



Incline Village/Crystal Bay Citizen Advisory Board

Minutes of the regular meeting of the Incline Village/Crystal Bay Citizen Advisory Board held on June 24, 2024, at 5:30 p.m. at 845 Alder Ave., Incline Village, Nevada 89451

1. CALL TO ORDER/ DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

PRESENT - Kevin Lyons, Roxanna Dunn, Chris Wood, Denise Davis, Diane Becker, Carla Werner

A quorum was established, and the meeting was brought to order.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The pledge of allegiance was recited.

3. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Helen Neff addressed the board about the 2024 East Shore Express route. She noted that the route map on the TDD website shows a stop at Incline Village Elementary School, located at the corner of Village and Northwood Blvds. . The map indicates Northwood as overflow parking with a stop marker. She inquired whether the bus would stop on Village without a designated bus stop or pull into the school parking lot for pickups and drop-offs. She also asked if using the parking lot would require a special use permit from the Washoe County Board of Adjustment, according to the Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan. This question was previously posed at a TTD meeting but remained unanswered, prompting her to seek clarification from the board. She raised several concerns regarding the East Shore Express route and traffic safety. She pointed out that during school hours, the area around Incline Village Elementary School has controlled traffic with a speed limit of 15 mph and a school police officer present. However, when school is not in session, there are no traffic controls on Village Boulevard, which often sees speeding and poses risks to pedestrians and vehicles. The crosswalk over Village Boulevard is faded and needs repainting, and the area is a designated bike route, increasing safety concerns. She also noted that the Boys and Girls Club of North Lake Tahoe operates a summer camp at the school, raising questions about the safety measures for children during bus drop-offs, pickups, and field trips. Additionally, she expressed frustration that TDD did not offer a platform for public input on the 2024 East Shore Express plan, emphasizing the need for safety considerations. She also mentioned a recent article in Tahoe in Depth about plans to add 530 parking spaces along State Route 28 by 2025. She questioned how many parking spaces would be eliminated by no-parking designations and stressed that simply adding parking lots without addressing side-road parking does not effectively address congestion, safety, or evacuation issues. She noted recent observations of pedestrians walking in the street on State Route 28, further highlighting the problem.

Doug Flaherty, Chair of TahoeCleanAir.org, addressed the CAB, expressing concerns about the lack of an emergency evacuation plan in Washoe County. He highlighted several critical issues that need

to be analyzed, including: A comprehensive, data-driven evacuation plan for each roadway. Thresholds for evacuation times and real-life scenarios, such as family gathering time. Cell tower reliability during wildfires and evacuations. Impacts of increased construction height, density, and coverage on evacuation. Limitations of contraflow evacuation and the need for public agency presence at intersections. Effects of smoke on evacuees' decision-making and cognitive function. Special considerations for those hiking or biking, given the heavy use of the Shore Trail. Evacuation impacts on Incline Village from traffic fleeing Sand Harbor. Power loss and its effect on evacuation due to energy company failures. Impact of construction. Impact of increased regional population on Incline Village's evacuation capacity.

Effects of seasonal construction on evacuation times. Role of social media in evacuations, noting its potential for spreading inaccurate information. Flaherty criticized the county representatives for approving developments that prioritize growth and resort projects over public safety and environmental considerations. He argued that the current TRPA process is flawed, lacks transparency, and discourages public input.

Aaron Vanderpool commented on a related issue concerning healthcare costs in Tahoe. He discovered that a scheduled procedure at Tahoe Forest Hospital was significantly more expensive compared to similar procedures in Carson City or Reno. This disparity in costs is compounded by the lack of adequate public transportation options for residents to travel between Tahoe and these cities. Vanderpool pointed out that both insured and uninsured costs at the local hospital were much higher than those in neighboring areas. He linked these high costs to the broader issue of unsustainable development in the East Shore region, suggesting that the overall lack of effective public transportation exacerbates these problems.

Beth Davidson requested that Doug Flaherty's presentation be shared on the screen or in the chat. Since it could not be shared through those means, she was informed that a copy could be emailed if she sent a request.

4. ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM COMMISSIONER HILL

Commissioner Alexis Hill provided an update on recent county developments. She highlighted the certification of the primary election vote and progress with Phase 2.5 of housing amendments, noting that these changes do not include the Washoe Tahoe area. She mentioned that Dave Solaro (Assistant County Manager) would explain the process for these updates. Commissioner Hill also reported securing funding for TART Connect, despite concerns about its future funding. Efforts are underway to find sustainable transportation funding, including discussions with the Tahoe Oversight Committee about legislative initiatives. One proposal is to allocate a higher percentage of revenue from VRBOs and local hotel properties in Incline Village and Crystal Bay to Washoe County, rather than primarily using it for regional marketing and tourism. This funding could support transportation planning and reduce the need for annual funding requests for TART Connect. Additionally, Commissioner Hill addressed the issue of insurance difficulties due to wildfire risks. She is working with the Realtors Association and the Insurance Commissioner to explore state-level

solutions, though federal action remains uncertain. She expressed eagerness to hear further input and questions on these topics during the meeting.

