the globe? How can we not demand that the TRPA uphold the most stringent of environmental protections and concerns regarding the health of this special ecosystem? We ask this Committee to conduct a full and comprehensive audit of all TRPA financials— (Agenda Item II G)

Chair Daly:

You are at your two minutes. If you have additional testimony, you can submit it in writing. Next call, please.

Fred Voltz, Private Citizen:

Sadly, for the Tahoe Basin, TRPA has transformed from a protector of the environment to a protector of an entrenched cadre of staff regularly promoting the interests of over development and too much tourism. After the Caldor Fire evacuation and recent traffic gridlock from heavy snowstorms, narrowing Highway 50 would cause further problems rather than solve any transportation issues. The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency has failed to implement rudimentary conflict of interest guidelines for its Board Members. The TRPA has ignored contemporary environmental impact standards for new commercial projects. For at least the last ten years, the TRPA staff and Board have refused to act on the worsening uncontained human trash crisis—lethal to wildlife—and then increases microplastic pollution compromising water quality in the Lake. The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency has failed to conduct regular workshops with the public and implement the public's collective wisdom and constructive alternatives. The glut of vacation rentals has not been well managed. If this Oversight Committee is at all concerned with these multiple failings, it will withhold a material portion of Nevada's funding to TRPA until a list of operating reforms is assembled and implemented. I would ask my comments be added verbatim to the record. Thank you. (Agenda Item II H)

Chair Daly:

Thank you. Next caller, please.

Alan Miller, Resident of South Lake Tahoe:

I am a civil engineer and environmental engineer, and a resident of South Lake Tahoe. I am speaking today concerning TRPAs ongoing contamination of Lake Tahoe with microplastics. Committee Members, I wrote to you with detailed comments for your public record for the Committee meeting of January 23, 2024. Those prior comments and attachments were provided again today for this meeting for the Committee's consideration. I will simply add a few comments here from my comments today that I sent in writing, for your highlight. Now that Lake Tahoe is identified as among the most contaminated with microplastics of large water bodies in the world, TRPA continues to approve of a variety of plastic shore zone structures in and over the waters of Lake Tahoe in the absence of any policy or planning for control of microplastics—mainly to support recreational boating—approving of plastic docks,

marinas, and shore zone structures of all kinds. This they accomplish in collusion with a variety of federal, state, and local partner agencies as discussed in my January 2024 comment letter. The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency continues to approve of wireless cellular facilities, including macro towers clad with plastics that shed tons of microplastics annually, in the absence of any planning or policy provisions for wireless facilities, which they have generally exempted from environmental analysis and certainly from cumulative effects analysis while invisibly changing the Lake Tahoe Basin forever with toxic electromagnetic energies disastrously increasing potential fire risks with an area of concern for the public put at risk. The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency is antiscientific, a criminal enterprise run amok in pursuit of political and development agendas— (Agenda Item II I)

Chair Daly:

You are at your two minutes. Thank you. Next caller.

BPS:

If you recently joined and would like to provide public comment, please press *9 to take your place in the queue. Chair, we have no additional callers at this time.

Chair Daly:

We will come back and take two more in person and then we will cut off.

Elisabeth Lernhardt, Zephyr Cove Resident:

I brought you something from the beach this morning to add to the macroplastics and the microplastics. This will turn into that if you leave the trash there. Now to my comment, we respect and protect the lake, and we expect the same thing from the visitors. Unfortunately, Tahoe is at the brink of being loved to death by tourists. I am not denying the need for an oversight agency, but TRPA has strayed from its original mission. Their trustees have conflict of interest. There is too much concentration of powers in their unelected positions. They are involved with multiple nonprofit organizations all seemingly benefiting from trying to duplicate their efforts to save Tahoe. Rather than protecting the Lake, TRPA applies fashionable ideologies for forcing us out of our cars, e.g. road diets, without transportation alternatives. Instead of promoting responsible recreation, they have increased rowdy visitors by allowing VHRs (vacation home rentals). The last thing Tahoe needs is more advertisement, but the global marketing, increased property values, and created the affordable housing crisis. The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's solution are high-density multifamily silos with minimal parking. Does Tahoe need to become a concrete condo eyesore like some of the Colorado ski resorts? The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency is also the municipal planning organization for the Basin. Since 1999, it has received federal grants to improve transportation and provide alternatives to cars. What are the projects accomplished with these funds? The Nevada Legislature created visitor authorities, both in Washoe and Douglas Counties, to make the tourist money benefit the Lake. What do these tourist visitor authorities do with these funds? How much do the beneficiaries of this arrangement contribute to funding local infrastructure? I am talking about the Star Alliance Resorts, casinos, and chamber of commerces. Thank you for your attention.

Richard Miner, Private Citizen:

Good afternoon, Chairman Daly, Members of the Nevada Legislature. When I spoke to this group at your previous meeting, I warned about the peril of unanticipated consequences. The most egregious example of unanticipated consequences took place right in this very

room. When in 2004, the TRPA, in a landmark decision which echoed all around the country, stated the following, staff has completed TRPA's initial environmental checklist and chapter six findings. Based upon the checklist, information in this staff summary, and the record, staff is recommending that the Governing Board make a finding of no significant effect. This finding applied to treating normal, private residences as short-term rental for purposes of zoning. Short-term rentals were equated with private residences and the rest is history. In the 20 years since that decision, rental housing available for workforce has plummeted in the Tahoe Basin. Traffic flow has doubled. Problems with microplastics and pollution in the Lake have increased significantly. As an aside in that initial report in 2004, the TRPA kicked the enforcement of any provisions down the road to the county. I want to wrap up by saying they also suggested if this program was not working out, the TRPA would be willing to revisit it. I think this Committee needs to go back to the Legislature and say it is time we require the TRPA to revisit their 2004 decision.

Chair Daly:

With that, we will close the first portion of public comment. We will have public comment again at the end of the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM III—APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE MEETING ON JANUARY 23, 2024

Chair Daly:

We will move onto the approval of the minutes for the meeting on January 23, 2024.

I will take a motion to approve the minutes of January 23, 2024.

VICE CHAIR BILBRAY-AXELROD MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FOR THE MEETING ON JANUARY 23, 2024.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE SECONDED THE NOMINATION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

AGENDA ITEM IV—PRESENTATION REGARDING TAHOE-DOUGLAS VISITORS AUTHORITY ACTIVITIES AND PRIORITIES IN THE LAKE TAHOE BASIN

Chair Daly:

Agenda Item IV, a presentation regarding the Tahoe Douglas Visitor Authority (TDVA) activities and priorities in the Lake Tahoe Basin. We have the presenter, Carol Chaplin.

Carol Chaplin, President and Chief Executive Officer (CEO), TDVA:

Thank you, Chair Daly and the Committee for allowing us to come and present. I want to first thank the Legislature's support over the years resulting in the Event Center project you saw this morning. It was fun to have you there and great questions. I am always available if you have more. (Agenda Item IV)

The TDVA was formed in 1997. It was to grant a portion of the occupancy tax revenues for advertising, publicizing, and promoting tourism and recreation in the Tahoe Township, and also to plan, construct, and operate a multi-use event center in the Township. This was a response to the decline in gaming in the South Shore of Lake Tahoe. As you know, with the proliferation of gaming, not only in California but all over the country, we began to see a significant decline in gaming. We also saw a significant decline in revenues, lodging taxes, and gaming. At its height, we had over 10,000 casino jobs for instance. Now, we have less than 3,000 jobs; revenues and gaming revenues have also begun to take that economic hit. The TDVA was formed in response to this looking to the Legislature to allocate TOT (Transient Occupancy Tax) dollars for marketing and promotion. That went on for a while until in 2004, we began a relationship with the Lake Tahoe Visitors Authority (LTVA). Recently, I did a presentation to Douglas County about the difference between the LTVA and the TDVA. It is a little bit confusing because I am here to represent both organizations. The TDVA has become more visible with the opening of the Event Center. I thought it was important for you to understand the relationship between those two entities.

The LTVA was formed in 1986, to do the same thing that the TDVA was formed to do in 1997. The difference between those two was the 1997 formation of the TDVA was in direct response to the gaming issues and the economic impact to the Township, and the LTVA had been in existence for a long time supporting the South Shore of Lake Tahoe to promote tourism. In 2004, we understood that gaming was not the driver of visits to Lake Tahoe outdoor recreation, and the spectacular scenery overshadowed that propensity for gaming. The TDVA and the LTVA found they were saying the same thing and even competing for the same audience. There was an MOU (memorandum of understanding) formed after that to allow the LTVA to do the marketing for the TDVA and thus making it a much more efficient operation where we were not duplicating administration. We were not marketing to the same markets, and we were talking to the same visitors about coming to Lake Tahoe.

The TDBA and the South Lake Tahoe Tourism Improvement District (TID), is the California entity that was formed. My Board Chair is here; until recently he was President of the TID. That is our funding source on the California side along with the TDVA TOT that comes to the TDVA and is passed through to the LTVA. There was an MOU formed to recognize the LTVA as the marketing organization for the South Shore, so the TDVA could continue its pursuit of this Event Center, the idea of providing a new facility on the South Shore of Lake Tahoe. If there are questions about that we will do that when you are ready for a nap or a cocktail, one of the two. It gets very complicated. The TDVA also allows, on the LTVA staff for administrative work, the same people that do presentations, like me, and run the organization, the accounting manager that does the books, and our administrative assistant that sets up our meetings, is all the same staff. We are very efficient in that respect.

In addition to the marketing money going to the LTVA, the TDVA also—you will be familiar with the American Century Championship last year was quite an epic year with Steph Curry hitting a hole in one and then following that up with it was not an eagle—I do not know they are called, to finish the tournament. We had 14 billion impressions during that tournament last year, 77,000 attendees, and \$252 million in public relations value. The TDVA also plans and organizes the Lights on the Lake fireworks every year on July 4th. That is an event that garners national recognition as one of the top ten shows in the country. We support Operation Sierra Storm in January; that is a meteorologist conference that we bring people to so they can understand our environment. They can talk about our beautiful lake, our ski resorts, all of our amenities, and also understand that we have really good snow removal in the Basin. After a big storm, we can get those roads clear and get people up here again. Sometimes they think—well we did have a storm of the century recently and people get scared of driving and we want the meteorologists to understand that we can handle this

kind of storm and get people here. Harvey's Outdoor Concert Series—as you may know, you might have been to one—is put on by Caesars Entertainment here on the South Shore. They provide 12 to 18 concerts a year in an outdoor venue. We support that series. We also support an event during the winter or the holiday season; Heavenly Holidays, which is a family experience and enhances the stay of our visitors during the Christmas and New Year's holidays. We also support air service into the Reno-Tahoe International Airport. The Regional Air Service Corporation is a collaboration of marketing organizations and private businesses who help support new service and maintain service into the Reno-Tahoe Airport.

Some of the community benefits the TDVA facilitates is now the annual Lake Link contribution. You heard about that this morning; \$4 of every ticket sale at the Event Center goes to support the Lake Link Micro Transit system. We also support nonprofits in the South Shore community with \$50,000 to \$250,000 in grants every year coming from the American Century Championship. We have recently started a contribution program to our local nonprofits by them helping with our concessions in the Event Center. In this first year, we have had some community event discount pricing for the first year of operation at the Event Center. We have about 300 part-time jobs at the Event Center, and we have about 10 to 20 local vendors that have found additional income from partnering in the Event Center.

Let us go back and talk about the history of this Event Center, which I mentioned the Legislature was very involved in this process of getting this approved—or allowing us to fund the project, I should say. The purpose is to provide a multiuse facility year-round. It broadens the season base to those shoulder seasons, October, November, December, and then again, April, May, and June. It is also stimulating the reinvention of the core area. We have about half a billion dollars of new renovation coming to the Casino core. That is not completely because of the Event Center, but certainly it is a consideration by these corporations to reinvest in their properties. We have year-round conventions and trade shows, special events, and entertainment. It is the only venue of its kind in an alpine resort. Our intention, with the help of TRPA and our other partners—actually, we have a few of them in the room today I could call out, we want to improve the environment quality of the area.

The Event Center has a bond debt, and it is funded by several different revenue streams. We have a property tax increment from Douglas County, the Redevelopment Area No. 2. We also have lodging and license fees from Douglas County. We have a \$5 room night surcharge that is levied—it is not the LTVA—by the TDVA that is also a result of the Legislative support in Nevada by passing that a few years ago. That is about 50 percent of our revenue that funds the debt of the Event Center and that is paid by visitors to the area; that is not paid by our local residents.

This morning, we had a conversation about the permit conditions for the Event Center. We have had lots of partners. I think you heard, our Executive Director for the TRPA, Julie Regan, talk about an Oversight Committee. We have an Oversight Committee that meets quarterly and looks at our results from the Event Center. Of course, we are in our first year and we are still learning about what works and what needs to be modified, and how we might improve our systems. We are held to a no-net increase in trips and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) during peak summer days. We are also limited in our capacity at the Event Center to 2,500 people for any event during the summer months, June 15 to Labor Day. Our casino partners have agreed to a paid parking program to encourage the transit along with the Lake Link. The concept there is an interesting one; if we can incentivize people to take free micro transit then that is such a success. I hope you got to

hear more about that from Gavin and Devin this morning. It is such a success, and we are looking at about 250,000 rides coming up in this next year. We started that a year earlier than we needed to. Along with that free and frequent transportation and paid parking what do you take? We are hoping we can incentivize not only visitors but residents to take that. I would say what we have seen from the results on the reports from the micro transit is that we are very much incentivizing people. Actually, our workforce takes that because we are seeing rides very early in the morning when a visitor is probably not going to get in the car and take a trip down to the casino core. We have the \$4 fee for the transit service. I think you heard our General Manager and myself say next year we are probably looking at about a \$600,000 contribution to that transportation service. Of course, we also spoke about the 2,500-attendee cap, and a limit of 130 events, 220 event days annually for the Event Center so far.

The TDVA is much more when we are talking about activities and priorities in the Basin right now. That is very much shifted—we leave the marketing to the LTVA—we are very much shifted to make sure this is a successful facility, a multiuse facility, and very much a community facility. This year we anticipate about 74 events and 124 event days at the Event Center. We are projecting attendance of about 88,000. Through our concessions, we talked about this, we are supporting nonprofits. We are looking at all kinds of events from concerts, to college basketball, to the conferences: National Association of State Park Directors; Nevada Hospital Association actually has a seven-year contract with us; we have had the Business Council of Douglas County Critical Issues Conference, they have rebooked for this next year; last week we had 500 tour and travel industry folks in from all over the world; and upcoming we have the Nevada Recreation and Parks Society Conference; the Nevada League of Cities; Travel Nevada Rural Roundup; we also have the Republican National Convention; and then of course, we have our ECHL Tenant Hockey Team coming in October with 36 games per year.

I want to complete this, and I will take questions after this. I know that was brief, but we talked about that this morning, we also received \$1.2 million in additional transportation money from the State of Nevada recently. I want to thank the Legislature for that. The South Shore Transportation Management Association, which I sit on, Gavin Feiger, Jerry Bindel, and Steve Teshara in the room—I hope I did not miss anybody. We are focused on using that money wisely with micro transit and also developing a van pool program for our private businesses which is being implemented now.

Chair Daly:

Any questions from the Committee? Senator Titus.

Senator Titus:

I think it is important we clarify that the national convention is not going to be at Lake Tahoe. It is a State convention.

Ms. Chaplin:

State convention, sorry about. Thank you. Milwaukee has the national.

Assemblyman Gray:

Thank you for a great presentation. A couple quick questions. The numbers were out this morning, but I did not quite hear them. How much was spent on Lake Link last year?

Ms. Chaplin:

How much was spent in the cost of the service? It is over a million; \$1.6 million.

Assemblyman Gray:

How many rider trips were there last year?

Ms. Chaplin:

I want to say 220—my little voice back there—yeah, 220,000. We started in July of 2022.

Assemblyman Gray:

I want to ask; I will probably get rocks thrown at me here—

Ms. Chaplin:

No, those are for me.

Assemblyman Gray:

The caps that are put on you, is that inhibiting your ability to bring events and high-profile events to the Lake? I mean, that will increase revenue and visitor ship.

Ms. Chaplin:

There are two things with that. Not in the first year, Assemblyman Gray. In the second year, we are concerned about it. The first year was a stub year. We opened in September of last year and our fiscal is July. What we think is the most likely outcome is we have to limit the community events that we have been asked to host. I think that is—the community events are something we want to—for instance, public skate. We have ice in the arena, and we have been asked to provide public skate facilities. We also have to pay our bond debt, which is about \$6 million a year. So, we have to weigh those kinds of things. We want to be all things to all people, but at some point, we are going to have to make decisions. We are developing that history, but the answer is probably, yes. We are going to have to decide the value of each event and whether or not we can host them. Now, obviously, in the summertime at 2,500, we are somewhat limited. We are not going to have a large concert, and we are not allowed to go head-to-head with Harvey's or the Outdoor Concert Series. It is not a good idea anyway, to have those events head-to-head; we are going to be competing for the same customer perhaps.

Assemblyman Gray:

But summer is a good time for conventions and things like that.

Ms. Chaplin:

Correct. Yes, and we did have a couple of those. I think, as you heard Ms. Regan say this morning, is we would like to come back to the Oversight Committee. Have a conversation about how we can still meet the goals of the Event Center, the net-zero VMTs and still host additional events. That will be somewhat dependent on our success with our mode of transportation and our ability to provide free transportation. As we mentioned, the \$1.2 million additional dollars helped us float our budget a little bit. We need to identify new sources and get more vehicles on the road and expand that service and the service hours.

Assemblyman Gray:

Mr. Chair, can I get a follow-up and clarification?

Chair Daly:

Yes.

Assemblyman Gray:

Thank you sir, just clarification. I am the new guy on the block. I am going to ask a lot of questions, some may be painful, and you guys may want to stone me, but there it is. The community events, and check me if I am wrong, the community events are counting towards your events. If there are meetings there or open skate, and there are no VMT there if it is a local community thing, correct?

Ms. Chaplin:

That is what we are finding is we have a lot of people that ride their bikes there, so that is not VMT. We also have an employee incentive program for carpooling or using other modes of transportation, so we need to take that into effect—but yes, in some cases. I gave this example, one of our local nonprofits who has a very successful event every year; had their event last year. It counted against us. They would have had it anyway. They would have had it at one of the other facilities. They would not have been as successful with their fundraising because they could not sell as many tickets. We also collected the \$4 for the transportation where they do not have that stipulation. There is kind of a win-win. With the community events, we are not competing with our partners for those events because those are usually discounted events anyway. They are looking for support from the facility. Some of them are happy if we would take that event.

Assemblyman Gray:

Was it the TRPA that placed those limitations?

Ms. Chaplin:

The TRPA in conjunction with our Oversight Committee met on a regular basis to come up with an acceptable plan so the building could be constructed. It was an ongoing conversation for many months. We received the support from the Oversight Committee based on our concessions to limit those events.

Chair Daly:

If I can interject, because I know we have a couple other questions. I do believe the Oversight Committee is going to take that up. I do believe before we are done, we will have a recommendation in that regard to help advise the Committee if that helps. But I know Senator Scheibel has a question.

Assemblyman Gray:

That helps a lot.

Senator Scheible:

My question is also about Lake Link. You said the projected budget or the budget you have already spent was \$1.6 million?

Ms. Chaplin:

\$1.6 million was the first year.

Senator Scheible:

And you got \$1.2 from the Legislature?

Ms. Chaplin:

We received that recently.

Senator Scheible:

What I am getting at, is how much are the casinos, the local businesses—how much are the local moneymakers contributing to this, and how much are you drawing from the rest of the State via the Legislature?

