

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

reasons. He's not sure if it's still possible to consider for those reasons, or at least to make those comparisons of safety emissions and efficiency clear in the document so that it can at least be evaluated while there's still an option.

Mr. Bruce said one of the things that the NDOT representative mentioned was the pedestrian danger. Because there's going to be a lot of parking on Warrior Way and people coming across the highway, he thinks that that was one of the primary focuses that they had. We'll leave the highway design to them and monitor it along the way.

Mr. Lawrence said they had that issue with the East Shore Trail and the solution was to have pedestrian access under the highway which alleviated having to have red lights or roundabouts with people crossing the highway. Not sure what the water table is there compared to the East Shore and knows that it makes it more expensive, etc. but there are other solutions.

Ms. Aldean said in speaking with Mr. Haven, this is commonly done. If it is a lit intersection that the two lights would be synchronized. So, hopefully there will not be a lot of stopping and starting.

Ms. Novasel said the roundabout that Caltrans put in is one lane and they did that on purpose. You lose a lot of safety when you put a two lane roundabout in. The Meyers roundabout was a win for the environment because there's not all the stop and go. As people get used to it, it's becoming better and better. They are planning to put another one at Pioneer and Highway 50. If there is going to be parking on Warrior Way, are you going to have parking spaces there or how are you going to address that?

Mr. Rice said there's a large piece of land behind the fire station and the senior center. The Tahoe Transportation District along with Douglas County are discussing the possibility of creating paid off street parking at that location. They don't expect that they're going to take all the traffic off of Highway 50. They are looking at a large area that could be used for off street parking. They hope to have the paid parking there to supplement transportation.

Ms. Novasel said the Tahoe Transportation District is one of the partners in this project and it's been mentioned that they are talking about possibly putting a maintenance center in somewhere there. When we talk about things such as parking and the ability to put other services in, it sounds like there is an opportunity around there somewhere to be able to use that. Keeping that open with the Tahoe Transportation District, they're always looking for areas on the East Shore to put the busses, not just for bus services, but also for people and parking for them. And possibly a mobility hub.

Mr. Rice said the conversation is the possibility of a mobility hub as well as at Spooner where State Route 28 comes off of highway 50. The conversation is being held; no decisions have been made but everything is inter-connected. That's why he doesn't want to get too far into it, because it's still in the planning process.

Public Comments & Questions

None.

B. Briefing on Meeks Bay Restoration Project

TRPA staff Ms. Cremeen, Ms. Sibr, US Forest Service Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, and Mr. Lewandowski, Ascent Environmental provided the presentation.

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

Ms. Cremeen said they made a presentation to the Regional Plan Implementation Committee in January 2021 to get input on the range of alternatives. The alternatives have been refined and today the board will hear an update on the project, share what they've heard from the public, and provide the board with an opportunity to give feedback prior to the environmental analysis.

Meeks Bay is located on the West Shore of Lake Tahoe, south of Sugar Pine Point State Park and north of Emerald Bay. The planning for this restoration project is a partnership between the Forest Service, TRPA, and the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board. A joint environmental document is being prepared that meets the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and TRPA requirements.

This restoration project is part of a bigger vision in planning for Lake Tahoe and the West shore. The habitat improvements at Meeks Bay will complement the work being done on the Lake Tahoe West Restoration Strategy. Meeks Bay is also one of the recreational hot spots along the State Route 89 recreation corridor identified in the SR89 Corridor Management Plan for transportation and visitor management improvements including parking, transit, and bicycle and pedestrian connections. This project is being coordinated with the planning team that is studying trail alignments to connect Meeks Bay with Emerald Bay and the South Shore. All the recreation and shoreline improvements planned for the Meeks Bay project will be consistent with the Lake Tahoe Shoreline Plan.

