



Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Advisory Planning Commission
128 Market St.
Stateline, NV 89449

April 24, 2017

Re: Comments on the final Regional Transportation Plan update, associated Initial Study/Initial Environmental Checklist (IS/IEC), and related documents

Dear Chair Lawrence, Governing Board members, and TRPA staff:

The Friends of the West Shore (“FOWS”) and the Tahoe Area Sierra Club (“TASC”) thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the final 2017 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update, Initial Study/Initial Environmental Checklist (IS/IEC), and related documents (RTP package). As noted in our 3/22/2017 comments on the draft RTP package, the 2017 RTP includes many policies and projects that we believe will improve elements of Tahoe’s transportation system. We also appreciate staff’s responses to our comments, provided on 4/10/2017.

FOWS and TASC understand there are no easy solutions to many of the larger traffic problems affecting the Tahoe Basin, especially in light of the increased populations of Northern California and Nevada. While the RTP update contains many positive actions, we remain concerned that the RTP does not go far enough to encourage and require more aggressive actions to address expanding traffic problems and transit needs.¹

The traffic impacts Lake Tahoe is now experiencing are not new or unexpected. While smartphone apps have aggravated problems by sending drivers on neighborhood streets, VMT and peak period vehicle trips to the Basin by visitors has been a well-documented problem for decades. In fact, the 2017 RTP data show that the percentage of trips accounted for by visitors to the Basin is 42 percent – *exactly the same value reflected in 1995*.² The overall actions recommended to address transportation issues have also been around for decades (in fact, a review of the 1986 Regional Plan Transportation Element reveals a lot of the same information and planning as what is included in the 2017 RTP).³ We remain concerned that for over forty years plans have failed to include more aggressive measures to address traffic problems, and the 2017 RTP update once again passes the buck forward at least another four years (to the 2021 update). The lack of inclusion of aggressive measures to fund and implement actions after decades of transportation and land use plan updates and revisions is a good reason the public has repeatedly critiqued recent plans that fail to implement every available measure to reduce traffic,

¹ 3/22/2017 and 4/10/2017 written comments and 4/12/2017 verbal comments to APC.

² **1995:** “According to the 1995 base year model output, visitor trips account for 42% of the total trips, and 56% of the total VMT. A visitor/recreational trip is a one-time activity rather than a regular daily-based activity such as a commute trip. Recreational trips normally involve an individual making choices from sets of alternative destinations.” (2000 Lake Tahoe Air Quality Research Scoping document, TRPA, p. 84) [Emphasis added]

2017: “...visitors to Lake Tahoe account for nearly 42 percent of daily trips. Recognizing that residents, commuters, and visitors each use the system differently and sometimes similarly is the first step to understanding patterns of travel behavior at Lake Tahoe.” (2017 RTP, p. 1-14) [Emphasis added]

³ Excerpt attached.

nor sufficiently addressed the traffic added from conversions of single-family homes to vacation rentals.

While several positive changes were made to the proposed RTP for the final RTP package, several concerns and recommendations have not been addressed. The following comments are provided in addition to our 3/22/2017 and 4/10/2017 comments.

Recommendation for “no new VMT” policies:

Traffic should not be made worse before TRPA figures out how to reduce the congestion problems that already exist. Therefore, we recommend the adoption of policies that would prohibit the approval of projects that generate additional VMT and new special events and temporary uses that would increase vehicle trips (neither of these recommendations suggests a moratorium, but rather that more stringent measures be required with such approvals so traffic problems are not made worse). Staff’s response is that such a policy would likely prevent new redevelopment projects from being constructed,⁴ and that the RTP collectively is forecast to reduce VMT. The Tahoe City Lodge was cited as an example of a project that would increase VMT (and thus be prohibited under such a policy) yet provide water quality benefits to the area.⁵ As noted in our RTP comments, as well as extensive public comments on the Tahoe Basin Area Plan (see 3/22/2017 letter for cites), there are more options available to reduce the vehicle use generated by new projects and plans that have not been incorporated into such plans. In other words, more could be done to reduce the traffic generated by new and large redevelopment projects.

