BUDGET FINANCE COMMITTEE
Meeting Agenda

North Lake Tahoe Event Center  
8318 North Lake Blvd.  
Kings Beach, CA  
8:30 a.m.  
August 8, 2014

All items on this agenda are action items unless otherwise noted. Items on the agenda may be taken out of order. The Board may combine two or more items for consideration. The Board may remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item on the agenda at any time.

I. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS
   All comments are to be limited to no more than five minutes per person. Comments made cannot be acted upon or discussed at this meeting, but may be placed on a future agenda for consideration.

II. RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JULY 11, 2014

III. DISCUSSION ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action Requested</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Approval of Fiscal Year 2015 Contract Amendment for HDR; Approval of Task Orders for the Capital Improvement Program Manual and Rocky Point-Hidden Beach Vista Point Parking Lot; and a Task Order Amendment for the Meeks Bay Bike Path Project</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Approval to Establish a TTD Retirement Plan with MassMutual as TTD’s Plan Administrator and Raymond James and Associates as Investment Advisors</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. ADJOURNMENT
TAHOE TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT (TTD)
TAHOE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (TTC)
Meeting Agenda

North Tahoe Event Center
8318 North Lake Blvd.
Kings Beach, CA

August 8, 2014  9:30 a.m.

All items on this agenda are action items unless otherwise noted. Items on the agenda may be taken out of order. The Board may combine two or more items for consideration. The Board may remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item on the agenda at any time.

I. CALL TO ORDER AND GENERAL MATTERS
   A. Roll Call and Determination of Quorum of TTD/TTC
   B. Approval of Agenda for August 8, 2014
   C. Approval of Minutes of July 11, 2014

II. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS
   At this time, members of the public shall have the opportunity to directly address the Board. All comments are to be limited to no more than five minutes per person. The Board is prohibited by law from taking immediate action on or discussing issues raised by the public that are not listed on this agenda. In addition, members of the public shall have the opportunity to directly address the Board after each item on which action may be taken is discussed by the public body, but before the public body takes action on the item.

III. BUDGET FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT

IV. TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION APPOINTEE REPORT

V. PUBLIC HEARING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items for Possible Action</th>
<th>Action Requested</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conduct a Public Hearing</td>
<td>Conduct Public Hearing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the Draft 2015 Federal Transportation Improvement Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. ADJOURN AS TTC AND RECONVENE AS TTD
### VII. TAHOE TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT (TTD) CONSENT ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items for Possible Action</th>
<th>Action Requested</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Approval of Fiscal Year 2015 Contract Amendment for HDR; Approval of Task Orders for</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Capital Improvement Program Manual and Rocky Point-Hidden Beach Vista Point Parking Lot; and a Task Order Amendment for the Meeks Bay Bike Path Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Review and Acceptance of South Shore and Commuter Transit June 2014 Operations Reports</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Approval to Establish a TTD Retirement Plan with MassMutual as TTD’s Plan Administrator and Raymond James and Associates as Investment Advisors</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Review and Approval of Updated Consultant Indefinite Quantity Indefinite Delivery List for Various Professional Consulting Services</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VIII. TAHOE TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT (TTD) BUSINESS ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items for Possible Action</th>
<th>Action Requested</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Discussion of the Corridor Management Plan Concept as a Means of Accelerated Implementation Using the SR 28 Corridor Management Plan as Illustration, Including an Update on Recent Funding Awards</td>
<td>Discussion and Possible Direction</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Approval of a Contract Amendment and Task Order for Stantec Consulting Services, Inc. for the Tahoe Basin Corridor and Integrated Transit System Planning Project</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Approval of the Creation of Transit System Program Manager Position to Lead, Develop, and Oversee a Regional Integrated Transit System for the Lake Tahoe Region, Starting with the Tahoe Basin Corridor and Integrated Transit System Planning Project</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Presentation on the North Tahoe Truckee Transportation Vision Service Plan by the North Lake Tahoe Chamber/CVB/Resort Association</td>
<td>Informational Only</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Approve Resolution Adopting Policies and Procedures Regarding Conflict of Interest and Disclosure Rules</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IX. DISTRICT MANAGER REPORT

### X. LEGAL COUNSEL REPORT

### XI. BOARD, COMMISSION MEMBER AND STAFF COMMENTS

### XII. ADJOURNMENT
COMPLIANCE WITH PUBLIC NOTICE REQUIREMENTS

This notice and agenda has been posted at the TTD office and at the Stateline, Nevada post office. The notice and agenda has also been posted at the North Tahoe Conference Center in Kings Beach, the Incline Village GID office and the North Tahoe Chamber of Commerce and on the TTD website: www.tahoetransportation.org.

For those individuals with a disability who require a modification or accommodation in order to participate in the public meeting, please contact Judi White at (775) 589-5502 or jwhite@tahoetransportation.org.

Nevada Open Meeting Law Compliance
Written notice of this meeting has been given at least three working days before the meeting by posting a copy of this agenda at the principal office of the Board and at three other separate, prominent places within the jurisdiction of the Board not later than 9 a.m. of the third working day before the meeting.

Written notice of this meeting has been given by providing a copy of this agenda to any person who has requested notice of the meetings of the Board. Such notice was delivered to the postal service used by the Board not later than 9 a.m. of the third working day before the meeting for transmittal to the requester by regular mail, or if feasible for the Board and the requester has agreed to receive the public notice by electronic mail, transmitted to the requester by electronic mail sent not later than 9 a.m. of the third working day before the meeting.

Supporting materials were provided to any person requesting such materials and were made available to the requester at the time the material was provided to the members of the Board or, if provided to the members of the Board at the meeting, were made available to the requester at the meeting and are available on the TTD website: www.tahoetransportation.org. Please send requests for copies of supporting materials to Judi White at (775) 589-5502 or jwhite@tahoetransportation.org.
Committee Members in Attendance:  
Will Garner, Placer County, Chair  
Steve Teshara, SS-TMA  
Ron Treabess, TNT-TMA  

Committee Members Absent:  
Norma Santiago, El Dorado County  

Others in Attendance:  
Carl Hasty, Tahoe Transportation District  
Joanie Schmitt, Tahoe Transportation District  
Judi White, Tahoe Transportation District  
Adam Spear, Esq., Legal Counsel  

I. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS  
No public interest comments were made.  

II. RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JUNE 13, 2014  
Mr. Treabess made the motion to recommend approval of the minutes of June 13, 2014. Mr. Teshara seconded the motion. The motion passed.  

III. DISCUSSION ITEMS  
Ms. Schmitt reviewed this item. Mr. Hasty noted the audit process has started.  

Action Requested: Recommend Acceptance  

Mr. Teshara made the motion to recommend acceptance of the District’s financial statement of operations for July 1, 2013 through May 31, 2014. Mr. Treabess seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.  

B. Approval of Purchase Order in the Amount of $129,600 to Purchase GFI Genfare Transit Fareboxes for TTD Buses, Installation, System Setup, and Staff Training  
Ms. Schmitt reviewed this item.  

Action Requested: Recommend Approval  

Mr. Treabess made the motion to recommend approval of the purchase order in the amount of $129,600 to purchase GFI Genfare transit fareboxes for TTD buses, installation, system setup and staff training. Mr. Teshara seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.  

IV. ADJOURNMENT
I. TAHOE TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT AND TAHOE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL

A. Roll Call and Determination of Quorum
   The meeting of the Tahoe Transportation Commission was called to order by Chairman Teshara at 9:36 a.m., at the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency. Roll call was taken and it was determined a quorum was in attendance for the TTC.

B. Approval of TTC Agenda of July 11, 2014
   Motion/second by Ms. Berkbigler/Mr. Treabess to approve the TTC portion agenda for today’s meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

C. Approval of TTD/TTC Meeting Minutes for June 13, 2014
   Motion/Second by Ms. Berkbigler/Mr. Treabess to approve the TTD and TTC minutes, as amended by Mr. Garner and Mr. Teshara. The motion passed.

II. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS
   No public interest comments were made.
III. KEOLIS EMPLOYEE RECOGNITION
This item was taken out of order and was considered after Agenda Item VII when it was determined a quorum was in attendance for the TTD. Fred Mittermayr was awarded the Customer Service Award for February. Adria Miller was awarded the Safety Award for February. Abraham Rodriguez was awarded the Customer Service Award for March. Susan Pickles was awarded the Safety Award for March. Evandro Guirmaraes was awarded the Customer Service Award for April. Billy Lewis was awarded the Safety Award for April. Sam Peterson was awarded the Customer Service Award for May. Frank Aquino was awarded the Safety Award for May.

IV. BUDGET FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT
This item was taken out of order and was considered after Agenda Item VII when it was determined a quorum was in attendance for the TTD. Mr. Garner reported the committee reviewed the items and recommended the requested actions of the consent items.

V. TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION APPOINTEE REPORT
This item was taken out of order and was considered after Agenda Item VII when it was determined a quorum was in attendance for the TTD. Mr. Teshara reported the APC held its first strategic retreat. Ms. McDermid suggested a joint workshop with the TRPA Governing Board and the APC. Mr. Teshara noted that a charter regarding the commitment of the members is being developed which will be presented to the Governing Board for endorsement and there should be an opportunity to have a joint meeting.

VI. TAHOE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (TTC) BUSINESS ITEMS
A. Acceptance of the Nevada Department of Transportation’s Fiscal Years 2015-2024 Tahoe Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Work Program
Mr. Haven introduced Mr. Tom Greco, Assistant Director of Planning, Nevada Department of Transportation. Mr. Greco announced he is retiring from NDOT. He introduced NDOT staff members and reviewed NDOT’s work program. Mr. Gabor noted the Forest Service is very interested in safety improvements at the entrances to Round Hill Pines and Zephyr Cove resorts and asked for NDOT’s assistance in addressing those areas. Mr. Teshara thanked Mr. Greco for his contributions with NDOT to Tahoe and the rest of the state over the years.

Action Requested: Acceptance

Ms. Berkbigler made the motion to accept the Nevada Department of Transportation’s fiscal years 2015-2024 Tahoe Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s work program. Mr. Gabor seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. McDermid arrived at 9:53 a.m.

Mr. Strain arrived at 9:57 a.m.
B. Initiate the 30-Day Public Comment Period for the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization Draft 2015 Federal Transportation Improvement Program
Ms. Weber reviewed this item and gave a presentation. Mr. Hasty asked if the definition of reasonably foreseeable is changing to be more difficult to satisfy. Mr. Haven replied he believes the FHWA interpretation is changing, not the definition.

Ms. Swanson arrived at 10:15 a.m.

Action Requested: Initiate Public Comment Period

Mr. Strain made the motion to initiate the 30-day public comment period for the draft 2015 Federal Transportation Improvement Program. Ms. Berkbigler seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Gabor left at 10:45 a.m.

VII. ADJOURN AS TTC AND RECONVENE AS TTD
Roll call was taken and it was determined a quorum was in attendance for the TTD

VIII. TAHOE TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT (TTD) CONSENT ITEMS

B. Review and Acceptance of South Shore and Commuter Transit May 2014 Operations Reports
C. Approval of Purchase Order in the Amount of $129,600 to Purchase GFI Genfare Transit Fareboxes for TTD Buses, Installation, System Setup, and Staff Training

Ms. McDermid motioned to approve the consent calendar, Ms. Swanson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

IX. TAHOE TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT (TTD) BUSINESS ITEMS

A. Approval of Creation of Transit Program Manager Position to Lead, Develop, and Oversee a Regional Transit System for the Lake Tahoe Region
Mr. Hasty reviewed this item. Mr. Garner asked for a current organizational chart of the District. Ms. Swanson asked if the position will be a permanent or a temporary position. Mr. Hasty responded the position is based on the ability to generate revenue to continue paying for position. No action was taken and the item was continued to next month in order for staff to bring more clarification and detail to the Board.