Upstream from Meeks Bay is Meeks Meadow and slide 5 shows the Washoe Tribe working on a restoration project at Meeks Meadow. The Tribe is heading up the project that will remove encroaching Conifers and introduce traditional cultural burning practices. The objective is to raise the water table and encourage meadow species to thrive. Restoring Meeks Creek will directly benefit the meadow by improving wildlife connectivity and hydrologic function.

Ms. Sibr, Forest Service said Meeks Bay has a long history in the area and this project started about 15 years ago. The purpose of the project is that they're looking at it to restore the Meeks Bay Marina back to a wetland and lagoon ecosystem. They want to make sure that this system is functioning, both hydrologically, as well as, for the rest of the ecosystem, and really try to bring back that wetland lagoon ecosystems. And another important piece to remember is that this is an active recreation site. Part of the project is also to preserve and enhance recreation opportunities. (Slide 7) is an aerial view of Meeks Bay which is separated and basically on the north half which is the Meeks Bay Resort which is currently managed by the Washoe Tribe. The Meeks Bay campground is south of the marina and the Creek Campground and day use. The project area is outlined in green. It basically covers all of the resort in the campground area as well as a little ways upstream in Meeks Creek.

In thinking about this project and why they would need to do this project, there are a couple of needs in the area. There's this need to improve the hydrologic functions and processes of Meeks Creek, the lagoon, and the flood plain. If you're not familiar with what a lagoon ecosystem is like, if you've ever been out to Taylor Creek or Taylor and Tallac Creeks essentially, there's those swales and that backwater system where the groundwater backfills into the area, and the mouth of the creek moves back and forth. That's what is called the lagoon system and the barrier beach is the beach that has the mouth that is variable based upon the flow, that happened that year, as well as the water level in the lake. There's also a need to repair some of the habitat that are associated with these barrier beaches. They're looking to try and provide a high quality habitat in this area for some of those sensitive species that we have, one of them being the Tahoe Yellow Cress. Most folks are familiar with the plant which is endemic to Tahoe. The struggle with Tahoe Yellow Cress is that it only grows on the beaches based upon lake level.

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

That species grows very effectively in these lagoon and backwater ecosystems because they provide essentially more habitat for them to be able to grow in. Lahontan Cutthroat Trout is another species of interests that currently cannot get past the Meeks Creek Bridge because of the aquatic organism constriction there.

Meeks Creek has been identified both in this project and in the Lake Tahoe West Project as a creek that has been identified for restoration in aquatic organism passage and restoration of the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout in the whole system going back up into the wilderness. Depending upon what the water level is coming out of the creek, there's no barrier or very little barrier up to sometimes even multiple feet of a barrier there. This bridge is a constriction, so, the aquatic organism passage being an issue in this whole area. Originally in this project, it did not include replacement of the bridge. However, that was always a desire but essentially, Caltrans just was not ready going to begin looking at the Bridge replacement. They have since signed on to the project and are they're working on getting their full involvement. The bridge is now included in the project.

These are recreational sites and want to maintain access to Lake Tahoe and National Forest Systems lands, but they want to be able to do that in a way that is sustainable and provides recreation opportunities consistent with a functioning ecosystem. What's out there right now is a marina that has not actually been operated in a couple of years. It's basically an area that is kind of like the Tahoe Keys. It's shallow, warm water at this point, and in its current state isn't providing a recreation amenity. The impetus for this project is restoration, but they became aware pretty quickly that the restoration was going to actually impact the recreation site. They wanted to ensure that it's maintaining sustainable recreation in some form or another and was included as elements of the project and was identified as a need in the project. With that restoration work, there's many opportunities to provide educational and interpretive opportunities. There's been quite a few discussions with the Washoe Tribe related to some of the content that could be going into the restoration area once that work is complete. Then they would also like to enhance species of value to the Washoe Tribe. A lot of that comes with just basically doing the restoration work, because a lot of those species are things that will be promoted by this habitat improvements as well as that lagoon ecosystem.