Diane Becker suggested exploring the possibility of having the local tourist bureau contribute to transportation funding. She mentioned having previously discussed this with a former CFO and provided research indicating that the bureau could contribute more towards transportation. They recommended working with local stakeholders to pressure the Incline tourist bureau to provide funding if county sources fall short.

Commissioner Hill acknowledged that the local tourist bureau funded transportation fully for the first two seasons but has since reduced its contribution, seeking more partnership support. They suggested that there is still an opportunity for increased local involvement in transportation funding. She proposed potentially redirecting some taxes from the Reno Sparks Convention & Visitors Authority (RSCVA) to Washoe County to support local transportation projects, including trail connections. She commended Dave Solaro, the Assistant County manager, for his efforts in securing grants for transportation projects and emphasized the importance of continuing these initiatives for a safer community.

Andrew Wyman from Incline Village noted that California has already addressed the insurance crisis by implementing new laws requiring insurance companies to provide coverage in high fire areas. He questioned whether Nevada could expedite similar measures to address the issue more quickly rather than waiting several years.

In response, Commissioner Hill suggested to put pressure on state elected representatives in Nevada to address the insurance issue. She mentioned she is new to this role, mentioned that while California has made strides, their insurance solutions might be underfunded and problematic. They emphasized that if Nevada were to implement similar measures, it would require careful consideration and resolution of several significant issues. These are ongoing discussions at the local level.

Ann Nichols asked about TART Connect and questioned if it was providing a good balance of service for the cost.

Commissioner Hill responded that it is a pilot program, and they are doing a study with Reno Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) and Washoe County RTC, along with Placer County (CA). The program with Placer is turnkey but it is just a pilot with no long-term commitment. Incline Village resident Yolanda Knaak voiced a concern regarding the users of the TART Connect being local, and Commissioner Hill did confirm stats were provided of 60/40 part time locals over visitors, and she would get her that data later.

Chris Johnson offered two comments. First, she expressed appreciation for the data collection efforts but suggested that sharing this data more broadly would be beneficial. She also pointed out that reducing miles driven only makes a difference if the rides are shared, rather than just reducing individual trips. Regarding fire insurance, Johnson acknowledged the excellent work of the local fire department in creating a buffer around the community. She proposed that the benefits of these

efforts be communicated to insurance companies and the insurance commissioner, as they might not fully understand the local fire prevention work. She recommended using this information as part of a marketing or awareness campaign to potentially improve insurance coverage and rates for the area.

5. PUBLIC SAFETY UPDATES

Lieutenant Colacurcio from the Washoe County Sheriff's Office discussed preparations for the July 4th events in Incline Village, highlighting increased staffing from July 2nd through the weekend. He noted that Marine 9 has been very active, having assisted 15 people in two separate incidents on June 16th—one involving a rental boat towed from Tahoe City and the other from Cave Rock. Additionally, he reminded that since May 13th, open fires have been prohibited in the Incline Village area to prevent wildland fires. Denise Davis pointed out that last week the Chief stated it was only no wood burning. Lieutenant Colacurcio corrected himself and directed the attendees to NLTFPD.org for the most current fire updates. He then updated attendees regarding the eBike crew getting trained up and ready for enforcement.

Monique Penny raised concerns about how rental and sublease tenants are informed about fire restrictions. She questioned whether this information is effectively communicated through websites or other means and if there are inconsistencies within the system. Pinney also highlighted the need for a clear fire evacuation plan and emphasized the importance of defensible space around homes. She expressed frustration over the lack of progress and cohesive communication regarding fire safety regulations. Additionally, she suggested increasing public information, enforcing regulations for rental properties, and improving community awareness to ensure safety and proper maintenance, particularly in light of increased visitors and the associated risks.

Aaron Vanderpool asked about the plans for signage re: fire danger this year, particularly due to the high number of short-term rentals and tourists. He stressed the need for ample signage to warn about fire dangers during the busy season and expressed his opposition to short-term rentals in the community.

Miles Riner wanted to know if TTD has had communications with the Sheriff's Department about the possibility of using the substation along Mt. Rose Highway as an alternative site for the transportation hub.

Lieutenant Colacurcio responded TTD has not reached out to them to use that as a secondary or a primary transportation hub.

Denise Davis inquired about the absence of the Fire Chief and suggested announcing an upcoming meeting on his behalf.

Diane Becker provided details for a town hall meeting with the Nevada Division of Insurance, scheduled for Friday, June 28th, at 10:00 AM at the Parasol. She encouraged everyone to attend, as it will be a valuable meeting for those who have lost insurance.

6. TAHOE TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT (TTD)

Jim Marino, Deputy District Manager for Tahoe Transportation District, did a presentation on the Incline Village mobility project. He explained the project's importance, citing several regional and local transportation plans that support the development of a mobility hub in Incline Village. These plans include the Washoe County plans, Tahoe Area Plan, Tahoe Transportation Plan, and others.