While the staff response to comments states that such a policy may prevent new beneficial redevelopment projects, given the significant environmental, social, economic, and public health and safety impacts of increased traffic, we question the presumed ‘benefits’ of traffic-worsening projects and believe that policies which will allow large redevelopment projects to increase VMT should be reconsidered unless and until more measures are included to prevent the additional impacts. For example, the increased extent of resuspended road dust (which may deposit much farther from the highway and thus not be captured through street sweeping or other stormwater treatment facilities) and NOx emissions from VMT may negate water quality benefits from projects which implement BMPs on non-compliant parcels (a common ‘theme’ for ‘redevelopment’ projects approved by TRPA). Either way, there is no question that more traffic will create more environmental impacts throughout the Basin and further threaten public health and safety by impeding emergency access and services on roadways, especially during peak periods. The RTP should implement all available options to minimize traffic increases.

The limited time frame resulting from the late release of the RTP update precludes any meaningful discussion between the public and TRPA regarding potential alternatives or variations of a “no new VMT” policy that could be discussed.

⁴ “Such a policy would likely stop most redevelopment projects needed to support the implementation of Area Plans and the TRPA Regional Plan.” (TRPA response to League to Save Lake Tahoe [LTSLT], p. 6)

⁵ Statement by General Counsel John Marshall during 4/12/2017 APC hearing.

The RTP should include a no new VMT policy. We request staff and GB members discuss this issue and go on record supporting the immediate consideration of stronger land use policies that will prohibit existing traffic problems from being made worse. Such actions may also include tighter regulations regarding the conversion of single family homes into vacation homes, a trend which has allowed for the impacts of 1000's of additional de facto Tourist Accommodation Units (TAUs) that are not addressed in the RTP or RPU environmental documents (more below).

Vacation Rentals:

Our previous comments explained that the environmental analysis has not addressed the increased traffic impacts from recent trends, including the conversion of single family homes to vacation rentals,⁶ the exploding popularity of VRBO, Airbnb, etc.). Notably, the 2012 RPU advertised “no new TAUs”⁷ and as a result, did not analyze impacts from, and mitigation for, additional TAUs, yet 1000's of single family homes have been and continue to be converted to de facto TAUs.⁸ While we appreciate TRPA's efforts to participate on housing forums and discuss transit improvements with management companies,⁹ the RTP fails to address the impacts and include any meaningful actions to reduce them, let alone prevent new impacts (impacts include both annual and peak increases in VMT and vehicle trips). These vacation rentals have become an unchecked source of additional vehicle traffic in the Basin. Further, it is possible that a large extent of TRPA's other efforts to reduce transportation impacts by visitors may be negated by the increases in vacation rentals alone, rendering the extensive time, energy, and resources being put into other actions of the RTP and RPU of limited or no use.

We recommend the GB direct staff (and redirect workloads, as necessary), to immediately analyze the impacts of vacation rentals and investigate possible regulatory mechanisms to ensure the impacts are addressed by the RTP and RPU plans.

⁶ “From a modeling perspective, it is important to understand what percentage of homes operate as seasonal homes or vacation rentals, because seasonal visitors and vacationers have different travel patterns than full-time residents. For instance, the average number of trips per day for a full-time residential household is approximately 9.6, while lodging properties geared towards visitors generate approximately 10.6 vehicle trips per day...” (draft 2017 RTP, App. D, p. D-26)

⁷ http://www.trpa.org/wp-content/uploads/RPU_2pager_Numbers_3-251.pdf

⁸ Detailed examples of the significant increases in vacation rentals are provided in our 4/10/2017 APC comments.

⁹ “TRPA is involved in a number of housing forums. We anticipate public discussion on the concerns of residential building allocations and possible land use policies. TRPA and partners will be working with all major commercial interests that manage vacation home rentals through transportation demand management programs focused on encouraging active transportation and transit as a means for getting around Tahoe.” (TRPA 4/10/2017 response to the League to Save Lake Tahoe's draft RTP comments, p. 3)

Parking Management and Limits:

As noted by our comments, as well as the League to Save Lake Tahoe (LTSLT), the RTP's parking requirements need to be strengthened. The staff summary reports no changes were made to the parking requirements and that parking standards are implemented by local jurisdictions.¹⁰ However, given that parking spaces increase VMT¹¹ and vehicle use,¹² and TRPA is the agency responsible for regulating VMT in the Basin, it is reasonable—and *required*—for TRPA to address the impacts of parking spaces on VMT. Local jurisdictions are responsible for enforcing TRPA's requirements. It is also worth noting that parking spaces are very expensive, and drive up the cost of the desired redevelopment promoted by the TRPA Regional Plan (see previous cites).