Action Requested: Approval
B. Approval of Two Legislative Initiatives Pertaining to Funding for the Trans Sierra Transportation Coalition and the Development of a Transportation Investment Plan for the State of Nevada as Part of the District's Overall Legislative Program

Mr. Hasty reviewed the development of a transportation investment plan for the State of Nevada initiative. The discussion regarding funding for the Trans Sierra Transportation Coalition was continued to next month.

Action Requested: Approval

Ms. Berkbigler made the motion to pursue working with a broad-based group in the State of Nevada relative to the issue of funding for transportation in the long-term. Ms. McDermid seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

X. DISTRICT MANAGER REPORT

Mr. Hasty introduced Aaron Langmayer, the District’s new Transit Manager. He noted staff and SR 28 CMP stakeholders met with Project Decision Committee for the Nevada Federal Lands Access Program and had a field trip. He also noted the next call for projects is scheduled to be released this fall.

XI. LEGAL COUNSEL REPORT

Legal counsel had nothing to report.

XII. BOARD, COMMISSION MEMBER AND STAFF COMMENTS

Ms. Swanson distributed a letter the City received from Caltrans regarding the Tahoe Valley Area Plan and noted the City asked TTD staff to be cognizant of the letter.

Mr. Treabess requested to schedule a presentation regarding the North Tahoe Transit Vision at the August Board meeting. He also commented regarding the need to find funding opportunities for maintenance of existing bike trail facilities to prevent them. He noted the Water Shuttle is doing well this summer.

Mr. Teshara thanked staff for a great tour of SR28 given to the Nevada Oversight committee.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 12:13 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Judi White
Executive Assistant
Clerk to the Board
Tahoe Transportation District

(The above meeting was recorded in its entirety, anyone wishing to listen to the aforementioned tapes, please contact Judi White, Clerk to the Board, (775) 589-5502.)
MEMORANDUM

Date: August 4, 2014

To: Tahoe Transportation Commission Board

From: TMPO Staff

Subject: Conduct a Public Hearing for the Draft 2015 Federal Transportation Improvement Program

**Action Requested:**
No action is required. It is requested the Tahoe Transportation Commission Board accept public comment for the Draft 2015 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP).

**Background:**
On July 11, 2014, the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO) released the Draft 2015 FTIP for public review and comment as required by the United States Department of Transportation’s metropolitan planning Code of Federal Regulations Title 23, Part 450. The public comment period will close on August 8, 2014 at 5:00 pm. All comments received will be responded to and incorporated in the final document.

**Discussion:**
TMPO is soliciting public comment on the Draft 2015 FTIP. The 2015 FTIP is a four-year program of transportation projects for the Tahoe Region that is consistent with the Lake Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan and related local, state, and federal planning processes. The document covers federal fiscal years 2015 through 2018. The FTIP must be financially constrained by year, meaning that the amount of dollars committed to the projects must not exceed the amount of dollars estimated to be available and include sufficient financial information to demonstrate that projects can be funded as programmed.

The Draft 2015 FTIP is available online at: [www.trpa.org](http://www.trpa.org).

**Next Steps:**
2015 FTIP Approval Timeline:
- September 12, 2014  TTC Board recommendation of approval of the 2015 FTIP
- September 24, 2014  TMPO Governing Board adoption of the 2015 FTIP
- October 01, 2014  2015 FTIP submittal to Caltrans and NDOT
- December 17, 2014  2015 FSTIP/FTIP Federal approval

**Additional Information:**
For questions regarding this item, please contact Judy Weber at (775) 589-5203 or jweber@trpa.org.
MEMORANDUM

Date: August 4, 2014

To: Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) Board of Directors

From: TTD Staff

Subject: Approval of Fiscal Year 2015 Contract Amendment for HDR; Approval of Task Orders for the Capital Improvement Program Manual and Rocky Point-Hidden Beach Vista Point Parking Lot; and a Task Order Amendment for the Meeks Bay Bike Path Project

Action Requested:
It is requested the Board approve the Contract Amendment and Task Orders as recommended by Staff in the following tables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK ORDERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Rodgers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichols Consulting Engineers (NCE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fiscal Analysis:
All expenditures associated with this item are accounted for in the approved 2014/15 budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Match</th>
<th>Match Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>HDR Task Order for CIP Manual</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>FLH ½%</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>NCE Task Order Amendment for the Meeks Bay Bike Path</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>FLH ½%</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>Wood Rodgers Task Order for the Rocky Point Vista Parking Project</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>FLH ½%</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Work Program Analysis:
All work associated with this effort is captured under respective elements of the approved FY 2015 Work Program and corresponding allotted staff time.

Background and Discussion:

TTD CIP Policy and Procedure Manual (WE 2.2)

Background:
At the March 2012 TTD Board meeting, the Board approved a Task Order for Collins Engineers to develop a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Policy and Procedures Manual for TTD. Since that date, Staff had been working with Collins to complete that task. Over the past year, Collins struggled with deliverables and requests from Staff regarding the scope of work. In June, Staff learned that Collins closed their Folsom, CA office, however, Collins did not properly notify Staff of the closure. Without that office, Collins no longer had the Tahoe Basin regional experience and qualifications to complete the task. TTD Legal Counsel and Staff notified Collins’ Chicago headquarters that the task had not been completed and negotiated a settlement, whereby Collins agreed to reimburse TTD for all funds paid to Collins for the task.

Discussion:
After resolving the issues with Collins and mutually agreeing to terminate the project agreement, Staff sought to hire a new consultant to draft the CIP Manual. Staff reviewed the list of qualified consultants for firms most qualified to assist TTD. After reviewing a few of the firm’s qualifications, Staff found that HDR appeared to have the expertise and qualifications that best fit TTD’s needs. TTD Staff and Legal Counsel interviewed HDR staff who would be developing the CIP manual. HDR has developed similar CIP manuals for numerous other agencies, including NDOT’s construction manual, which they completed recently. Staff and Legal Counsel negotiated a scope of work and budget for the manual, which is identified in the tables above. Staff recommends approval of the Task Order for HDR to complete TTD’s CIP Manual based on their expertise and qualifications for this specific work, knowledge of the Tahoe Basin, and past experience and history working with TTD. The current schedule anticipates the final CIP Manual coming to the Board around January 2015 for review and approval.
**Rocky Point – Hidden Beach Vista Point Parking (WE 3.12)**

**Background:**
At the June 13, 2014 Board meeting, Staff presented the Rocky Point-Hidden Beach Vista Point Parking Project to the Board and requested approval to enter into a funding agreement with NDOT and release a Request for Approach (RFA) to TTD’s list of qualified consultants. Staff also had a discussion with the Board regarding the potential risk with this Project, as well as all of the other Projects identified in the SR 28 Corridor Management Plan, related to the roles and responsibilities of operations and maintenance (O&M) upon completion of the Project. Staff mentioned that Nevada Division of State Parks is willing to take on the daily maintenance of the Project, but did not have enough funding to allow them to take on the long-term capital maintenance of the Project. Staff identified that on-going capital maintenance is minimal at approximately $4,000 annually, including building a long-term capital maintenance fund for repairs and replacement after 20 years.

To prevent losing the Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) funding and keep the project on schedule for construction in 2015, the Board approved executing the funding agreement with NDOT and solicit consultant services to complete the environmental and design. The Board requested Staff to return to the Board at a later date with a larger discussion on future O&M roles and responsibilities as part of the SR 28 Corridor Management Plan and future projects Basin wide. Item VIII.A. of this Board meeting provides the discussion on O&M roles and responsibilities, as well as other capital projects identified for Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP) funds for the overall SR 28 Corridor. Staff continues to work with all of the SR 28 Corridor Project Development Team (PDT) agencies to develop solutions for funding O&M, and sees this Project as minimal risk for identifying O&M responsibilities prior to the start of construction.

**Discussion:**
Staff received three responses to the RFA from Wood Rodgers, Lumos & Associates, and Stantec for the Project engineering services. Based on their qualifications, expertise, ability to demonstrate an efficient approach to completing the work, knowledge of the area, and ability to work with the applicable agencies, Wood Rodgers’ approach scored the highest. With the need to program the TAP construction funds for 2015, Staff is requesting approval of a Task Order with Wood Rodgers to complete the environmental and geotechnical field work and preliminary engineering and design for the Project. This will allow Wood Rodgers to complete all of the necessary field work during the remainder of this summer, ensuring the design can be completed this fall and ready for a construction start date of June 2015. The final design will come back to the Board for review and approval, along with an O&M agreement, prior to the bid and award of the Project, also requiring Board authorization. Approval of the Task Order also allows Staff to continue working on the larger O&M agreements for all of the SR 28 Corridor Projects, including an O&M agreement for this Project prior to bidding the Project in the spring of 2015.

**Meeks Bay Bike Path (WE 3.9)**

**Background:**
In September 2013, the Meeks Bay Bike Trail Project was selected for award by the California FLAP, administered by Federal Highways Administration – Central Federal Lands Highways Division (CFLHD). Since the award, Staff has been working closely with CFLHD, as co-project leads in order to deliver the project during the 2015 construction season. Currently, the Project
is within the final design and permitting phase, and NCE is working to complete 95% design under their current Task Order.

Discussion:
Staff, in coordination with NCE, has been working with the permitting agencies to ensure the 95% design will receive a permit once completed. Comments received from the permitting agencies 90% design review indicated minor design changes that will require additional engineering and survey that was not originally anticipated in the current Task Order. The US Forest Service has requested modifications to the alignment within the Meeks Bay Resort, which will also require additional survey and supplemental engineering. The amendment also includes staking of the centerline alignment for a field review with the PDT and other stakeholders, as well as survey work for utility relocations.

Additional Information:
If you have any questions or comments regarding this item, please contact Derek Kirkland at (775) 589-5504 or dkirkland@tahoetransportation.org.
MEMORANDUM

Date: August 4, 2014

To: Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) Board of Directors

From: TTD Staff

Subject: Review and Acceptance of South Shore and Commuter Transit June 2014 Operations Reports

Action Requested:
It is requested the Board review and accept the monthly transit operations report for June 2014.

Background:
To inform the Board of the performance of the transit system, Staff will submit a monthly summary of key operational information.

Transit Operations Discussion:
The Emerald Bay Trolley began operations on June 28.

The shop safety meeting covered spill prevention. A safety committee meeting was held with discussions regarding programming of the GFI fareboxes, scheduling CPR and first aid training, and construction on Vista Grande and Topsy Lane.

Felicia Watkins is the recipient of this month’s Customer Service award for her pleasant personality while going above and beyond to make sure her passengers get to their destination on time.

Tarma Tribble is the recipient of the June Safety Award for always demonstrating safe practices while driving the Express routes.

There were four driver-related complaints, two related to bad attitude, one to bad driving and one to unhelpfulness and one compliment of good attitude received. There was four road calls in June, with a 15-minute delay and 30-minute delay in service.

June’s combined regular fixed-route, East Shore Express shuttle and on-call ridership totaled 41,239 passenger trips, up 1.8% from 2013.

Additional Information:
If you have any questions or comments regarding this item, please contact Aaron Langmayer at (775) 589-5505 or aaronl@tahoetransportation.org.