Ms. Chaplin:

We have California and the City of South Lake Tahoe just approved an additional \$600,000. The LTVA contributed money. The casinos all contributed money to get this launched.

Senator Scheible:

Do we have a ballpark number?

Ms. Chaplin:

I think that was about \$800,000 of our first year's budget that we raised from different entities, the TID on California's side contributed funds. Again, this is the second year of our operation, but the Event Center's money is starting to kick in as well.

Senator Scheible:

Do you have a sense for the rides that are being provided by Lake Link? Are there common routes? Are there common places that people are coming from?

Ms. Chaplin:

It is door-to-door service. We do. We have a lot. We have heat maps that show where people are coming from and where they are going to. We have a Managing Director that is steeped in transportation. He is one of those transportation experts who is looking at this all the time. The company that we use, the Downtowner, which is also used on the North Shore for their service—incredibly good partner—they are looking at this to see if we can somehow streamline in some ways, like for the casino core instead of door-to-door is there a common place you get picked up and a common place you get dropped off so we can make it more efficient. But that was not your question, would you repeat that?

Senator Scheible:

That was part of my question. I am trying to get a sense for whether the Lake Link is mostly used or equally used by residents going to work, residents going to events, casinos, recreation, and by visitors or is it predominantly one of those three groups or a different group?

Steve Teshara, Chair, Board, South Shore Transportation Management Association:

All great questions. We will be happy to provide the Committee and your staff with all the data we have to answer all the questions you asked. Yes, we have it. Yes, we will provide it.

Ms. Chaplin:

I would add it depends on the time of day and who is using it. What I mentioned was at seven o'clock in the morning, that is typically a workforce person who is going into the core. We have also recently expanded the Douglas County portion of our route, and we have also increased the hours of operation to be later because we know our casino core operates on that level. Those are all works in progress. We do have a lot of data that we could give you that would show you exactly what is going on. It is a big project.

Senator Scheible:

That would be great.

Mr. Teshara:

We will provide that information to you, Mr. Chairman, your team, and your staff after this meeting and before your next.

Chair Daly:

Remember you are supposed to say your name. Technically, you are supposed to say that even if there was only one person up there.

Assemblywoman Taylor, before I ask my questions, do you have any questions? Does not sound like it.

I have a few questions. I understand because you talked today about the TDVA. I think it was mentioned earlier that it is empowered or created through statute in Nevada.

Ms. Chaplin:

Correct.

Chair Daly:

I know you said you have shifted some of the focus from marketing over to managing the Event Center. Then there is the LTVA. Is that also Nevada statute? Does that overlap both areas of the states?

Ms. Chaplin:

It is bi-state.

Chair Daly:

It is bi-state. How is that—

Ms. Chaplin:

It is a Nevada 501(c)(6), but yes, it is a Nevada corporation. It is a bi-state organization that by this MOU shows the South Shore of Lake Tahoe, which includes the Tahoe Township and the City of South Lake Tahoe are being promoted.

Chair Daly:

How is it formed? They collect money from room tax. Where do they—

Ms. Chaplin:

The LTVA is a tourism improvement district—the TID was formed. It is only a lodging tourism improvement district. It does not include all businesses on the South Shore, but it is California based. It is an overnight assessment on visitor rooms. That is the only source of funding the LTVA has except for the pass through.

Chair Daly:

You mentioned the third entity. You have TDVA, you have the LTVA, which you said was bi-state, but it is incorporated in Nevada. Then you mentioned the South Lake Tahoe TID, which is a separate entity. It is a third entity, and that is only South Lake Tahoe?

Ms. Chaplin:

That is only South Lake Tahoe.

Chair Daly:

Right. Then both entities, Tahoe Douglas, which is only Nevada, and South Lake Tahoe, which is only California, have both utilized the Lake Tahoe bi-state for marketing, and that is primarily their focus, marketing?

Ms. Chaplin:

Correct.

Chair Daly:

How is TDVA funded? I know you said you received some from the Legislature, but let us say that was a one-off and do you have ticket sales and then you spend money on that? How are you funded? How do you get your money? How does the LTVA get their money? And how does South Lake Tahoe—you may not be able to answer that one—but South Lake Tahoe TID how are they funded?

Ms. Chaplin:

The TDVA is funded by transient occupancy tax in the Tahoe Township.

Chair Daly:

A room tax, right?

Ms. Chaplin:

Room tax. There is a lodging license fee that is Douglas County specific. Those are the two main funds. Obviously, with the Event Center, there are restricted funds. There is a one percent lodging license fee that is restricted now, then there is that redevelopment money that I spoke about, and the \$5 surcharge. Those are restricted funds. Those must be used for the Event Center. The 8 percent of the Transient Occupancy tax (TOT) comes to the TDVA and that has been used—

Chair Daly:

You used more acronyms there.

Ms. Chaplin:

Transient occupancy tax.

Chair Daly:

So, room tax?

Ms. Chaplin:

Room tax.

Chair Daly:

The \$5 surcharge is in addition to—

Ms. Chaplin:

That is correct and it is restricted for the event centers.

Chair Daly:

Understood. You have bonds to pay. I understood that. You used another acronym right there a second ago.

Ms. Chaplin:

The lodging license fee, which is very specific to Douglas County—overnight rooms. There is 14 percent levied on any room in the Tahoe Township.

Chair Daly:

How does the LVA—how is that enacted? How does that have authority? They collect money or does the money go to the two separate—I am assuming the South Lake Tahoe is enacted by statute in California somehow given authority to collect these revenues. Then did they have the MOU with the LTVA or is that a statutorily organized group as well?

Ms. Chaplin:

The TID is approved every year through the City of South Lake Tahoe City Council. It has been approved through 2029, by its members and it is an overnight assessment for each room that the lodging community pays in.

Chair Daly:

Basically, a room tax.

Ms. Chaplin:

Room tax.

Chair Daly:

What about the LTVA? How are they established or are they ad hoc?

Ms. Chaplin:

The TID funnels 95 percent of—

Chair Daly:

How is the LTVA authorized? Who gave them their authority?

Ms. Chaplin:

It was formed in 1986. It is a 501(c)(6) and it was—I cannot tell you that. I was not here in 1986.

Chair Daly:

We will try to find out.

Ms. Chaplin:

I will find out for you.

Chair Daly:

I am trying to get to the part—and I understand you have revenues that are locked up and are going to pay the bonds on there and no matter what we wanted to do, no one would be able to interfere with that, at least not on the Nevada side—

Ms. Chaplin:

That is correct.

Chair Daly:

—paying those bonds and fully aware and support that concept. It needs to be there. As far as the unrestricted portion of the fund, the room tax, so everybody knows what we are talking about, is that dedicated to anything? How is that spent? Who decides how much is generated in the Basin from both sides. We are concerned about the Nevada side? How

much of what is generated in the Basin stays in the Basin or is dedicated back? I understand you have a marketing side of all of this. I am trying to get to the transportation one and RSCVA (Reno-Sparks Convention and Visitors Authority) will have some of these very same questions.

Ms. Chaplin:

Right.

Chair Daly:

How much of that then could be—apparently you do not need to market too, too much more. You have got all these other entities for the marketing. It would seem to me, if you are trying to get visitors here, you are trying to have them have a good experience here, you are trying to make sure there is minimal impact on the Lake, riding the micro transit, and all the rest of the stuff. How much investment of this money that is coming in off the room tax is being focused towards the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD). That is what I am trying to get to; RSCVA, same question. It seems to me a greater investment be made by these visitor authorities to not only do the Lake Link—which is great and growing and it is going to have more revenue—but some of the infrastructure side of those things, building it out, parking facilities, getting people off the road, completing trails, and various things so people have better experiences when they are at the Lake with lower impact. That is what I am trying to get to. How much of that money is generated in the Basin, how much of it stays in the Basin and how much of it maybe goes to these transportation issues that we are trying to focus on today? You may not have the answers, but I am going to seek the answers to those questions.

Ms. Chaplin:

I have part of the answer to that. As the MOU for the TDVA and the TID has been laid out, the LTVA is the marketing organization. The LTVA has recently formed a new strategic plan that focuses much more on the balance between stewardship, residents, and still the visitor economy. We have an economy in the Basin that is over 63 percent tourism. We cannot deny that is what we depend on, but we are starting to shift our focus to that balance. We are involved in the Lake Tahoe Basin Stewardship Council—I am Co-Chair of that Council this year—we spent two years developing the plan. We did contribute money to that plan, we have contributed money to the Managing Director, and the plan of work that is being undertaken this year. I do not have specifics on that. The LTVA has pledged \$50,000 a year towards Lake Link at this point in time, that is up for Board approval to increase, change, or whatever. The TDVA, as I mentioned, all of the revenue the TDVA receives except for the portion of the marketing that goes to the LTVA, from my perspective, stays in the Basin because of the Event Center and the support we have to direct towards that.

Chair Daly:

That is why it is important to have the answers to the first two questions: how much is generated in the Basin? How much stays in the Basin? I am sure it is a lot more than \$50,000, which go to one portion of transit, which is the Lake Link, which needs to be supported. But it does not get to the trails, it does not get to the other infrastructure, and various things the whole TTD is trying to put together for the entire Basin. I am wanting to find out and ask—I will ask RSCVA the same things. I want you to all get together and hopefully make investment towards those things, so we do not have to get involved.

Ms. Chaplin:

I think it is a shift in conversation the Board is having right now. The LTVA, as the marketing organization, at this point its goals, its purpose, its mission if you will, is focused more on the promotion of an awareness of the destination. As I mentioned, we have a new stewardship plan that is fairly different. I have to say that is a work in progress, and it is a conversation the Board has to change because at this point in time it has not changed its mission to include specifically transportation, trails, or infrastructure.

Chair Daly:

Thank you for that. I am hoping, part of this will be a catalyst for that. We are going to move on to the next one, but what I am hoping is the TTD, the visitor authorities—all of them, not just the Nevada ones—can start having a conversation and hopefully have at least framework commitments and types of things by the time this Committee ends for this interim. That way, the more you guys work together, the less we have to be involved. I do not want to, if I do not have to.

Ms. Chaplin:

I understand.

Chair Daly:

If we cannot make changes and try to have a shift in focus to improve that experience, lessen the impact on the Lake, et cetera. I think it benefits everybody. The visitor authorities can jump up and down and say, oh, we have got to do all this other stuff. If you can improve those two things for your visitors, you are going to have more visitors with better experiences, and you will have more than your 14 million impressions and all that kind of stuff.

Ms. Chaplin:

Understood.

Chair Daly:

That was all of my questions. Any others?

AGENDA ITEM V—PRESENTATION REGARDING RENO-SPARKS CONVENTION AND VISITORS AUTHORITY ACTIVITIES AND PRIORITIES IN THE LAKE TAHOE BASIN

Chair Daly:

We will move on to Item V, which is a presentation regarding the Reno-Sparks Convention and Visitors Authority activities and priorities in the Lake Tahoe Basin. I am sure you are going to anticipate those same questions. Please state your name for the record and proceed when you are ready.

Courtney Jaeger, Certified Public Accountant, Vice President of Finance, RSCVA:

Here with me today is Ben McDonald, our Senior Director of Communications and Public Affairs. I want to thank the Committee for inviting us to speak today. We are excited

to be here and provide you with more information about the RSCVA. (Agenda Item V)
[Due to copyright issues, the handout is on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Carson City, Nevada. For copies, contact the Library at (775) 684-6827 or <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Division/Research/About/Contact>.]

I am going to start off with an overview of the Board for the RSCVA to give you an understanding of how we are governed. Three of our Board members are elected officials from the City of Sparks, the City of Reno, and Washoe County. Commissioner Hill is currently our representative from Washoe County. In total we have nine Board members, and the remaining six Board members consist of a mix of representatives from the Reno-Tahoe International Airport, the Reno-Sparks Chamber of Commerce, the gaming industry, and a representative from Travel North Tahoe, which is currently Mr. Greg Long.

The RSCVA was formed in 1959 as the Washoe County Fair and Recreation Board. We serve as the destination marketing organization for Washoe County. As an organization that is primarily funded by room tax, our mission is to attract overnight visitors to Reno-Tahoe. In our most recent strategic plan, we defined our vision. Our vision is to be the preferred outdoor gaming and event destination. The RSCVA carries out our vision and mission through our efforts in key areas. As I mentioned, the RSCVA is primarily funded by room tax and the RSCVA administers all room tax collections and distributions in Washoe County. Later in the presentation, we will go into a bit more detail about that activity. We are also responsible for managing four venues in Washoe County. We will go into more detail about that later as well. We market the destination internationally and domestically. The RSCVA creates visitor reports that are posted on our website and distributed to community stakeholders, which include information about visitor trends. Our convention sales department is responsible for bringing group and convention business to the area. Our Tourism Sales Department works with various travel partners to extend our reach. We will go into more detail about each of these areas later in the presentation.

Like I mentioned, the RSCVA is the administrator and the collection agent for all transient lodging taxes imposed within Washoe County. Transient lodging tax is more commonly referred to as room tax. All operators who engage in transient lodging activities must be licensed with RSCVA, and we relicense all properties every four years. Here we have our room tax matrix. There are six districts in Washoe County and properties in those districts pay between 13 and 13.5 percent in taxes. Those taxes are distributed between the RSCVA, the City of Reno, the City of Sparks, Washoe County, Travel North Tahoe, and the State of Nevada in accordance with existing legislation. The RSCVA does not set these tax rates or distribution percentages; we enforce them, and we set the regulations to collect those taxes. I know the Committee is interested in the tax percentage remitted to Washoe B. In Washoe B, you will see there is a 6.625 percent tax rate collected that goes towards the RSCVA's General Fund. We remit one half of that tax back to Travel North Tahoe.

Here we have taxable room revenues generated by tax district for the fiscal year (FY) ended June 30, 2023. Our largest district is Reno B, which is suburban Reno. That is where properties such as the Atlantis and Peppermill are located. Based on the allocations that I showed you on the previous slide, based on our room tax matrix, this is what room tax distributions looked like for the FY ended June 30, 2023. Room tax is primarily how the RSCVA is funded. You will see we have the largest allocation, and in the prior year our allocation to Travel North Tahoe was \$2.2 million.

It was my understanding the Committee is interested in the RSCVA's involvement in transportation funding historically. Historically, this is not something the RSCVA has been heavily involved in. In terms of what we have the authority to spend funds on, the RSCVA

must spend our money on activities that are tied to the promotion and solicitation of tourism and gaming. Our budget is heavily guided by our strategic plan, which is approved by our Board of Directors. Our Board also approves our budget annually. Our Board approved a \$350,000 allocation to the TART (Tahoe Truckee Area Regional Transportation) Connect program in FY 2023. It is our understanding a potential discussion regarding additional TART funding will come to our Board later this year for FY 2024.

Next, we wanted to give the Committee an overview of our venue management activities for the four venues the RSCVA manages.

First, we will talk about the Reno-Sparks Livestock Events Center. This facility has been around for many years and has been home to the Reno Rodeo since 1919. Each year, we hold over 60 events at this facility. We do not own this building, but we do manage it per an agreement with Washoe County. The building is owned by the State of Nevada.

Next is the Reno Events Center. This facility is located in downtown Reno and was built in 2005. We hold concerts, sporting events, and trade shows in this building. We do not own this building either. We manage it via an agreement with the City of Reno.

We also manage the National Bowling Stadium. We manage this building via that same agreement with the City of Reno as the Reno Events Center. The National Bowling Stadium hosts many events each year including events with the United States Bowling Congress. Last year, the U.S. Bowling Congress brought their open championships to the National Bowling Stadium, which brought over 47,000 bowlers to the area.

Last is the Reno-Sparks Convention Center. This was built in 1965, is owned by the RSCVA, and underwent a major expansion in 2002. The Convention Center is over 600,000 square feet and hosts over 200 events annually.

Next, I will turn it over to Ben McDonald.

Ben McDonald, Senior Director, Communications and Public Affairs, RSCVA:

We are the premier sales and destination marketing organization of RSCVA also branded as Reno-Tahoe. Convention sales is certainly one of our major contributions to the county.

We have seven regional offices around the country including the primary association markets of Washington, D.C. We also cover the Midwest, Southwest, the South, and we have two representatives in California, which is by far our largest feeder market for visitation overall, but also meetings and conventions business.

These are a few of the recent and upcoming events we have booked from a meeting and convention standpoint: Connect by Grassroots was a large organization; NGAUS is the National Guard Association of the United States; and American Beekeeping Federation. All four of these combined to account for about 20,000 room nights in visitation to Washoe County, primarily down in the valley in the Reno-Sparks area. Shriners International is coming in July representing about 4,000 people and 11,000 room nights at the height of our summer visiting season in July. The United States Bowling Congress (USBC) was referenced earlier. We still have a long-standing agreement. The Bowling Stadium was built in 1995. Since that time, we have held roughly 20 different championships including Open and Women's. This year, we will also have a women's championship. They bring about 35,000 bowlers to the destination and represent over \$30 million of economic impact when they are here. The Open Championships is both men's

and women's. When that event is in town that generates roughly \$70 million in economic impact.

Sports development teams. We have three individuals booking sports for us. In addition to the meetings and conventions market, we utilize the local facilities including Reno Events Center, which you can see an example there. The Davis Cup by Rakuten, we brought that event to downtown Reno a couple of years ago. In the top left, that is a shot of the Reno-Sparks Convention Center. That is NorCal Volleyball Association. That is an annual event. They come for two weeks every year during April, so that is right around the corner. Then our largest outdoor facility, Golden Eagle Regional Park up in Sparks. They are booked over 100 percent every year. We bring in a lot of groups when it comes to softball, baseball, and most of those groups will stay in the Sparks area at the Nugget or even in downtown Reno. We are still trying to fill those shoulder seasons. Our Board has asked us to find a solution to fill that time frame, November to March, when there is not a lot going on other than ski, of course, but that is not filling up the hotel rooms at all times. We found an opportunity to bring indoor track to the region. We have a partnership with the University of Nevada to generate roughly 20,000 to 40,000 room nights within the first three years in that November to March window. During the indoor track season, there are only three portable indoor tracks on the West Coast. Most of the major events, whether it is seniors or high school or collegiate, most of those events will go to Albuquerque in the West, sometimes the Pacific Northwest, and now there will be a new venue here. Most of those tracks in the United States are located east of the Mississippi, so it gives us a unique opportunity. The RSCVA Board of Directors made a significant investment in allowing us to help attract that business here. The track is currently being built in Italy. It will be shipped over here sometime in October and built in hall four of the Reno-Sparks Convention Center.

Sales and marketing is primarily what we do at RSCVA, specifically for Washoe County. We have a new research firm that is helping us acquire additional economic impact information including origination markets. This is a look at the top markets where people are visiting from. This FY, July through the end of January, you can see most of those markets are directly in California. We are fortunate that most of the people that are coming to visit us live nearby; it gives us a solid base to continue generating room tax dollars. There is a major drop off after you get out of that Seattle and Chico DMAs (designated market area) and spread out all over the country. Specifically, USBC brings us a lot of people that you will not see on that list from Texas and Ohio.

We also are responsible for visitor profile studies. We handle all the research based on visitation here. We will have a new visitor profile study coming probably in the next three to four weeks based on visitation that tracks about 1,200 people who have visited the area recently, Washoe County specifically, and also probably about 300 to 400 individuals who we have identified as prospective visitors. We also have a resident sentiment survey coming out for the first time. We should have those results for 2023, in the next three to four weeks. We also have ongoing brand effectiveness studies to measure the impact of our marketing efforts.