The following recommendations were included in our 3/22/2017 draft RTP comments:

- 1) Additional parking spaces should be discouraged/prohibited and existing parking spaces reduced in order to reduce vehicle use (this does not mean new or redevelopment projects would not be allowed to construct new spaces in their project areas, however a system could be in place to ensure spaces elsewhere are reduced, just as there are coverage and other commodity transfer programs); and
- 2) It is more effective to better manage existing parking spaces to address peak needs rather than simply construct additional spaces.

We request the RTP be amended to include policies to implement (or require the swift development of) a parking commodities program within a designated time frame. At a minimum, the environmental impacts of new parking spaces (e.g. increased VMT) must be adequately evaluated, disclosed, and mitigated in the environmental assessment of all future projects and plans.

¹⁰ “First, there is no regionally suitable, one-size fits all maximum parking standard. The better avenue for implementation of the approach is thru local government Area Plans...TRPA does not have minimum or maximum parking standards. Parking standards are set only by local jurisdictions through area plans and local codes. Existing TRPA policies and code require local jurisdictions to analyze parking and include parking measures to encourage walking, biking, and transit development of area plans.” (4/10/2017 Response to LTSLT, p. 2)

¹¹ “Each additional parking space constructed deepens the hole of air and water quality impacts that the Tahoe Basin is trying to climb out of. The report confirms this connection on page 57: “It is in the public interest to minimize parking wherever possible in order to...encourage non-auto transit modes.” However, there is no mention of VMT in the report, specifically, the relationship between parking and VMT. This document should describe how minimizing the parking supply serves to reduce VMT and addresses the TRPA's VMT threshold, while increasing parking supply will increase VMT and undermine threshold attainment. Similarly, there is no mention in the report of the relationship between increased parking supply and worsened traffic congestion.” (12/9/2016 LTSLT comments on draft TBAP DEIR/S, as taken from transportation expert Greg Reissen)

¹² “Forget about building downtown parking lots: You won't need them.” San Francisco Chronicle, 12/30/2016. <http://www.sfchronicle.com/opinion/article/Forget-about-building-downtown-parking-lots-You-10827773.php> and “The High Cost of Free Parking.” Donald Shoup. 2011. American Planning Association.

Road toll/user fee:

1) Funding:

We appreciate staff's response to our recommendation that a road toll/user fee be considered to generate transit funds and disincentivize personal automobile use into the Basin (a suggestion also made by the LTSLT and other GB members and cited in our previous comments). Many of the 2017 RTP's measures have been around for decades, as shown by the attached 1986 Regional Plan Transportation Element; however many have not been implemented due to a lack of funding. Unless new and more aggressive actions are taken to secure funding, another thirty years could go by with more plan updates prescribing what needs to be done but with little implementation. In addition, as noted by Placer County's comments on the RTP, the funding has not even been fully secured for the RTP's "constrained" projects.¹³

The 2017 Tahoe Transit Master Plan identifies substantial cost increases associated with providing improved transit systems to meet traffic reduction goals;¹⁴ as with the RTP, if new sources of significant funding are not located, then plans will not be fully implemented and transportation impacts will not be reduced. Over four decades of efforts to secure sufficient public and private funding have not been adequate. As noted by comments from the Truckee North Tahoe Transportation Management Associated, TRPA must "proactively think beyond...typical traditional [funding] sources."¹⁵ Staff's response regarding the suggestion to consider this option to generate funds refers to the development of a bi-state working group that will "look at all possible funding mechanisms."¹⁶

2) Disincentivizing personal automobile use:

As also noted in our previous comments, a road toll/user fee would serve to disincentivize the use of private automobiles to visit the Basin. Otherwise, all of the efforts and resources being spent to implement the RTP's measures may simply result in the same traffic problems as exist today as more vehicles fill in the 'space' left by those who begin to use transit options and/or carpool. As experienced again in recent (post-recession) years, visitors have continued to come to the Basin even though congestion has resulted in hours-long delays. Clearly, a

¹³ "Many of the projects that have been included on the constrained list have only partial funding identified and therefore questionable for inclusion. Placer understands from conversations with TRPA staff that projects were qualified for the constrained list when the project was determined to have a high likelihood of being fully funded through grant funding programs being administered by TRPA or other State and Federal grant programs. As some of these sources are uncertain and local funds are currently unidentified to fully fund these projects, Placer County would caution inclusion of these projects on the constrained list. Future funding strategies for construction and/or implementation of these projects will require stakeholder partnerships. Additionally, funding for O&M projects such as winter trail and road maintenance will be funding-dependent annually." (Public comment record, p. 165)

¹⁴ Pages 131-133.