Attachments:
A. TTD Transit statistical data for June 2014
## Ridership Report

### Jun 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Riders</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2014</td>
<td>Jun 2013</td>
<td>YOY Change</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>MOM Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Routes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19X</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20X</td>
<td>1,394</td>
<td>1,451</td>
<td>-57</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21X</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>-150</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>6,533</td>
<td>6,540</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>14,581</td>
<td>14,288</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>13,706</td>
<td>13,380</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fixed</td>
<td>39,059</td>
<td>38,984</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farebox</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2014</td>
<td>Jun 2013</td>
<td>YOY Change</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>MOM Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19X</td>
<td>4,746</td>
<td>4,520</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20X</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21X</td>
<td>9,918</td>
<td>9,860</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>7,052</td>
<td>7,052</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>6,120</td>
<td>6,120</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>7,020</td>
<td>7,020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fixed</td>
<td>42,769</td>
<td>44,284</td>
<td>(1,515)</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Vehicle Service Hours

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2014</td>
<td>Jun 2013</td>
<td>YOY Change</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>MOM Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Call</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>-73</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3,073</td>
<td>3,214</td>
<td>(141)</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Vehicle Service Miles

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2014</td>
<td>Jun 2013</td>
<td>YOY Change</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>MOM Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>3,156</td>
<td>8023</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Call</td>
<td>6,360</td>
<td>8,023</td>
<td>-1,663</td>
<td>-21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>52,285</td>
<td>52,307</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

Date: August 4, 2014

To: Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) Board of Directors

From: TTD Staff

Subject: Approval to Establish a TTD Retirement Plan with MassMutual as TTD’s Plan Administrator and Raymond James and Associates as Investment Advisors

Action Requested:
The District Manager requests that the Board approve the establishment of a standalone retirement plan, thereby separating from TRPA’s plan with Daily Access Corp., and authorize the execution of agreements with MassMutual and Raymond James and Associates for the purposes of providing a competitive and qualified retirement benefit plan for TTD employees.

Fiscal Analysis:
TTD will pay MassMutual a first year plan management fee of less than $3,500. After the initial year, annual plan management fees are estimated at $2,500. Raymond James company investment account fees are 0.25% of account value per year, and will be paid directly from the employees plans, as is currently the procedure with Daily Access Corp. The employer contributions are included in FY 15’s budget under personnel costs. Annual fees will be recorded in the General fund and allocated to the grants as part of Admin Support.

Work Program Analysis:
Currently, TTD Staff manages retirement benefit administration through payroll activity. Approval of a standalone plan will simplify management and give TTD more control over plan management.

Background:
TTD hired their first employee in January 2009. At that time, payroll was handled by TRPA and TTD employees were offered the same benefits as TRPA employees and followed TRPA’s personnel policies. TRPA’s plan does not participate in Social Security, except for Medicare; nor is it part of either California or Nevada’s public employee retirement system (PERS), which also do not participate in Social Security except for Medicare. TRPA’s plan includes employer paid social security replacement known as a 457 Money Participation Plan and the agency’s contribution is 8% of annual salary. Employees are also encouraged to establish their own personalized 457 plan at an equal contribution rate of 8% making a potential combined annual contribution of 16%. These plans are administered by Daily Access Corp. TRPA had obtained the services of Joe Ciaramitaro with Raymond James & Associates as investment account advisors.

In 2012, TTD began administering its own payroll services which have included direct employee and agency contributions to the plans. Staff has not been directly involved in any management decisions regarding the plan and plan choices. Recognizing that the offered retirement plan is considerably less than what is offered by either state’s PERS (both of which have combined contribution rates closer to...
27% annually), the District Manager proposed an increase in TTD’s contribution rate to become more comparable and competitive. In May 2014, the Board authorized the District to increase its retirement plan contribution from 8% to 12%, effective July 1, 2014. Employees are encouraged to match the contribution, which would bring the combined contribution up to 24% annually.

By establishing its own retirement plan, TTD will be following and advancing its auditors’ recommendations that TTD continue its separation process from TRPA.

**Discussion:**
With different contribution rates between the agencies, TTD staff approached Mr. Ciaramitaro to pursue the possibility of separating from TRPA and establishing TTD’s own plan. Mr. Ciaramitaro is the managing director and senior vice president with Raymond James. He is a certified financial planner with emphasis in retirement plans. He has worked with Raymond James for 12 years and in the industry for 28 years. Staff feels it prudent to maintain continuity with the current financial plan services while establishing the new plan.

Mr. Ciaramitaro has researched and recommends the TTD pursue a plan administrative relationship with MassMutual for the following reasons:
- Experience with government entities and the 457 plan. They manage approximately $1.5 billion in assets in Nevada.
- Excellent fund choices including index fund options
- Competitive fee structure
- Excellent technology services
- Excellent customer service including payroll assistance

The “8% employer contribution” will go into a 457 Money Participation Plan (Social Security Replacement) and be invested in a conservative fund portfolio. Pursuant to TTD policies, employees will be eligible for automatic enrollment and fully vested on the first day of hire.

The new “4% employer contribution” will go into a 457 fund portfolio, to be determined by the employee. Employees will be eligible for automatic enrollment on the first day of hire and 100% vested after the first year of employment. Should an employee sever employment with the TTD earlier than the initial year, this portion of the plan will revert back to the TTD.

Employees also have the option to contribute into a 457 deferred compensation plan and/or a 457 ROTH plan. Currently, the maximum employee elected annual contribution is $17,500 and determined by the IRS. Employees will set up their own fund portfolio with the aid of Mr. Ciaramitaro.

Upon Board approval, current plans with Daily Access will be closed and rolled into MassMutual.

**Additional Information:**
If you have any questions or comments regarding this item, please contact Carl Hasty at chasty@tahoetransportation.org or (775) 589-5500.
MEMORANDUM

Date: August 4, 2014

To: Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) Board of Directors

From: TTD Staff

Subject: Review and Approval of Updated Consultant Indefinite Quantity Indefinite Delivery List for Various Professional Consulting Services

Action Requested:
It is requested the Board review and approve the recommended Indefinite Quantity Indefinite Delivery List (IDIQ List) of qualified Consultants to assist the TTD in carrying out project and program related activities (Attachment A).

Fiscal Analysis:
Future contracts and task orders will be brought back to the Board for approval at a later date as work on Projects is necessary. There is no fiscal impact at this time.

Work Program Analysis:
No work is authorized with the approval of the IDIQ List.

Background:
At the May 9, 2014 Board meeting, the Board gave approval for Staff to release a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for professional services. On June 17, 2014, Staff issued the RFQ for professional services specific to five categories of needs, which are anticipated to be required to implement the TTD Capital Improvement Program, Transit Program, as well as address other short and long-term organizational needs. The five categories are as follows:

- Category 1 - Project Delivery
- Category 2 - Project and Program Management
- Category 3 - Specialty Assistance in Support of Project Delivery or Design Review
- Category 4 - Transit Systems/Service Planning
- Category 5 - Miscellaneous (Landscaping, Architecture, Financial Services, Utility Locating, Land Use Planning, Public Outreach and Education, Organizational Management, Marketing/Surveys/Polling and Evaluation)

A detailed description of each category is provided in Attachment B.

The RFQ solicitation period closed at 3:00 p.m. on July 11, 2014, at which time, the TTD received approximately 40 Statements of Qualifications/Statements of Interest (SOQ/SOI) for the above-referenced categories.
**Discussion:**
Staff, along with an external evaluator represented by staff from the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency/Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TRPA/TMPO), reviewed and evaluated the SOQ/SOI's and categorized them into Priority 1 and Priority 2 listings, with the Priority 1 listing being the most qualified firms that match up with the anticipated project needs over the next three years. Approximately 26 firms received the Priority 1 listing.

Staff has developed the IDIQ List (previously referred to as TTD’s “short list”) of consulting firms, which includes all firms receiving a Priority 1 ranking, as well as which qualification category they submitted to (Attachment A). Upon Board approval of the IDIQ List, Staff will begin contract negotiations to amend existing contracts with firms for additional work or execute new contracts, as deemed necessary by the District Manager to carry out the TTD CIP, Transit Program, as well as tasks and programs outlined in the approved TTD Overall Work Program. Individual Task Orders requesting authorization to expend funds would come back to the Board for approval as part of a future action. The IDIQ List will remain active for a period of three years.

**Additional Information:**
If you have any questions or comments regarding this item, please contact Derek Kirkland at (775) 589-5504 or dkirkland@tahoetransportation.org.

**Attachments:**
A. TTD IDIQ List of Consultants
B. SOQ/SOI Category Description
## Tahoe Transportation District
### Indefinite Quantity Indefinite Delivery List
for Various Professional Consulting Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Category 1</th>
<th>Category 2</th>
<th>Category 3</th>
<th>Category 4</th>
<th>Category 5</th>
<th>SI Skillset</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ascent Environmental</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A B C A B C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape Arch &amp; Stormwater Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auerbach Engineering Corp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Innovative Project Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bender Rosenthal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardno Entrix</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH2M Hill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowd Brite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Workshop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauge Brueck</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBI Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Mullen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSC Transportation Consultants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumos &amp; Associates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matzoll Development Consultants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morse Associates Consulting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCE Engineering &amp; Environmental Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Economics &amp; Advisory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith &amp; Jones</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial Informatics Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stantec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Packard &amp; Associates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Plus Inc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Barnett Associates, LLC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Rodgers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOQ - Consultant Service Categories

Category 1 Project Delivery: This includes management, planning, design, environmental, utility coordination, and similar tasks to deliver a transportation capital project.

A. Large complex transportation projects – Over $10M construction
B. Smaller transportation projects - Under $10M construction

Category 2 Project and Program Management: Due to current workloads and staffing levels, management and coordination services may be sought.

A. Project management – manage a specific project or groups of projects
B. Program management services – manage a unit or program of the District, such as development review, permitting, and plan checking (provide full service)
C. Federal Compliance Procedures and Guidance – development and or refinement of DBE and Title VI policies and procedures, other related federally required programs and procedures, and development of Capital Program guidance.