Speaking of marketing, our new campaign launched a few months ago. This is the no limits campaign primarily on digital platforms regionally and nationally. We primarily market to the greater United States. We do not do a lot of international. We do not have a lot of pick up in that area. It makes more sense to spend our dollars where people are coming from. This is the campaign you will see whether you are a leisure traveler, or meetings and conventions, or if we are focused on you for sports development, there are certainly aspects that speak to Nevada. The gaming aspect No Limits [Campaign] definitely touches on that. Our target market is an ambitious traveler, someone who wants to get outdoors and do a

little bit more than your traditional sightseeing, so the No Limits Campaign also speaks to that. Then of course, from the meetings and conventions standpoint, speaks to the lack of limitations that we offer when it comes to meetings and conventions opportunities throughout Washoe County.

Special events are huge. We basically say we have two seasons in Washoe County. It is ski season, or it is special event season. We have over 100 special events each year that we market, and we promote throughout the destination. In this past year, we awarded marketing sponsorships in the amount of about \$435,000. We have a \$500,000 annual fund. Last year we gave those to about 32 separate events. It is a growing list of events. Any event can apply to meet a certain amount of specifications regarding how many hotel partners do they have and these monies that are distributed—\$5.5 million awarded since 2007—are specifically for marketing purposes. We are trying to bring more visitors to Washoe County to stay overnight and add to that room tax.

From a tourism sales perspective, the largest piece of tourism sales are OTAs (online travel agents); Expedia, Travelocity, things like that. We have a three-person team that markets specifically with a lot of our partners you can see there. It is not just OTAs but also tour operators, travel agents, kind of old school there but it is still a large contingent of what we have to do to ensure we are meeting demand and bringing visitors to the region. Part of that effort is attending trade shows. Of course, Go West Summit was recently up here in South Lake. We attend IPW, which is one of the longest international trade markets. We do a lot of business for international trade when it comes to OTAs, travel agents, and other group business, not so much on the leisure side; as I said, that is more domestic. Go West we also hosted, I think three years ago, in Reno. These are large organizations that help us bring large groups of people to the area at a time.

Community partnership is something the RSCVA has put an emphasis on in the last two years. Speaking of our marketing efforts in 2020, we saw an influx of people obviously to the Basin. We are partners of the Basin. Our County feeds into the Basin, we understand we are not the largest piece of the Basin, but we also want to be good community partners. We had billboards in Southern California that had a lot of Lake Tahoe imagery. We were asked, and we thought it would be in the best interest of everybody, to pull those billboards down. We did that on behalf of all the residents and everybody else working in tourism in the Basin, as well as in Washoe County, in an attempt to be good partners and try not to over flood our communities with more visitors than we can handle. Nobody wants that. We are also very involved in the Lake Tahoe Destination Stewardship Plan. Very happy to be part of that, and it is all part of our ongoing effort to be good partners. Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority is one of our closest partners and working with Regional Air Service Corporation. We are one of the largest contributors to that from a transportation perspective and bringing people to Northern Nevada so we can all lighten our tax burden a little bit and enjoy that room tax and also feed our small businesses who rely heavily on folks from outside of the area. Community partnership has been part of our mission, written into our new strategic plan, which we are in our second year now, and we take it very seriously and we hope to continue doing so. Tourism in Washoe County also contributes to more than 35,000 jobs and we take that role very seriously as well as a public body. We are appreciative of the RSCVA Board who allow us to take part in these community partnerships, because it is based on their direction. I think that is about all we have for today, but we are happy to entertain any questions.

Chair Daly:

Thank you and Vice Chair has a question. Anybody else?

Vice Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Thank you for the presentation. Can you explain the room tax distribution to me? At the very top is the RSCVA and then it says net of distribution to Travel North Tahoe is the 45 but then Travel North Tahoe has another—I cannot make sense of this slide.

Ms. Jaeger:

That comment indicates that in our financial statements, we would report that number gross, but we expend \$2.2 million to Travel North Tahoe. We have deducted it from above to show what the RSCVA is actually keeping. We received roughly \$47 million; we remitted \$2.2 million back to Travel North Tahoe.

Vice Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Thank you for that clarification. I have one more if you would. I am kind of obsessed with the term shoulder season. I was not familiar with it until today and now I cannot stop thinking about it. I looked up Tahoe's shoulder season; it is September to November and then March through May. But you said your shoulder season is November through March, which I am guessing that would not be so of your North Tahoe area, which would have the same shoulder season as Tahoe. It does not seem like there is—it seems like all year round should be head season. I do not know, what do you call it?

Mr. McDonald:

I would say the properties that are represented specifically by RSCVA within the Tahoe Basin portion of Washoe County, make up a small amount of available room nights when compared to the rest of Washoe County. Specifically, you can see the difference, right? We have about 15,500 rooms available each night that we would consider convention room nights or primary leisure room nights. For the majority of those, the shoulder season is specifically late October through mid to early March for the majority of those hotel rooms.

Senator Scheible:

I also want to thank you for your presentation. I have seen a lot of presentations by a lot of different agencies with acronyms and jargon. This was one of the clearest presentations I have ever seen. I actually understand what you do and how you do it. Thank you and congrats to your team who put that together. I do not know if it was you two. If it was, you guys are awesome.

I was surprised at the end of your presentation when you mentioned taking down billboards in Southern California. But I get it, because even as we have been having these conversations all day about wanting to attract conventions and wanting to attract people who are going to come and walk around Lake Tahoe, we do not want to inadvertently invite buses full of people who cannot park here, or buses that do not have space to park here. I am wondering if you could speak to whether that is a regional problem or whether you are trying to attract certain kinds of tourism to certain areas within the area you cover or whether there are more regional kinds of patterns? Like we want more conventions, less vacations, more vacations, less conventions, more of both. Could you speak to that?

Mr. McDonald:

I do not think there is a simple answer to that question. I think from a room tax perspective, we are trying to fill needs periods, which primarily year-round would be that

Monday through Friday traveler. The majority of those folks are business travelers. We are heavily invested. We generate 250,000 to 300,000 room nights each year, just on meetings and conventions. Again, these are primarily valley room nights. There is not a simple mix answer to that question. We are certainly trying to get as many people here as possible. A lot of that has to do with air service and trying to target those air service markets where we need to either fill planes or get new service following demand where we can. The mix of travelers, I would say there is not—we are looking for people who are going to stay a little bit longer and do a little bit more as opposed to having additional visitors in a specific time frame if that makes sense. From a visitation standpoint, our mission is really heads in beds and however we can get them here, we will. I think a lot of that has to do—it always incorporates the partnership with everybody else that we are working with, whether it is the county, cities, the entirety of the stewardship partnership, and making sure we are, again, being good partners. As the research comes in and we identify different types of visitors or different times of year that are going to help alleviate some of the issues that we are facing, we are obviously poised to adjust and find those new visitors. But for us, it is about focusing on slower time periods and trying to fill those.

Chair Daly:

No questions? [No further Member questions.]

Looking at the same—and a couple of interest for my sake—issues. When you have the revenue slide, I see south or suburban Reno. Does that include the GSR (Grand Sierra Resort) or is the GSR in Reno E?

Ms. Jaeger:

That includes the GSR.

Chair Daly:

The one-mile radius from downtown, how small is the postage stamp for downtown?

Ms. Jaeger:

Downtown includes the large properties like the Row and the J Resort.

Chair Daly:

I know, but then you have E which is a one-mile radius.

Ms. Jaeger:

In Reno E, the Courtyard Downtown and the Jesse would be the only hotel properties there with the remainder being 28-day stays in vacation rentals.

Chair Daly:

That was a curiosity question there. You have the number on room tax that is generated in the Basin—well at least in the Washoe portion, Incline Village—at almost \$67 million. Then when I get to the distribution of the room tax, of the \$223 million in suburban Reno, what happens to the rest? Obviously, you are not distributing it all to them. You have other things, you have staff, you have other promotions, and advertisements. When you give the \$45 million to RSCVA, is that to maintain your facilities? What does the City of Reno do with

theirs or are they free to do whatever they want? And on down your list ,and then I will have a question on Travel North once you answer that.

Ms. Jaeger:

For the RSCVA, the 6.625 percent goes to our general fund and that goes to fund our overall budget. About 41 percent of our budget goes towards sales and marketing, 24 percent goes towards facilities. The 2 percent tax, you saw in that room tax matrix, goes towards our debt, which is about \$8 to \$9 million per year. We spend about 8 percent of our budget on capital; 4 percent of our budget is that allocation to Travel North Tahoe with the remainder being general and administrative costs to support the organization. As far as the other distributions like to the City of Reno, Sparks; there are certain restrictions for legislation, like some of the City of Reno money is restricted towards debt payments for them. City of Sparks must spend their money on tourism. Within the legislation, there are certain nuances on how the other entities spend their money.

Chair Daly:

All of that is covered in the \$45 million or all of that is covered in the \$223 million; if I add up all of the bigger numbers—

Ms. Jaeger:

To clarify a bit, these are total taxable room revenues generated by tax district. These are the amounts that the 13 and 13.5 percent taxes are levied on. These are the gross room revenues generated by the properties, and this is what they are paying their taxes from; those 13 and 13.5 percent taxes are represented here. That is how those are distributed.

Chair Daly:

This is how much the income is?

Ms. Jaeger:

Yes.

Chair Daly:

Even though it says distribution.

Ms. Jaeger:

Yes. Distribution means essentially, RSCVA is responsible for collecting all room taxes in Washoe County and distributing them. We distribute \$45 million to ourselves and then distribute the rest accordingly per statute.

Chair Daly:

The Travel North Tahoe—I know what the State of Nevada is, City of Reno, City of Sparks, Washoe County—what is Travel North Tahoe?

Ms. Jaeger:

That is the Incline Village Visitors and Conventions Bureau.

Chair Daly:

I am saying, they are not a municipality or whatever. How were they created or are they just a subset of the RSCVA?

Ms. Jaeger:

They are their own separate local government. Travel North Tahoe is essentially the name they operate under. Similar to us, we operate under Visit Reno-Tahoe, but we are the Reno-Sparks Convention and Visitors Authority. Travel North Tahoe, they are the Incline Village-Crystal Bay Visitors Bureau.

Chair Daly:

They are basically those townships of those two unincorporated entities, and they call themselves—Travel North Tahoe?

Ms. Jaeger:

Yes, exactly.

Chair Daly:

You mentioned on your strategic plan on what it is you can and cannot spend money on. You are saying you cannot spend money on some of the transportation issues at the Lake. Does it take legislation? We can make some of that happen.

Ms. Jaeger:

We can spend our money on any activities that are directly related to the promotion and solicitation of tourism. If someone were to come to our Board with a request for transportation funding and can tie that into tourism, such as this lack of transportation is inhibiting tourism, then that is something we would be able to fund. Those decisions are made at the Board level, since they have oversight for our strategic plan and our budget. We can fund anything that relates to the promotion and solicitation of tourism and gaming.

Chair Daly:

So, you can help fund that? Because I see there is a portion, \$350,000, the Travel North Tahoe sends to TART, if I remember correctly.

Ms. Jaeger:

That is what the RSCVA paid towards the TART program. That came as two separate requests to our Board. A request for \$100,000 that was approved and then a separate request for \$250,000. Presentations were made to our Board, and they evaluated whether that was something they wanted to fund and they voted to support it.

Chair Daly:

That is in addition to the \$2.2 million to Travel North Tahoe.

Ms. Jaeger:

Correct. That is in addition. The \$2.2 million is what we allocate to them per statute. The \$350,000 was on top of that.

Chair Daly:

I understand the Tahoe Area Regional Transportation is mostly Incline Village and you rightfully should stay Washoe County focused; I would agree. Has the TTD come to you and said, 'hey, we could use help with some of the things we are trying to do in that area?' They have a broader span, but I am sure you could make sure it stays focused on that—same thing as I was talking to the TDVA.

The rest of the questions I have are enhancing the ability for people to get the Lake and have a good experience while they are there is a key element of what you are trying to do. If you can make that—and if the added benefit, I also believe this would be an added benefit, of less impact on Lake, less cars that are coming into the Basin, people's ease of getting around—can only promote and help the businesses that exist there. I am hoping, like I told the last group, some of this can be done. You can go back to your Board and get structures framework to help support some of these issues. Not just the micro transit, like we said, but some of the infrastructure things, various aspects of that before the end of this Committee this interim. I am hoping there is something that can be done there. If you will take that back to your folks. I have talked to a couple of your Board Members and gave them a heads-up. I think that is something when we are trying to solve problems at the Lake, as far as these things go, it ties into what you are already doing. We need a catalyst to make people move.

Assemblywoman Taylor, I know you can hear us. Do you have any questions?

Assemblywoman Taylor:

Thank you, Mister Chair. I can hear you. I do not have any questions. I do agree this was clear and easy to follow. It was good as a resident here to jump into a little bit more of the specifics of the tax collection and distribution. So, no, I am good. The previous presentation from the TDVA was good too. I am here. I am listening. I am paying attention. I am talking to staff sometimes, but I am here, and I am awake.

Chair Daly:

No worries. I wanted to remind you that we have not forgotten you.

Assemblywoman Taylor:

I know and I appreciate that.

Chair Daly:

With that, thank you for your presentation.

AGENDA ITEM VI—PRESENTATION REGARDING WASHOE NATION INTERESTS AND PRIORITIES IN THE LAKE TAHOE BASIN

Chair Daly:

We will move on to Item VI, which is a presentation regarding the Washoe Nation interests and priorities of the Lake Tahoe Basin. Chairman Smokey.

Serrell Smokey, Chairman, Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California:

I thank you all for having me here today. What I am going to present to you very brief overview of the Washoe Tribe: who we are, what we are about, and directly related towards our interests up here at the Lake and with TRPA. (Agenda Item VI) [Due to copyright issues, the handout is on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Carson City, Nevada. For copies, contact the Library at (775) 684-6827 or <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Division/Research/About/Contact.>]

First is showing our homelands of the Wá·šiw People. This is where, to us, our people originated from as living beings since the beginning of time. The map here shows a general area outlined. You cannot see it too good on the screen, but it is a dotted line. That map shows the basic nuclear boundaries of Wá·šiw People. Where our people specifically were the majority of the time throughout history. What is not shown here is the outside borders of where our original homelands actually extend to. The reason this map is shown is because this was a part of the Indian Claims Commission settlement of the Washoe Tribe settlement. We had to prove, as a Tribe and Sovereign Nation, where our lands actually were and where we have lived as a people. We had to prove that in Court through the use of archaeology as well as documented history, which there was not a whole lot of, but this is what happened a while back.

One of the things about the area within the Tahoe Basin, we wanted to highlight is even though this is the area the Wá·šiw People came from, the Tribe owns less than 30 acres in the entire Tahoe Basin. We have two parcels up in the Incline area which can only be served as conservation. We are looking at how do we extend that and create a bigger presence within the Tahoe Basin overall. We work with all counties all around Lake Tahoe, that is Nevada and California. We work with all representatives. Going back to what I mentioned as far as the extended boundaries of our Wá·šiw homelands, what are not shown are allotments that happened. That was due to the Dawes Act in 1887, which gave individuals of tribes pieces of land in order to separate them from being a people as a whole. Those lands extend all the way up to Susanville up in the north and going south all the way up to the north side of Yosemite—Mono Lake area. We also have archaeology that extends all the way to Sacramento going west and Walker Lake to the east. That would be the big picture of where Wá·šiw People have always been.

Quick history and culture; this section alone we could probably spend a good whole day on at least. There is plenty of information out there but a quick overview. Today, we are a federally recognized tribe, the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California. There are old documents stating it used to be the Washoe Tribe of California and Nevada, but that was before anything was formalized, and they ended up being Nevada and California. With the original peoples of the Tahoe Basin and surrounding land, one of the ways of distinguishing Wá·šiw People, especially from the tribes surrounding us in Nevada and California, is our language. Our language is isolate or what they call geographically isolate, which means Wá·šiw language cannot be placed in origin of anywhere else. That is why we know we as our people have always been from this place and did not come from somewhere else. Most

of the other tribal languages, you can trace it back to an origin or someplace else other than where they originally were. We know not just through our own history, but the documented history, as Wá·šiw People, we were not moved around as much as the majority of tribes. Most tribes in their local areas were pushed to their local areas. It is a little bit the same for us. We were not pushed that far. We were pushed out of the Tahoe Basin into the areas mostly in Nevada, California, Alpine County, Douglas County, Washoe County, and surrounding areas. Something I figured I would mention is Washoe County itself is named Washoe County because of the Wá·šiw People. It was the Wá·šiw People's territory. I spoke with other Assembly people from the State of Nevada who never made that connection before. They assumed it was a name thrown out there.

We have our creation story, again, since the beginning of time is what we believe. But also, through archaeology, we can place Wá·šiw People in the Tahoe Basin at least 12,000 years. A little fun fact is where did the name Tahoe come from? Tahoe itself is a mispronunciation of our Wá·šiw word, which is dáʔaw which means lake. There was a mispronunciation, so it is called Tahoe. To call it "Lake Tahoe" is calling it "Lake Lake." Again, the Tahoe Basin is the center of our homelands, cosmology, epistemology; to break it down in simpler terms, it is the heart of our existence.

Impacts on Wá·šiw lands and people when the destruction, degradation of place, logging, mining, overfishing, pollution, tourism—I will come back to that one—the forceful removal of Wá·šiw Peoples. From different organizations in the past, something we have been trying to clear up is the Wá·šiw People did not just leave these lands. We were forced off these lands. It was not our choice. It was move or death—the genocide. Also, the target placed on Wá·šiw People's backs, especially in the Tahoe Basin. A lot of history that is not shared too much is Wá·šiw scalps were paid \$5 apiece in Nevada City. That is a newspaper article that is documented in history.

We also do have interest in the aquatic invasive species issues, NZ mud snails, but details are needed for more monitoring, stricter requirements, and enforcements. We believe we can do better.

This is a quick overview of our Washoe Environmental Protection. Some projects we have, the largest being the Maʔyála Wàʔa Restoration Project, is the 300-acre meadow which has been encroached by conifers, reducing available waters to culturally significant plants. That is the area the Meeks Meadow Restoration Act. Maʔyála Wàʔa is the original place name the tribe has always called that area. Very big on the reintroduction of the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout. Putting the natural species back into the Lake, as well as aquatic invasive species monitoring and abatement. A couple of things that are not on this list that we have recently been involved in are getting individuals scuba certifications to pick out the trash that is within the Lake. Something that is not fully talked about, as I was going over this with my teams, is there can be—and is—a worry about the trash that is inside the water sitting at the bottom of the Lake. Depending on some federal laws, after X amount of years that trash becomes an artifact and cannot be touched. Basically, it is going to have to stay there. That is an issue that needs to be brought up about clearing up the bottom of the Lake. We were joking talking about these old boom boxes are going to be artifacts at the bottom of the Lake, but it could be a reality—we need to think about. We have also implemented the creation of conservation crews and teams within the Tribe that we are still building to not only work on the political side of promoting healthy forests, but actually getting our people and our tribal members back out doing the work to promote original stewardships as the way our people always have within all these mountains.