In order to get all this done, they've had to get everyone involved. Initially, the Forest Service received funding that was a pretty short turnaround time. They were able to get that to TRPA in order for them to be able to hire a Ascent Environmental who is the contractor for this project. The Forest Service and TRPA has a participating agreement for the entire planning of this project. The end result of this will be a joint environmental document that is EIR/EIS/EIS. For the CEQA side of things, it's an EIR and Lahontan is the lead agency leading the CEQA for this project and then it will be a TRPA EIS as well as a Forest Service, NEPA, EIS.

They now have involvement from Caltrans on this project and are in the early stages of getting that agreement worked through with Caltrans. They believe that it will be three separate agreements; an agreement for the planning/environmental phase which they're in now, then the second phase will be design, and the third phase construction.

Mr. Lewandowski provided an overview of the project alternatives that are proposed for consideration in the environmental document.

These alternatives are all intended to achieve the purpose and need that Ms. Sibr described and that includes achieving the ecosystem restoration goals for the project. The alternatives also consider how the restoration affects the overall use of the site and they attempt to provide appropriate recreation opportunities that are compatible with the restoration. These

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

alternatives were all developed over the past year or so. And through a collaborative, stakeholder and public planning process that Ms. Cremeen will talk about.

All of these alternatives will be treated equally in the environmental document, although the lead agencies will identify a staff recommended alternative prior to the release of the draft environmental document.

The No Action Alternative is essentially the status quo. It represents what would happen if the project's not approved. This No action alternative will be evaluated in the environmental document, and it will be treated the same as the Action Alternatives. (Slide 14) shows the conditions at Meeks Bay today which would continue under the No Action Alternative. Those two green areas are the two campsites, with six campsites between them on the north and south side. The existing marina infrastructure and boat ramp is shown in the blue, right in the middle. Ms. Sibr mentioned it hasn't been operational for several years, and slips have been removed, but it does have capacity of 100 boat slips. The parking areas are the gray/brown color, and the day use is in orange. There's an existing bike path, the brown line on the north side of the project area that right now ends within Meeks Bay. With the No Action Alternative, the marina would remain and there would be no restoration of the creek or lagoon. And that marina could be operated, again, when the water level is high enough.

The upland facilities, the campgrounds, day use areas, and parking areas would generally remain as they are today, but there would be on going management that would continue like Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) control.

They've also developed three action alternatives and all of these action alternatives would include the same basic approach to the restoration. (Slide 15) The existing compacted fill and marina infrastructure would be removed. The dredged lagoon would be recreated to create a more natural, wider and shallower lagoon. At the upstream end of the restoration area, the State Route 89 bridge would be replaced, and the channel would be enhanced to raise the channel bed and reconnect it to the riparian floodplain. Near the center of the restoration area, there be transition zone from the creek to the lagoon, which would include log structures or other aquatic habitat features. Then the lagoon would be restored to a more natural wetland. It would have more complex edges with shallow water and emergent vegetation. It would be in a better condition to increase the filtration of nutrients and fine sediment flowing from the watershed before they reach the lake. At the mouth of the creek, the sheet pile and dredged channel would be restored to a more natural barrier beach, like the ones that Ms. Sibr described and there would be a bike and pedestrian crossing that would connect the north and the south sides of the project area. It would be designed as an elevated boardwalk were similar designed to minimize the environmental impacts. There are also a number of other features that came up through the alternatives development process that really made sense to include in all of the alternatives.

These include the removal of an older rock gabion shoreline protection that's at the north end of the project area and that would be replaced with a more natural shoreline protection including boulder's and native vegetation. All of the alternatives also include the replacement of the State Route 89 Bridge. It will include an interpretive walking trail, signage and other interpretive materials that are focused on the local, natural and cultural history, including the importance of Meeks Bay to the Washoe Tribe.

A paddle craft storage rack or shed would be included in all the alternatives and wouldn't be very visible from the lake but would allow the public to store kayaks and paddle boards on-site. Hopefully, that would reduce vehicle trips if nearby visitors don't need to drive in and out of

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

Meeks Bay with their paddle craft each time, they want to use it.