Category 3 Specialty Assistance in Support of Project Delivery or Design Review: TTD seeks specialty assistance in delivering CIP projects relative to the following disciplines:

A. Civil Engineering – general civil engineering, as it relates to transportation and environmental restoration
B. Surveying – construction staking, topography, aerial mapping
C. Geotechnical Engineering – roadway, foundation for structures reports
D. Environmental Services – EIS, EIR, EA, MND, and IS documentation, as well as TRPA, USACOE, CA DF&G, NV DOW, FHW, FTA, Caltrans, and NDOT permitting, other special studies as necessary
E. Right-of-way – appraisals, property acquisition, title and escrow services
F. Structural Engineering – bridge design/inspection, retaining wall design/inspection
G. Traffic Engineering – conduct and review of various studies, Synchro/Sim traffic analysis, traffic forecasting and modeling, design and review of traffic signals, signing, and striping
H. Hydraulics and Hydrology Engineering – drainage studies, design, CCTV inspections
I. Computer Aided Design and Drafting (CADD)/Geographic Information Systems (GIS) – ability to provide “on-call” technical assistance with AutoCAD Civil 3D, ESRI ArcGIS, and drafting services
J. Utility Coordination and Relocation Services – design for the relocation of various utilities, coordination between various utility companies
K. Construction Management and Other Construction Services – inspections, contract administration
L. Materials Testing

Category 4 Transit Systems/Service Planning: TTD owns various transit-related rolling stock and support facilities, in addition to operating local and regional transit services. Additionally, TTD will be evaluating future transit service opportunities from various modes (i.e. bus, ferry, fixed
guideway) included in existing short and long-term regional transportation plans that will require specialized services. Examples of areas of assistance include, but are not limited to:

A. Bus Transit Route and System Planning - date collecting, existing route analysis, efficiency recommendations, future route analysis, ridership projections, develop capital and operational requirements for future services, conduct route cost/benefit analysis
B. Fixed Guideway and Bus Rapid Transit Planning - conduct feasibility, fatal flaw and alternatives analysis, develop ridership projections, systems requirements, and capital and operations requirements for preferred alternative
C. Multi-modal Planning – transit planning and service design (Ferry and Bus), aerial tramway planning and service design, pedestrian and bicycle planning and design
D. Transit Facility Planning and Design – including small facilities, such as bus shelters to fueling facilities, and larger transit operations and maintenance facilities.
E. Federal Compliance Procedures – development and/or refinement of DBE and Title VI policies and procedures, and other related federally required programs

Category 5 Miscellaneous: TTD requires a variety of assistance in the performance of duties. Examples of areas of assistance include, but are not limited to:

A. Landscaping – tree trimming service, planting and maintenance, arborist consulting
B. Financial services – CIP and O&M financing, Financial Auditing Services
C. Potholing – provide utility location services through potholing
D. Land use planning – transportation related land use policies and growth projections
E. Public Outreach and Education– organizational and project/program specific
F. Organizational Management - strategic planning, asset management
G. Architectural
H. Marketing/Surveys/Polling and Evaluation
I. Other - If there are areas of expertise that your firm holds which you believe may be of assistance in delivery of Capital Projects, Transit Services or the performance of TTD duties, please include them in the SOQ.
MEMORANDUM

Date: August 4, 2014

To: Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) Board of Directors

From: TTD Staff

Subject: Discussion of the Corridor Management Plan Concept as a Means of Accelerated Implementation Using the SR 28 Corridor Management Plan as Illustration, Including an Update on Recent Funding Awards

**Action Requested:**
It is requested that the Board have a discussion and provide possible direction.

**Fiscal Analysis**
TTD has been notified of a $12.5M Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP) award for projects identified in the Nevada State Route 28 Corridor Management Plan (SR28 CMP) covering Fiscal Year 2015 – 2017 for design and construction activities.

**Work Program Analysis**
Projects identified in the SR28 CMP that will be receiving funding are identified in the approved Fiscal Year 2014/2015 Work Program. TTD staff will be working with Federal Highways Administration (FHWA)-Central Federal Lands Highways Division (CFHLD), and Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) as co-project leads for the projects.

**Background:**
On October 11, 2013, the Board adopted the SR28 CMP. Since that date, Staff has been working to secure funding to implement the projects and solutions identified in the SR28 CMP. The most significant request for funding was the application for FLAP funds through the FHWA – CFLHD. Over the past several months, Staff has been working with CFLHD Staff, NDOT Staff, and other Project Development Team (PDT) members to refine the Project scopes and budgets in order to secure FLAP funds, as well as the matching funds identified in the application.

As Staff has gained more experience in moving forward on corridor implementation, a number of issues and considerations have presented themselves that warrants discussion.

**Discussion:**
The Project Decision Committee (PDC) for the FLAP funds notified Staff at the end of July 2014 that $12,500,000 would be awarded for the three miles of the Nevada Stateline to Stateline Bikeway Phase 2 - North Demo Project (NV Bikeway Phase 2), US Forest Service parking lot expansions, a new park and ride lot at the top of Spooner Summit, and other safety improvements identified in the SR28 CMP. Overall with matching funds, the total Project award
will be approximately $25,000,000 for improvements identified in the SR28 CMP, including the three miles of the NV Bikeway Phase 2 Project, scheduled to begin construction the summer of 2015.

At the June 13, 2014 Board meeting, Staff presented another Project to the Board identified in the SR28 CMP, the Rocky Point-Hidden Beach Vista Point parking lot, which has been awarded Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funds through NDOT. As part of this presentation, Staff brought to the Board’s attention the need to begin developing a SR28 corridor wide operations and maintenance (O&M) agreement as identified in the SR28 CMP. The O&M agreement is becoming an important part of the SR28 CMP and the identified improvements, as all of these recent capital improvement project awards will require project agreements that identify the O&M roles and responsibilities. Staff has been working with the SR28 CMP PDT to establish a SR28 O&M committee to help shape the roles and responsibilities of the SR 28 Corridor not only for the upcoming projects, but for the future of the corridor and creating consistency for the users/public.

Below is a risk based analysis related to the upcoming tasks necessary to securing the awarded funds for the Projects and demonstrates the issues and considerations that have presented themselves not only in the SR 28 Corridor, but seem to be the region-wide trend:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Potential Risk</th>
<th>What’s at Stake</th>
<th>Risk Management Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| O&M agreement in place for all Projects | O&M agreement can’t be reached | No O&M agreement means no funding | - Cooperative agreement with 28 O&M Committee for shared responsibility. (NDSP/NDOT/WC/DC/ IVGID already providing similar services)  
- Implement parking management strategy with paid parking: TTD managed system and/or TTD managed enterprise fund  
- TTD assumes O&M responsibilities |
| Project Implementation Fiscal Administration | - Multiple sources of funding  
- Reimbursable agreements get delayed  
- Cash flow | - Project delays  
- Not meeting federal fund requirements  
- Fiscal control record keeping  
- Loss of funding | - TTD holds all matching funds and has single reimbursable agreement with FHWA-CFLHD.  
- TTD obtains individual agreements with PDT partners. |
| Co-project management and collaboration | - 13 agencies can’t reach agreement on design element.  
- CFLHD and NDOT not familiar with locals/user groups  
- Different agency projects and objectives  
- Projects cross multiple jurisdictions  
- History of SR 28 Corridor | - Project Delays  
- Project scope becomes larger than budget  
- Limited project resources  
- Project design elements don’t line up with SR 28 CMP recommendations  
- Community not in agreement with Project elements | - TTD, CFLHD, and NDOT have a co-project management role  
- TTD leads public outreach and plays an agency partnership/collaboration role, CFLHD leads design and construction management, NDOT represents the State interest from a highway user and safety perspective  
- Use of Crowdbrite for public engagement throughout the process.  
- Engage community in design. |

The SR28 CMP (chapter 11) identifies strategies for implementation, as well as management (O&M) of the corridor, including the identification of potential O&M funding strategies. Below is a comparison of O&M costs and a potential revenue source for the SR 28 corridor:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SR 28 Corridor Projections</th>
<th>Annual O&amp;M Costs</th>
<th>Annual Parking Management System Cost</th>
<th>Estimated Parking Revenue at $7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Corridor Analysis</td>
<td>$140,000(1)</td>
<td>$25,000(2)</td>
<td>$180,000 - $265,000(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLAP Project Analysis</td>
<td>$60,000(1)</td>
<td>$25,000(2)</td>
<td>$170,000 - $250,000(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Does not include transit operating costs. Full corridor transit operating cost is estimated at $400,000/yr.
(2) Does not include enforcement – could range $15,000/yr to $30,000/yr. Revenue from parking tickets could also help offset parking enforcement costs. City of South Lake Tahoe typically sees approximately $80,000 per year in parking tickets.
(3) Numbers are conservative enough to include some non-compliance. Parking demand is so high in the corridor that occupancy rates and turnover will probably be much higher than projected and will also encourage self-compliance.

The annual parking management system cost identified above is a very conceptual estimate based on discussions with other agencies using the systems, and is assumed to include projected administrative costs, fee collection services, annual technology fees, and maintenance. The capital cost of the system would be paid for through project implementation funding. Attachment A has more detailed information on the O&M costs as outlined in the SR 28 CMP, and Attachment B has more detailed information on the revenue projections. Washoe County is also embarking on a parking management study focused on assessing the feasibility and fee options for the SR 28 Corridor through a TMPO “On Our Way” grant. TTD is participating in this study, which will provide additional information on a possible parking management system for the SR 28 corridor.

In summary, Staff is anticipating over $25,000,000 in improvements in the SR 28 corridor over the next two to three years, with another $35,000,000 in the next two to five years to complete the co-location of IVGID’s effluent export line and the last eight miles of bikeway connecting Sand Harbor to Spooner. In order to ensure those funds are not lost and the projects move forward to construction, TTD will need to execute a series of agreements over the next few months:

1) O&M agreement with all applicable agencies. In order to accomplish this, direction on a funding source will need to be agreed upon, which could mean TTD assuming oversight of that funding source.

2) Reimbursable agreements with CFLHD, NDOT and the other funding partners including the counties and Nevada Division of State Lands for State Question 1 funds, Washoe County for Washoe County 1 funds, Tahoe Fund, among others.

3) Project agreement with the SR 28 PDT and CFLHD for all of the Projects identified for funding. The O&M agreement will need to be completed and included with this agreement.
The schedule for the upcoming work is as follows:

August 2014: Begin design on NV Bikeway Phase 2, parking areas, and other corridor safety improvements

June 2015: Begin construction NV Bikeway Phase 2 Incline to Hidden Beach, continue design on all other elements of the corridor

June 2016: Begin construction of NV Bikeway Phase 2 Hidden Beach to Sand Harbor, parking lots and other safety improvements.

**Additional Information:**
If you have any questions or comments regarding this item, please contact Carl Hasty at chasty@tahoetransportation.org or (775) 589-5501.

**Attachments:**
A. O&M Cost Spreadsheet
B. Parking Management System Revenue Spreadsheet
Potential Infrastructure Maintenance and Operating Expenses
The cost to maintain the recommended infrastructure projects estimates maintenance using Washoe County Public Works' unit prices and applies a life span/depreciation factor. A contingency was added to account for additional costs associated with projects in the Tahoe Basin such as stormwater treatment systems. Estimates are conceptual and based on gross square footage of project areas. This is a snapshot shot in time as costs will change based on factors such as the price of oil and the length of time before actual construction. The projected costs are comparable to existing facilities in the Basin.

The estimated expenses present a general sense of costs and illustrate the need to look at strategies to fund improvements. At this point, designs are conceptual and will likely be modified. Costs should be revised during project design. As the CMP is implemented, projects should ensure they have a funding source for maintenance costs prior to moving forward.

Existing Maintenance and Operation Needs Not Included
This document does not look at existing agency facility maintenance and operation needs. For example, NDOT is scheduled to complete water quality improvements along SR 28 and maintenance will be incorporated into NDOT’s existing budget. The CMP also provides for emergency turnouts and viewpoints which are essentially a widening of the existing pavement. Maintenance of these areas is anticipated to be folded into routine highway maintenance.