This is going off things that we have been doing. Establishing and updating MOUs with Tahoe agencies. Some of this has taken a long time. It took 20 years to establish a stewardship agreement with the LTBMU (Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit), U.S. Forest Service, a co-stewardship at Meeks Meadow; that took 20 years of the tribe pushing to get that actually formalized. Updating the TRPA MOU allowed the tribe to have more inclusion and involvement in decision making in our ancestral lands. There are over 80 environmental agencies in the Tahoe Basin but only one Wá·šiw Tribe. TRPA limited capacity, but we still work to contribute with all these organizations as well. The work of the Tahoe Basin is maybe one-eighth of the stewardship work that we do in our ancestral lands. We are going to talk about formalizing—this is highlighted—on this is article and this is from July 27, 1997, from President Clinton. It is Memorandum of Agreement 2-201. The partnerships shall negotiate a Memorandum of Agreement with the States of California and Nevada, the Washoe Tribal Government, the TRPA, and interested local governments. We have not been doing that in all these years since 1997. Until recently, within the past few years. I cannot point the finger and say anybody specifically is to blame for that. Since I have been the Chairman of the Washoe Tribe, I have been pushing hard to make sure the Washoe Tribe is included in everything that happens in and around the Lake, especially regarding when were supposed to be formally put into these areas. A note I do want to make, something I have been doing is when decisions are made, policies or things like that, to specifically include tribal governments in there—Washoe Tribe—as well because this has actually been through a federal court. Anything that states that an organization needs to work with federal, state, and local agencies or governments, is specifically to not include tribes. We are not included under that realm. We have to have tribes specifically stated in these policies that are created.

This is a basic summary. My team helped put this together for me. It is simple because I did not know how deep we wanted to go in this meeting, and I did not want to drag it out for everybody. We could talk about this all day long. Some of the main things are the intentional fire and cultural burning. That area specifically is what I talk about the creation of our conservation crews. One thing we are doing is reimplementing how Wá·šiw People used to use fire in and around the whole entire Tahoe Basin that has been proven by not only our history, written history, and archaeology within the grounds; and the geology of the ground knowing that fires were created intentionally. There is more to it than just lighting fires. There is a specific reason for that to happen at a certain time. That is what we are trying to reintroduce into the areas. We are not the only ones. There are so many tribes throughout the Sierras that are doing the same thing. We work with them hand-in-hand in order to reimplement these. The fires that happened recently on this side, specifically, the Tamarack Fire that came through and caused the evacuation. It shows that we have needed this for a long time, and what we have been doing the past 50 years or so was not working. We thought it was but as soon as it lit, it took off.

Personhood for the Lake. That is something that we as the Washoe Tribe are moving towards. There has been some movement in this from other tribes around the surrounding areas, especially in California. But the idea behind this is that is how much this water means to us. This water is life for us. It has kept our people alive. And so, the protections of it need to be increased. Personhood would, for our people, through our laws, make it that if the Lake is harmed, we would be able to hold those people accountable as if they harmed an individual of our people. That is how much it means to us. We are a Sovereign Nation and should be treated as such. I think there is a lack of understanding that people have with tribes. As tribes in the areas, we are not shareholders like any other organization. We are the original peoples of these lands. We run our own governments and have our own laws.

A couple of basic things in here is, the time to elevate and incorporate the voice of the Washoe Tribe, which is what we have been doing over the last few years and trying to be more involved. I cannot speak for anything that happened in the past. Maybe there was a lack of involvement from predecessors of mine or leadership within the Washoe Tribe. I am going to make sure we are here and being a part of this because this is our lands that we will always care for no matter what is in place or no matter who else comes around.

Now, the tourism issue. The Washoe Tribe—we have to balance tourism for us. We cannot say we are against tourism and do not want anybody to come into the Lake. Some people will say that though. Some say there are way too many people. We do believe there is some over tourism. But again, we are not against tourism. We do have tourism up here. We as the Washoe Tribe run the Meeks Bay Resort on the California side. We have been running it for the past 24 years and are very grateful and thankful that we have been selected to run it again and operate it for another 20 years. We weigh the balance. We have businesses to make money here up at the Lake and in the Basin. But at the same time, money is not everything to us as well. There needs to be a limit and a cap and that it would include thinking outside the box. I know we talked a lot about transportation today. That is a huge part of it. But what is the true capacity? What is the capacity of boating? How many boats on the Lake are going to create such an issue that we are not fully monitoring that? With the new snails or other aquatic invasive species that have recently popped up within the past year, proved that. Again, it is not to say we are doing bad, it is to say what we have been doing needs to be better because it is not fully working.

The big thing we are pushing within the Washoe Tribe is that it [the Lake] needs a break. I think that was proven through the Coronavirus Disease of 2019 (COVID-19). When COVID-19 was hitting, everything was shutting down, which included a lot of access to more tourist areas. But then at the same time increase because of outdoor recreation. A lot of the areas that were shut down, you could see the difference in not even a year of not allowing boats on there, not allowing as many people in the water. Let me use Pyramid Lake as a huge example. That little bit of time they shut down the whole entire Lake to recreation, it added so much clarity to it as well as the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout. They have a fish hatchery, but at the same time, the trout flourished on their own because they were not messed with for that little bit of time. Something we bring up is that the Lake needs a break. It needs some kind of break. Something regarding the Washoe Tribe and organizations, is we have not always been in agreement with everything that goes on out here. We are not in agreement with access for all. Again, that is the balance that we look at. We do not want more people to come in just because. There needs to be a balance somewhere. We do not have all the answers, but that is how we feel.

This was more focused directly about the Lake and our involvement with the organizations around the Tahoe Basin. A little more information about the Washoe Tribe. We operate in multiple counties; we have three different colonies in Nevada, one in California. We have land interest as well as co-stewardships and management across all the counties surrounding the Lake and some even outside of that in California. Most of our businesses are mainly in Douglas County. We are the second largest employer in the Carson Valley. We as a Washoe Tribe, run a TANF program which is Temporary Assistance for Needy Families. We run the Tribal TANF; only one in the State of Nevada. We control the Bay Area offices in California. We have offices as far as San Francisco. I have an office in San Francisco, Oakland, Stockton, San Jose, and Grass Valley. That is a quick rundown of the Washoe Tribe. A lot of these things can be broken down. A lot of the things I mentioned as far as our projects or opinions on things that are happening in and around the Lake can be broken down and given a lot more detail. We do have presentations from tribal members and some of our tribal teams that extend a few hours long. We can get everybody together

to listen to that presentation. That would be great, and we are open for it. That is all I have. Are there any questions?

Chair Daly:

Are there any questions from anybody? Not seeing any. We did want to make sure we included the Washoe Tribe as part of this Committee. I am not sure we have time for a two-hour presentation, but maybe we can do something in the future. We appreciate your input today, and we look forward to making sure you are involved.

AGENDA ITEM VII—PRESENTATION REGARDING THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY’S TRANSPORTATION ROLE AND REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Chair Daly:

We will move on to Item VII, which is a presentation regarding the TRPA's transportation role and *Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)* update. Proceed when you are ready.

Julie Regan, Executive Director, TRPA:

Thank you, Chair Daly, Members of the Committee, staff, and the public. Welcome to the TRPA offices and to Lake Tahoe. I am pleased to be here with you. To my left is Devin Middlebrook, TRPA’s Government Affairs Manager. He will be helping me with the slides. I want to recognize Shelly Aldean who is on our Governing Board, Alexis Hill who is in the room as well, and you saw Director James Settlemeyer earlier, so several of our Board Members are with you as well. It is such an honor for me to follow Chairman Smokey and we are honored to work with him and his staff on many Tahoe issues and to do better of that moving forward here in their homelands. (Agenda Item VII)

I do have important slides to go through on transportation. It is such an important topic as judged by the comments that you heard here in front of you. As was stated earlier, transportation is important for many reasons, in all communities, but here it connects to our crystal-clear blue Lake. What happens on land affects the water clarity of the Lake, and the roadway networks are very much tied to water quality. I want to say on the record because of the public comment we heard as well, we do all share this love for Lake Tahoe. I moved to Tahoe 30 years ago. It is in my heart and soul just as everyone that works in this building and on our Board. We have that common ground with folks that have concerns about the Lake. We look forward to working through with your leadership of this Committee and with many of our partners to find solutions to the big challenges we have.

Lake Tahoe’s stunning environment and outdoor recreational opportunities do support residential quality of life and attract millions of visitors each year, as you have heard. However, the lack of a fully connected transit system causes congestion at popular recreation sites, increasing vehicle impacts on our air and water quality, and disproportionately affecting underserved community members, as you heard in public testimony as well. We have a world class resort here at Lake Tahoe, but our transportation system is a relic of the past. Our roadway system was designed before TRPA's regional plan. It was in the era of an auto centric system. It is auto dominated. A highway rings our Lake. Back in the 1950s, there were plans for freeways. What is now the Tahoe Rim Trail was designed to be a freeway with on-ramps and off-ramps. This was to be a big city. Luckily that envisioned future never became a reality. Largely because the two states created the TRPA, and the communities came together to go forward with a different vision. The TRPA

and many partner agencies are working together to implement sustainable transportation solutions that efficiently serve the region while preserving Lake Tahoe's clarity and surrounding natural environment. Today, you will hear from me and other speakers about the Lake Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan, transit operations, infrastructure improvements, and how the region is addressing safety, congestion, and peak visitation periods.

Our transportation role is outlined in our Bi-State Compact. California and Nevada came together to pass the Compact. In 1969 it was signed; it was consented to by Congress and signed into law by then President Nixon. The original Bi-State Compact mandated TRPA develop a transportation plan for the region. The Bi-State Compact went one step further in managing transportation impacts with an update in 1980. The update mandated the Transportation Plan reduce dependency on the private automobile providing preference for transit, biking, walking. It prohibits us from expanding roadways so we cannot build our way out of this problem. Other communities can expand lanes and do intersection widening. That is not an option for us because of our statutory obligation under the Compact.

To further enable TRPA to implement the goals of the Compact, the federal government recognized TRPA as what is called a Metropolitan Planning Organization, or MPO, more than 25 years ago. This designation is typically reserved for regions with large populations of at least 50,000. We got a special exemption to count our full Basin-wide population to qualify for that—California and Nevada. In 2015, under the leadership of our delegation, including Senator Harry Reid, the federal government recognized Tahoe's visitor population slightly for transportation formula funding programs. This recognition has resulted in an increase of more than \$50 million in federal transportation funding since 2015. As we heard about the costs of these projects, it is not nearly enough, but it was a good start.

We talked a little bit about hierarchy in our meeting last month. With the understanding of TRPA's role in transportation, I wanted to walk you now through the hierarchy of how we approach transportation at Lake Tahoe. At the top is the Compact which you just heard about. Our goal is to harmonize all of these various elements. Next, we implement the Bi-State Compact's transportation mandate through our *RTP*. The *RTP* is a 25-year vision for the system to reduce that dependency on the private auto and create more walkable, bikeable, transit-oriented town centers. We have about a \$3.5 billion *RTP* that looks over these 25 years. A billion of that are projects that we do not have the funding for in the foreseeable future. Things like a water-based ferry system and water taxis. That is in our plan, but we do not have the money to implement it. If you drill down from there, \$2.5 billion is what we are doing now. We have a \$100 million program of work every year for transportation. For small little Lake Tahoe, \$100 million going into transportation is a big accomplishment. But again, it is not enough for the overall need. We have about a \$2.5 billion overall over 25 years.

To implement the priority projects in what we call the *RTP*, partners in Tahoe have created an action plan. We have got the big \$2.5 billion and then we have a smaller subset of more near term priorities and that is what we call the action plan. There is a share funding strategy. We play a supporting role along with all the implementers of transportation, which are many. The Compact makes us, TRPA, accountable for achieving our environmental standards and thresholds. But we have to rely on our partners to implement the projects to achieve those goals. The partnership truly is at the core of how collaboration at Tahoe works. As you hear from other speakers today, we will talk more about the who does what of transportation. I am going to try to walk you through briefly. We also monitor project implementation and transparently report progress to the public through our Lake Tahoe information website, laketahoeinfo.org. We manage this transportation system adaptively,

and we update it every few years. We are launching an update of this plan this year and our Governing Board will act on that next year.

Data is at the heart of this planning process and is in all things Tahoe. It is important to understand that data drives the decisions that are made. Let us look at who is using this transportation system at Tahoe. We have the unique challenge of planning for three types of transportation trips. We have got regional entry and exit trips. Highway 50 is a federal highway. It goes from Sacramento all the way to Ocean City, Maryland—near where I grew up. That is a federal highway. People come and go, and commerce happens between areas. That is about 11 percent of our total trips. Then we have got recreation trips taken by both residents and visitors, which are almost 40 percent of the region's trips. That is the middle part of that graphic. Then trips from work, school, and shopping account for another half of all trips in the region. While resident trips make up about half of the region's overall trips, we recognize that visitors do represent more vehicles and are concentrated in different areas and at different times of the year. I think that is some of the frustration you have been hearing from the community about these peak congestion times on our public lands. Different trips require different transportation strategies that we have to work in tandem with each other. For example, we want to connect visitors to recreation sites, and we cannot forget about the elderly person needing to visit the doctor, go to get medicine while there is a traffic jam. We must create a system that can efficiently serve vastly different transportation needs. That is a challenge in our resort town.

Next, let us talk about traffic volumes. The graph on this slide shows overall winter traffic volumes near the California Nevada State Line here in the South Lake Tahoe area. On the vertical axis of the chart is the total trip volume with years across the bottom X axis. The stats show traffic volumes peaking in the 1980s. This decrease in traffic volumes at this location over time, as you see in the graph, is an indicator of how traffic patterns have shifted from where people used to be in the casino core and park in a casino parking lot. Now, outdoor recreation is through the roof, and people are not congregating in those developed areas as they once were. They are dispersing through our public lands, our beaches, and all the beautiful amenities Lake Tahoe has to offer, and that drives some congestion. This shift in travel patterns is visible when we look at travel times and recreation hotspots.

The bar chart on this slide shows travel times in the region. The chart shows travel time in minutes on the Y up axis and years along the bottom. Since 2015, travel times in the region have been relatively flat and unchanged. The biggest impacts on travel times are from construction and from winter weather. We all know we have two seasons in Tahoe. We have winter and construction. We have a very short window to do roadway improvements and our communities find that difficult to manage, including myself, but we have to do it. We know residents and visitors experience congestion at peak times and at these recreation hotspots. The map on this slide, to the right, shows where people are recreating during the summer. It is a little light there but basically people are recreating across the region and often in areas that lack transportation infrastructure, ample parking, transit, and waste management facilities such as trash cans and other necessary infrastructure items.

We talked a bit about evacuation in the last meeting and you have heard some public comment around that today. I do want to note TRPA is involved in evacuation planning with our partners. Public safety and proper evacuation planning is so important to TRPA, our staff, our Board. It is the responsibility of our first responders, our law enforcement, our fire community members. Our transportation system is a key consideration in evacuation planning. We play a support role for these public safety organizations where needed. There are a lot of exciting movements around the Basin. I know you will hear about that in a

future meeting of what is being done to unify evacuation plans for the whole region. There is exciting work ahead. We will be covering that in this update of our *RTP* this year into next.

The basic understanding of how Tahoe's transportation system is being used, informs our planning. This overarching plan and vision for the region is what we call the *RTP*. We are updating that currently. We are trying to get a system that is interconnected. Right now, unfortunately, as much progress as we are making, if you wanted to get on a bus to go to Incline Village or Tahoe City, that is not possible today. We need to connect these different systems and tie the system together. Tahoe's transportation plans and all of our programs are developed with extensive community input. In the last three years our transportation team at TRPA has engaged more than 9,700 people including roughly 400 primarily Spanish-speaking residents. We also collected more than 6,000 survey responses that informed our equity and safety planning. We won an equity award for a transportation study that we did earlier this year, the Rosa Parks Award. TRPA is beginning this update, as I mentioned, and we want to inform you as we go along and keep connected to the community as part of that.

Transportation funding is complicated and is made more complicated by our multiple jurisdictions within the Tahoe watershed. Funding comes from a variety of sources from federal, state, local, and the private sector which has always a key strength of Tahoe's overall partnership—in that it is public and private. Much of this funding, however, comes from discretionary grants making proper planning collaboration critical to securing the funding needed to implement our priority projects. We often do not compete well because we are small—we are considered rural. I always say we are a small town on the weekdays and a big city on the weekends because of that influx. The grant system at the federal level is often not geared to that. Sustainable, ongoing funding remains one of the biggest challenges to transform our aging infrastructure and to meet the needs of today.

The most *RTP* our Board adopted in 2021, identified a funding gap of about \$20 million per year to implement the plan. We have a strategy of how to fill that hole. To fund this gap, our partners came together with both states leading the way through a Bi-State consultation process on transportation. This resulted in two key outcomes. First, that action plan I mentioned, is the cover and the slide. We identified regionally significant priority transportation projects across the area. Second, it developed a shared funding framework to find solutions for that \$20 million a year. We call that the 7-7-7 Plan. If each share: the federal, the two states, and the local private shares, could come up with \$7 million additional monies a year, we could hit the number. Like all things in Tahoe, partnerships are key. The partnership agreed to this shared funding strategy. We have a lot of progress to report to you on that.

Under that strategy, we are looking for \$7 million. For the State of Nevada's perspective, that reflects about \$2.5 million. California would be \$4.5 million and Nevada \$2.5 million; that is the two-third, one-third ratio that is typical for our Compact. I am happy to report that under this new funding strategy, all sectors have stepped up to the plate and have exceeded our goal for year one of the funding target. The State of Nevada's portion came from the project funding of Nevada's Department of Transportation (NDOT), micro transit funding, through the Legislature. This project and this process has been very challenging but was greeted with a lot of enthusiasm because we know our success in Tahoe, through the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP), is the partnership approach with each sector doing its share.

While funding is an important milestone, the more important outcome to measure is the positive impact these projects can have on our environment and on Tahoe's communities. This map is a rough idea of the very big regional projects in our action plan. It is important to note that TRPA does not implement transportation projects and the Bi-State Compact makes us accountable for these projects. Again, we are attached at the hip with our partners, and it is collaboration that gets the job done.

I want to take a minute to illustrate how this works with two priority projects in Nevada. First, State Route 28. It is winter and we just had a blizzard, so we did not get to wrap you around the East Shore earlier today, but we did get to go a little bit on Highway 50. You all are familiar with the gorgeous nature of the East Shore. This Corridor is home to several beautiful parks—Nevada State Parks—with Sand Harbor State Park being one of the two most visited State Parks in Nevada; next to the Valley of Fire State Park. The goal along this Corridor is to enhance safety by removing roadside parking, enhance equitable access through trails and transit, and reduce congestion by constructing new parking lots and parking ride facilities. We are making progress, but you can see from this slide, the various colors are different segments. We have many partners, the U.S. Forest Service, who you heard from earlier today; the Tahoe Fund; the private community; the States. We also are building an invasive species inspection station, to speak to Chairman Smokey's point earlier—we will be doing that at the top of Spooner Summit.

I will roll through a quick recap of transit because you are going to hear from the TTD next, and you have already heard a good bit about transit and transit operations. The bottom line is the money to operate it. I appreciate the Chair and the Committee's attention to the need for transportation funding in particular with transit. I want to go back to Senator Scheibel's comment about who is riding this. We know from the research and data that roughly 40 percent of the people riding that Lake Link shuttle are going to work—and they are local. Not only is it easing some pressure on the visitor congestion, but it is also serving people going to work. We need to expand it, and make it permanent because some of these funds were one time. You will hear more about that.

Monitoring and transparency, you have had some public comment about that last time and today. I wanted to alert you to an incredible resource called laketahoeinfo.org. Our team, through a lot of grant support under the EIP, set this up. Every project that is in that \$2.9 billion EIP is online. You can click and look at what projects are going to water quality. Over a billion dollars has been invested in water quality since the first Presidential Summit of 1997. You can look and see where that money has been spent, what partners are putting in; Nevada has supported this extensively through bond sales. All of the projects in transportation generally have a water quality benefit as well. I encourage you to poke around laketahoeinfo.org.