Marino then addressed concerns about the old elementary school site, noting that the project aims to remove this eyesore, not to build or add parking there. The process involves assessing and removing hazardous materials, including asbestos and underground storage tanks. Following the assessment, a demolition plan will be developed, and utilities will be relocated as needed. The final feasibility study is expected to be completed by late summer, with demolition funding mostly secured but additional funds needed. Afterward, the project will seek funding for a preferred alternative analysis and environmental analysis to determine the best site for the mobility hub. This phase is anticipated to begin by midwinter. Marino concluded the presentation and invited questions.

Diane Becker expressed surprise at the selection of the three proposed sites for the mobility hub, questioning the evaluation process used. She pointed out concerns raised in a previous public meeting, including issues with how venues were categorized and a critical evaluation from the Washoe Tahoe Transportation Plan, which identified the proposed intersection (referring to Southwood/Northwood's intersection with Tahoe Blvd.) as the most dangerous in Incline Village and Crystal Bay. Becker highlighted specific objections related to the sites, noting that two of the options appear impractical, such as the university (UNR-Tahoe) site, which is unlikely to be available due to recent investments and objections from local entities. She asked for clarification on how the most dangerous site was chosen despite these concerns and questioned why other potential sites were not considered.

In response, Marino explained that if the site were chosen, a formal design process would include a thorough evaluation of the intersection, site access, and safety. They noted ongoing discussions with NDOT about improving the intersection, as outlined in the Washoe County plan. Regarding the slope of the street, it was estimated to be around 7 to 12%.

Becker raised concerns about the evaluation process under NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act), which requires considering and explaining alternatives and why some are rejected. They felt it was unfair that two of the selected alternatives were not viable—specifically mentioning Diamond Peak and Mount Rose as sites that had not been consulted or were not

available. She expressed frustration, feeling that the selection process did not adequately consider the best interests of the community.

Marino acknowledged that for the selected alternatives to become viable, all conditions would need to align, particularly regarding ownership or partnerships. He mentioned using 14 measurable criteria for analysis and assured that the NEPA process will include these criteria in evaluating the preferred alternative. He confirmed they would perform any impact studies that were needed once the selected locations presented viability.

There was ongoing dialog between Becker and Marino regarding concerns about traffic. Marino stated they are looking at a mobility hub at Spooner Summit and SR28. This can accommodate micro-transit, East Shore Express, TART, and links with bike trails and walking trails. In addition, expanding the parking lot at Secret Harbor to remove parking along SR28. These updates and more are available in the Tahoe plans.

Becker stated that they need to consider more transit options like bus stops, and stop focusing on parking spaces that bring more people into Incline Village. Marino advised that they cannot prevent people from coming to Incline Village, rather they need to make public transit more attractive and a part of normal transportation options. They discussed Kings Beach not getting a parking lot. Marino stated it is still on the regional plan.

Chris Wood asked if some criteria for selecting optional sites were weighed more than others. Marino advised they did not at this point. Discussion ensued regarding the 14 criteria to evaluate the optional locations for the site. Marino expressed that the public opinion criteria is weighed when they get to the environmental phase. To date, it has not been used to narrow down the list of sites. He discussed other options for 771 Southwood (the Old Elementary School site), including selling the property. The difference is between a hub vs a transit center is discussed and Marino confirmed they still have that on the regional plan.

Kevin reminded Jim Merino that last time TTD was here Kevin asked, "what is the problem you are trying to solve?" and that we still didn't have a real answer now months later, which is one reason why people are upset. Kevin noted that there were plenty of real problems we must solve here regarding traffic and highlighted several including the traffic blockage on 28 at Sand Harbor from parking lines there in the morning and the Kings beach traffic backups at the moronically designed roundabouts that are so bad they have to be staffed with live traffic guards at peak times. Kevin noted that a transportation hub would not seem to solve any of those real and important problems and also noted that if someone wants to use public resources to do something they need to solve a real public problem, not an imagined one. Kevin asked for the scores used to compare the different locations for a hub and Jim stated that "They'll be in the feasibility, analysis, study." and added that "We have a draft feasibility analysis." Kevin told him that he would be requesting that public record. Kevin also asked about some traffic modeling facts like the intercept rate of traffic that would be off the road with a hub and how much hub traffic would be

walking vs driving and parking. Jim stated that that he didn't have any answers to any of those questions. Kevin pointed out that those were basic facts that anyone involved in a transportation project should know.