The alternatives also include a number of resource protection features, such as the protection of the Tahoe Yellow Cress. All the alternatives, particularly the restoration would be made through an ongoing adaptive management process.

The major differences between the action alternatives are summarized on page 203 of the packet.

(Slide 16) Alternative 1: It would include the removal of the marina and the full restoration of the creek. The restoration of the lagoon and creek would require the removal of the boating access facilities in the marina. This alternative seeks to offset that loss of boating infrastructure by including a new pier on the north side of the creek. The pier would allow boats to access Meeks Bay from elsewhere on the lake but not launch from Meeks Bay.

For example, somebody that was boating on Lake could pull up to the pier, temporarily dock their boat, access the beach, the restrooms, or the snack bar. To reach a navigable water depth, even during low conditions, this pier would need to be about 300 feet long and would include one boatlift at the end, that could be used for public safety or firefighting boat. This could improve the emergency response capabilities by providing a fireboat on this portion of the Lake. With Alternative 1, there would be no change to the campground on the north side. The south side, the alternative would include minor reconfigurations of the campground to increase privacy and improve access. With this reconfiguration, there may be a need to remove a couple of campsites or there might be an opportunity to add a site or two. They won't know until the final design layout of the campgrounds is complete, but they'll be evaluating a high-end addition of two campsites in this alternative. So, pretty much close to the existing campground capacity.

This alternative as well as the other two action alternatives would also seek to create a different camping experience on the north end campgrounds. This would be achieved by limiting recreational vehicle hookups, spur lengths, turn radius, and instituting vehicle length limits or other similar measures on the south side. This alternative would also reconfigure and expand the day use areas near the pier on the north side and as well as the one on the south side. On the north end, it would also remove two existing motel style cabin buildings that are located right on the lake shore. They would be replaced with new cabins that are located a little farther from the beach. This would allow for an expanded natural beach area that would be open for public use. It would improve scenic quality but would not change the overall lodging capacity within the project area. There would also be a connected bike path that's shown in the reddish brown line on slide 16. That would include two loops; the main alignment would go parallel to State Route 89 and would be for through traffic. It would also include a slower speed spur loop that would go through the project area and would get close to the pier, the other day use and beach areas.

(Slide 17) Alternative 2: It includes the full restoration of the creek and lagoon. This alternative would include a pedestrian pier in the same location as the boating pier in Alternative 1. This would be a pier that's universally accessible and it would allow people to get out on the lake but it wouldn't be by used by motorized boats. It is proposed at about 100 feet because it doesn't have to reach the navigable water depth. It would be a floating pier design where the pier deck is floating on the water with the pilings sticking above that. Like Alternative 1, this alternative would include the reconfigured camp sites with potential minor adjustments in the number and configuration of sites on the south side. This alternative would also expand and reconfigure the day use areas and it would include those connected bike paths similar to Alternative 1. But the alignment in this alternative doesn't go as close to the beach, it's more in the middle of the

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

project area.

(Slide 18) Alternative 3: Includes full restoration of the creek and lagoon. This alternative would not include a pier. It does propose a small paddle craft launch structure about 30 feet long on the south end. It's intended to be a universally accessible structure. Something that would allow people with all abilities to launch their kayaks or other paddle craft but would not provide access for motorized boats. This alternative would also reconfigure the campgrounds and it would expand them by adding a total of up to 22 campsites with up to 10 sites on the north and up to 12 on the south end. That would be within the larger campground footprint. This would also reconfigure the parking on the south side. It would include a drop off area near the beach, but then the main parking area would be located between the highway and the campground. The intent is to provide direct access between the campground and the beach and to help buffer the campground from the noise of the road. This alternative would also increase the parking capacity by about 14 spaces on the south end. It would also include a similar bike path alignment as Alternative 2 except in this alternative the alignment through the project area would be more direct and would pass through the extended campground on the south side.