Table 13: Estimated Additional Maintenance and Operating Expenses Using 2013 Dollars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORRIDOR SEGMENT</th>
<th>INFRASTRUCTURE CAPITAL MAINTENANCE 1</th>
<th>ROUTINE OPERATING EXPENSES 2</th>
<th>TOTAL ANNUAL INFRASTRUCTURE &amp; MAINTENANCE</th>
<th>ANNUAL TRANSIT OPERATING EXPENSES 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incline to Sand Harbor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikeway Phase 2</td>
<td>$28,490.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$29,990.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flume Trail Trailhead</td>
<td>$4,387.00</td>
<td>$660.00</td>
<td>$5,047.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Corridor A</td>
<td>$8,216.00</td>
<td>$660.00</td>
<td>$8,876.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Corridor B</td>
<td>$2,368.00</td>
<td>$510.00</td>
<td>$2,878.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Point Vista</td>
<td>$3,724.00</td>
<td>$510.00</td>
<td>$4,234.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Annual Expenses</td>
<td>$47,185.00</td>
<td>$3,840.00</td>
<td>$51,115</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Harbor to Bliss Pond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikeway Phase 3A</td>
<td>$26,379.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$27,879.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thunderbird Cove</td>
<td>$2,316.00</td>
<td>$510.00</td>
<td>$2,826.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimney Beach</td>
<td>$8,331.00</td>
<td>$660.00</td>
<td>$8,991.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secret Harbor</td>
<td>$6,844.00</td>
<td>$660.00</td>
<td>$7,504.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Annual Expense</td>
<td>$43,870.00</td>
<td>$3,330.00</td>
<td>$47,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss Pond to U.S. 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikeway Phase 3B</td>
<td>$35,250.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$37,250.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skunk Harbor</td>
<td>$3,374.00</td>
<td>$510.00</td>
<td>$3,884.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Annual Expense</td>
<td>$38,624.00</td>
<td>$2,510.00</td>
<td>$41,134</td>
<td>$150,000-$250,000 (depending on level of service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Corridor Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$139,449</td>
<td>$300,000-$400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1 Infrastructure maintenance costs include sealing pavement, re-striping, pavement overlays, visitor amenity replacement etc.
2 Operating costs include sweeping of pavement twice per year, seasonal labor for litter, and trash pickup etc.
3 Transit costs are general estimates subject to change on an annual basis.
Conceptual Funding based on a $7.00 Parking Fee and estimated parking space occupancy percentages with and without turnover of vehicles applied and industry standard for those who do not pay or who go elsewhere.

| Incline to Sand Harbor | # of parking spaces | Weekday May 20% | Weekend May 20% | Weekday June 24% | Weekend June 40% | Weekday July 24% | Weekend July 100% | Weekday Aug 65% | Weekend Aug 100% | Weekday Sept 24% | Weekend Sept 40% | Weekday Oct 24% | Weekend Oct 20% | Total No Turnover | Turnover Rate | Turnover Applied |
|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| North Corridor Parking Node B (30) | 30 | $924.00 | $378.00 | $1,008.00 | $840.00 | $3,003.00 | $1,890.00 | $3,003.00 | $1,890.00 | $1,008.00 | $840.00 | $924.00 | $378.00 | $16,086.00 | 1.50 | $24,129.00 |
| North Corridor Parking Node A (65) | 65 | $2,002.00 | $819.00 | $2,184.00 | $1,820.00 | $6,506.50 | $4,095.00 | $6,506.50 | $4,095.00 | $2,184.00 | $1,820.00 | $2,002.00 | $819.00 | $34,853.00 | 1.30 | $45,308.90 |
| North Corridor Parking Node C (15) | 15 | $462.00 | $189.00 | $504.00 | $420.00 | $1,501.50 | $945.00 | $1,501.50 | $945.00 | $504.00 | $420.00 | $462.00 | $189.00 | $8,043.00 | 1.50 | $12,064.50 |
| Hidden Beach Trailhead (21) | 21 | $464.80 | $264.60 | $705.60 | $588.00 | $2,102.10 | $1,323.00 | $2,102.10 | $1,323.00 | $705.60 | $588.00 | $464.80 | $264.60 | $11,260.20 | 2.00 | $22,520.40 |
| **Total** | 131 | $4,034.80 | $1,650.60 | $4,401.60 | $3,668.00 | $13,113.10 | $8,253.00 | $13,113.10 | $8,253.00 | $4,401.60 | $3,668.00 | $4,034.80 | $1,650.60 | $70,242.20 | 1.50 | $104,022.80 |

| Sand Harbor to Hwy 50 | # of parking spaces | Weekday May 20% | Weekend May 20% | Weekday June 24% | Weekend June 40% | Weekday July 24% | Weekend July 100% | Weekday Aug 65% | Weekend Aug 100% | Weekday Sept 24% | Weekend Sept 40% | Weekday Oct 24% | Weekend Oct 20% | Total No Turnover | Turnover Rate | Turnover Applied |
|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Thunderbird Cove Trailhead (15) | 15 | $462.00 | $189.00 | $504.00 | $420.00 | $1,501.50 | $945.00 | $1,501.50 | $945.00 | $504.00 | $420.00 | $462.00 | $189.00 | $8,043.00 | 1.50 | $12,064.50 |
| Chimney Beach USFS East (217/67= 88) | 88 | $2,710.40 | $1,071.00 | $2,856.00 | $1,108.80 | $8,808.80 | $4,264.00 | $8,808.80 | $4,264.00 | $2,856.00 | $1,108.80 | $2,710.40 | $1,071.00 | $47,185.60 | 1.50 | $70,778.40 |
| Secret Harbor USFS West Lot(31*/54= 85) | 85 | $2,618.00 | $1,071.00 | $2,856.00 | $1,108.80 | $8,808.80 | $4,264.00 | $8,808.80 | $4,264.00 | $2,856.00 | $1,108.80 | $2,618.00 | $1,071.00 | $45,577.00 | 1.30 | $59,250.10 |
| **Sub Total** | 188 | $5,790.40 | $2,368.80 | $6,316.80 | $5,264.00 | $18,818.80 | $11,844.00 | $18,818.80 | $11,844.00 | $6,316.80 | $5,264.00 | $5,790.40 | $2,368.80 | $100,805.60 | 1.50 | $146,114.50 |
| Skunk Harbor Trailhead (20) | 20 | $616.00 | $252.00 | $672.00 | $296.00 | $2,002.00 | $1,260.00 | $2,002.00 | $1,260.00 | $672.00 | $296.00 | $616.00 | $252.00 | $10,724.00 | 1.30 | $13,951.20 |
| **Total** | 206 | $6,406.40 | $2,620.80 | $6,988.80 | $5,824.00 | $20,820.80 | $13,104.00 | $20,820.80 | $13,104.00 | $6,988.80 | $5,824.00 | $6,406.40 | $2,620.80 | $111,529.60 | 1.30 | $160,055.70 |
| * existing parking lot spaces | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **GRAND TOTAL** | $10,441.20 | $4,271.40 | $11,390.40 | $9,492.00 | $33,933.90 | $21,357.00 | $33,933.90 | $21,357.00 | $11,390.40 | $9,492.00 | $10,441.20 | $4,271.40 | $181,771.80 | 1.50 | $264,078.50 |

| Intercept Lot Parking 50 Revenues: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| North Intercept Parking (160) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| South Intercept Parking (42) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Sub Total** | $0.00 Fee to ride transit | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
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AGENDA ITEM: VIII.A.
MEMORANDUM

Date: August 4, 2014

To: Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) Board of Directors

From: TTD Staff

Subject: Approval of a Contract Amendment and Task Order for Stantec Consulting Services, Inc. for the Tahoe Basin Corridor and Integrated Transit System Planning Project

Action Requested:
It is requested the Board approve a Contract Amendment and Task Order for Stantec Consulting Services, Inc. for the Tahoe Basin Corridor Planning Project as recommended by Staff in the following tables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contracts</th>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Work Element</th>
<th>Type of Agreement</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stantec</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Contract Amendment</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Amend the existing blanket contract by increasing the not-to-exceed amount by $950,000, providing capacity for the proposed Task Order below, and possible inclusion of the Meyers area transportation study.</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Orders</th>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Work Element</th>
<th>Type of Agreement</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Work to be Performed/Deliverable</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stantec</td>
<td>5.4.1- Tahoe Basin Corridor Planning Study</td>
<td>Task Order</td>
<td>Planning and Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>Provide planning services for the Tahoe Basin Corridor and Integrated Transit System Project as proposed in the attached proposal submitted by Stantec. (Attachment A)</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fiscal Analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Match</th>
<th>Match Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>Stantec Task Order for the Tahoe Basin Corridor Planning Study Budget</td>
<td>See Below</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>See below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Grantor</td>
<td>Grant Amount</td>
<td>Match</td>
<td>Match Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for Stantec Task Order</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>NDOT 5303</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for Stantec Task Order</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>FLH ½%</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for Stantec Task Order</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>CA 5311 Funds</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Transit Fund</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Transit Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for Stantec Task Order</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>TMPO Funds</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$790,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Work Program Analysis:**
The Tahoe Basin Corridor Planning Project is identified in the approved FY 2014/2015 work program. The Task Order and associated, but limited, staff time are also identified in the approved FY 2014/2015 budget. It is anticipated that the creation of a new Transit Program Manager position as described in Item VIII.C. of this Board meeting will be needed for oversight of this project and other planned projects. Workloads will be affected if existing staff is used to manage the contract and work.

**Background:**
At the March 14, 2014 Board meeting, Staff introduced the concept and approach to addressing the remaining Basin wide highway corridors, similar to the one that was successfully implemented with the Nevada SR28 Corridor Management Plan. The Board directed Staff to continue refining the approach to addressing all of the corridors. At the May 9, 2014 Board meeting, the Board approved the FY 2014/2015 Work Program and Budget, which included the Tahoe Basin Corridor Planning Project WE 5.4.1. Funding for the Project was identified in the budget, which is being provided through NDOT FTA 5303 funds, FHWA Federal Lands Highways Funds, Caltrans FTA 5311 funds, and TMPO funds. Staff released a Request for Approach (RFA) to several firms on the District’s prequalified list of consultants (Indefinite Quantity, Indefinite Delivery-IDIQ “Short List”) with the District’s approach to the Tahoe Basin Corridor Study. At the July 11, 2014 Board meeting, the District Manager distributed the RFA that was sent out to the firms. Staff received two proposals in response to the RFA, one from Stantec and one from HDR.

**Discussion:**
TTD Staff, along with TRPA staff, reviewed the two proposals and after a very thorough review and careful consideration, the Stantec proposal (Attachment A) appeared to best meet the qualifications, expertise, innovation, knowledge and understanding it will take to accomplish the Tahoe Basin Corridor Planning effort.

**Outline of the District’s approach to delivering the Tahoe Basin Corridor Planning Study:**
- Creation of a regionally connected transit system
- Creation of a regional Project Development Team (PDT)
- Stakeholder/public involvement
- Inform the RTP update
- Inform and integrate with the environmental process the Lake Tahoe Passenger Ferry Project
- Integration with local area plans
- Long range intra/inter regional transit plan
- TTD transit facility plan
- Region-wide corridor implementation plans
- Completion early 2016

Highlights of Stantec's approach to delivering the Tahoe Basin Corridor Planning Study:

- High level of public engagement using TTD’s public outreach approach
- Market based transit ridership assessment
- Integration of land use and transportation with an emphasis on the economy
- Futuristic vision of the Tahoe transportation system
- Experienced team to deliver the Ferry Oriented Development plan
- Building upon the strategic findings of the Bay to Basin study and Trans Sierra Transportation Business case analysis
- Schedule for completion - January 2016

Stantec’s proposal demonstrated innovation, creativity, and a thorough approach to addressing the District’s needs for a short and long range intra/inter regional transit plan. This included transit facility planning; integrating the land use and passenger ferry terminal transportation requirements through the Ferry Oriented Development (FOD); and developing a full implementation approach through the Lake Tahoe Multi-Modal Corridor Management Plan. Stantec put together a team of professionals with extensive experience and knowledge of the Tahoe Basin; transportation and land use planning, integrated with economics; transit planning in resort communities; public participation and outreach; as well as developing successful implementation plans. In their proposal, Stantec’s team demonstrated an understanding of the vision and goals that many agencies and the public share for the Tahoe Basin - an integrated regional multi-modal system with seamless transit service, with efficient and economically viable modes of transportation, transit to trails, transportation as economic development, and land use integrated with bikeways, transit, and a cross-lake ferry system.