Chris Wood commented again that a reduction in vehicle miles traveled should be the goal. Doug Flaherty had some thoughts. All proposed alternatives for the mobility hub are likely to jeopardize public safety due to their impact on already congested residential and commercial routes. This could exacerbate traffic problems daily and during critical wildfire evacuations. The proposed sites for the mobility hub adversely affect already congested roads leading to Highway 28, increasing safety risks. The Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) removed public participation by dissolving the Incline Mobility Hub Committee. This move is seen as an attempt to minimize opposition to the proposed locations, which are perceived as unsafe and poorly planned. TTD's claims about reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and overall traffic are viewed as controversial and lacking substantial evidence. These claims are criticized as being speculative and not based on concrete data. The effectiveness of TTD's proposals in achieving traffic reduction is deemed uncertain, likened to requiring a "crystal ball" to predict. The active community's opposition is criticized as being labeled disingenuously as "NIMBY" (Not In My Backyard), ignoring the community's genuine safety and traffic concerns. It is argued that the TTD developed the proposed alternatives without adequate community input, making the criticisms and concerns valid. The original Federal Transit Administration (FTA) application is criticized for being flawed and misleading. This issue is anticipated to be a significant aspect of an eventual lawsuit. It is argued that the TTD: reevaluate proposed sites for the mobility hub to address safety concerns and their impact on local traffic and emergency evacuation routes.

Consider reinstating or enhancing public involvement in decision-making processes to ensure community input is adequately considered; Provide clear, evidence-based documentation to support claims of traffic reduction and mobility improvements; Investigate and address any potential flaws in the original FTA application to ensure transparency and accuracy; and recognize and address the validity of community concerns rather than dismissing them as opposition based on proximity or local bias.

Aaron Vanderpool commented again expressing frustration with the proposed site alternatives for the mobility hub, suggesting that the process might be a formality rather than a genuine search for better locations. He is particularly surprised that none of the proposed alternatives include entrances or exits off Tahoe Boulevard, which he believes would alleviate some traffic issues. Aaron supports the UNR site as a potential location for the mobility hub. He argues that it is in a commercial area, owned by Duffield, and would be a better fit compared to the current proposals. He advocates for the implementation of bus stops as a more viable solution than large parking facilities, echoing a common sentiment among local stakeholders.

Aaron criticizes the ongoing development on the East Shore, arguing that it is unsustainable and contributes to increased traffic and environmental degradation. He views TTD and TRPA as

complicit in promoting unsustainable development by creating trails and infrastructure that encourage more visitors, which in turn exacerbates the problem. Aaron emphasizes that expanding parking capacity without addressing overall traffic management and reducing existing parking options will only worsen the situation. He believes that adding more trails and recreational facilities will attract even more visitors, leading to further congestion and environmental impact. Aaron calls for: A reevaluation of the current approach to development and tourism management, urging decision-makers to consider the long-term sustainability of the East Shore and Tahoe Basin; Consider reexamining proposed mobility hub sites, including potential new locations such as the UNR site, and ensure that all viable options are thoroughly assessed; Take into account public suggestions, such as implementing more bus stops, to reduce reliance on personal vehicles and address local traffic concerns; Review and address concerns about unsustainable development practices and their impact on the East Shore and Tahoe Basin; Focus on balancing growth with environmental preservation and community needs; Develop strategies to manage parking more effectively, including potential reductions in parking capacity in congested areas, and ensure that new parking facilities align with broader traffic management goals. Engage in comprehensive long-term planning to address the balance between tourism, development and environmental sustainability; and consider setting limits on development to protect the region's natural resources and quality of life.

Rhonda Tycer, a long-time resident of Incline Village, opposes the mobility hub proposed for the old Incline Elementary School. She believes the decision to place affordable housing along with the hub there is part of a plan to make it seem more acceptable. While she acknowledges some proposed solutions, like leaving space for affordable housing or rerouting buses, she argues that these do not address the main issues. A mobility hub will attract more cars to Incline Village, and visitors may park in residential areas rather than designated lots. This problem is exacerbated by services like TART Connect, which allow visitors to park anywhere and then request a ride. The increased traffic from the hub will make evacuation more difficult in emergencies. No amount of planning or new alert systems will mitigate this increased risk. Tycer questions the fairness of residents funding Nevada State Parks at Sand Harbor, which in turn pays TTD for tourist services. She feels this arrangement is unfair to local residents. With recent fires on the North Shore, she highlights the urgent need to address these issues before a disaster strikes.

Richard Miner added criticism of the ongoing strategy to encourage more visitors to Lake Tahoe and the subsequent need to use public funds to accommodate them. He suggests that access to attractions should be regulated to manage visitor numbers. He proposes implementing access fees or restrictions similar to those used in other parts of California to manage traffic and reduce strain on the local infrastructure. Miner argues that residents should not bear the costs of building transportation centers or managing tourist parking. He expresses doubt that visitors will use proposed bus services, particularly those traveling long distances. He believes that such plans are unrealistic and will fail. Instead of investing in transportation hubs, Miner advocates for limiting access to the Tahoe Basin for those who do not live or work there, as a more effective solution.