Let us talk about the work of the interim Committee that rolled into the 2023 Session in supporting Tahoe and securing resources for transportation. Sponsored as a bill draft request from the Committee, the Legislature adopted Assembly Concurrent Resolution 5, a resolution endorsing the Transportation Action Plan, I mentioned before, and the 7-7-7 strategy. The Committee helped secure the State's portion of transportation funding through \$5 million in Environmental Improvement Program bonds, general fund support for the TTD—which we greatly appreciate—and micro transit funding through Senate Bill 341. I also would love to recognize the Governor's Office for supporting these crucial funding measures and for TRPA's Governing Board for their leadership and advocating for transportation dollars as an important VMT policy hinges on our collective success. That is being discussed at our Board meeting this month—in this very room—at the end of March.

As this Committee moves through the interim session, I want to highlight three areas of discussion for all of you. First, how can this Committee help secure the State's \$2.5 million annual commitment to transportation funding? As I said, we are off to a great start, but we have more than 20 years to go on our plan. Second, how can this Committee enable local jurisdictions to develop self-help funding mechanisms for transportation? Third, how can the Committee support cross jurisdictional enforcement strategies and tools? We heard a lot of great discussion in the last couple of presenters and there are fantastic ideas on the table. I wanted this Committee to know, again, we stand at the ready to work with you collaboratively and with our community to solve these tough problems. Thank you for all you are doing for the Lake. I am happy to answer any questions.

Chair Daly:

Any questions from the Committee? Nobody.

I want to understand—and I know we are going to have the TTD next. On the funding from the State, the \$2.5 million to get the one part of the 7. That has to be done every two years when we are in Session, I am assuming. Obviously there needs to be some—we cannot do it from here—resolution or something that supports that or whatever it might be. Does that have to be done every two years?

Ms. Regan:

Yes. We want to see that ongoing commitment. Typically, the State sells bonds for the EIP every two years as part of the budget process. That goes everywhere from watershed restoration at Third Creek and Incline Village to forest health. To continue to support that through transportation would be a great opportunity for this Committee and the State.

Chair Daly:

So, the EIP money is separate?

Ms. Regan:

It is part of it. Historically, as you heard last month from Charlie Donahue when he presented, there are a host of projects the State has supported over the 27 years of the EIP. Only more recently have we—transportation has always been a part of what we call the EIP. But these new emerging needs have made it more focused to have some of those dollars support transit shuttles, the mobility hub at the top of Spooner, for the various parking lots, and the rides we hope to have from the top of Spooner to Sand Harbor, and shuttles back and forth. We are still building that whole Corridor plan out. There are some critical components the \$2.5 million would support.

Chair Daly:

How often do you have to go back for the federal money or is that annual?

Ms. Regan:

That that is annual. We have got appropriations requests that several Tahoe folks are going to go to Washington next week. Wrapped up in the budget are a couple of key projects. One for the 28 Corridor that would support that. There are other programs and grants that our TTD, our other partners, NDOT, the counties are working on, and we help support and collaborate. I think Devin Middlebrook might want to jump in there.

Devin Middlebrook, Government Affairs Manager, TRPA:

Yes, that is correct. The federal government, we typically go back every year. In the appropriations bill that is working through final approvals in Congress right now, there is an additional \$5 million in community project funding for State Route 28. That would meet part of the next year's round of the federal \$7 million; \$5 million of their \$7 million is counted in that. At the local level—what we are trying to do at all levels, but the local level has had real success—is creating these funding sources in a sustainable manner so we do not have to go back to every different funding partner every year or every two years to ask for funding. Creating more sustainable funding revenues that are ongoing so we can count on that money in future years without having to get discretionary funding every year.

Chair Daly:

I was trying to get the visitor authorities to help out. California has to the same thing every year?

Mr. Middlebrook:

Correct. We do go back to California every year. We are working on a proposal for a more sustainable funding source in California. We are happy to update this Committee as those conversations continue with the state ,and maybe a good topic for a potential joint meeting with the California side.

Chair Daly:

On the local private funding net \$7 million, how does that work out? Who is the local private? How do you allocate that? Is it every community, unincorporated town, incorporated, South Lake Tahoe? Who is involved and counted as local, and with activities they may already be doing on intersection improvements, do they say, we already do that; we are going to count that towards our \$7 million or is the \$7 million above what they were already raising?

Ms. Regan:

The RTP has that price tag—the price tag of \$2.5 billion. That is what we call, in transportation lingo, constrained funds. Those are projects that are ongoing and have been accounted for. What the 7-7-7 \$20–21 million number is, is new money. It is new money that was not already accounted for in that RTP. It is a gap. We have an elaborate spreadsheet that we would be happy to share with this Committee that tracks all those contributions. We exceeded our goal. Our goal was \$20–21 million. We hit \$23 million for this FY. That is new money. The transportation investments in micros transit, we talked about earlier are counting from various private sources. We have local governments, and they are all different in how they work. Placer County, for example, you heard about a tourism business improvement district. They are putting many millions of dollars into the transportation system from that. The City of South Lake Tahoe is investing, Douglas County; all the local jurisdiction partners are contributing in different ways. We can get you an accounting of the spreadsheet so you can see for this first year who is putting in what shares. The challenge right now with the federal monies we have received is some of them are one-time funds. They are—in old terms—earmarks, congressionally designated funding, or project specifics. We are trying to get an ongoing source from the federal government. Our work is not done. There is a lot more work to do.

Chair Daly:

Understood. I wanted to have that understanding on the funding and where it is going and then you have your overall plan. When you said the TRPA cannot expand the roads, is that the controlling plan or document or does it control what TRPA does or can the City of South Lake Tahoe or NDOT or whoever else—because you said you do not build—does the money come in and go to a separate fund? I am asking two questions. Answer the first one about does that restriction control everybody or just TRPA?

Ms. Regan:

The Compact is our constitution. The Compact basically sets the parameters of what happens in Tahoe. It limits development, which is our proxy for a capacity. We only allow so many homes. Only about 100 homes a year, for example, get built around the Basin. We limit development and then we have that mandate to reduce dependency on the private auto. We have land constraints. The federal government owns 80 percent of the land—and the U.S. Forest Service. All of those partners have to adhere to the rules of the Compact, the Regional Plan, and that falls under our jurisdiction. But Caltrans (California Department of Transportation) and NDOT have their own highway parameters and we do it through partnership. For example, when the Round Hill Pines project—that we drove by—it is a very different new entrance. We had a lot of federal support for that from the federal highways. Their engineers first designed that with very large road cuts that they might have done in Denver or in another place. Our team worked collaboratively with NDOT and said we have to change this design. That is not how we do projects here. We have experienced that a few times because we are unique. That is why education and conversation is so critical. Our staff does that every day on projects from small to large.

Mr. Middlebrook:

To the second part of your question about all that money, where does it go? Who is touching it? Not all of that \$2.x billion for the overall program—about \$100 million a year—not all of that comes through our Agency. Much of that money is spent directly by the implementer; NDOT on the Nevada side, Caltrans on the California side, and the local jurisdictions. Much of that overall money is directly applied to/earned by those local jurisdictions and implemented. At the TRPA, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization, we do receive a base budget based on that formula funding population from the federal government. Part of that base—a portion of the money is spent on our planning activities, creating our regional transportation plan, coordinating with all of our state, federal, tribal, local, nonprofit partners. Part of that funding we received, we then pass through to local jurisdictions to implement. Every two years, we have a regional grant program. I believe last year we awarded funding to 11 different projects across the region that we passed that funding through to. Some of that money never touches TRPA, some of it comes to us and we spend on planning activities, and some of it comes to us and we pass through to our implementing agencies.

Chair Daly:

The \$7 million you get from the federal government goes to different agencies or goes to you? Same thing with the money the State allocates. Does it go through you, or does it say we are going to put this to transportation, and it helps fund part of a project for NDOT or—

Ms. Regan:

Our Board functions as the TRPA Governing Board, but when we have matters to pass these monies through to projects, they have to physically adjourn as TRPA and reconvene as the MPO and the U.S. Forest Service joins us for that. The MPO Board is essentially our Board plus the Forest Service and then they take actions. They review, public documents are vetted—we had some actions last week at our Board meeting where those dollars are passed to projects. It depends on what the project is. You will hear from the TTD. We pass millions of dollars through the federal system in that capacity as the MPO. All of that is public and vetted; then those monies go to the projects which we overall organize in that RTP. Any project cannot just get dollars. It has to be in that RTP. Then there is something called the Federal TIP, the Transportation Improvement Program—I am sure you have all heard this in other briefings—it is the plan that all rolls up in our role as the MPO and then we pass many of those dollars to the implementing partners. Those grants are on top of that—Devin Middlebrook previously mentioned—to support additional projects.

Chair Daly:

I think I got it. Any other questions? Senator Scheible.

Senator Scheible:

I am wondering if you have a lot of data on the use of rideshare apps within the Tahoe Basin, especially on the North Shore. You are nodding your head so I will let you go ahead and answer.

Ms. Regan:

I will start and perhaps Devin Middlebrook could answer. For some years we did not have the presence of Uber or other rideshare services in the Basin. It has been spotty. We do have them. Crossing state lines has been complicated for those companies. There are not a lot of local drivers—there are some. If you were to check right now on your phone, you might have an hour-ish wait to get a driver from Reno to come pick you up. Devin may have more data on that.

Mr. Middlebrook:

Ms. Regan is correct; we do not have a lot of the Uber riders. We do have some data. On a typical day there are three or four Uber rides available in town. It is not a significant portion of our ride use in the Basin.

Senator Scheible:

It was about 9,000 people who you reached in your survey. But they were mostly local, right? I am wondering about the semi-local people. Because that is where a lot of us come from. People who live in Carson and Reno; this is purely anecdotal. Can you tell me whether I am an outlier in this or whether you have heard this in surveys and whatnot, a lot of people drive to their Tahoe destination because they are concerned the bus will stop running, or they will not be able to get an Uber; there is this insecurity of transportation? It is not necessarily a lack because there is, in fact, great bus service. Well, there is a two-and-a-half-hour bus service from Carson to where we are right now. But it is more the concern that they stop running at 11 p.m. and there is no Uber, just in case.

Ms. Regan:

You have hit it. I think a big barrier to more usage on transit is the fear of, is the bus going to be reliable? Will it pick me up? If I get there some other way, how will I get home? We have some exciting new programs with vanship and carpool. With vanship systems for employers that come from Reno and the Carson Valley, there is a guaranteed ride home provision. We have an ordinance that affects employers of a certain size; it is a Commute Tahoe Program. We here have a guaranteed ride home; if our staff come by bike or carpool and something happens, and they have to take their child to the doctor. We will make sure we have a TRPA vehicle or a guaranteed ride home. A lot of our employers in town are doing that. But you have hit on a key point. The connections to the Valley and to Reno must be strengthened. We have to do better there, and that is a funding question. The other part of your question was on the numbers. Where do we talk to people? Where do we go over to Reno? We do intercept surveys at the beaches. We do have a lot of folks that are coming from Reno, from the Carson City area. We have done focus groups in Northern Nevada to make sure we are not just talking to people that live in Tahoe, but that we are getting the contiguous counties on the California side as well; Placerville, the gateway communities that come into the Basin. Historically we have incorporated feedback from those important constituencies as well.

Senator Scheible:

I have one more question. Are you seeing or hearing, what I am guessing is happening, that people who come from these neighboring communities—Reno, Carson, Minden, Gardnerville—even if they could drive, say, to Zephyr Cove, and there would be great micro transit in between, and they could get down to the concert they want to go to here at Stateline or the gondola ride they want to take their mother-in-law on, but they do not do it. By the time you have already driven from Carson City to Zephyr Cove, everyone thinks, I might as well drive all the way to Stateline and not bother parking here and taking micro transit in that smaller area.

Ms. Regan:

Satellite parking out of the Basin is definitely needed. We, as a Basin community, have been talking about that for years. On the I-80 Corridor coming up before Truckee or in Truckee, Mount Rose in the Reno area, Carson, hopefully we can even engage with the tribe in connecting with them in future partnerships. Because if we make it easy for people to leave their cars, and we have shuttles that people can put their bikes on and bring their coolers—there are buses now that accommodate gear and all the things families need when they come to the Lake. That will not work for everyone. Clearly, some people want to have their car. But if we can smooth out the edges with other options and have a park once and come up and enjoy the Lake and invest in the trails—we have built, as a partnership, 200 miles of trails in the last 15 years. It is incredible, but we have so much more to do. That is definitely part of the solution, and it is something we have been talking about with our partners.

Chair Daly:

Before we go to Senator Titus, we are going to go to Assemblywoman Taylor.

Assemblywoman Taylor:

I have a couple of questions. One, you alluded to funding progress of the 7-7-7 strategy overachieving this year—congratulations on that—what do you do with the extra money? The extra \$2 million?

Mr. Middlebrook:

That money is going into projects. That money is going forward and continuing our goal of \$20 million each year in future years. It is bonus money we are excited about putting into projects. We are not necessarily carrying that forward and calling it good for the next year, we want to have each year be it is own fundraising goal.

Assemblywoman Taylor:

So, you do not say, next year we only need \$19 million? They are one-time projects you use that money for.

Ms. Regan:

That is right. On balance, from year to year, we always knew going into this it would ebb and flow. Costs of transportation projects change. Right now, bids are coming in 50 percent bigger than we thought a year or two ago. That is happening statewide. There is a little flexibility. These are targets, these are goals. Some years we might exceed and some years we might fall short, but on balance over 20 to 25 years, we want to collectively raise more than \$400 million for transportation. The money will go into projects because projects will go over budget—we expect in the coming years. Some projects we thought we had fully funded now are short—as we heard in part of our tour right down the road here at Stateline on Kahle Drive, for example.

Assemblywoman Taylor:

Thank you. I was wondering what that surplus would do and how that might help. Regarding the Lake Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan public engagement, first of all, I commend you for making that opportunity for the Spanish-speaking residents to participate. It is easy, sometimes, to leave that group behind. So, thank you. Can you give us an idea or number—if you have one—of the residents there? About what percentage of your residents are Spanish-speaking? More specifically, what percentage use the transportation you have now?

Mr. Middlebrook:

Basin-wide our Hispanic population varies depending on which community you are in. It usually is around 20 to 30 percent Hispanic. I do not know off the top of my head; I can follow up with you on what percentage of those folks are primarily Spanish-speaking. Eight percent of that population is primarily Spanish-speaking. TRPA and our staff recently completed a transportation equity study. One of the challenges we have seen in transportation equity is the rural regions are often left out of definitions of what is considered disadvantage. We have good air quality up here, so we do not have that impact. We have looked and went into our community and designated our own level of what we are considering our underserved or priority community zones. Those zones are where people are underserved, minority populations, populations without access to a car. We have identified five specific areas around the region that we are calling our Community Priority

Zones. We are adopting policies to ensure a fair share distribution of transportation funding serves those specific communities.

Assemblywoman Taylor:

I certainly understand your community is by design, so it is a little different. Whatever information you have as you collect it would be great. That is more of a curiosity thing for me. I do want to applaud your efforts to make sure you include that segment of your population.

Senator Titus:

I know we are going to hear from the TTD, which is talking about transportation. We are going to hear from NDOT, which is talking about conditions of the roads. Either of them, or if they are not, would you address the actual parking issues and the thoughts about smart parking? For example, if you come from Smith Valley and come up here skiing or come up here in the summertime, if we had an app—I have an app and there are other areas—where you can reserve a parking spot at a certain time and pay for it at that time—smart parking. Who is addressing that? Along that same line of questioning, the concerns I have heard from citizens is the infrastructure, the Wi-Fi systems, and all of those limited capabilities this Basin has already has limited services to begin with, with cell towers being needed, a push back from that, and the impact as you expand on smart parking ideas—which I do think work. But along with those come other issues with infrastructure. Whose niche is that?

Ms. Regan:

It is a partnership. A couple of things in the question related to apps and the cell service; many partners are trying to innovate around the modern day needs for Tahoe, not only from smart apps for parking—we call that Intelligent Transportation Systems, ITS—but also evacuation, fire, and emergencies for cell towers. The Tahoe Basin Prosperity Center has been working on some of that and have had federal grants to look at broadband. There is a Dig Once Policy; NDOT has been an incredible partner trying to lay fiber and do all those utilities at once to help support increased coverage. We all know the dead spots—when you are going over Spooner you are like, I will call you right back—we have these dead spots in our community, and we are working at that. There is a program called Park Tahoe. I think Carl Hasty from the TTD can tell you about that. The challenge though, which you are picking up on immediately, is the distinct jurisdictions around transportation and parking. Placer County right now has an incredible new parking strategy they are rolling out. For the first time in the Basin's history, they may do a pilot in Kings Beach, that has residential permits for parking because there is such a mass of parking in the residential neighborhoods. People in Tahoe, locals, hate paying for parking, and they are not interested in having a permit to park in front of their home. This is a big challenge with the community. But we know we have to do more. The Tahoe Fund, Amy Berry, gave an update on this parking enforcement strategy. The enforcement of parking on the roads is also disparate or balkanized in terms of different law enforcement fines. The fine for Nevada is now over \$300, which is amazing; a few years back, it might have only been \$50. At Emerald Bay it is still very low. We are trying to unify—what is the enforcement—but people need other ways to get there if we cannot have them park there, we need more shuttles to get people to experience those without having to park on the road. We are working on it.

Mr. Middlebrook:

In terms of the different roles, TRPA, and our role in creating the RTP, that plan does include policies around parking. We use that plan and those policies to help coordinate

across the region. As Julie mentioned in her presentation, we do not implement, we do not own parking lots, so we work with partners. On the East Shore and near Incline Village, going to Sand Harbor, the TTD, who you will hear from next, owns and operates that trailhead parking lot. They do have paid parking there that is dynamically priced, so you pay more to park on July 4th weekend than you do September 12th. We also work with all of our other partners, the U.S. Forest Service, Nevada State Parks, on all that. Our role is that coordination, as Julie said, to make sure it is consistent and then support the local partners in implementing it. It is complicated. For example, in the City of South Lake Tahoe in 2016, the voters, through a citizens' initiative, banned paid parking except near the casino area. Varying different communities have varying degrees of acceptance around that idea, but it is something that is continuing to be an important policy for us.

Senator Titus:

Along that line, part of my question was infrastructure, communication, and broadband services. Are there any ordinances that mandate when a road is worked on, they have to put down fiber? If the road is open, it is an opportunity to put fiber in. Is anything like that going on up here?

Mr. Middlebrook:

Yes, there are Dig Once policies around the Lake. For example, NDOT is working on resurfacing on Spooner Summit U.S. 50 East as part of that—not to get ahead of them too much in their presentation—they are installing fiber and conduit all the way through there. We will be able to, hopefully, in the next few years connect to digital 395. I think that will open up the possibilities for broadband for us. But yes, correct. There are Dig Once policies in the Basin.

Chair Daly:

Which community did you say banned parking through an initiative?

Mr. Middlebrook:

The City of South Lake Tahoe on the California side.

Chair Daly:

Any other questions, Committee? Assemblyman Gray.

Assemblyman Gray:

Out of curiosity, what happens with the Heavenly parking lots in the summer months? I do not imagine they are used too heavily. It seems like they would be good hub spots for shuttling people to and from the beaches and stuff.

Mr. Middlebrook:

Absolutely. Most of the ski resort parking lots do sit empty in the summer. We know that is an opportunity for park and rides because we do not have to build a parking lot, they already exist. Conversations have been going on with Diamond Peak to potentially use their ski resort as additional parking for the shuttle to Sand Harbor. Heavenly is a great partner and is open to those conversations as well. I appreciate the idea; it is something we have looked at.