Ms. Cremeen provided an overview of how they've been working with stakeholders and the public throughout the planning process, and then also share the feedback that they've received thus far.

The Forest Service first scoped this project in 2018 and did receive quite a bit of interest and concerns over what was being proposed at the time which then the proposed action included a pier and boat launch on the south side of the Bay. The Forest Service decided to take a step back and spend more time on a robust public engagement strategy, that would look at a range of alternatives and more closely, involve stakeholders. This is where TRPA came in under the agreement to help lead the environmental planning and public engagement.

They engaged the services of Ascent Environmental and Consensus Building Institute. For this project, CBI headed up a stakeholder assessment and led the stakeholder forum meetings. The forum included representatives from nearby property owners, the Washoe Tribe, the Tahoe Lakefront Owners' Association, the Marina Association, the League to Save Lake Tahoe, Friends of the West Shore, and the Meeks Bay Fire District.

They've met five times over the 1.5 years to flesh out issues as they developed project alternatives and identified potential areas of environmental effect. They've also held two virtual public workshops with over 150 attendees.

Throughout this process, they've tried some new engagement tools. They launched the Meeks Bay project website in 2020, where the public can get background on the project, access meeting information, and review alternative themes. They introduced a new interactive tool where folks can go in and look at the alternative designs, click on an area of interest and provide their feedback directly. Those responses have been really helpful for them to understand where folks are concerned or interested in seeing changes or keeping things the way they are.

In June they published a full page article on Meeks Bay in the Summer Edition of the Tahoe In Depth which was distributed throughout Tahoe. They also distributed and published rack cards in English, and Spanish and distributed those to Meeks Bay Resort and campgrounds.

After all of this outreach and engagement, what are they hearing from their stakeholders and the public? Overall, they're receiving very broad support for the stream restoration. The majority are in favor of leaving Meeks Bay the way it is now without a marina or launch. There's concern that introducing piers or launches would result in obstruction of views, less beach

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

areas, noise, and user conflicts in the water. They've also heard a desire to retain the two different types of camping experiences. The resort side can accommodate RVs and hookups while the south side is geared towards campers, tent campers, and smaller vehicles. The Meeks Bay Resort has more amenities, snack shop, paddle craft rentals, and cabins while the south beach does not.

When they solicited feedback on introducing a pier to Meeks Bay, there was concern that motorized boats could exacerbate conflicts on the water between user types. If the pier alternative is selected, there should be clear separation between motorized boating and non-motorized, swimming and paddling. This could be accomplished by clearly delineating the swimming areas, the no wake zone and buffers around the pier.

They also heard from the Meeks Bay Fire District and others that there is a need to improve emergency response at Meeks Bay and along the West Shore. They responded to this concern by including a pier in one of the alternatives that could be available to the fire district to moor a fire boat. However, the primary purpose of any pier at Meeks Bay would be to enhance recreation and it would have to be open to the public as well for them to temporarily moor their boats and walk out on. If this alternative with the pier is not selected, it would not preclude emergency responders from proposing a pier or other public health and safety facilities at Meeks Bay in the future or another location along the West Shore. They do recognize that lake wide emergency response planning is needed but at this time, there is no agreement from land managers and emergency responders as to where the best location is on the West Shore. TRPA is committed to continue working with emergency response providers on a more comprehensive strategy.

Funding and implementation strategy for this project: The planning environmental phase work that's been done to date has been funded by the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act. They've also got some aquatic invasive species work done in the lagoon, slide 24 shows some of those initial stages where they took out the marina infrastructure and they're laying down mats to control the AIS in the lagoon. That work will continue in the near future. The Forest Service estimates that the overall restoration and recreation improvements would range from \$5 to \$10 million to implement. This does not include the bridge which is estimated at \$4 to \$5 million. Progress is being made with Caltrans to include this project in this environmental analysis which is a good first step. They're well on their way to positioning this project for additional funds, given its multi benefits and its tie to the State Route 89 Corridor Transportation Improvements and Trail as well.