Wayne Ford lives 1000ft from the Old Incline Elementary School and is concerned about the impact of using this site for a mobility hub on his and his daughter's daily life. Ford predicts significant traffic issues if the mobility hub is implemented. He expects overflow parking to spread onto nearby Route 28 and into residential neighborhoods, exacerbating congestion. He also mentions potential problems with traffic affecting access to local destinations, such as golf courses. Ford alleges that the use of the OES site was initially established through illegal activities. He recounts that Mr. (Carl) Hasty (Chair of the TTD) began operating a hub without proper permits after the school had been closed for over five years. Ford claims that he was informed by Mr. (John) Hester, the acting TRPA director at the time (specifically titled: Interim Executive Director), that no permit was issued for this operation. Ford raises concerns about the lack of certification for Best Management Practices (BMPs) on the site, which had not been inspected for over 15 years. He describes a situation where records related to the site, including reports on oil contamination and earthquake damage, were not available when requested. Ford asserts that these issues indicate a pattern of neglect and improper management related to the site. Ford concludes by stating that the foundation of the current plan for the OES site is based on activities that he believes were conducted illegally, and he feels that there is an attempt to legitimize these actions retroactively.

Barbara Perlman Wyman highlights her extensive experience and leadership roles, including serving as a supervisor for Washoe, Carson, and Douglas counties, and her leadership positions in conservation at both the state and national levels. She has also been actively involved in local committees and community planning for over 20 years. Wyman emphasizes the value and contributions of the community, noting that local committees and residents have invested significant time and effort to address various issues. She asserts that conservation encompasses not just wildlife and plants but also people and community. Wyman expresses concern that the current planning and decision-making processes are not adequately respecting community input. She believes that the community's needs and concerns should be given the same level of respect as environmental considerations. Wyman references her involvement in the 1996 community plan and her ongoing commitment to ensuring that community needs are addressed in planning efforts.

Andrew Wyman acknowledges that many others have provided detailed and knowledgeable insights into why the project is problematic. He describes the project as a "Mission Impossible," suggesting that it is fundamentally flawed and unlikely to succeed. Wyman emphasizes that the project's issues are part of a broader regional problem related to overpopulation and traffic congestion. He advocates for regional solutions rather than focusing on a single project that cannot address these larger issues. He concludes by reiterating that the project is unlikely to solve the fundamental problems and may lead to additional costs and complications.

Monique Penny agrees with previous speakers that the voice of the community should be the primary criterion in decision-making, even more important than the 14 other criteria. She emphasizes that the community's opposition to the project is clear and should be paramount. She

highlights that the old elementary school was originally built for the children of Incline Village, benefiting local families. She questions how converting it into a mobility hub would benefit the community and suggests that replacing something that served the community well with something that doesn't is not a positive change. Penny addresses concerns about the site's appearance, noting that it has been an eyesore for some time. She advocates for finding a solution that would enhance the community rather than simply demolishing the building to create a hub. She stresses the need to preserve the community's character and warns that the proposed hub will not address the real issues of over-tourism and congestion. Penny emphasizes that Incline Village's growing recognition should be managed carefully to maintain its charm. She concludes by reaffirming that the mobility hub is not the right solution for the community and that continuing to invest in it will not yield the desired outcomes.

Jack Dalton emphasizes that the discussion seems to be a repeat of past arguments, indicating frustration with what he perceives as a lack of progress or new solutions. Dalton recalls that the initial decision to use the old elementary school site was made by a narrow margin of just one vote. He highlights that some officials who voted on the initial decision are still present, suggesting that the process may be flawed or lacking transparency. He draws a parallel to traffic management in New York City, where restrictions led to unintended consequences, such as an increase in the number of cars. Dalton argues that similar strategies are ineffective and should not be supported. Dalton concludes by urging representatives to stop supporting the current proposal, implying that it is not a viable solution and will not address the issues effectively.

Judith Miller expresses skepticism about the proposal to include affordable housing on the site as a compromise. She argues that affordable housing would be more feasible without the mobility hub and feels that this offer is being used to placate community concerns. She contends that neither the proposed alternative sites nor the OES site is suitable for the mobility hub. Miller questions whether any of the identified sites are appropriate. Miller suggests that if a mobility hub is necessary, the government could use eminent domain to acquire private land for a more suitable location. She acknowledges that this process is not ideal but believes it could be a viable solution if no other options are available.

Yolanda Knaak agrees with Kevin's perspective on solving problems before implementing solutions. Knaak recalls a Zoom call from three years ago, during which a large majority of participants opposed the old elementary school location for the hub. She expresses frustration at the continued discussion of this site despite the strong community opposition at that time.

Dave Solero, Assistant Washoe County Manager, clarified that the intersection mentioned as having the highest crash rate is not Northwood/Southwood Blvds. and SR28. According to the Tahoe transportation plan, from 2015 to 2019, the highest crash intersection was actually Village and SR28, followed by Mount Rose Highway and SR28. He wanted to ensure that this correction was on the record.