¹⁵ "We were heartened to hear that the TRPA Governing Board began a candid conversation about options for pursuing a much greater level of funding for transit and mobility at its 2017 strategic planning retreat February 23. We must proactively think beyond the typical traditional sources of sales tax and transient occupancy tax." (Public Comment record, p. 264)

¹⁶ "A bi-state funding workgroup will be forming that will look at all possible funding mechanisms to support priority transportation projects that could also act as an incentive system...As projects further develop, TRPA will support their accelerated delivery as appropriate." (Response to FOWS&TASC RTP comments, p. 4)

substantial number of people are not discouraged by the congested conditions. Simply improving/incentivizing transit alone cannot be reasonably expected to alleviate existing environmental and congestion problems.

We recommend the analysis of a road toll/user fee be specifically called out by the RTP and that this workgroup be tasked with considering more aggressive measures to both reduce regional traffic and provide substantial funding for transit.

Adaptive Roadway Management:

FOWS and TASC previously recommended prioritization of efforts to implement adaptive roadway management programs (currently on the ‘unconstrained’ list in the RTP), not only to alleviate peak period congestion and the associated public health and safety threats, but also because as noted by the Lake Tahoe Transit Master Plan (released to the public on 4/14/2017), public transit buses will be stuck in the same congestion as passenger vehicles,¹⁷ thus providing little incentive to take transit. Staff’s response states that such projects are currently being discussed.¹⁸

As with the road toll/user fee, more aggressive measures are imperative and we request that the development and implementation of Adaptive Roadway Management be specifically called out in the RTP as a priority action.

Public process and timeline:

FOWS and TASC appreciate the efforts of staff to respond to our comments on the draft RTP in the limited time provided. However, as noted in our comments to the Advisory Planning Commission, the public was provided just one business day to review specific responses to our comments.¹⁹ While TRPA’s general counsel assured the APC that this was legally acceptable because such responses to comments on an IS/IEC are not required,²⁰ the importance of the RTP update, the extent of public interest (as expressed by TRPA staff during the APC hearing and reflected by the numerous comments received), and a desire for collaborative public process should encourage the agency to plan ahead in order to be able to adequately address public concerns and accommodate staff’s workloads accordingly. In fact, responses to RTP comments note, “Public outreach is not just a requirement for TRPA, it is the foundation of the agency. The agency continually strives for new and innovative ways to collaborate with everyone in the Lake Tahoe Region. Stakeholders are not the only input but are valued because they often represent

¹⁷ “TTD buses, Thruway Bus Connection buses, private car share services, and airport shuttles are subject to the same congestion as automobiles on I-80, US50 and other roadways leading into and out of the Tahoe Basin. Transit priority in the form of exclusive bus lanes or queue jump lanes at key points along specific routes could help address this challenge.” (Linking Tahoe: Lake Tahoe Basin Transit Master Plan, p. 42)

¹⁸ “Adaptive Roadway Management projects are already under discussion with many of the appropriate lead and operating agencies. As projects further develop, TRPA will support their accelerated delivery as appropriate.” (Response to FOWS&TASC RTP comments, p. 2)

¹⁹ Staff emailed responses after close of business on Monday, April 10th.

²⁰ Per John Marshall during 4/12/2017 APC hearing.

the opinions of more than just themselves.”²¹ Planning so that there is adequate time for public participation – including time for staff to respond to extensive and thoughtful public input – would go a long way to support this statement. We commend Ms. Beryl for her extensive work responding to all 51 public comment letters (which became available to the public on 4/19/2017), however better planning would have alleviated the additional burden this no doubt created for staff during a short period of time and supported more productive dialogue with the public.

We also understand the limited time frame available for RTP update approval in order to qualify for federal funding,²² however TRPA has been aware of this deadline since last summer²³ and should have planned accordingly to allow for adequate public input.

We hope the truncated public process associated with the RTP update will not set a precedent for future projects and plans to be pushed through at the last minute, barring meaningful public participation. In the future, TRPA needs to plan ahead to ensure adequate time and consideration for meaningful public participation.