Staff encourages the Board to review Stantec’s proposal for more detailed information on their approach and response to the District’s RFA. TTD staff along with TRPA staff interviewed Stantec’s team and extensively reviewed the proposal. Staff is confident that Stantec and their team will successfully complete the work within the Project budget. Staff is excited for the opportunity this proposal presents and the ability to implement and improve on the SR 28 Corridor Management Plan approach for all Tahoe Basin Corridors.

**Additional Information:**
If you have any questions or comments regarding this item, please contact Carl Hasty at chasty@tahoetransportation.org or (775) 589-5501.

**Attachment:**
- Stantec Tahoe Basin Corridor Planning Study Proposal
July 18, 2014

Derek Kirkland, Capital Program Specialist  
**Tahoe Transportation District**  
PO Box 499  
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448

**Reference:** TTD-RFA-2014-1

**Dear Mr. Kirkland,**

**Picture this:** It is 2026 and Lake Tahoe is hosting the Olympic Games based on a successful bid package that was focused on transportation. Visitors flock to the lake from across the globe to be a part of history knowing that they don’t need to bring a car. Interstate and rail services deliver throngs of visitors to the neighboring Sierra communities associated with the Tahoe Basin. Visitors journey onward by mass transit options up to the lake to avoid road closures and restrictions required by the IOC. Ferries transport passengers between the north and south shores as they have done for years. Multiple bus services traverse the basin, carrying riders to the various resort and retail destinations. Pedestrian skyways and footbridges ease traffic congestion at the various choke points to facilitate steady movement of autos and buses through intersections. In the summers prior to the Games, plentiful parking areas encourage visitors to park their cars and choose a more environmentally friendly form of transportation. A bicycle lane wraps the lake and bike share stations are strategically placed. The auto is passé. Residents and visitors hop a bus, ride a bike, or walk between destinations. The basin economy is thriving. Residents are content. The future of Lake Tahoe is “bluer” than blue.

**Back to 2014.** TTD desires a consultant team to complete the necessary groundwork and identify the most realistic and cost-effective approach to implement the vision that creates a regionally connected multi-modal transportation system for the Lake Tahoe Basin. Many of the required studies have been initiated and/or completed by professionals on our team. Since the vision needs the philosophical and fiscal support of the larger Trans Sierra Region, coordination with multiple entities will be fundamental. Relationships and/or the ability to garner respect and trust among these various entities also will be essential. This scope of work is a forward step to maintaining the positive direction charted by the TTD staff with support from the Tahoe Fund, the TRPA, the TMPO, and many others.

Stantec has assembled a team of professionals and resort transit experts to provide the TTD with an accomplished transportation team who will bring a fresh perspective to this important effort. While our competition is accomplished, Stantec’s Graeme Masterton has planned and implemented transit strategies for the London and Vancouver Olympics and studied successful resort communities throughout North America including work over more than a decade in Whistler. Our team is based on the premise that the people who live and recreate in the Basin will take a much greater pride of ownership with the deliverables, and their expertise and enthusiasm can be supplemented with targeted experience from outside the region. We realize that this plan sets the groundwork for future economic stability that many resort areas struggle with. It also sets the stage for endeavors such as an Olympic bid. Our motto is local presence, national reach. We sincerely look forward to the opportunity to show the TTD how impassioned we are about Lake Tahoe and the work we do.

If you have any questions or comments on the enclosed information, please do not hesitate to contact myself directly.

We look forward to an opportunity to assist you on this project.

Kind Regards,

**Stantec Consulting Services Inc.**

John Welsh, PE  
Managing Principal/Project Manager  
(775) 398-1215 | john.welsh@stantec.com

*Design with community in mind*
Stantec

Stantec was founded in 1954 and has since become a leading global design firm. At 14,000 employees strong, we are proud of our ability to provide local consulting services to our regional clients and backfill any of their needs with experts in a wide array of areas to solve challenging issues. To successfully complete this project on behalf of the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD), Stantec has done just that.

Locally, Stantec is considered a leading office in transportation/transit planning and engineering. We have been involved in designing a great many roadways in the Reno/Sparks areas. Thanks, in part, to the complete streets momentum, Stantec successfully completed the Queue Jump Signalization redesign for transit operations, and the design, engineering and environmental approvals for 14 new Bus Rapid Transit Stations on S. Virginia Street and a complete overhaul of the Meadowood Mall Transit Facility. We are currently involved in the first regional Bike Share Feasibility study and completed the S. Virginia Street Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis with Shiels Obletz Johnson to implement streetcar on 6.5 miles of roadway.

In conjunction with our outstanding subconsultants, our team intends to collaborate with the TTD and its partners to take a holistic view of the larger region and patterns of movements to help identify the most suitable recommendations for a coordinated lake corridor management plan. Collecting additional data through surveys will be key to developing strategies that are based on realistic existing and projected demands.

Stantec team members include: John Welsh, PE; Paul Menaker, Ph.D.; Art Hadnett; Cynthia Albright, AICP; Graeme Masterson, M.A.; Joe Macutis, PE; Cordelia Crockett, M.Sc.; Michelle Orfield, MA; Michelle Blake, PE; Clint Alverson, PE; Habib Shamskhou; David Harding, RA, LEED AP; Jim Daisa, PE; Bernadette Bezy; Nancy Kang; Cary Baird, PLA, CLARB; Michelle Blake, PE; Michelle Orfield, MA; and Colleen Shea.

Community Design + Architecture

Community Design + Architecture is a planning, urban design, and architecture firm based in Oakland and has been in business since 1997. The primary services offered relative to this project are urban design, master planning, and multi-modal transportation planning through Tim Rood, Principal, with assistance from urban designers and planners from its Oakland office.

Strategic Economics

Strategic Economics has one office located in Berkeley, California and is a recognized national expert on real estate demand and feasibility related to transit oriented development. The firm, founded in 1998, has extensive experience and expertise in many disciplines including urban economics, regional economic development, and infrastructure financing. Strategic Economics is a certified Women-Owned, Small Business, Disadvantaged Business Enterprise, Alameda County Small Local Business, and a California Small Business Enterprise.

Morse Associates Consulting, LLC

Morse Associates Consulting, LLC (MAC) was formed in 2014 by Derek Morse after a 38 year career in financial strategies for successfully delivering infrastructure programs and projects, public-private partnerships (P3), and Infrastructure related policy and legislation.

ESI

ESI is a 25-year-old, woman-owned business specializing in strategic planning, outreach, research and political consulting that has been in business since 1997. ESI has extensive experience in the Lake Tahoe basin and maintains its office in Carson City, Nevada. Kathy Pulliam-Jordan will work with S&J on this project.

Smith & Jones

Smith + Jones (SJ) provides community outreach, research and marketing strategies and tactics. SJ has offices in Incline Village, Nevada and has over 30 years of experience in the Tahoe basin. Kelly Houston will lead the public and client outreach.
Team Qualifications

The planned multi-modal system will strengthen the economy of the Tahoe Basin and positively affect businesses, residents, and visitors in a significant way over the next few decades. It will also help achieve basin sustainability and improved quality of life for residents and improved experiences for visitors. Economic expansion and diversity is a primary goal of an improved transportation system and implementation of a planned multi-model system that is regionally based will produce a much stronger community throughout the region. An integrated and diverse regional system will also serve as a launching pad for future global opportunities, such as the Olympic bid.

Our team will deliver a master transportation plan that is not only sustainable for the long-term, but considers the flexibility and long-term need to support future plans, such as hosting the 2026 Olympics, and additional issues that arise from that including: increased traffic and transit needs, infrastructure, and development. Our multi-modal transportation planning and design services will meet the goals of TTD, while considering how all the elements of the Basin come into play to meet the broader objectives of the Mobility 2030 Transportation Monitoring Program.

Transit within the Lake Tahoe Basin and the greater Trans-Sierra region are vital to the economic growth and strength of the region. The ability to provide access within the Tahoe area through different seasonality needs for residents and visitors is critical to continuing an environmentally sustainable approach to transportation within the area. Ensuring that the environment retains the character that draws both visitors, new residents, and appeases existing residents means creating the ability to access the region without the need for a vehicle, or leaving the vehicle parked once a person has arrived. Resort communities have significantly different transit needs than non-resort communities because the demand times relate to the seasons, the days of the week, and even specific time spans within the day based on access to jobs and tourist-based activities (e.g. ski hills, cycling, water activities).

Lake Tahoe is home to 50,000 full-time residents and frequented primarily from California and Nevada residents as well as visitors from all over the world. The number of actual visitors is still in question but many believe they rival any US National Park which could be 9 million visits annually or more. Lake Tahoe is a rare resource that we must continue to protect.

Integrated Transportation Planning, Engineering, and Urban Design

As residents of the Tahoe community, we take pride in transforming the communities where we live, work, and recreate. Our transportation planning and design services integrate all facets of mobility-oriented transportation systems. Our collective team of professionals includes engineers, urban designers, transit oriented development planners, and public outreach specialists that blend local experience and knowledge of current challenges and issues with the experience of resort transportation planning. We work with our clients to improve the vitality of their communities by integrating transit, bicycle, and pedestrian modes into our designs by strategically looking at the bigger picture and also focusing on the details. Our plans result in healthier communities. Our greatest satisfaction comes from creating value for our clients, and creating communities focused on a better quality of life, by the work we do.

Transit

Our team has successfully developed transit master plans, and our goal is to continue to support TTD by developing a sustainable long-range plan that creates mobility and socio-economic vitality in the Tahoe Basin. Our transit planning team has extensive experience in developing strategic transit service and infrastructure plans for both conventional and specialized transit systems for small and large municipalities. We have completed comprehensive conventional transit service plans across the US and Canada.

In order to retain and attract new business, this plan must increase transit modes, infrastructure, and parking, to meet current and future needs specifically in resort communities such as Whistler, British Columbia. There are numerous parallels between Whistler and Tahoe. The impact of regional transportation on the local area is profound and creates a population that ebbs and flows throughout the year with a constant replenishing of people new to the area. The effect of winter on the transportation network combined with the limited road capacity is the challenge to resolve and will feature centrally in this plan. Our team recognizes the importance of reducing dependency on automobiles to promote a healthier and more sustainable transportation network that includes pedestrian ways, bike paths, and bus modes that ultimately reduce maintenance cost levels and draw greater numbers of visitors, permanent residents and jobs to the basin.

Comprehensive transit planning in Whistler comprised of creating a transit feasibility study that created the system, undertaking two long range plans over a 15 year period, and doing a critical system review including a peer review to understand how mature
We have worked on regional rail, regional bus, ferry and transit agencies in all capacities so the understanding of transit and how to plan for the future is well developed. We have worked on regional rail, regional bus, ferry and local bus transit and rely on an integrated approach with land use and active mode planning to develop solutions that match the local needs.

Public Outreach

Stakeholder and public outreach is an important element to this project because it is about the residents of the Tahoe basin, as well as those who visit – groups that often have differing opinions. Our stakeholder outreach team will build on the existing planning efforts and relationships to create an accelerated implementation plan through multi-agency, stakeholder and public/private partnerships.

Outreach methods we have experience with and would like to use include:

- Polling and intercept surveys
- Public open houses, workshops, sometimes utilizing crowd sourcing software
- Web surveys and other online communication methods
- Public and committee visioning sessions
- Discussion papers, reports, and other written documents that are easy for the public to read and understand

Committed to Sustainability

Stantec is widely recognized as a global leader and innovator in sustainability consulting. We have experience with a wide range of planning and policy development projects that have been guided by the principles of sustainability and stewardship, complemented by a broad inventory of built projects incorporating sustainability strategies. We have expertise in the development and application of community scale indicator and benchmarking programs, transportation demand management, energy and water efficiency plans, renewable energy technology, greenhouse gas reduction strategies, and strategies to reduce the use of natural resources.