Helen Neff, an Incline Village resident, expressed her strong opposition to building more parking lots and adding free parking spaces, as she believes this undermines the viability of public transit. She thanked the panel for confirming that 530 parking spaces on State Route 28 will be removed when new lots are completed, with the project expected to finish by 2025. Helen emphasized the importance of monitoring these changes to ensure road safety.

She also criticized the plans for ignoring the safety requirements outlined in the Washoe transportation plan and the Tahoe area plan. Helen shared a personal experience, recounting a severe accident she suffered in March 2021 while crossing a street in a crosswalk. The accident resulted in significant medical expenses and extensive recovery time. She stressed the importance of prioritizing safety to prevent similar incidents.

Lorene Meyer, a 32-year resident of Incline Village, expressed her concerns about the proposed mobility hub at the old elementary school site. She questioned the logic of increasing vehicle traffic while trying to reduce it and suggested utilizing existing facilities at Mount Rose, including unused restrooms and parking areas, for a trial period to gauge effectiveness.

Lorene also criticized the idea of bringing more visitors to Incline Village when there are (only) private beaches with restricted access. She recommended directing visitors to public beaches at King's Beach and Sand Harbor and using buses for transportation instead of adding more cars to the area.

Additionally, she pointed out the presence of a fault line at the old elementary school site, noting that this was a significant factor in why the school was not rebuilt. She concluded by urging that the site should not be considered for the mobility hub and advocating for measures to keep additional traffic out of the basin.

Chuck Meyer expressed his agreement with the concerns voiced by other speakers and conveyed his dissatisfaction with the proposed mobility hub project. He criticized the proposed solutions and explanations provided by Washoe County, describing them as insulting and illogical. Chuck specifically pointed out the idea of adding amenities like parks or housing at a problematic intersection does not make sense. He supported the suggestion of locating parking facilities in areas where there are fewer residential impacts, such as Spooner or the base of Mount Rose. He found the reasoning behind demolishing the old elementary school without a clear plan for its future to be flawed and embarrassing. Chuck emphasized that the current proposals and justifications are inadequate and urged reconsideration of the project's approach.

Chris Johnson, a 25-year resident of Incline Village, expressed appreciation for the Citizens Advisory Board's (CAB) efforts and Rhonda's updates. He shared several points:

Request for Accessibility: He suggested providing hot links to referenced documents in presentations to facilitate easier access and reduce the need for additional questions.

Bus Ridership Concerns: Chris questioned the effectiveness of current bus systems, noting that despite the presence of buses in South Lake Tahoe, ridership appears low and buses are often underused.

Traffic and Transportation Issues: He highlighted issues with transportation infrastructure, such as traffic congestion affecting

bus efficiency. He recommended considering dedicated bus lanes to improve transportation to ski areas. Practical Solutions Over Hub: Chris questioned whether the proposed mobility hub is the optimal solution and suggested focusing on addressing fundamental transportation problems with more practical and immediate fixes, like improving existing transit systems and ensuring timely bus services. He emphasized the importance of addressing these core issues rather than investing in potentially ineffective new projects.

Miles Reiner, a resident of Incline Village, expressed frustration and concern about the ongoing effort to use the old elementary school site as a bus hub. He has posed this question several times and is seeking a clear answer from the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD): Question on Abandoning the Site: Miles asked what it would take for TTD to abandon the plan to use the old elementary school site for the bus hub, given the significant objections from the community. Community Actions: He inquired about the necessary actions the community would need to take to influence TTD's decision. He suggested various potential measures, including legal action, petitions, or public demonstrations, to signal to TTD the community's strong opposition. Threshold for Change: He expressed frustration that despite the community's efforts, TTD has not changed its approach or reconsidered the site. Miles is seeking clarity on what threshold or type of action would be sufficient for TTD to abandon the site as a bus hub. He is looking for a definitive response on how the community can effectively impact the decision-making process regarding the bus hub location.

Jim Marino addressed Miles Reiner's question. He acknowledged that it is a challenging question to answer directly. He emphasized the district's intention to improve transit services and recognize the need for better transit options beyond the current plans. He stated that the Transportation District will re-evaluate the situation after the meeting and discuss the next steps internally. (Comment: While Jim's response indicates a willingness to consider community feedback and re-assess the project, he did not provide a specific threshold or criteria for abandoning the current site plan. These objections have been stated for a long time. Carl Hasty, TTD Chair, has previously exclaimed at a prior CAB meeting: "We've heard you!". The community is getting very skeptical of this response from the TTD.)

Beth Davidson echoed Andrew Wyman's point about the necessity of a regional solution for transportation issues. She emphasized that addressing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) outside the basin is crucial. Criticism of TTD's Approach: She criticized the Transportation District (TTD) for not adequately addressing VMT and for pursuing a mobility hub within the basin, which she believes does not effectively reduce VMT. Alternative Solutions: Davidson supported Richard Miner's suggestion of using systems like Fast Track, which involve parking outside the basin and using buses for entry, to reduce VMT. She argued that this approach aligns better with TTD's responsibilities and could be more effective. Frustration with Ongoing Plans: She expressed frustration with the continued push for the current plan, deeming it unworkable and insulting given the feedback from the community and previous meetings.