Conclusion:

FOWS and TASC are aware that the RTP’s adoption is necessary for the Tahoe Basin to qualify for selected federal transportation funds, however, the RTP does not go far enough to include more aggressive actions than have been required in the past, raising concerns that without additional measures, there will not be enough meaningful action to truly reduce traffic impacts, and therefore the inadequate transportation measures of the past four decades will be perpetuated through yet another planning document. We believe that minor changes to the RTP along with amendments to associated documents can help address several of our concerns and recommendations without slowing down the approval process for the RTP, and request your consideration of our recommendations.

We would be happy to meet to discuss these comments. Please contact Jennifer Quashnick at jqtahoe@sbcglobal.net or Laurel Ames at amesl@sbcglobal.net if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Susan Gearhart,
President
Friends of the West Shore



Laurel Ames,
Conservation Chair
Tahoe Area Sierra Club



Jennifer Quashnick,
Conservation Consultant

²¹ Staff responses to comments on RTP, p. 253; <http://www.trpa.org/wp-content/uploads/Full-Public-Comment-Record.pdf>

²² See our 4/10/2017 comments to the APC for details.

²³ “No later than April every year, the Parties shall meet to draft a program of projects for the following two (2) federal fiscal years. Following the enactment of an annual federal budget and publication of funding apportionments in the Federal Register, TMPO shall inform the Parties of the amounts of the formula and other designated federal funds coming to the Lake Tahoe UZA. TMPO will then re-convene the Parties to finalize the programming of those funds into the FTIP, making adjustments as necessary to the draft program of projects completed earlier.” (August 2016 Governing Board packet, p. 41-42)

CHAPTER III

TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT §

A. INTRODUCTION

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is an Element of the Regional Transportation Plan - Air Quality Plan, which focuses on transportation improvements needed to meet transportation related goals for the Tahoe Region. The Tahoe Regional Planning Compact says that the goal of transportation planning shall be to reduce dependency on the automobile, and to give preference to providing increases in capacity on the Region's transportation system through public transportation projects and programs. The Compact also requires a transportation plan for the Region which provides for the integrated development of a regional system of transportation. This system is to include parkways, highways, public transportation facilities, bicycle facilities, and appurtenant terminals and facilities for the movement of people and goods within the Region.

The RTP addresses the requirements of the Compact. The RTP also addresses the need to provide an integrated transportation system for the Region which will meet the basic transportation needs of residents and visitors by providing adequate local circulation and access to goods and services.

Congestion within the Region interferes with the ability to provide adequate circulation and access to basic goods and services. During periods of peak traffic demand, congestion on the Region's highway system creates lengthy delays and affects the accessibility of health care and emergency facilities, and other basic services for residents and visitors to the Region.

The Regional Transportation Plan discusses standards and the status of compliance with these standards. Level of service (LOS) standards are contained in the Transportation Element of the Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin. Goals and Policies (TRPA, 1986, as amended). The Goals and Policies establishes level of service criteria for various types of highways and an operational level of service for signalized intersections.

LOS criteria established by the Regional Plan Goals and Policies are not being met at some locations along U.S. 50, including the intersections at Park Avenue, Pioneer Trail, Ski Run Boulevard, and Tahoe Keys Boulevard. Although LOS criteria were not established for unsignalized intersections, the unsignalized intersections at California 28 and Grove Street and Jack Pine operate at a poor level of service during weekends and holiday periods.

Reduction in vehicle miles of travel (VMT) is a requirement of the threshold management standards for subregional visibility and nitrate deposition. These management standards require a ten percent reduction in VMT from the 1981 base year. Vehicle miles of travel in the Tahoe Region, from 1981 to 1987, increased by 10.0 percent.

§ Amended 10/27/04

The Regional Transportation Plan contains the following sections:

- ◆ Lake Tahoe Basin Transportation Overview
- ◆ Lake Tahoe Basin Transportation Planning Framework
- ◆ Lake Tahoe Basin Transportation System
- ◆ Goals, Policies and Objectives
- ◆ Action Plan
- ◆ Financial Element
- ◆ Air Quality Conformity Determination

The Goals, Policies and Objectives state the ends toward which efforts are to be directed, provide policy guidance for courses of action, and identify objectives which can be obtained or measured. Section 3 - Action Plan and Appendix A – Project List of the RTP identifies programs and capital improvements and projects needed to implement the goals, policies and objectives of the RTP.