Chair Daly:

Seeing no further questions, we are going to let you guys go.

AGENDA ITEM VIII—UPDATE ON TAHOE TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT PLANS, ACTIVITIES, AND PRIORITIES

Chair Daly:

Moving on to Item VIII, update on the TTD plans, activities, and priorities.

Carl Hasty, District Manager, TTD:

Julie [Regan] spoke about the Compact. The TTD was added to the Compact in 1980. Article 9 of the Compact created TTD. As Julie has said, we are tied to the hip with TRPA. That is the way I look at it as well. One luxury we have is that we can focus exclusively on transportation whereas TRPA has got to fit that in. They have got their MPO authority under California and TRPA authority. They are making sure the planning is working as it needs to and the policies are there that are consistent with the land use objectives as well as the threshold objectives of the Lake. Organizations like TTD are here to help implement those policies and get things on the ground. Our authority is both within the Basin and inter-regionally. We have the authority to own and operate and connect Tahoe to essentially drive-up markets, if you will. That is part of what we are attempting to do.

We are looking at all the multimodal system components—to use jargon there—which is all modes: roadway, transit, parking, bicycle, pedestrian facilities. Communications is where what I would call support infrastructure is important in order to engage the folks and tools and apply these types of things—which can be of great benefit—and other related supporting infrastructure and services. Our aim here is to make—we have too many cars, let us get right to it. In our peak periods it overwhelms everything. That is not a pleasant experience for anybody. Julie had spoken to what direction does a compact provide us? To give you a little more specificity, it directs us to say that we are to deal with our congestion and our capacity issues through multimodal means, which is why we cannot, and are not, going to be widening highways. These other alternative strategies are the tools we have to deal with our congestion and capacity issues when it comes to the road network.

We play a broker role in a lot of ways. A lot of the solutions and some of those that you saw this morning are cross-ownership boundaries, they are cross-jurisdiction boundaries. This is where an organization like ours, as a regional entity, has a better picture and ability to do that. Whereas particular entity or ownership is usually confined to their property or their jurisdiction. A lot of what we do in the 28 Corridor is a good example of that. You saw some examples of that at Zephyr Cove today. It is about working with those adjacent property owners and the like. It is about getting solutions that will be more effective than if you are working within the confines of one's right-of-way, for example. That is a large part of what we do as a role and bring to the table to the many other organizations who are implementing part of the transportation picture: local jurisdictions, public works departments, the two state DOTs [Departments of Transportation]. It is TRPA and TTD together who have the responsibility of looking at the region as a whole when it comes to transportation.

A lot of what we are looking at doing is providing access to this recreation amenity. The Lake is a federally controlled reservoir. The U.S. Forest Service owns most of the land base with State Parks and some PUDs (Planned Unit Developments) and GIDs (General

Improvement Districts) owning a little bit more. That is the draw for folks coming here. Our drive-up market is essentially a part of this larger megapolitan region, which is the Bay area up to northwestern Nevada. That is where the bulk of our visitation comes from. We can see as many as 10 million vehicles in a year—on a busy year—in and out of the Basin. That, as I note, is our issue. I have got a population here that is larger than the Tahoe Basin because we are so interconnected with the town of Truckee. Looking at the 80 Corridor down to the 50 Corridor, we behave much the same way. Our visitation behaves much the same way. That economic tie with those communities—and we can have a visitation base up here. To me, it is almost like having the entire population, the Truckee Meadows, up here at the top of the Sierra recreating, having a good time during the summertime. Imagine trying to get around that many people on a largely two-lane highway system if were down in the Truckee Meadows—very, very difficult.

We have a Board of 14. We have two Governor appointments, and we have a State appointment from the TRPA Board on our Board, as well as all the local jurisdictions, the two TMAs (Transportation Management Associations), as you heard Mr. Teshara representing one of them today, and then an at-large transit operator. One change I failed to make is for El Dorado County. We have a new supervisor there, Brooke Laine. These are our current board members otherwise.

There is a different form of a map than what Julie [Regan] had in her presentation showing hotspots of where we have winter and summer activity travel patterns. It is during the peak periods. As I noted, with the number of cars—and as I think Julie mentioned—we could have over 15 million visitors in a year. About the only way you can get here is by a car. Even if you are flying into an airport, you are taking a car to get up here, unless you are able to get on some kind of shuttle service. That is usually out of the Reno. If you are coming from Sacramento, if you are coming in from San Francisco or Oakland, you are going to be in a car to get to Lake Tahoe.

As we talked about in our field trip this morning, congestion on roadways and parking lots makes it an unsafe issue here. For me, I have gotten to euphemistically term it, people get up here and they are on vacation brain. It is like the regular rules do not apply; so walking down a travel lane is not considered nearly as dangerous as if you are in downtown Reno. That is a difficult behavior to challenge. Our need is to make things safer. Providing relocation of parking off of roadways onto safe parking lots is important and all the other types of things we are dealing with here and have to anticipate, including fire and evacuation. When the Caldor Fire happened, TTD did provide, at the City's request, assistance and removing folks, particularly folks who did not have automobiles or anyone else to take them off the hill. We worked in partnership with the school district up here. Everyone was very responsive. We had a combination of TTD buses and school buses getting people off the hill who had no other way of getting off the hill. When it came to—and I learned a new term—repopulating the area after the fire was done, we brought them back from the shelter in Reno. Including the school buses there—which I was glad for because they have room for all the equipment underneath. Some folks came back with a whole lot of things that we were filling up the buses with otherwise, but it was important. We had to evacuate our facility because of that fire. We had to quickly scramble. We had a couple of days heads-up to find a location to relocate our operations. The school district near where we were, Whittell High School in Douglas County, has a bus barn where they keep their six buses. They were good enough to let us use their facility. They came up, got their buses, took them down the hill, and we set up our operations out of there. The first day of evacuation we were doing dispatch here in our office with two walkie-talkies all day because that is all there was. It worked and that was our part in getting it done. But it was also a good experience of getting to understand how that kind of situation works and how we can

improve that kind of situation in the future when it comes to emergency management. As I and Julie noted, widening the highways is not an option. That is due to extreme environmental sensitivity, high cost, and the lack of any alternative routes open during construction.

I will discuss the types of projects we have been working on. We have been investing time on the 28 Corridor for the last 15 years to start to get that trail—that first three miles. You spoke a little bit about parking and paid parking. Park Tahoe is one of our pilots with that trailhead, experimenting with paid parking, first of all, and introducing that in a recreation area, and then congestion pricing. Folks have been responsive to it. The other reason for doing this, besides behavior change, is to provide financing for maintenance. It is easy to find capital projects and tough to find operating dollars. We are looking at paid parking as a way to also help maintain the paid parking service as well as the trail. Right now, what we have learned out of that experience, is we can probably deal with financing from those revenues. The one-to-five-year cycle of maintenance. In fact, we just approved a budget for the first slurry seal on that trail because it is time. It will not finance the life cycle cost of that. How we end up working those solutions—and this is where this brokering comes into play—the Trail here in the south end that you saw this morning—or tried to see where all the snow was covering it—TTD led that project on U.S. Forest Service land and Douglas County is the one who has agreed to maintain it. This is how we leverage each other as well as monies to get these projects on the ground. It is the same for Incline Village and that north trail there. Washoe County has agreed to the long-term maintenance, State Parks has agreed to the annual maintenance. That is a parking trailhead on NDOT right-of-way, which TTD is then managing the paid parking component of that. We meet regularly. What we are finding with these cross-jurisdictional solutions, is it is one thing to get them built, but then you are into the forever after that. That coordination with all of these entities and every part they have to do is a practice that is emerging now with what we are having to do here with solutions.

Some of the other things we are doing include SMART technology. I will note, we were one of the first recipients in the country of this new SMART application. We are now experimenting with technology to help us understand better our visitorship. That is a new grant program. The best part about it, which is unusual, is once you are done with the trial, you will be able to move into a second phase and ask for the construction money. This one is being administered straight out of the D.C. U.S. DOT Office. They are interested in this, and we are working with them along with the 58 other applicants who were successful in getting that done.

Operation of an inter-regional transit system and creation of a connected network is a big objective of ours. I will get to that in a moment. We operate transit here at the South Shore. We took that over in 2010, after the nonprofit ran into some financial trouble and filed for bankruptcy and the system was going to go down. We connect Minden, Gardnerville with South Lake Tahoe and with Carson City. We have some inter-regional access already. It is not the robust transit system we would like. That is one of the things we are wanting to fix. You heard a lot about Lake Link. Unlike the North Shore, we are working now—a little bit backwards—on how to integrate this with our fixed route service. We are modeling and doing what the North Shore has been doing, which has been successful at being able to effectively get clear communication to the user—because nobody understands the differences between us—and to increase and grow ridership. It is an exciting prospect. Lake Link is a great way to get to areas we cannot, like deep into neighborhoods. It is a good combination. Where we have seen that with Washoe RTC (Regional Transportation Commission), where we have seen that at North Lake, it works well.

I would like to switch to an initiative here. This is a draft. We are all working on this—working this with TRPA and the TTD Board. This year is the 50th anniversary of public transit at Lake Tahoe. After 50 years, we still do not have, as Julie noted, a regionally connected network. In order to do that—and it makes some sense as to why that has not happened. The first generation of VIP for Transportation was about retrofitting all the roadways for water quality. That was the right thing to do. Now that we are into the second generation of VIP for Transportation, it is about getting this multi-modal network on the ground. What we have been discussing at the TTD Board and at TRPA, is targeting a subset of the next *RTP*, and trying to focus on getting an agreement and then working to get serious capitalization—like we did for water quality all those years ago—to put this connected network in place. It is a key component to fit the Compact's multi-modal solution to congestion. Julie mentioned a passenger ferry. Kind of going back to the future using—like the states of Washington and Alaska do—the Lake as an extension of the highway system. Nobody wants to be in a bus, stuck in traffic trying to drive around the Lake. It has been tried. It is not very attractive. We have looked at this and done a Federal Transit Administration Alternatives Analysis for a passenger ferry—not a car ferry; a passenger ferry—120 to 125 people vessels that are high-speed, low-weight. It is a great way to do this to tie into the marinas that exist. The marina owners are interested in that. That is something that would immediately connect the two what I call rubber tire systems of the North Shore and the South Shore, and allow us to start to have connections between the 80 and the 50 Corridor which then allows us to build more to start to gain more from our drive-up markets. There are a number of capital projects that have to go with this though. We need capture points. We need places both inside the Basin and outside the Basin to give folks the ability to park their car and get on transit to be able to go where they want to go. That is not cheap, but this is where the capitalization comes into play. Probably one of the biggest gaps in the finance plan of the RTP is operating money, that non-sexy thing that you cannot do a ribbon cutting for, but you can provide a lot of service for that if you have an operating source. It is what Tahoe needs because of our visitation is beyond what the local population and businesses can afford to do. That is what it is going to require. This is what you will be hearing more about as we go forward.

Delivery here at Tahoe, and for us, as a district, is we were created about the same time as the RTCs in Nevada. We do not have the same toolkit, however. Since we are portions of five counties in two states, those financing mechanisms are not the same, and we do not have one that works well. What we have talked about this morning is what local jurisdictions can do and that is important. That is a step in the right direction. But, as I noted, it will not be enough to do what is necessary if we are going to put a serious dent in getting folks out of their car in and around Tahoe and alleviating the issues that happen. That is something we are wanting to explore here locally. We have been doing that quite a bit the last six years, and I think we will be revisiting another time here with this concept we are talking about.

For the next Biennium, Julie noted how the last Committee and the Legislature supported TTD. I will give you an illustration of another aspect of not having the same toolkit. We have no general fund source for TTD. The State of Nevada has provided the first dedicated general fund source for TTD in the last Biennium. It is about \$330,000 a year. We would be looking to do that again. We are not part of the State budget. We did that by piggybacking onto TRPA's budget. We will be seeking that two-thirds match from California. These last two years has not been a good time have asked them given the deficits they have got, but that does not mean that is going to go away. We will be looking for that. What we are seeing now and what we are successfully applying on the SR 28 is addressing parking that first three miles of trail is in. The next eight miles of trail is going to be difficult, expensive, and take a long time. When we get these parking lots online, we are going to want to

connect them with seasonal transit. That is where we are going to need additional operating monies to be able to do that while we continue to focus on funding for those trail segments.

Part of what we are talking about in the Basin is what we might be able to explore with you in the Legislature about self-help funding mechanism to get into this larger picture. When it comes to parking—in our experience with doing the parking on North Shore—what we have seen is that statutorily right now, it goes by jurisdiction by jurisdiction. To get to parking management for the region, as Julie has noted, we are going to want to get uniformity. The ability to do this and bring the other prospects of doing it—like using a constable for example and alleviating a law enforcement official from having to do parking enforcement—we are going to need consistency across jurisdictional boundaries to be able to do that. That would also help us in our ability to inform our traveling public, consistently about what they can expect. When we start seeing things like better communication with broadband and the like, we can also start engaging our motorists to make better decisions because we will be able to push information to them in real time, which is difficult to do right now.

To recap the efforts have looked at here, in terms of looking at this funding issue, starting back in 2017, with the first Bi-State which led to Senate Concurrent Resolution 8, which is a resolution that came back to us with a game plan. The TTD looked at revenue—with what we called One Tahoe at the time—which had landed on a single source proposal. It did not have the political gravitas it needed behind it. In 2020, update of the RTP, the BMT threshold changed and that is what led to the 7-7-7 that Julie talked about. The programs monies that we have to go after to do capital projects—and even transit infrastructure like bus replacements—are all discretionary grants. A large part of our RTP is discretionary grant based. That makes it take a long time for us to get things on the ground. That is why this focus effort to see if we can arrive at some consensus about it is intended to accelerate implementation, so we can start to work on some of those capitalizations.

That concludes my presentation. I will be happy to answer any questions.

Chair Daly:

Committee, any questions?

I am trying to understand your role. You mentioned you are similar to the RTC in Reno, but you are not set up that way. You have no dedicated funding, et cetera. It seems to me—and maybe I am off base—if you are going to do the parking, what stage are we at on identifying, or securing, or partnering to have parking locations for people to get to that then you can pick them up and they can get a ride to somewhere either in the Basin or outside the Basin. Where are we on that?

Mr. Hasty:

That is a collective effort. We have been focusing on SR 28 from more of a recreational aspect. Here with the Highway 50 project, the South Shore, and paid parking at the casinos, I think a lot of the strategy that is being executed around the Basin right now, including with Placer County, is how do we optimize the utilization of every parking space that is available, which means both public and private. The predominant amount of parking in the Basin is private. This is where there are good examples of that and good consultant folks out there that we have been using, and Placer County has been using, who have great experience with blending the interest of the private sector with the interest of the public sector to start to utilize that parking that is underutilized. You asked—or someone asked—about the Heavenly lot; that is a good example of that. In that south Stateline area, there

are about 7,000 parking spaces there. If we can take full advantage of those in a way that works for both the public and private sector, that is a consistent way of us being able to communicate to the public where they can go and park—and it may cost them money. Step number one is to start to get a handle on that. Beyond that, is looking at the physical infrastructure or the locations of which we can direct people to go both in the Basin and the like. This is what we are calling mobility hubs in these communities where if we are going to have a transit network, and they are coming from outside the Basin, they are going to go back out of the Basin. There are usually transfer point, places where a resident—in Incline Village or in Kings Beach, because they are looking at a mobility hub now in Kings Beach—needs to get there because they want to go somewhere else, then you are going to have to have that connection. Those are capital needs to do that around the Basin in a lot of the communities. That includes looking at and working with a community like Truckee. The North Shore has done quite a bit there, especially in wintertime, with using the General Aviation Airport and that parking; they get the visitor or the skier to go there and they will shuttle them to the ski area and the like. Those are the efforts that are underway right now being conducted by a variety of partners.

Chair Daly:

I understand there is no public parking. It is basically owned by the casinos, the ski resort, or the airport, as you mentioned. We are not moving anywhere. We do not have any of these transportation hubs that are going to be owned publicly. Thinking ahead, the way you would have to solve your maintenance and ongoing issues with maintaining your fleet and establishing this would be those parking fees as a revenue source. I do not know how much you would have to charge, but it seems to me that it could be a steady type of income. If you can make it so people can park there and then move and you can have that as your source. But how do you get the casino to give a part of the money they are making on parking now? I do not know if there can be a surcharge or something that says, if you want to help solve this problem—casino, airport, ski resort—let us partner with you in sharing that revenue?

Mr. Hasty:

I do think that is at least a partial solution. From what we have seen with parking fees, it is a great behavior change. It does become a revenue source. It can take a while to become a bigger revenue source. I was listening to the TMA discussion up at North Shore yesterday when Placer County was sharing, and the town of Truckee has been in the paid parking business for quite a while now. That has taken them years to get to a place now where they are starting to experience larger revenues for that. A lot of this is going to take the seed to get that established. When you are looking at as many locations as we have around the Basin, that is part of the challenge. It is a good practice to do. What we see with successful mountain resort communities; that is what they do. That is what helps drive the utility of free transit. It is part of the strategy that needs to be implemented and we need to keep on it.

Chair Daly:

I think you said the one part I did not quite get to once they get to the parking place, they transit down to where they need to go; that needs to be free. Otherwise, if I have to pay to park and then I have to pay to ride, I am going to say this is not working. I think identifying those and then partnering with the private entities, or finding a spot where they find it to be in their own interest to do; that is the key.

Mr. Hasty:

The phrase we use up here is free, fun, and frequent. That is what transit needs to be in order for a system like that to work. The successful mountain resort communities that have applied that, it works. We have a ways to go, and this is going to be difficult, and it is going to take larger capitalization to get it happening. The other thing we see with transit is expense goes up, but revenues do not. We are not expecting to see greater federal operating dollars than we do right now, maybe in the next bill that will be an opportunity. We are also seeing that labor—like every other transit entities—is getting more expensive and we are having to raise our rates to keep that staff. Those are the things that are before us.

Chair Daly:

You said there are other areas for us to draw on from experience in various things. What we talked a little bit about with the visitor authorities is how can you help at least with the startup seed money. If we can get this going and get established—if you get past that inertia—maybe you can continue setting you up similar to RTC. I am not sure how that works. They get funded from gas tax increments and various things—at least in Reno—Washoe County. I thought of something else when you were talking about the jurisdictions, and you covered both sides. Maybe that is where we need to partner with our counterparts in California, their legislative body. I am thinking along the lines of the transportation district, for the infrastructure and the things that you need to do is having one set of rules that apply only for you. If they want to have a different set of rules for parking or whatever it is for a private entity that is moving in or doing something. I will give this example; the Washoe County School District has schools in Washoe County, Sparks, and Reno. When they were designing schools and trying to build schools, they had to meet the Sparks rules in Sparks, the Washoe rules in Washoe, and the Reno rules in Reno. Halfway through one school, it transitioned from being Washoe County only to the sphere of influence of Reno. Then Reno put all these other conditions on there. So, the school district was at a disadvantage. They had to redesign, increased costs, et cetera. We passed a bill applied to Washoe County that said school districts, regardless of what jurisdiction it is in, we have one set of rules for schools. They will have the same height restrictions, setbacks, parking, landscape requirements. They expanded that into other areas in their cooperation. Once they figured it out and the more they started working together, the farther away the Legislature got. We would have to partner with California in order to do something like that. On the Nevada side, we would have to say, we do not care about the rules in this town; we are going to have one set of rules and establish what they are. I think that would solve some of your problems.

Mr. Hasty:

I like the suggestion and recommendation. These are the ideas we want to talk about.