Melissa Horton asked about the hypothetical timeline for completion if the site were approved today. She wanted to know if it would take 5 years, 10 years, or another duration. Support for the Project: Despite the strong opposition in the community, she expressed her support for the project and acknowledged the concerns of others, such as safety and the influx of unfamiliar people. Current Safety Issues: She outlined several safety concerns with the current intersection: Lack of a protected left turn. Difficulty in seeing oncoming traffic when turning east from the northbound lane. Non-compliance with the 25-mph speed limit. Significant lane shift when driving southbound, suggesting a need for lane widening and possibly a bus lane or a traffic circle for increased safety. Support for Mount Rose Parking: She liked the idea of utilizing Mount Rose for parking and hoped that facilities there would open year-round, enhancing the experience for visitors. Personal Connection: She mentioned being a military family who has called Incline Village home for over a decade and expressed a deep affection for the community. Desire for Improvement: Despite the unpopularity of her opinion, she believes the area is overdue for improvements and feels that the mobility hub could be beneficial. Interest in Improvement Solutions: Melissa also suggested specific improvements to the current intersection to address safety issues and improve traffic flow.

Jim Marino would say if it was approved today, probably be at least three years before breaking ground by the time they have permits in hand and funding in place.

Marsha Birkbigler shared that she has been in touch with Incline Village residents and received recurring questions about the transportation plans, which have not been adequately addressed by TTD. Marsha highlighted the current lack of public transportation in Incline Village and Crystal Bay and asked if the proposed hub would lead to additional bus services, particularly to Reno or Carson City. She inquired about the possibility of smaller community vans to assist residents with essential trips, such as medical visits or shopping. She raised concerns about the existing parking issues in Incline Village, suggesting that any parking spaces at the new hub should be designated for residents only to prevent outside visitors from occupying them. Marsha emphasized that any transportation solutions should benefit Incline Village residents and not lead to visitors spending their money in other areas. She expressed frustration that she cannot answer the questions from residents regarding potential taxes or fees that might be imposed on them without clear benefits to the local community. Marsha concluded by stating that the community deserves answers to these questions before any plans move forward, particularly given the current traffic and congestion issues in the area.

Pamela Tsigdinos emphasized concern that TTD and its consultants are disconnected from the realities facing Tahoe and its communities, particularly regarding the increasing wildfire dangers. She called for TTD to conduct a 2025 carrying capacity study specifically focused on wildfire evacuation for both residents and visitors. She argued that it makes more sense to reduce vehicle congestion by keeping cars outside the basin in safe locations rather than bringing them into the area. Pamela highlighted the availability of significant federal grants and urged TTD to prioritize solving the pressing issue of moving people out of the basin instead of adding parking spaces. She suggested that TTD has the opportunity to set a national example by adopting best practices for

wildfire evacuations, arguing that this should be the primary focus of TTD rather than creating more congestion and risking lives. The speaker concluded by stressing the urgency of addressing these concerns.

Patricia Lord, a resident of Incline Village and former employee at the now-closed elementary school, expressed her concerns about traffic in the area, particularly since the opening of Grocery Outlet. She noted a significant increase in cars coming into the Village Center, which she estimates has almost doubled. Patricia clarified that her previous comments were misinterpreted; she is not opposed to the concept of a transportation hub but specifically opposed to its proposed location at the old elementary school. She emphasized the importance of safety as the number one priority, particularly given the challenges posed by increased traffic and the potential confusion of drivers navigating side streets and parking options. She concluded by reiterating her concern for the community's safety.

Jim Marino thanked everyone for the engaging conversation and noted that he took detailed notes during the meeting. He appreciated the board's insights regarding the proposed site at 771 Southwood and alternative locations. Jim mentioned that he would return to the Tahoe Transportation District to discuss the next steps and assured the attendees that they would be kept informed about any developments

7. TAHOE AREA PLAN (2025)

Dave Solaro, Assistant County Manager for Washoe County, provided an update on the Tahoe Area Plan, detailing the process and anticipated timeline for amendments. This update is part of Washoe County's strategic plan, addressing economic impacts and community needs.

- **Process Overview:** Updating the Tahoe Area Plan involves a detailed, 15-step process outlined in a 44-page document by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA). The process is expected to take 9 to 12 months, including multiple opportunities for public input.
- **Current Status:** Washoe County has completed 1.5 of the board's priorities and is working on the second half of priority #2, which is expected to go to a second reading in August or July 16th. The Tahoe Area Plan update is prioritized as #4 among housing packages.
- **Kickoff Meeting:** Initial project kickoff and gathering of community feedback.
- **Notice of Intent:** Submission of intent to amend the area plan to TRPA in October.
- **Draft Preparation:** Development of draft language and circulation to the community for feedback.
- **Environmental Checklist:** Creation and review of a draft environmental checklist by TRPA.
- **TRPA Review:** Information meetings and review by the TRPA Regional Plan Committee.