B. GOALS, POLICIES AND OBJECTIVES

The formulation of regional transportation goals and policies is a fundamental step in the transportation planning process. The goals and policies reflect the consideration of environmental, social, and economic factors in making transportation related decisions.

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION GOALS

1. It is the goal of the Regional Transportation Plan to fulfill the requirements of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact.
2. It is the goal of the Regional Transportation Plan to attain and maintain the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities and federal, state, and local transportation standards.
3. It is the goal of the Regional Transportation Plan to establish a safe, efficient, and integrated transportation system which reduces reliance on the private automobile, provides for alternative modes of transportation, and serves the basic transportation needs of the citizens of the Tahoe Region, supports the economic base of the Region in the movement of goods and people, and minimizes adverse impacts on man and the environment.
4. The organizational structures and process relevant to transportation and transit operations and governance shall be designed to facilitate the implementation of the Regional Transportation Plan and the goals of the Compact.
5. It is the goal of the Regional Transportation Plan to research potential funding sources as referenced in the RTP Financial Element.

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION POLICIES AND OBJECTIVES

1. Participate in state and local transportation planning efforts to ensure coordination and consistency in the transportation system.
 - A. TRPA shall work with appropriate public entities and private interest groups in the Region to ensure coordination and consistency in transportation planning efforts within multijurisdictional transportation corridors.
 - B. TRPA shall work with federal, state and local agencies to develop a rail system which will provide access from northern California and Nevada population centers.
 - C. TRPA shall participate in the Community Plan process to provide consistency between Community Plans and the RTP.
 - D. TRPA will work with organizations that facilitate public-private transportation partnerships and coordination for the benefit of improved transportation in the Lake Tahoe Region.

2. Plan for and promote land use changes and development patterns which will encourage the use of alternative transportation modes and minimize impacts on the existing transportation system.
 - A. Community Plans shall promote land use development patterns and designs which will increase the ability to use public transportation, waterborne, bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
 - B. Community Plans shall promote the development of neighborhood commercial areas which will reduce travel distances.
 - C. Development patterns shall provide for the in-fill of existing areas, making use of existing transportation facilities and promoting the use of alternative transportation modes.
 - D. New, expanded or revised developments and land uses shall fully mitigate their regional and cumulative traffic impacts.
 - E. Parking for residential usage shall meet TRPA standards and shall be provided on-site.
 - F. Parking for non-residential uses shall be the minimum/maximum required to meet the demand for parking generated by the use, except as may be offset by reducing parking demand through parking management and trip reduction programs.
 - G. Driveways shall be designed and sited to minimize impacts on public transportation, adjacent roadways and intersections, bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
 - H. Public land management agencies shall develop transit services that manage access.

3. Actively pursue programs that promote the use of mass transit as an alternative to the automobile.
 - A. Expansion of transit services shall be provided to residential areas of the Region with the system being appropriate for the area to be served, and shall be consistent with the Action element of the TRPA Regional Transportation Plan.
 - B. Public or private transit services shall be given preference in mitigating traffic and transportation related impacts due to new, expanded or revised development or land use activities.
 - C. Transit facilities shall be provided which encourage the use of public transit services, with new or revised developments incorporating transit facilities into their designs or plans.
 - D. Transit service shall be expanded to cities, towns, and recreational areas outside of the Tahoe Region, and be coordinated with other transportation modes.
 - E. Bus lanes with preferential signal controls should be implemented along U.S. 50, California 89 and California/Nevada 28.
 - F. Alternative transit modes including fixed guideway systems should be implemented.
 - G. Multi-modal transfer facilities shall be located in activity centers in both the North and South Shore areas.
 - H. Transit shelters shall be provided at major transit stops.
 - I. Transit services shall be provided to connect the North and South Shore areas of the Tahoe Region.
 - J. Transit services shall be provided to beaches, campgrounds and other summer-time recreational areas.
 - K. Transit excursion services should be provided in the Region.
4. Develop and encourage the use of pedestrian and bicycle facilities as a safe and viable alternative to automobile use.
 - A. There shall be a high priority on constructing pedestrian and bicycle facilities in urbanized areas of the Region and where reductions in congestion will result.
 - B. Pedestrian and bicycle facilities shall be constructed, or upgraded, and maintained along major travel routes.
 - C. Where it is not feasible to construct or maintain Class I bicycle paths along the Region's major travel routes, Class II bicycle lanes should be provided on roadway shoulders.
 - D. Bicycle racks or storage facilities shall be provided at non-residential developments, transit stops, and on transit vehicles.
 - E. Bicycle and pedestrian linkages shall be provided between residential and non-residential areas.