The next steps for this project are to consolidate the public comments and what they hear today to move forward with a proposal for a preferred alternative. That preferred alternative will be evaluated equally with the other alternatives in the environmental document, which they anticipate releasing in October 2021. They would bring that back to this board during the public review period, which will be around 60 days. They anticipate having the response to comments next spring and then taking the final EIR, EIS, EIS for consideration, late Spring or Summer of 2022.

Mr. Sibr said they've done a couple of versions of this presentation and would like to mention one thing. They mentioned that the No Action Alternative essentially includes sort of the existing site out there, as well as, operating that marina. The point of a no action alternative is to say, okay, if this project didn't exist, what would be happening on the site? That's essentially why they included the operation of the marina, in the No Action Alternative. In addition, they did look at multiple hybrid alternatives. Where they looked at trying to maintain a smaller marina with a boat ramp and a few slips. They had a lot of internal and external conversations and it's really not feasible on a couple of different levels. One level was when the existing

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

marina was operating with 120 slips, it almost covered the maintenance of that facility. But anything with a fewer number of slips would definitely not be able to fund itself. In addition, the engineering of having that marina piece with essentially a creek mouth right next to it, is a significant engineering feat. There was a question about the build ability of it, as well as the maintenance cost, etc. They looked at multiple alternatives and, in the end, they couldn't move forward with an alternative that included some type of marina or hybrid system because it didn't meet the purpose and need for the project and could not accomplish either the restoration or keeping a meaningful recreation activity.

Presentation can be found at:

[Agenda-Item-No.-VII.B-Meeks-Bay-Restoration.pdf](#)

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Bruce said wonderful presentation and amazing project. He likes the possibility of the alternatives and it's going to be interesting to go through the process.

Ms. Novasel said she's very excited about this project. It's longtime coming and is a great restoration project and is so needed. Glad to see that old marina getting out of there and the idea of bringing it back to an ecologically, comfortable, and clean environment is exciting.

Ms. Aldean said all the alternatives with the exception of the No Action Alternative have a cleaning station for paddle boards, canoes, or whatever is being launched. Is there no cleaning station now? Are people allowed to launch their personal watercraft without going through an AIS inspection at Meeks Bay?

Ms. Sibr, Forest Service said currently there are no AIS inspection facilities. There was never a boat inspection station when the marina existed. There's no actual paddle craft inspection station. They're trying to promote the clean, drain, & dry and provide the facilities for people to do that there. Because folks get busy and they don't always remember to do it when they go home.

Ms. Cremeen said they could improve the education on that through the water trail and interpretive signage, etc. As of now, they don't have anything proposed specifically for that kind of operation.

Ms. Aldean said if the No Action Alternative was selected and is not suggesting that but will there be an opportunity to include a cleaning station, even though there's not a place for storage of paddle boats. Her assumption is that it's a fairly popular activity to launch personal watercraft at Meeks Bay.

Ms. Sibr, Forest Service said yes, it is a very popular activity there. Under the No Action Alternative, they wouldn't be proposing any new facilities there. If that, in theory, is what moved forward, there would probably be another project, at some point, to address the different maintenance at the marina, as an example. But something like a clean, drain, & dry, is not something they need NEPA for. They've included it in this, because folks ask about it but things like that are not something they need environmental documentation for. That could be something that could go out on the site very easily, at any point.

Ms. Aldean said she would certainly encourage that. Another comment is that she understands that there's some opposition to the idea of any type of pier whether it's intended for motorboat use or for pedestrians. But was there any thought given to incorporating some kind of dedicated ADA parking or some sort of walking block to allow people who have mobility issues to access

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

the lake? Alternative 3 does have ADA parking.

Ms. Sibr, Forest Service said they did not include a specific project component for that because it's part of what they have to do when they design these facilities. The Forest Service has outdoor recreation accessibility guidelines that they have to follow. Anything that they redo will be made to be accessible. She thinks the element that Ms. Aldean is seeing is the accessible paddle craft launch facility because all of the alternatives will have accessible parking in them.