Chair Daly:

Our Vice Chair has to head back back to Las Vegas, but she is going to listen in on the phone. Does anyone else have any questions? Assemblywoman Taylor, any questions?

Assemblywoman Taylor:

I do not have any questions. I like what you said about the school district. That is similar. A lot of jurisdictions that need to work together, and having a lot of different sets of rules makes it difficult.

Chair Daly:

Were you on the school district when we put that stuff in? I think so. It has worked well for you guys. We would have to partner with our California counterparts to do something like that for the entire Basin. Seeing no other questions.

AGENDA ITEM IX—UPDATE ON NEVADA’S DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION PLANS AND ACTIVITIES IN THE LAKE TAHOE BASIN

Chair Daly:

We are going to move on to Item IX, update on NDOT plans and activities at the Lake.

Sondra Rosenberg, PTP, Deputy Director, Planning and Administration, NDOT:

I am available to come back and answer questions. In the meantime, we are always available to provide more information. A quick overview about NDOT overall, I know during the session we will provide more in-depth information on this as well as to the Growth and Infrastructure Committee next week. We have just under 2,000 full-time equivalent positions. We do not have that many employees at the moment. We have about a 20 to 21 percent vacancy rate that varies in different areas of the of the State and different maintenance districts. Nevada’s Department of Transportation is responsible for planning, construction, operation, and maintenance of 5,400 lane miles of highway and over 1,000 bridges that make up Nevada’s highway system. We maintain the roads that get food and other supplies to Nevada families. As we look towards tomorrow, our team works to plan and create a program that is equitable and safe for all users. We know that access opens up worlds.

Our vision is to be a leader and partner in delivering effective transportation solutions for a safe and connected Nevada. You heard a lot about partnerships today from all the different entities, both this morning and this afternoon. I will say in Tahoe, that is particularly important. None of us accomplish anything alone. It is all about the partnerships. Just as TRPA has a *RTP*, NDOT has a statewide transportation plan and prioritization process. That is the One Nevada Transportation Plan. You can find more information online. It is surrounded by the six goals we have identified to enhance safety, preserve infrastructure, optimize mobility, transform economies, foster sustainability, and connect communities. We have data supporting that. We use that data to go through a need, identification, concept development, and project prioritization process. It is how we identify projects and concepts to move forward is primarily data driven. There is a number of other factors such as geographic distribution of funding, project readiness, funding types—we talked a lot about different types of funding here today. We have a number of different federal funding sources, and we need to make sure everything lines up that way. That does have a basis in our performance metrics and data.

A little bit about the operations in Lake Tahoe. I know several of you met Bhupinder Sandhu, our District 2 Engineer this morning. He did have to go back, but he is responsible for most of the maintenance in this area. The NDOT maintained routes in the Tahoe Basin are U.S. 50, SR 28, California State Routes 431 and 207. That includes both in the Basin as well as connecting to the Basin. The Tahoe area does comprise about 100 lane miles out of our much larger lane miles across the State. It is important and complex.

In conjunction with our roadway projects, we do have a water quality and sediment reduction effort. Typically, as I said, in conjunction with our projects, we do utilize best

management practices including in our road operations such as balanced salt and sand usage, highway sweeping, and sediment removal. Some examples of recent water quality improvements on some of our projects include the recent SR 28 SR 431 pavement preservation project, SR 28 at Marlette Creek, and U.S. 50 Warrior Way—which you heard about a little bit this morning. Not only did we put in the signal but other environmental improvements at the same time, which is typical. We also partner with the Nevada Tahoe Conservation District to work on various water quality improvement projects throughout the Basin. We know it is critically important.

Staffing in the area, as I mentioned, we have a vacancy rate across the State. It is higher in District 2. It is particularly high in the Tahoe area. I will say these numbers include not just in the Basin but those connecting roads as well. Dedicated maintenance staff in the Basin is smaller than this, but they do share resources. As you can see, we have a high vacancy rate. I think we are doing a good job with all things considered. I will not go through the details of how many crews and people we have on all the different routes. We have a dedicated and committed crew to keep things safe in winter operations as well as improvements in the summer.

A little bit about some of our projects, both recent and upcoming. Recently completed projects, I mentioned this in terms of the water quality improvements we did as well, the SRs 28 and 431 resurfacing was over the last few years. I know those of you who have been out in the summer have seen a lot of construction. The construction season for the Tahoe area is short so sometimes our projects last into multiple seasons. We try and minimize that as much as possible, and work with other agencies to minimize the disruptions and coordinate construction activities across multiple agencies. We also mentioned the Warrior Way Signal which you saw this morning. We are all excited about that in terms of both access as well as safety along that Corridor.

The Spooner Mobility Hub is a partnership effort with a number of different agencies. It is a cooperative project between NDOT, TTD, TRPA, State Parks, and U.S. Forest Service. We talked about parking. That is something we are looking at in terms of parking and EV (electric vehicle) charging, inspection station, recreation, access, transit, as well as access to the future East Shore path. Again, this is underway. We are starting to work on that, but we are excited about the opportunity for additional parking in this area.

Some other upcoming projects; many of you have heard about our U.S. 50 Corridor Management Plan, which I am going to touch on in a moment. We do have a resurfacing project coming up. Soon it will be advertised; we are hoping to advertise it this year. Again, it may take time to get all the materials up and get the construction done. We talked about the technology and connectivity. This project will include conduit for fiber along that Corridor from essentially Spooner Summit down into South Lake Tahoe. It will also include pavement markings and edge line striping countermeasures. We have heard about safety concerns along this Corridor. Primarily, we are going to be widening the striping along this Corridor as well as on the highest part—basically from the Summit east for about three miles—we are looking at adding a little bit of space between the two directions of travel to get people to slow down, as well as provide a little bit of a safety measure there. I want to state for the record, and you will hear me say this a couple of times, there is no reduction in the number of travel lanes along this Corridor. You may or may not have heard about that. That was something we evaluated as part of the Corridor study, and I have decided to not move forward with that. Some additional future projects in the area include U.S. 50 resurfacing from Spooner down to Carson City. That will also include conduit and replacing barrier rail, improving signage, and hydraulic improvements. As well, SR 28, similarly, guardrail, signage, sidewalk improvements as well as improving access to the

beaches along that Corridor. These projects are in the future. We do not have a timeline yet in terms of when they will be advertised and constructed. Again, we are working in partnership with other areas. We certainly do not want every road in the Tahoe area to be under construction at the same time. We are working on the design of those.

As I mentioned, the U.S. 50 East Shore Corridor Management Plan is currently out for public comment and will be through the end of next week. We held a public meeting last week—on Tuesday, February 27—we had about 83 participants at that. We have had a number of outreach activities. The purpose of that is safety number one. We know it is a high visitation, high recreation Corridor. There are multi-modal needs, as you heard from TRPA and TTD, the primary goal for this area. Needs of technology—you can see from that picture that is a very low-tech solution to tell people parking lots are full. We think we can do better. And certainly, protecting the environment and the Lake.

As I mentioned, we did multiple rounds of public engagement including public workshops, individual meetings, surveys, and finally this current public comment period that we are in right now as well as a public meeting. We have been tracking all of the comments and responses to those. It is all available online, if you want to see the thousands of comments we have received and our various responses to that. We are trying to wrap up the management plan itself, which serves as a foundation and a vision for the Corridor. It is a plan; it is not an engineering-level analysis. The various recommendations from that will go through engineering and will be included in various projects going forward. Some of the early action, I mentioned this a little bit in the U.S. 50 project, pavement marking and edge striping countermeasures. Again, wider striping providing separation where there is space there, speed feedback signs, and establishing a multi-agency Safety and Operations Committee for that Corridor. We have longer-term improvements that are identified, and they are, again, primarily focused on safety. We talked a lot about parking already today, eliminating the on-street parking. That is a collaborative effort that will take time in terms of identifying other off-highway locations for parking in conjunction with continuing to eliminate the on-highway parking, improving pedestrian crossings, extending the Tahoe East Shore Trail, connecting signals, and adding dilemma zone protections. Again, all of these are identified in more detail in the plan. We have them broken out by anticipated timelines. We have early short-, mid-, and long-term implementation actions and identifying the partners that will help us achieve those projects. Everything is preliminary and will require further analysis before moving forward. But this gives us that foundation and identifies those improvements to then move forward through that One Nevada Process in partnership with TRPA, TTD, U.S. Forest Service, and other partners around here.

We mentioned multiple times, partnerships are critical. We work hard to support our partners in the Tahoe Basin in terms of finding funding. We talked a lot about grants today. We try hard to support grants, earmark requests, and other funding requests for Tahoe, because we are also limited in funding. As many of you know, from across the State, there are needs all over the State. We are limited in that way as well. We partner with the TRPA on their *RTP* and try and coordinate our plans and identify priorities together. We work together on corridor studies and other planning documents as well as coordination on the various projects in the Corridor. We are currently working on developing a business plan for integration and a region-wide system for parking. You asked this of a number of other members; it will be a multi-agency effort. We do want to contribute to that including potentially some of our planning funding we get from the feds to contribute to that Parking Management Plan.

With that, I know I went fast, and I probably did not cover enough detail. We are available but I did want to be mindful of the time. I am happy to answer any questions.

Chair Daly:

It looks like we have a couple. We will go with Senator Titus first and then we will go to Assemblyman Gray.

Senator Titus:

Thank you for that. It was fast but efficient. I have a couple of questions. Thank you for the lane reduction. There are people that are terribly concerned with that, especially for evacuation purposes. What is the option on speed reduction? Who controls speed reduction?

Ms. Rosenberg:

That is a challenging issue because there are a number of ways to do that. We have found through studies within our State as well as nationally, lowering the speed limit itself does not necessarily get people to slow down. We have seen on that Corridor on average, people are going about 30 percent over the speed limit now. Lowering that limit itself without putting in other countermeasures to encourage people to slow down—and we know enforcement is a challenge—it is a combination of design. We are hoping the wider edge lines and adding separation will encourage people to slow down. We are planning on putting in speed feedback signs. They will flash and tell you how fast you are going along with the speed limit. We are continuing to partner with enforcement, both Highway Patrol as well as Douglas County Sheriff to add more patrols there. Again, they have staff limitations as well. We encourage, continue to educate, enforce, and engineer better solutions.

Senator Titus:

I hear constantly that you have to have enforcement, but you did not tell me who was in charge of reduction. Could you on your own, even if there is no enforcement, reduce the speed in those areas?

Ms. Rosenberg:

The Director of NDOT does have the authority to set speed limits. We typically do that along with a speed study to ensure that it does not create other safety issues by creating a bigger difference in speed.

Senator Titus:

With the reduction study that is happening now, is the Director directing you to do that?

Ms. Rosenberg:

Not at this time. We do have the speed data. Typically, when there is already a speeding issue, again, we do not like to lower the speed limit unless there are other measures in place to encourage that slower speed. We will continue to monitor with the speed feedback signs. If that is effective, we will consider lowering the speed limit.

Senator Titus:

When will that data be available? I sit in a lot of committees, and I hear people say, we are looking at this. What is the timeline on that? When are you going to have that data available? When are we going to know whether a reduction—and I will take the engagement of law enforcement. I understand you do not live in a silo; that you could do all these

studies, and nothing happens. But I would like to see some actual production on the speed studies. Lowering the speed around there—the reinforcement signs are helpful, they are; people do look at those. They may or may not slow down, but they know. If you, as a Department, do these studies and say, we should lower these. Then convincing the Sheriff's Department and Highway Patrol to do the enforcement—I know they are short staffed, but all I ever hear is excuses. We cannot do this, because of this. At some point, somebody says, you guys are more than capable of lowering speeds. I just heard you say your Director could do that. Then it would be up to the Sheriff Departments to enforce them. But that is not your problem. You still have something you could do by yourselves without saying, they are not going to do that. I hate to see you passing the buck to people. I would like to see movement forward on speed reduction around there. I think that is significant.

I have another question, if I might, Mr. Chair. You did a presentation on staff vacancies. I have sat on money committees for five sessions now. I hear about the vacancies on State jobs across the State. Yours is significant in NDOT in this area. I am wondering where the solution is. We, as a body, increased State employees' salaries. We tried hard. The Governor made it clear. It was not just teachers; it was across the board. I am looking here at 100 percent vacancy for winter temporary staff. Is this a new problem or is it a consistent problem? If so, what analysis have you done for this particular problem?

Ms. Rosenberg:

We continue to analyze it and we have a number of programs. I am not prepared to talk about those today. However, I will say, first of all, thank you for the raises. That has helped tremendously. A year ago, agency wide, we are closer to 26 percent vacancy. The number is going down. That is helping. The temporary workers, that is seasonal workers for the winter, I do not have on the top of my head their rate. We are still competing—everyone else has raised their rates as well. We have a number of programs we are working with. We have brought in outside help too. In terms of training, we are reaching out to high schools, trade schools, and working with prisoners that are going to be released soon; in terms of training. We are all hands-on deck figuring out all the ways we can recruit and retain talented people. The recruitment is an issue. The retention is also an issue. We often get folks lost to, again, higher paying jobs.

Senator Titus:

Not to beat on this a little bit. But I think it is important. Is it worse here in the Tahoe area versus other rural—where I live out in Smith Valley it seems like they are busy all the time. We always have people working there. Is it unique here? If so, is it an issue with housing? Can people not afford to live up here? Is it an issue with transportation? Do you offer solutions like meeting at the yard in Douglas County and bringing them up to work here? Have you done some troubleshooting for this specific area with solutions?

Ms. Rosenberg:

I cannot answer this specific area question. I apologize. We do that analysis and bring it back to you. Different areas of the State do have different vacancy rates, but it is an issue across the State. In Northern Nevada, generally, we are competing with a number of different public agencies that do similar work and again, have higher salaries. In Eastern Nevada we are competing with the mines; in Southern Nevada again, a number of public agencies. Certainly, I think all those issues you mentioned are challenges; housing prices, where people live versus where they have to go to pick up the equipment, those

sorts of things. I would be happy to follow-up. We have been diving into and breaking it down. We are preparing to present that to our Board next week. In terms of the different areas, I do not have that information in front of me, but I would be happy to follow-up with more specifics in the Tahoe area, what the challenges are, and what things we are doing to try and resolve that.

Senator Titus:

Thank you for that. I think it is critical that we are looking at solutions for the Tahoe area, NDOT is intimately engaged in that process, having solutions, and identifying what the problems are unique to this area so that we might be engaged in the solutions. I know the Committee would like to see more specifics—if the Chair would agree—for this area. What is the uniqueness about this area and getting employees versus some other area? There are statewide issues. I get that, but what are the areas here that maybe we can help?

Ms. Rosenberg:

We would be happy to provide that information either offline or come back prepared to talk about that question.

Chair Daly:

Assemblyman Gray.

Assemblyman Gray:

First, I want to say thank you. You guys get beat up so often you probably do not hear thank you that often. I will be the first to admit, I am one of the guys that beats up on you guys. Highway 50 runs right through my district, Assembly District 39, from the State line all the way to just about Churchill County. I have a couple of things. One, what did you say about the lane reduction? That is not going to happen, right?

Ms. Rosenberg:

It is not going to happen. We are not—

Assemblyman Gray:

Can I hear that one more time?

Ms. Rosenberg:

We are not reducing the number of lanes on U.S. 50.

Assemblyman Gray:

So, it is not going to be reduced. A lot of people have been fighting that for a long time. I am glad to hear that. That was not the answer to the problem. I know most of the residents are probably going to be happy to hear that as well.

I am right there with the Senator on the safety issues and stuff. One of the things that concerns me is the Spooner Intersection. What is on the table for that? When can we expect to see something implemented there? I just missed that—literally by two minutes—fatal

accident I was coming from Sand Harbor. I was bringing my niece and nephew from there. We had a day there, and I was not five minutes away from that intersection when I was getting calls from people hearing on the news there had been a fatal there. I am tired of seeing fatalities on Highway 50 from one end to the other. If you could let us know what is going on with that, I appreciate it.

Ms. Rosenberg:

As are we. We have identified that as one of our top priorities out of this quarter management plan. It is currently going through the Intersection Control Evaluation process. We also call it ICE, and that is where our engineers—we have done the planning study, we determined this is an issue, here is a potential solution, that potential solution might be a roundabout, but we have not done the engineering on it. That is what we are doing now, comparing a possible roundabout or signal. We had members of the public suggest a grade separation. We are looking at all the potential solutions and then looking at, as I mentioned, we have a number of projects each side of U.S. 50 as well as SR 28. The idea is to figure out what the solution is there and potentially add that to one of those upcoming resurfacing projects since it is in the same area. I do not have a specific timeline yet because we are still figuring out the time of the construction. Hopefully we will have an answer and a schedule soon. Hopefully in the next couple years, we will be able to do something there because it is it is a priority for us as well.

Assemblyman Gray:

Before you go, I have to give you guys a shout out. You have one employee, Colleen Underbrink, who has done so much to improve communication with the elected officials and the communities. Promote her—not out of her job—give her a raise. Whatever you have got to do. She is a shining star. Make sure you guys take care of her and please take that message back to her.

Ms. Rosenberg:

I will. Thank you, Assemblyman Gray. Before you mentioned her name, I knew who you were talking about. She is amazing, and I am going to do everything I can to keep her. Thank you for mentioning that.

Chair Daly:

Senator Scheible, and then we will see if Assemblywomen Taylor and Vice Chair Bilbray-Axelrod, who are online, have any questions.

Senator Scheible:

I will follow-up on my colleague's question. Remind me, what did ICE stand for?

Ms. Rosenberg:

Intersection Control Evaluation.

Senator Scheible:

Is that required by statute? Is that required by regulation? You said it is going to take a couple of years, which sounds like way too much red tape. Whose fault is that?

Ms. Rosenberg:

Let me clarify that. It will be a couple years before we have a construction project on the ground.

Senator Scheible:

That still sounds like it is way too long.

Ms. Rosenberg:

That process takes a couple of weeks, but the purpose of it is to make sure there are no unintended consequences, the operations work, that it does improve safety. There are no, again, additional delays, that we have the appropriate right-of-way, and to start putting a cost to it. Before we assign any money to any project and put it on our schedule, we need to know how much it is going to cost so we have to do the engineering work for it.

Senator Scheible:

Is that true of every project of every scale?

Ms. Rosenberg:

Some level of engineering is needed for every project that we do, yes.

Senator Scheible:

Is this one a larger scale because that intersection is larger, it is on a hill. I get it. I will get to the point. We have a similar but different struggle in my district. We have a middle school that is next to a four-lane road that students have to cross every day with no crosswalk. They are being told it is a two-year-long study, evaluation, and assessing the right-of-way. They cannot just put up a crosswalk. Is it different for different levels of construction or is this across the board any time the Department wants to improve safety somewhere that someone has already died?

Ms. Rosenberg:

The process is similar. The timeline is different, depending on the complexity. I do not know the specifics of the one you are referring to, but I would love to talk with you afterwards to get those specifics and see what we can do. There are times we can move much faster if it is just a crosswalk and there are no other issues that is going to create, we can often move much faster than that. Let me better understand this. I am not making a promise. Let me better understand the specifics of that and see what we can do to turn that around.

Senator Scheible:

Thank you. I did not mean to hijack the meeting. I was interested when you explained that. I also agree with my colleague that you guys get a lot of complaints and not a lot of credit, because we also cannot go haphazardly adding stop signs and traffic control devices without some study. But there has to be a balance there. I want to make sure, as legislators, in our job in drafting statutes, are developing a system that gives you the appropriate level of red tape, if you will, and the appropriate level of direction so you can do the administrative background work you need to do, but do not get bogged down and unnecessary minutiae.