- F. Bicycle and pedestrian facilities in urbanized areas and along transportation routes used for commuting should be maintained to allow year-around use of the facilities.
 - G. The unconstructed Route 50 right-of-way remains an integral component of the overall transportation system in the South Shore by providing commuting and recreational bicycle options which will maximize the function of the highway network.
 - H. The RTP shall contain bicycle and pedestrian policies for the development of any new bicycle/pedestrian facilities in the Lake Tahoe Region.
5. Implement transportation demand management (TDM) measures to reduce the number of vehicle trips on the Region's highways.
- A. Transit fare reductions, including free fares, should be used to encourage transit use.
 - B. Employers shall implement vehicle trip reduction programs, including carpool and vanpool matching programs, employee shuttles, flexible work hours, and transit use incentives.
 - C. Public and private employers shall develop parking management programs including preferential parking and reduced parking rates for carpools and vanpools, parking charges for employee parking and paid patron parking.
 - D. Condominiums, timeshares, hotels and motels shall participate in public transit and private shuttle programs, and provide transit information and incentives to their guests and residents.
 - E. Commercial interests providing gaming, recreational activities, or excursion services shall provide or participate in joint shuttle services or provide transit use incentives to their guests or patrons.
 - F. Park-and-Ride facilities shall be provided by local jurisdictions to encourage ridesharing.[§]
 - G. Automobile rentals should be discouraged within the Tahoe Region, and alternative fuel vehicle technology should be used if feasible. Air quality and traffic mitigation fees shall be assessed on vehicles rented in the Region.[§]
 - H. Ski areas and other recreational activity areas shall control the rate of departure of patrons from parking areas to minimize the impact on congested transportation facilities.[§]
6. Transportation System Management (TSM) measures shall be used to improve the efficiency of the existing transportation system.
- A. High occupancy and reversible vehicle lanes should be considered in high traffic demand areas, provided existing roadway capacities can be maintained.

[§] Amended 12/22/00

- B. Traffic conflicts should be reduced by limiting or controlling access to major regional travel routes and major local road ways.
 - C. Intersection improvements required to upgrade existing levels of service including lane restriping, turn lanes, channelization and traffic signals should be implemented when warranted.
 - D. Roadway designs shall accommodate bicycle lanes and transit stops and reduce conflicts between vehicles and bicycle and pedestrians.
 - E. New on-street parking shall be prohibited along major regional travel routes and existing parking should be discouraged along major regional travel routes and local roads.
 - F. View turn-outs should be provided along scenic highways.
 - G. Left-turn lanes and right-turn lanes shall be provided to reduce turning conflicts along major travel routes.
 - H. Utilization of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) technology shall be implemented consistent with the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO) *Tahoe Basin ITS Strategic Plan*.
7. Limit improvements to the regional highway system to those necessary to meet the Goals and Policies of the Regional Plan.
- A. The construction of roadways to freeway design standards is inappropriate in the Tahoe Region. However, grade separations may be appropriate at locations where traffic volumes exceed the capability of intersection improvements and local trip reduction measures to meet LOS criteria.
 - B. Highway design criteria shall be developed for the Tahoe Region which minimizes the environmental impact of highway projects while providing for the needs of the traveling public.
 - C. New roadways or projects which expand the capacity of existing roadways shall be consistent with traffic and circulation elements of TRPA adopted redevelopment plans or community plans.
 - D. Local roadways connecting residential areas, and connecting residential areas with non-residential areas, may be constructed provided these roadways are designed to improve local circulation and will not induce through traffic.
 - E. Roadway projects designed to correct hazardous roadway conditions shall be encouraged provided these projects are limited to needed safety improvements.
 - F. Level of service (LOS) criteria for the Region's highway system and signalized intersections during peak periods shall be:
 - ◆ Level of service "C" on rural recreational/scenic roads.
 - ◆ Level of service "D" on rural developed area roads.
 - ◆ Level of service "D" on urban developed area roads.
 - ◆ Level of service "D" for signalized intersections.
 - ◆ Level of service "E" may be acceptable during peak periods in urban areas, not to exceed four hours per day.