Mr. Lewandowski, Ascent Environmental said that was really the impetus for that paddle craft launch facility in Alternative 3 because Alternatives 1 and 2 would have piers that would have accessible walkways and would provide accessible access to the lake. They had also called out the ADA parking specifically in Alternative 3 because they're relocating the parking area much farther from the beach. They wanted to make it clear that there still was ADA accessible parking near the beach but that the rest of the parking would be farther from the beach.

Mr. Hicks had some questions about the No Action Alternative. Is there a possibility that what is shown as the existing marina would be reactivated? The second question is that if it's not reactivated is there a possibility that those 120 boat slips becoming 120 buoys?

Mr. Lewandowski, Ascent Environmental said under the No Action Alternative there is a possibility that the marina would be reactivated. They'll be evaluating that in the environmental document. The bulk of the infrastructure is still out there today even though it's been closed down for a couple of years. The assumption is that it could be reactivated under the No Action Alternative. One thing the environmental document will be taking a close look at is the effects on overall boating access. They know that's an important recreational amenity. There will be more detail once the environmental document comes out. The shoreline plan does not allow new buoy fields and there's no proposal to move those moorings from slips in the marina and create a new buoy field in Meeks Bay.

Ms. Sibr, Forest Service said they did an exercise to look at what that would be if they put those buoys out into the Bay. When you look at the aerial, and you put the buoys on, at the appropriate spacing with a number of slips that were there, it essentially took up the entire area that is shallow enough to have buoys. From the TRPA shorezone standpoint, that was a non-starter and changing the character of the Bay with making the slips into buoys was more than what the Forest Service was willing to accept.

Mr. Friedrich said it's an exciting project. He commended everyone on the extent of the public outreach. The innovative ways of getting feedback directly from people on site in particular, who probably have more connection, then just about any of us. The public comment seems to be correlating with the top level goals of the project for sustainable recreation and compatible with restoration. In his view, it would also probably be the one that minimizes AIS spread that they've seen in other parts of the lake with boat propellers spreading Eurasian watermilfoil, etc. That would seem to be a benefit and to have some separation of uses with the motorboats and non-motorized boaters. That would be another benefit of an alternative, such as, Alternative 3.

Ms. Novasel asked if the plan was to completely remove the RVs or is it going to be minimization. She's curious because the 56 acres in South Shore, they're talking about wanting to increase RVs.

Ms. Sibr, Forest Service said they're not proposing to remove these. In all of the alternatives, essentially the existing RV campground on the north side of the resort would stay. There are some spaces to fit some more in if they wanted to. The discussion about possibly limiting RVs on the campground side is based on some of the feedback that they've received from some of the stakeholders. From the Forest Service perspective and the trends that they see in recreation,

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

providing tent only camping sites, doesn't fit with trends in recreation as well as the facilities that we see a demand for. One of the things that wasn't explicitly mentioned today that they've talked about before, is that they are exploring the use of things like yurts. They see that those types of facilities get used by a lot of entry level users, It's a lot cheaper to rent a yurt for your family for \$80 a night than it is to go out and buy a tent, sleeping bags, etc. They are still thinking through what that mix looks like on the south side and still taking the input related to that. There's definitely a feeling that there's two different experiences in these campgrounds and that the resort side is the RVs and more of the party side and that the south side is more of the quiet campground.