- **Planning Commission:** Public hearings and adoption process at the Planning Commission level.
- **Board of County Commissioners:** First and second readings of the ordinance, with opportunities for public comment.
- **TRPA Conformance Review:** Final review and approval by TRPA to ensure alignment with regional plans.
- **Public Input:** Multiple opportunities for public comment will be provided throughout the process, including during draft review and before final adoption.
- Feedback will be integrated as appropriate, with a focus on community concerns and needs.
- **Proposed Amendments:** Notable issues include correcting typos in the plan and addressing specific housing needs, such as workforce housing. Other potential amendments will be detailed as the process progresses, with a focus on incorporating TRPA requirements and community feedback.
- **Next Steps:** A draft letter of intent to TRPA will be shared with the CAB and the community for review. Updates and information will be regularly provided to ensure community awareness and involvement.
- **Discussion:** Diane Becker inquired about specific areas proposed for amendment. Dave Solaro mentioned workforce housing and a correction for a typo in the plan. A more detailed list of proposed changes will be provided later.
- **Community Engagement:** Feedback from the CAB and community members is encouraged and will be used to refine and improve the Tahoe Area Plan update.

This presentation emphasizes the importance of public participation in shaping the Tahoe Area Plan and outlines the structured approach Washoe County is taking to ensure thorough and transparent updates.

Chris Wood asked if the TRPA amendments related to density, height, parking, and coverage are being addressed. Dave Solaro confirmed that these details are part of what TRPA requires for the area plan. Specifics will be outlined in the letter of intent that Washoe County will submit to TRPA. Dave will need to verify the exact requirements with staff. Chris inquired if Washoe County's updates to the Tahoe Area Plan will be consistent with the current TRPA area plan. Yes, Washoe County is required to ensure consistency with the current TRPA area plan as part of their update process. Chris asked if the presentation slides are available online. Dave confirmed that the slides should be available on the CAB website. They were updated Friday afternoon, but Chris mentioned not seeing them at that time. The letter of intent to TRPA will provide more detailed information on the required changes, including any updates related to density, height, and other planning

elements. The presentation and related materials are intended to be accessible for public review and input, and the website should have the most current information available.

8. NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT HUB

Alexandra Wilson provided meeting notice updates regarding housing affordability packages. The upcoming meetings include: One this evening, one on Wednesday and one in person on July 1st, 2024. Two of these meetings are via Zoom, and the in-person meeting offers an additional option to attend. If unable to attend, the meetings will be recorded, and the recording can be provided if needed.

9. BOARD MEMBER ANNOUNCEMENTS/REQUESTS/DISCUSSION

Denise Davis reminded everyone about the meeting with the Nevada Division of Insurance on June 28th at 10:00 AM at the Parasol. Attendees are encouraged to speak up about fire insurance issues. Denise Davis also highlighted the A55 Plus senior transportation program sponsored by GID, Washoe County, NDOT, and RTC. It offers scheduled and on-demand services for seniors 55 and over. For more details, search online for "GID senior transportation."

Chris Wood requested that the board consider inviting speakers to discuss the plans for expanding the East Shore Trail from Sand Harbor to Spooner Summit and its impact on Route 28 and local traffic. This aligns with ongoing discussions about infrastructure and traffic. Washoe County

Roxana Dunn requested a speaker on Washoe County's upcoming sustainability initiatives. The board will address this request.

Kevin Lyons announced he had requested a draft plan through a public records request and will share it online.

10. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

East Shore Trail Concerns: Incline Village resident, Doug Flaherty, praised Chris Wood for raising the issue about the East Shore Trail expansion. Doug highlighted that the next phase of the trail is planned to go over Lake Tahoe, which raises concerns about environmental impact. They suggested that there might be grounds to challenge this expansion due to changing conditions and population data.

Local Transportation and Trails: Helen Neff expressed concern about the lack of local bus and bike paths between Crystal Bay and Incline Village.¹ She also shared an update from Mr. Morino, who indicated that the current elementary school site would be removed from the route list, which was confirmed by Washoe County due to a special use permit issue.

¹ However, she is on the record in prior CAB meetings about the lack of local road-pedestrian safety improvements while priority is given instead to bus and bike paths between Crystal Bay and Incline Village.

Development and Impact: Aaron Vanderpool supported the concerns about the East Shore Trail and its potential to overwhelm Lake Tahoe. They also mentioned the expansion of campgrounds in Zephyr Cove and expressed worry about increased demand and the impact of free transportation services. They argued that creating more parking and trails could exacerbate the problem rather than addressing it.

Final Thoughts: The commenter concluded by emphasizing that rather than creating more infrastructure, efforts should focus on preventing dangerous parking and managing demand more effectively.

11. ADJOURNMENT - Adjourned at 8:40pm