- G. TRPA will work with roadway maintenance agencies that manage roadway runoff and erosion.
8. Encourage air service as a viable alternative for travel to the Tahoe Region, provided all impacts can be mitigated.
- A. The location of aviation facilities within the Tahoe Region shall be limited to existing facilities.
 - B. Expansion of aviation facilities shall be limited to service levels identified in a TRPA-approved Airport Master Plan.
 - C. Public and private mass transportation systems shall be given preference in serving air service passengers.
 - D. Multi-modal transit links are to be provided to the Lake Tahoe Basin from primary commercial air services in Reno and Sacramento.
 - E. All operations for the Lake Tahoe Airport are subject to the terms of the Lake Tahoe Airport Settlement Agreement/Master Plan.
 - F. The Airport Master Plan/Settlement Agreement shall be updated. This update shall be predicated on a study evaluating: (1) the potential for both aviation and non-aviation uses of the site; (2) the role of the proposed uses in Tahoe's transit system; and (3) the appropriate scale of facilities related thereto. Any update that includes regional commercial service shall additionally require a comprehensive feasibility study of the viability of regional commercial air service.
9. Encourage waterborne transportation systems as an alternative to automobile travel within the Region.
- A. Waterborne point-to-point services are encouraged.
 - B. Waterborne excursion services are encouraged.
 - C. Waterborne services shall coordinate with, and provide access to, other public and private transportation systems.
10. Improve the mobility of the elderly, handicapped and other transit-dependent groups.
- A. Provide specialized public transportation services with subsidized fare programs for transit, taxi, demand responsive, and accessible van services.
 - B. Ensure access to the public transportation system by providing and maintaining sidewalks with curb cuts and ramps.
 - C. Provide and maintain accessible transit stops and shelters with ramps and paved areas.
 - D. Provide and maintain accessible transportation vehicles with adequate lifts and ramps and wheelchair tiedowns.
11. Postal Carrier service shall be provided Region wide, with the U.S. Postal Service Tahoe Regional Master Plan identifying priority areas and a timeframe for implementation. The following Regional Goals establish the objectives of the U.S. Postal Service, and the TRPA concerning mail service.

- A. The U.S. Postal Service shall provide mail service for areas not currently served in the Tahoe Region that encourages residents to drive fewer miles for the service. U.S. Postal Service facilities and operations shall maximize reductions in vehicle miles traveled by postal customers to the extent practicable.
 - B. In fulfillment of its national environmental values, the U.S. Postal Service will develop future facilities and implement future operations in ways that meet its desire to protect and preserve the environment.
 - C. Locating new or expanded U.S. Postal Service facilities near population and commercial concentrations is a priority for both the U.S. Postal Service and the TRPA.
 - D. Many existing U.S. Postal Service facilities require replacement and/or renovation to meet minimum health, safety, operational, environmental, and business requirements. Many elements of the Tahoe Regional Master Plan, such as new services, cannot be realized without improvements in facilities.
 - E. U.S. Postal Service facilities and operations that can meet multiple goals require a partnership between the USPS, TRPA, local and regional agencies, and individual and community groups. These groups should work in partnership to conduct collaborative planning, to identify the appropriate organization to undertake the leadership role on specific issues, and to facilitate project approval.
 - F. To maximize benefit from available financial resources, new facilities and operations shall be prioritized in large measure based on their contribution to overall Master Plan goals.
 - G. U.S. Postal Service facilities and operations that implement TRPA RTP/AQP control strategies (including carrier service) shall receive credit for impact fees equal to the financial contribution. Future consideration may be given to provision of alternative fuel fleet vehicles.
 - H. The U.S. Postal Service and TRPA will diligently pursue Master Plan implementation within the constraints of future available resources.[§]
12. Increase the use of alternative fuel vehicles within the Lake Tahoe Basin.
- A. Future public transit vehicles purchased for operations in the Lake Tahoe Basin shall be alternative fuel powered.
 - B. When considering new or replacement vehicles for public and private fleets alternative fuel vehicles should be purchased.
 - C. TRPA shall phase in alternative fuel vehicle requirements for public and private fleet purchases above 15 vehicles in size.
13. The Regional Transportation Plan shall include an Action Plan and Project List containing transportation capital improvement projects, plans and programs needed to achieve transportation goals, carry out transportation policies, and implement transportation objectives.

[§] Amended 12/22/00