Public Comments & Questions

Judith Tornese, President of Friends of the West Shore provided comments on behalf of the that group. They have over 500 subscriber members. They appreciated the involvement of the community in the development process for this project. They also liked the idea of taking the best features of all four alternatives and having the ability to mix and match the features. Approximately two thirds of their membership is in favor of Alternative 3 which is the non-motorized recreation with no pier but with some modifications. First, install a paddle board, kayak storage for day users on both beaches. All water activities should be available and launched from both beaches and not concentrated on one beach. Second, they do not favor the relocation of the day use parking on the south beach. Parking should remain close to the beach as it is now for the easy access and convenience of day users. They also favor increased parking for day users to avoid overflow parking on Highway 89. Third, they suggested getting feedback and recent statistics on this summer's activity from the Meeks Bay staff. They're the people who work there every day and they should be aware of what's going on. Four, they favor the idea of moving the cabins on the north beach to increase the beach area for the public. Lastly, they do not favor a paddle craft launch. It's not needed and would cause confusion and congestion in one area of the beach versus spreading the launch area across the entire area, for both beaches, as is done now. Thank you for the opportunity to make these comments on behalf of this important project, which affects the public.

Steve, McNamara, Division Chief and Fire Marshal, Meeks Bay Fire Protection District said he also acts as the Division Chief and Fire Marshal for North Tahoe Fire and Alpine Springs County Water. He commended the collaborative approach taken by the US Forest Service, TRPA, and the many stakeholders on the project. Staff from Ascent Environmental who provided an excellent process for all involved parties to have a voice and input. Fire Chief Michael Schwartz, Fire Chief Steve Leighton, and himself have been acting on behalf of the Meeks Bay Fire District in relation to this project since 2018 when they provided a comment letter to then Forest Supervisor, Jeff Marsolais. It was their hope then, as it is now that the Meeks Bay Restoration Project could enhance our emergency service delivery as well as the safety of the communities they serve.

Specific to the project update that is before you today, they wanted to extend their previous intent to request an establish a pier for a fire boat in Meeks Bay as reflected an Alternative 1. Although, Alternative 1 includes public access, they're also open to augmenting that in eliminating public access by public watercraft on the pier. They do recognize that the informal polls with the stakeholder groups and the public conflict with this desire, but it is their civic duty to continue to attempt to improve their emergency services delivery. Furthermore, the addition of a fire boat to their fleet would also benefit all the communities in the Lake Tahoe Basin. This is especially applicable to the entire West Shore of Lake Tahoe as the closest such vessel to the West Shore is located in an Incline Village or Zephyr Cove, Nevada. It should also be noted that these are the only two boats equipped with both firefighting and rescue capability on Lake

GOVERNING BOARD

July 28-29, 2021

Tahoe. Their response to an incident on the West Shore may take upwards of one hour. This amount of response time could mean the difference in saving life or property. Meeks Bay is an excellent location to respond to an area of the Lake that is currently underserved, as well as being close to their existing Meeks Bay Fire Station 67. This location is in a protected harbor and will allow the quickest response from any of our current fire stations at both North Tahoe and Meeks Bay Fire. Thank you for your consideration and enhancing emergency service delivery to not only the West Shore of Lake Tahoe, but also the entirety of Lake Tahoe and its shoreline.

VIII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director Status Report

Ms. Marchetta said the Governing Board retreat yesterday was perfect smoke clear day on the lake shore. She thanked all the Governing Board members for your very, very robust participation. They had a very successful day. She thanked the staff who helped set the arrangements and set up and tear down in record time during a lightning storm in the afternoon. Marja, Steve Biddle, Katherine, Dan, Julie, Jeff, Kim, and Dennis and if she forgot someone, mea culpa.

1) Quarterly Report: April – June 2021

No further report.

B. General Counsel Status Report

No report.

IX. GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER REPORTS

None.

X. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Local Government & Housing Committee

Ms. Novasel said they'll be having a committee meeting next month.

B. Legal Committee

None.

C. Operations & Governance Committee

None.

D. Environmental Improvement, Transportation, & Public Outreach Committee

Mr. Lawrence said the committee will meet at the conclusion of the board meeting. Discussion today will include how do they achieve a sustainable revenue source to pay for the \$20 million delta in order to get our Regional Transportation Plan. We'll also have a chance to meet the consultants that have been hired to give us some additional capacity to solve this complex problem.