Stantec is engaged in sustainability consulting because it is our professional responsibility. Given our increasing awareness of the ecological impact of development and growth, we are compelled to pursue increasingly sophisticated approaches to sustainability through our professional practice. We are leading the shift to a more integrated approach to design, planning, and management of the built environment, and we are involved in setting the future direction of policy, standards, and rating systems in the public and private sector.

For example, Stantec is at the forefront of the development of LEED® for Neighborhood Developments (ND), a pilot program of the US Green Building Council. Staff involved in this RFA for the TTD is providing engineering services for what may be British Columbia's most sustainable communities—the South East False Creek Neighborhood in Vancouver, and Dockside Green in Victoria. Both developments are registered LEED® ND projects. In addition, more than 100 Stantec employees have become certified for the Envision project evaluation system. While LEED is primarily used for buildings and neighborhoods, Envision is well suited for rating the sustainability of transportation projects.

At the corporate level, Stantec has a long history of working to minimize the environmental impact of our operations and business processes. With support from our corporate sustainability coordinator, our network of Green Office Committees has developed a number of local programs to reduce our ecological footprint, including waste audits, water and energy conservation programs, and alternative transportation strategies.

We believe in benchmarking our progress and setting targets for sustainability. Stantec has its Quality Management System registered under ISO 9001 and its Environmental Management System registered under ISO 14001. We are committed to third party verification of our management systems. In a recent review, the Pembina Institute found the Green Operations Plan of LEED® for Neighborhood Developments (ND) well suited for rating the sustainability of transportation projects.

We believe in benchmarking our progress and setting targets for sustainability. Stantec has its Quality Management System registered under ISO 9001 and its Environmental Management System registered under ISO 14001. We are committed to third party verification of our management systems. In a recent review, the Pembina Institute found the Green Operations Plan of LEED® for Neighborhood Developments (ND) well suited for rating the sustainability of transportation projects.

Specialty Services

- Environmental assessments for transportation projects
- Economic evaluation of transportation project

"Your name has become the most used for any engineer in the history of a public financing project."

Randy Mellinger, Assistant City Manager, City of Sparks (regarding John Welsh providing financial review services to the City of Sparks for engineering aspects of the Legends at Sparks Marina Development.)
## RELEVANT TEAM PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project 1</th>
<th>Central Healdsburg Avenue Plan, Healdsburg, California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of Services</strong></td>
<td>CD+A led a multi-disciplinary consultant team to create a plan for a new mixed-use neighborhood around a planned commuter rail transit station in the heart of Healdsburg, a center of visitor activity in Sonoma County’s wine country. Only a few blocks from the Healdsburg Plaza, a lively center of pedestrian activity surrounded by shops and restaurants, the properties along central Healdsburg Avenue include light industry, a lumberyard, and auto-oriented commercial uses. The team investigated options for reconfiguring U.S. 101 interchanges and street intersections along this gateway to Healdsburg, in order to both improve the area’s image and make Healdsburg Avenue a more pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly multi-modal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Client Reference</strong></td>
<td>Tom Chambers, Former Mayor, City of Healdsburg; Current City of Healdsburg City Council Member (707) 696-4010; <a href="mailto:tchambers@ci.healdsburg.ca.us">tchambers@ci.healdsburg.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team Members</strong></td>
<td>Tim Rood, AICP, LEED AP, ND and Dena Belzer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Relevance</strong></td>
<td>Similar to Tahoe City and South Lake Tahoe, Healdsburg, in Sonoma’s wine country, is a small town that is also a major center of visitor activity. Its residents take a keen interest in planning and development issues and great pride in their community’s character. The Central Healdsburg Avenue Plan sets a framework for multi-modal access, pedestrian-friendly streets and new districts around a planned commuter rail station a few blocks from the historic plaza at the center of town.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project 2</th>
<th>Comprehensive Review of Edmonton Transit System (ETS), Edmonton, Alberta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of Services</strong></td>
<td>Through analysis of the Edmonton Transit System’s organization, the consultant provided an assessment of the City’s current shared service model for transit operations and how its organization could be changed. The consultant also studied the City’s fare structure and how different segments of its ridership were being subsidized. The review resulted in recommendations regarding how the 950 buses in ETS’s fleet should be maintained in the future and how the network can be realigned to provide greater frequency on some routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Client Reference</strong></td>
<td>Rhonda Toohey, Director, Transportation Planning, City of Edmonton (780) 496-1797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team Members</strong></td>
<td>Cordelia Crockett, M.Sc., Graeme Masterton, M.A.; Michelle Orfield, M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Relevance</strong></td>
<td>This project demonstrates the in-depth understanding Stantec’s transit planners have about transit service and how questions of organizational structure, fare policy, and route structure are intertwined with the performance of transit systems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project 3</th>
<th>Green Line Transit Corridor Planning, Calgary, Alberta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of Services</strong></td>
<td>Current work effort to develop a transit corridor in the City of Calgary that connects Downtown to outlying residential neighborhoods and industrial land use areas. Stantec is carrying out extensive public outreach, land use analysis, ROW analyses, cost estimates, option develop, option evaluation, staging plans, life cycle cost analyses, maintenance facility siting, and traffic simulation work as part of this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Client Reference</strong></td>
<td>Chris Jordan, Manager, Strategic Planning, Calgary Transit (403) 537-7809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team Members</strong></td>
<td>Cordelia Crockett, M.Sc.; Graeme Masterton, M.A.; Paul Menaker, Ph.D.; Michelle Orfield, M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Relevance</strong></td>
<td>This project demonstrates Stantec’s ability to work closely with communities and municipal staff to develop plans for important infrastructure such as LRT systems. Stantec can bring a wide range of expertise to transportation projects including life cycle cost analysis, maintenance facility siting, option development, option evaluation, and land use analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project 4</th>
<th>RTC RAPID Station Architectural Design &amp; Engineering, Reno, Nevada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of Services</strong></td>
<td>Architectural Design and development of 14 new bus rapid transit stations along a five-mile segment of South Virginia Street and reconstruction of the bus terminal at Meadowood Mall. Several architectural designs were developed for Board approval. The members and public ultimately selected a stylized version that satisfies public safety and maintenance concerns and features such as solar powered electricity, closed circuit cameras, next bus arrival systems, route maps, and public art. Stantec developed the station layout, conducted all site analyses,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Client Reference</strong></td>
<td>Howard Riedl, Senior Engineer, Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County (775) 335-1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team Members</strong></td>
<td>Cynthia Albright, AICP; Senior Planner; Barb Santner, RLA, AICP; Joe Mactutis, PE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RELEVANT TEAM PROJECTS

**Project Relevance**
This project required extensive coordination and negotiation with the affected property owners to allow proper placement of the stations on private and the design of stations to satisfy property owner requests. Stantec successfully secured all NEPA Compliance for improvements in an expedited fashion and collaboratively worked with local municipalities and state agencies to ensure successful implementation of these new facilities along S. Virginia Street.

**Project 5** *Mountain Resort Transportation Planning, Multiple Locations*

**Description of Services**
Transit, roadway, cycling and pedestrian planning in resort communities. LSC has undertaken transportation services in Aspen, Snowmass, Jackson Hole, Mammoth Lakes, North Lake Tahoe, Park City, Summit County, Steamboat Springs, Telluride, Vail, Beaver Creek, and Durango.

**Client Reference**
Kent Cashel, Asst. Public Works Director, City of Park City, UT (435) 615-5360; cashel@parkcity.org

**Team Members**
Gordon Shaw, PE, AICP

**Project Relevance**
Planning for effective transit services is particularly important in the Tahoe Region. Due to environmental constraints, there is very little opportunity to address mobility through expanding highway capacity. Instead, solving mobility issues will require a strong focus on transit strategies, supported by bicycle and pedestrian improvements. The transit planning efforts will also support the myriad existing of regional, community and transportation plans that stress expansion of transit services.

**Project 6** *Joint Development for the Washington State Ferries, Washington*

**Description of Services**
Assessed 19 ferry terminals operated by the Washington State Department of Transportation to determine their joint development potential including the ability to generate revenue for the state of Washington.

**Client Reference**
Jeff Doyle, Director, Public-Private Partnerships, Washington State Department of Transportation Innovating Partnerships Program (360) 705-7023

**Team Members**
Dena Belzer

**Project Relevance**
Strategic Economics focused on the impact ferry service would have on adjacent properties to determine what development potential would be created by ferry ridership. In the Lake Tahoe case, this same potential link between ferry ridership and development potential will be a key variable in understand how to structure a successful TOD plan for each of the two proposed ferry terminals.