Chair Daly:

Assemblywomen Taylor or Vice Chair Bilbray-Axelrod, I do not know if they can hear me or if they have any questions before I ask mine.

Assemblywoman Taylor:

I can hear you, Mr. Chair. I do not have any questions.

Chair Daly:

I have a couple of questions and comments on various things, especially on the little part of the Corridor that we are on today and Deadman's Point. How much right-of-way of easement does NDOT have? I know we do not want to widen roads, but it seems to me there are some—I have driven up here and there are tight driveways, so there are no deceleration lanes, there is no acceleration. I do not know if we have room to do those things or if there is easement, right-of-way. It seems to me you could use the space currently used as parking spots, because somebody has got the right to have it. Answer what solutions are possible there. Of course, the center divider, if you put a center divider in, it is a matter of having to go down to a light to turn around to get back in, depending on which way you are going. I do not know if FHWA (Federal Highway Administration) would allow you to—because it is another agency they would have to deal with. It is still a federal highway, right?

Ms. Rosenberg:

Yes.

Chair Daly:

Roundabouts those types of things—I will say the rest of my comment on some of the issues on speed and reducing the speed limit—it sounds like it is simple enough to do. But you made the comment that sometimes it is not the speed of the vehicles, it is the difference of the speed of the vehicles. You have someone obeying the law driving 30 miles per hour because you reduced the speed limit, and you have someone else come up behind them driving 65 miles per hour, and it is the difference in those speeds that kills more than the speed of the vehicle. There are some traffic calming things you can do that are not available on a highway. You cannot put speed bumps in. I know you install rumble strips—which everybody loves—but you cannot put the narrowing devices in—where you narrow a little patch where they get closer together. You would have major issues with snowplows and snow removal, and it is not feasible for some of that stuff. I know I mentioned a lot in there, but what is your right-of-way? How much will FHWA let you do? That is part of the timing. Statistics for crosswalks and various things like that, the cold hard facts are they look at the number of accidents and if there are not enough accidents to justify it, they do not do it. Same thing with fatalities. Before they will put a light in, the statistics drive where those things go and when. That is my understanding.

Ms. Rosenberg:

Yes, there was a lot that you asked me. I will see if I can remember most of that. The right-of-way along U.S. 50 varies quite a bit. I do not have a solid answer for you on what the right-of-way is there because it comes in and out. During the quarter management plan process, we did look at that and where we thought we might be able to fit things. The additional challenge in terms of adding turn lanes is where we might have right-of-way.

There are also drainage features that are not easy to move. We are going to continue to work on that. The original proposal, which again, we are not moving forward with any reduction in the number of lanes. That was why that concept came up. It was to be able to fit in some turning movements at those locations. We have to find a different way to do it. We are going to continue to look at that and, again, work with partners who might own some of that land to see where we can squeeze those in. Crosswalks, signals, again, if they are not put in the appropriate place—and you mentioned the data and the engineering—sometimes it can create more of an issue. If you put in a crosswalk and pedestrians feel safe crossing there, but we do not think drivers will see them, that could create an unintended consequence. Similarly, with traffic signals, there are a lot of blind corners along this Corridor, so we do not necessarily want to put in a signal where someone coming—the speed limit or faster—may not see it in time to stop. Again, you give that false sense of security for the cross traffic. That is not to say those are off the table by any means. We are going to revisit all those different access points and determine the right solution for the different configurations we have all along the Corridor. Certainly, SR 28 and U.S. 50 being one of our top priorities for intersections. We are aware; we have heard from a number of community members in terms of their access points on the highway and being scared and concerned about safety. We are going to dive in and look at various intersections and access points. I do not know if that fully answered your question.

Chair Daly:

Some of what I said were comments. I understand on the deceleration/acceleration lanes, you may not have room. Some of those driveways, there are sharp turns you have to make and if you do not know it is there—hopefully people are using their turn signals. You are right, you can create additional problems by lowering the speed limit and then creating frustrations because people are going to drive over the speed limit. I have long argued to reduce the speed limits in construction zones. I helped sponsor the bill with the double penalties, et cetera over the years. That does not mean people are following it. You want to try to get their attention and get them to slow down. But human nature is what it is. You did answer all my questions.

Where the right-of-way is—even to put the barrier rail in the middle, by the time you get done, it takes up almost the whole lane of road space. Maybe not quite the whole ten feet, but you are taking up eight feet of it. Which you do not have on the other side. There are laws and rules about how narrow a lane can be, and you do have to deal with the FHWA. People do not like roundabouts, but I think they could be effective. I do not know if they would allow them on the highway or not. Those were comments based on other comments that were made.

Ms. Rosenberg:

We would be happy to come back to present to this Committee, or others, focused on safety and a number of efforts we have in that arena. I was not going to call them out, but some of our FHWA partners are in the room today. We appreciate their attendance. When it comes to safety, they are supportive of different measures. Yes, there are rules and regulations and some limitations, but we are happy to work with the community here as well as our federal partners to come up with some creative solutions.

Chair Daly:

Any other questions? It does not look like it.

AGENDA ITEM X—PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Daly:

With that, we will move on to the long-awaited Item X, which is our second period of public comment. We will be limiting it to two minutes per person. We will start here. State your name for the record and you may proceed.

Robert Aaron, Private Citizen:

I thank the Legislative Counsel Bureau and the Committee. I love the collaboration and all the partnerships and everybody's presentations. First off, I want to thank NDOT for designating Highway 50 as an evacuation route. One of the things I think the legislative body needs to always turn back to, is you guys are here as review and oversight of the TRPA. I want to ask about the 38 bodies of water that were looked at and we came in a devastating third place. I think we should look into each of those lakes and ask if they have spent \$660 million to protect their bodies of water. We are a unique environment, but we have spent all this money and it does not seem it has done its job to protect the Lake if we are in third. I hope the Director is not aiming for first place. Furthermore, Vail sold 2.4 million passes. The amount of miles traveled that are going to be driven on your highway in Nevada, driven by California, Heavenly Valley, and North Star—the amount of people that come up—I have already seen it—from the Bay area and use your highway. It is going to be destroyed. Just like all of the California highways. I applaud NDOT on keeping your highways nice. They are some of the smoothest I have ever driven on. I want to, again, say, when will the Lake come first? I think all of this needs to cycle back. You are the oversight and review of the TRPA. I think they have lost their way. I think they are not following their Bi-State Compact. As Ms. Rosenberg was here; I think she was amazing and stated some great things. I would like everyone here to look up the name Erica Rosenberg. She is from the FCC (Federal Communications Commission). I contacted her five years ago about these towers. She said there would definitely be environmental reviews done on all of them. I said I do not think it is being done. She said, we have had a problem with Verizon doing that, self-certifying and putting these towers in. She quit the FCC. She was the assistant lead attorney. She quit and is now a whistleblower. I think you should look her up.

Chair Daly:

You are at your two minutes.

Laura Koscki, South Lake Tahoe District:

I was appointed by the Trump Administration. I have been in Tahoe since I was a little kid. I have worked for all the resorts around the Lake. I have noticed several potholes that have never been dealt with. Some are extremely dangerous. T.J.Maxx makes \$25,000 a month and there is a huge pothole right before you enter. Same with Heavenly; they have tons of potholes. I have been taking pictures. I was a manager at Kirkwood as well as Heavenly. The management above me would overrule me and would not have people chain up and we would have 15 car pileups. I also noticed we needed to have the Post Office move their vehicles so we they can pave, and they told me no. During the Caldor Fire, people left their vehicles on the lot. They brought the tow truck guy out and I ran out and said, you are not going to charge them \$400 to move their vehicles. Let me at least look for a key to move the vehicle or call them. They did allow me to do that. They said, it is the higher-ups above us. What I am frustrated with is—Heavenly can make \$50,000 a day on a wedding. They had managers like me running all over and they would not pay the [unintelligible]. It was the same with Zephyr Cove. I was a manager out there and they did not want to pay the

[unintelligible] for the weddings, but they enjoyed charging all these extreme fees. I was frustrated. I had to spend \$1,000 out of my own money to get organized. They would not reimburse me. This attitude we have is wrong, and I think we can rectify it. Also, we had 20 semis that were stuck. If we had checkpoints and we had outgoing people to say, you guys need chain up or you have to pay the semis. We cannot have you coming into our town being stalled. I took tons of pictures of that. Right here outside the door, if you drive down here it is all marble ice. They are not even sanding. We had 24 pileups on Keller [Road].

Chair Daly:

You are at your two minutes.

Janine Nyre, Private Citizen:

I thought what Chairman said about capacity is a good point. I think we have to think about the capacity of our natural setting. When you think about Zephyr Cove Resort, which by the way, we call Zephyr Cove Fight Club because there are so many fights that break out there. The Sheriff's Deputies, when they have to respond to a beach, that is the beach they are going to. They have currently 200 parking spots-ish and RV spots. They are going to add probably another 200 under the current license agreement with the U.S. Forest Service. Douglas County in the next couple of years is planning on adding about 200 parking spots across the street from them. The school that is right there, the elementary school, has about 50 parking spots. They are hoping to put a park kiosk in so people can pay. That is now 650 parking spots for about a quarter of a mile beach that already has capacity problems and fights break out. I know, by the way, people go to the beach armed because they want to protect their families. It seems like capacity has to be part of the equation. I do not think Zephyr Cove Resort has any incentive to have a capacity limit, because they need to give the highest revenue to the Forest Service. The second thing, quickly, is regarding Lake Link. I think Lake Link is a great idea. It only serves maybe 10 to 15 percent of Nevada residents right now in the Basin. The number of single-user trips has to be tracked, because I do not understand how VMTs are reduced. If the car has to drive to my house, pick me up, take me somewhere, and then drive to that location later, pick me up, bring me home, and then drive back to their starting location.

Chair Daly:

Thank you. You are at your two minutes. And you were referencing the Chair you were referencing the Chair of the Washoe Tribe.

Ms. Nyre:

Yes. Thank you.

Elisabeth Lernhardt, Zephyr Cove Resident:

First, let me thank Chair Daly and Senator Scheible. Your questions were necessary and elucidative of the problems we have here with the Tahoe Douglas Visitor Authority. They are so opaque. I wish we would have the same number for them as we had for Washoe. Washoe's presentation was very helpful, and I wish we had the same number. To get back to Senator Titus. This is anecdotal from three years ago. Yes, we do have a unique problem here in Tahoe with NDOT. The problem is we compete with Caltrans for the seasonal workers. Caltrans gives them year-round contracts with benefits which NDOT does not, they hire for this season. That is my humble opinion about why there is a problem. For the

funding of RTC, Tahoe Transportation District proposed the 7-7-7 Plan. It levies taxes from the locals, businesses, tourists, as well as commuters. The numbers per month are: \$7, \$87, tourist \$4.1 per trip or visit, and commuters \$1. This would instantly create a shortage of workers who have to commute because of lack of housing. It would be the coup de grâs for the local economy. We are already short on workers. Sensing pushback, TRPA has been avoiding voter approval for this plan as required by the Compact. It has pushed for passage of ACR 5 to bypass the vote mandated in Article 9 of the Compact. I would really like this to be reexamined because I do not think this is a solution going forward. I also refer to an article by Randal O'Toole who writes about all municipal RTCs in this country. He shows that it takes an equal amount of money for maintenance every year as it does for start-up. That is why most of the RTCs in this country depend on federal money. Most of them are bankrupt. Look at their numbers.

Chair Daly:

You are at your two minutes.

Elisabeth Lernhardt, Zephyr Cove Resident:

Please read that article.

Ellie Waller, Douglas County Resident:

I drive from the Carson Valley. I will be one of those people that will not be able to use any kind of transit system because I need to be at your meetings on time. The 7-7-7 Plan, you have heard, like the one-third, two-third split of the states, each county's population base is very different, with Carson City and Douglas County in the 50,000 to 58,000 population versus Washoe at almost 500,000. The splits may not be reasonably obtainable with the 7-7-7 Plan as we go forward in looking at this information. I was glad Janine brought up capacity. Tahoe is over capacity with unique issues, unique infrastructure, with difficult solutions. I am hoping we can figure out a way to get there with all these different components. Yesterday, I went to the Tahoe Transportation District Implementation Committee. Nobody brought up electric vehicles today. They have a few in their fleet. California is pushing for 2029 to have all EV buses. I do not know how we are going to translate that into Nevada. Micro transit is having trouble getting—this is a unique issue right now—support to fix the vehicles. The continuous funding, I do not know how that works for micro transit. I was very happy TRPA brought up thresholds. Their site is really good. The scenic quality needs to be taken into consideration with signage as well. I know we have to have safety features, but people come here to see the Lake. We are destroying a scenic threshold.

Brett Tibbitts, Tahoe East Shore Alliance:

First of all, I have spent the past year at odds with Sondra Rosenberg on and NDOT and TRPA's plan to basically convert much of Highway 50 into two lanes so they could add a bike lane; take away a lane to add a bike lane behind the cement berm. I have to give her and NDOT a complete shut-out. I do not know how they do it with snow removal with the amount of vacancies they have. Those of us up here refer to the Stateline as the San Diego border crossing. When it is snowing up here, Highway 50 is absolutely fantastic. You go into South Lake Tahoe, and it is entering a third world country. I do not know how NDOT does it. I do not know if you have ever driven it, but kudos to them. I do want to point out again evacuations. I know it has been brought up. I have to give a shout-out to Senator Titus and Assemblyman Gray on this. Julie Regan told you she considers evacuation, but I do not see any evidence of it. They had a plan to reduce much of Highway 50 to two lanes. They did

not even consider evacuation in doing that. I do want you to know too, that yesterday, Douglas County passed a resolution of the Board unanimously that Highway 50 is to remain four lanes for evacuation and safety purposes. They have the right to do that under federal law, even though Highway 50 is a federal highway, because local jurisdictions, under federal directives, have the main role of determining evacuation routes.

Chair Daly:

Thank you. Seeing no other in-person public comment, do we have anybody on the phones for public comment?

BPS:

To provide public comment, please press *9 or raise hand on your Zoom window to take your place in the queue. Caller, you are unmuted. Please go ahead.

Helen Neff, Incline Village Resident:

My compliments to all the presenters on their professional presentations. I am on the phone so I cannot see the slides, but they sounded very good. Thank you for this opportunity to comment. I live in Incline Village. If I want to attend an event at the Tahoe Blue Event Center in Douglas County, there is no way to get there and back by transit. Director Regan said Lake Tahoe is auto dominated. We have a road that goes around the Lake, and we do not have a transit system that ties together. You can look at page 53 of the TRPA active Transportation Plan, which is on their website. That page has a map that shows where transit exists today. The South and the North Shores do not connect via transit. I have heard mention of ferries, water taxis, trains, and gondolas in various meetings. Very visionary but very complicated and expensive; and what happens when we have a red flag warning on the Lake? We have a road that already exists. I know it is boring, but it is the best that we have right now. We are trying to get visitors to where they want to go, people to jobs, residents to doctor's appointments, not create another Disneyland. Please provide a bus that goes around the Lake. One route in each direction. Operate 24/7. Do it frequently during peak hours. Link with micro transit. Link with bus routes to Reno, Carson, Truckee, et cetera, and build the parking lots there. Bike paths are wonderful, but they are expensive, and they cannot be used year-round. Do not abandon them but do not think they will reduce the VMTs. Julie Regan said, tie the system together. Thank you; please do it. She also said it is a partnership. Yes, I understand. But please require someone to take ownership for transit. It might reduce the cost of funding all the partners. Mr. Hasty said we have 50 years of transit in Lake Tahoe, yet nothing connects. This is a red flag. He also said we have too many cars. Why are they building parking lots? The TTD Board—
(Agenda Item X A)

Chair Daly:

You are at your two minutes. Wrap it up please.

Helen Neff, Incline Village Resident:

We should not abandon that strategy. Thank you.

Chair Daly:

Next caller.

BPS:

Chair, we have no additional callers for public comment at this time.

Chair Daly:

With that, we will close our second period of public comment.

Additional written public comment was submitted and compiled as (Agenda Item X B).

Chair Daly:

That brings us to our last agenda item, which adjournment. That concludes our meeting for today. Thank all of our presenters, members of the public, Members of the Committee, and most of all our staff and everybody that made everything happen. Before we adjourn, I would like to remind everybody our next meeting is scheduled for May 3. We are hoping to hold that meeting in the Tahoe Basin. We are hoping somewhere in the North Shore, Incline area. Please check the Committee website for our next meeting location.

AGENDA ITEM XI—ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 5:41 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Christina Harper
Manager of Research Policy Assistants

Alysa M. Keller
Senior Principal Policy Analyst

APPROVED BY:

Senator Skip Daly, Chair

Date: _____

MEETING MATERIALS

AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER/ENTITY	DESCRIPTION
Agenda Item II A	Pamela Tsigdinos, North Lake Tahoe Resident	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II B-1	Brett Tibbitts, Tahoe East Shore Alliance	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II B-2	Brett Tibbitts, Tahoe East Shore Alliance	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II B-3	Brett Tibbitts, Tahoe East Shore Alliance	Written Public Comments
Agenda Item II C	Rhonda Tyser, Incline Village Resident	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II D	Ellie Waller, Douglas County Resident and Former North Tahoe Resident	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II E-1	Dana Tibbitts, Tahoe East Shore Alliance	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II E-2	Dana Tibbitts, Tahoe East Shore Alliance	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II F-1	Robert Aaron, Private Citizen	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II F-2	Robert Aaron, Private Citizen	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II F-3	Robert Aaron, Private Citizen	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II F-4	Robert Aaron, Private Citizen	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II F-5	Robert Aaron, Private Citizen	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II F-6	Robert Aaron, Private Citizen	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II F-7	Robert Aaron, Private Citizen	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II F-8	Robert Aaron, Private Citizen	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II F-9	Robert Aaron, Private Citizen	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II F-10	Robert Aaron, Private Citizen	Written Public Comment

AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER/ENTITY	DESCRIPTION
Agenda Item II F-11	Robert Aaron, Private Citizen	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II F-12	Robert Aaron, Private Citizen	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II G	Melissa Soderston, Director, Tahoe Forests Matter	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II H	Fred Voltz, Private Citizen	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II I	Allen Miller, South Lake Tahoe Resident	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item IV	Carol Chaplin, President and Chief Executive Officer, Tahoe Douglas Visitors Authority	PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item V	Courtney Jaeger, Certified Public Accountant, Vice President of Finance, Reno--Sparks Convention and Visitors Authority	PowerPoint Presentation This is on file in the Research Library of the LCB, Carson City, Nevada. For copies, contact the Library at (775) 684-6825.
Agenda Item VI	Serrell Smokey, Chairman, Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California	PowerPoint Presentation This is on file in the Research Library of the LCB, Carson City, Nevada. For copies, contact the Library at (775) 684-6825.
Agenda Item VII	Julie Regan, Executive Director, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency	PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item VIII	Carol Hasty, District Manager, Tahoe Transportation District	PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item IX	Sondra Rosenberg, PTP, Deputy Director, Planning and Administration, Nevada's Department of Transportation	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item X A	Helen Neff, Incline Village Resident	Written Public Comment

AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER/ENTITY	DESCRIPTION
Agenda Item X B		Compilation of written comments received from members of the public who did not speak during the meeting. These comments are posted individually on the Legislature's website for this meeting and can be found at the address below: https://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/InterimCommittee/REL/Interim2023/Meeting/34497

The Minutes are supplied as an informational service. All meeting materials are on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Carson City, Nevada. For copies, contact the Library at (775) 684-6827 or <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Division/Research/Library/About/Contact/feedbackmail.cfm>.