### OUR TEAM MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member</th>
<th>Member Role</th>
<th>Value Added to Project Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Welsh, PE</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>• Broad engineering experience with a focus on transportation planning, design and construction that allows him to solve challenges and recommend efficient solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience: 38 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Common sense approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• John enjoys most summer weekends and vacations at Meeks Bay or Incline Village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Menaker, PhD</td>
<td>Quality Assurance and Quality Control</td>
<td>• Extensive background includes Transportation Planning, Traffic Engineering, Transit Planning, ITS, and Land Use Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience: 30 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Proven Transportation Problem Solver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Paul spends his free time volunteering in his community on a regular basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Shaw, PE, AICP</td>
<td>Team Lead</td>
<td>• 22 years of experience conducting transportation studies for the Tahoe Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience: 26 years</td>
<td>Work Item A Existing Corridor Analysis</td>
<td>• Extensive experience in transportation and transit planning for mountain resort communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Strong understanding of Tahoe Regional land use and transportation plans and planning processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Gordon’s experience in bicycle planning began with a trip bicycling across the country (Seattle to Maine), including the realization that the Rockies are very, very tall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Member</td>
<td>Member Role</td>
<td>Value Added to Project Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Graeme Masterton, M.A.              | Team Lead                    | • 2010 Olympics (Vancouver) worked for the transit agency as lead planner supporting the creation of media and athlete travel routes; developed security based operational plans of action for transit; and reviewed transit routes and volumes at venues.  
• 2010 Olympics (Whistler & Squamish) operational lead for BC Transit to estimate ridership; create a transit plan for the valley; provide service for media; and lead the on-ground operations plan through the Games.  
• 2012 Olympics (London) worked with the Olympic Delivery Authority to create operations plans for major transport hubs connected to Olympic Park including transportation modelling review, traffic movements and volumes review, operational planning and site development.  
• Graeme is also a wonderful water colorist who paints pictures with a focus on architectural elements and transit.                                                                                     |
| Tim Rood, AICP, LEED AP, ND         | Team Lead                    | • Planner and architect with 16 years’ experience planning Transit-Oriented and mixed-use Development plans and policies and leading participatory community processes  
• Brings an in-depth knowledge of sustainable planning, pedestrian and bicycle facility design  
• Tim has been bicycling to work daily for over 25 years and has always wanted a reason to visit Tahoe more often.                                                                                     |
| Cordelia Crockett, M.Sc.            | Team Lead                    | • Developed the foundations for a new regional transit system in and around Banff National Park through the creation of a five-year business plan that included an implementation plan, a cost- and revenue-sharing scheme for partners in the regional transit services.  
• Currently monitoring federally funded rail transit construction projects for the FTA and providing transit planning expertise as a part of multi-modal transportation planning projects around North America.  
• Cordelia has biked across Iowa 4 times; visited 18 Olympic cities; ridden a train to most jobs; and walked to a few.                                                                                     |
| Cynthia Albright, AICP              | Team Lead                    | • Extensive experience in site design and land use planning  
• Highly skilled user of GIS for the past 22 years to optimize site development and conduct build out projections  
• Currently working on the region’s first Bike Share Feasibility Study for the RTC  
• Successfully completed the S. Virginia Street Transit Alternatives Study exploring the use of Streetcar in Reno  
• Cynthia enjoys training for marathons and ultras, especially on the Tahoe Rim and flume trails.                                                                                     |
| Kelly Houston                       | Public Outreach & Stakeholder Engagement | • Extensive marketing and outreach experience  
• Handles outreach for TTD’s Bluego  
• Excellent with research and data  
• Coordinated several stakeholder meetings including a two-day event for the CA Transportation Commission  
• Kelly has a great lake view office in Incline next to the best bar/restaurant on the north shore.                                                                                     |
| Derek Morse, PE                     | Surveys, Data Collection, transportation financing, Stakeholder Committee Facilitation | • Direct experience working with TTD and members of the Trans-Sierra Transportation Coalition  
• Extensive knowledge of current transportation plans within the basin and adjacent areas  
• Successful record building consensus and support for new transportation funding and innovations  
• Deep understanding of federal transportation funding, policy, and legislation  
• Derek seeks his inspiration from a higher power: in the winter, this is usually the Blazing Zephyr at Mount Rose.                                                                                     |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member</th>
<th>Member Role</th>
<th>Value Added to Project Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Dena Belzer         | Ferry Oriented Development Economic  | • National expert on market demand for transit oriented development  
|                     | Analysis                             | • Expertise in linking regional growth projects with travel demand and transit ridership modeling  
|                     |                                      | • Knowledgeable about real estate market conditions in the North Lake Tahoe region  
|                     |                                      | • Extensive experience working with transit agencies  
|                     |                                      | • Extensive experience with area planning, including planning for areas around transit stations supported by transit modes  
|                     |                                      | • Dena walks to work in a circuitous fashion to log 10,000 daily steps so she’ll be prepared to glide over the streets of Paris in the fall.                                                                                                                                                        |
| Kathy Pulliam-      | Surveys, Data Collection and         | • Extensive marketing and outreach experience  
| Jordan              | Marketing Plan                       | • Handles outreach for TTD’s Bluego  
|                     |                                      | • Excellent with research and data  
|                     |                                      | • Coordinated several stakeholder meetings including a two-day event for the CA Transportation Commission  
|                     |                                      | • Kathy is short which allows her to catch stray loose ends.                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| Michelle Blake, PE  | Transit Facility Planning and        | • Substantial experience developing and implementing transit infrastructure and fleet capital programs as the former TransLink Director of Engineering and Project Services  
|                     | Maintenance Facilities               | • Completed numerous needs assessments, functional programming exercises and facility master planning throughout her career  
|                     |                                      | • Led the design team for the Ottawa Light Rail Transit Line Maintenance and Storage Facility and conceptual design for the Surrey Central Works Yard and Maintenance Facility                                                                                                                                 |
| Jim Daisa, PE       | Transportation Planning and          | • Led the development of several transit master plans including tourism destinations (Kelowna, BC)  
|                     | Financing                            | • Determined short, medium and long-term fleet composition and requirements for transit facilities in addition to calculating the operating costs of various site alternatives  
|                     |                                      | • When he started, “connectivity” referred to street networks that were also accessible to pedestrians and bicyclists; now to the newer generation of engineers and planners, it refers to how many contacts are in their LinkedIn social network. |
| Joe Mactutis, PE    | Parking and Park and Ride            | • Specialist in managing complex roadways and transit projects including the Virginia Street Queue Jump Signals for transit operations, Bus Rapid Transit Stations, Moana Lane Widening and the La Posada/Eagle Canyon Roundabout  
|                     |                                      | • Extensive experience using several micr-simulation traffic analysis tools including VISSIM, Synchro/SimTraffic and HCS  
|                     |                                      | • Working on this project will give Joe time to enjoy the tranquility of Lake Tahoe temporarily, while away from his family of six.                                                                                                                                                     |
| Michelle Orfield,   | Transit Operations Strategy, Fuel    | • Led the development of several transit master plans including tourism destinations (Kelowna, BC)  
| M.A.                | Strategy Verification                | • Determined short, medium and long-term fleet composition and requirements for transit facilities in addition to calculating the operating costs of various site alternatives  
|                     |                                      | • At a recent volleyball match, Michelle was given the distinguished title of “sandy britches” for diving for the ball repeatedly.                                                                                                                                                      |
| Kristina Svensk,    | Transportation Planning              | • Completed transit planning studies for South Lake Tahoe, Town of Truckee, Aspen Colorado and Park City Utah.  
| AICP                |                                      | • Contributed to the background reports for community plans and general plan documents in South Lake Tahoe  
|                     |                                      | • Kristina has recently learned the vehicle-miles of travel impacts after becoming a new mother.                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
Project Approach
Project Approach

The Stantec Team’s overall approach is to carry out this project such that the deliverables from each of the Items of Work are consistent and build upon each other in logical ways. That is why our plan includes the development of a Purpose and Needs Statement in an early piece of work to guide Items of Work B, C, D, and E. We also believe that the development of single outreach and data collection programs that serve all facets of the work program is the most efficient use of resources.

Internal communication among the team will be an important element to making sure that this project proceeds smoothly and that all of the documentation is consistent. To achieve this, documents and data will be stored on a shared project website and team leads will meet with the project manager on a regular basis. Having a single person responsible for the QA/QC function will also help the team identify inconsistencies among project deliverables.

### Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>Oct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>Sep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>Sep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item of Work A – Existing Corridor Analysis

The key goal of this item of work is to provide a common dataset for understanding existing transportation conditions and previous plans for the Tahoe Region as a whole and for the six key corridors identified in the RFA. The resulting document will allow team members working on Items of Work B, C, D, and E to start from a common understanding of current mobility conditions and existing plans. This Item of Work will also give the consultant team an opportunity to develop connections with staff from key stakeholders such as the transit agencies, municipalities, and regional planning organizations that will be essential for the transportation planning efforts.

Individual tasks will be as follows:

**A1 Trip Generator / Land Use Analysis**

The TRPA/TMPO has in recent years developed an advanced TransCAD travel demand model for the Tahoe Region which can be reviewed to provide a useful summary of Tahoe land uses and trip generation. The land use datasets and trip generation matrices for existing conditions will be obtained and summarized to yield tables and ArcGIS mapping documenting the following:

- Land use by major category by TAZ, corridor, and activity center, including dwelling units, lodging units, and commercial uses
- Vehicle trip-ends by TAZ, corridor and activity center
- An evaluation of per-unit vehicle-trip generation versus land use density, reflecting how increased density reduces per-unit trip generation

As the TransCAD model is for summer conditions, under this task a summary of key winter trip generators (such as ski resorts) will be prepared, based upon recent environmental documents.
A2 Review of Existing Plans and Studies

Current land use plans will be reviewed, including the Tahoe Regional Plan and adopted Area Plans and Community Plans throughout the Tahoe Region. Summaries will be provided of the following:

- Transportation policies, goals and objectives
- Placer County’s Tahoe Basin Community Plan
- 2012 TRPA Regional Plan
- City of South Lake Tahoe Tourist Core Area Plan
- Other land use plans

In addition, the many transportation studies and plans prepared in recent years will be reviewed and summarized, including the following:

- Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan
- Tahoe Federal Transportation Improvement Program
- Tahoe Basin Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan
- Short-Range Transit Plans for the South Shore and North Shore
- Tahoe Waterborne Ferry Study
- Tahoe Intra-regional Inter-regional Transit Study
- Transportation Concept Reports for Caltrans highways, and similar facility plans for NDOT highways
- SR 28 Corridor Management Plan
- US 50 / South Shore Community Revitalization Project
- SR 89 / Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project
- Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project
- Various Tahoe Bicycle/Pedestrian Plans, including the South Tahoe Greenway, North Tahoe Trail, Stateline-to-Stateline Trail, etc.
- Current Environmental Improvement Plans along major roadways

A summary of the current status and key elements of each plan or study will be prepared.

A3 Summary of Existing Transportation Data

An inventory of existing transportation data sources will be prepared, including the following:

- Existing local and state traffic count programs, including location, duration of count, and frequency of count
- Existing available bicycle and pedestrian counts, by location
- Existing ongoing transit data collection efforts
- Recent focused data collection efforts, such as the TRPA’s intercept surveys and license plate surveys

As part of Items of Work B, C, D, and E, a list of desirable data items will be prepared. If necessary, the Stantec Team will conduct additional identified data collection efforts through negotiations with the TTD to fill in gaps in traffic data.

A4 Summary of Existing Transportation Conditions by Mode

Using available data sources, existing conditions for the various travel modes will be analyzed and summarized by corridor segment, OD pairs, and municipality, as applicable. This will include the following:

- Average annual and peak daily traffic volumes
- Roadway level of service
- Daily transit passenger-trips (winter, summer, and average annual)
- Daily bicycle and pedestrian person-trips
- Total person-trips by all modes, for summer, winter and average annual conditions
- Proportion of person-trips by travel mode, by peak season
- Crash analysis for a five-year period, including total reported crashes, number of injury accidents, number of fatal accidents, number of fatalities, number of pedestrian accidents and number of bicycle accidents.
- Existing Level of Service at key intersections
- Quantification of key recurring traffic congestion problems, including season, hours of the day, extent of traffic queue.
- Transit facilities/providers
- Summary of new transportation projects

A5 Summary of Existing Public Park-and-Ride and Recreational Parking

As evidenced by the success of the East Shore Express, intercept parking can be a very effective tool in solving corridor mobility problems. Under this task, existing public off-street parking will be inventoried throughout the Tahoe Region, including parking areas under USFS, State Parks, California Tahoe Conservancy, County, City, and School District ownership. The number of spaces will be identified, and a qualitative assessment of availability for various times of the year will be prepared.

A6 Summary of Regional Economics Analysis and Demographics

While not requested in the RFA, the Stantec Team believes Item of Work A should contain a review of existing economic and demographic conditions in the Tahoe Basin. It should result in a summary of key employers, key industries, incomes levels, and other information that is relevant to travel demand.

Information sources could include census, voter registration, and media sources. The Stantec team also has extensive knowledge of existing data sets through previous work experience in the Tahoe region including surveys carried out by Kathy Jordan of ESL.

Schedule

This task will be carried out over the first three months of the project and be completed by the end of October 2014.

Other Relevant Information

The Stantec Team will focus on the content of the data and also use data visualization in an effective way to convey information about land use, travel demand, demographics, and existing corridor conditions.

The focus of this Item of Work will be on existing conditions, but the Stantec Team will make note of any forecasted conditions that may be available as this will be of use in the planning efforts of Items of Work B, C, D, and E.
Approach to the Tahoe Basin Transit Strategy

We will use the approach shown to review the system and create a transit strategy focused upon movements within the Tahoe Basin but cognizant of the need to create excellent connections to a regional service. The need to move people without additional roadways requires alternatives such as transit, cycling and pathway opportunities to fill the void. This creates interesting opportunities for water-based services. The challenge is the north-south gap in connectivity and the need to ensure that the region has good access to jobs and housing in order to avoid the social disconnect that has occurred in Aspen and Whistler where the main community becomes too expensive for local residents who move to smaller, more distant communities.

Specific tasks for this strategy that are additions to the standard approach include:

**System Operations & Structure**
- Consider land use and economic changes and the possible need to expand the service area or range of services offered.
- Review the opportunities and drawbacks to public and private transit operations.
- Create an alternative fuel strategy that examines the latest improvements in electric, hydrogen, CNG and hybrid options that includes the infrastructure investments required to support alternate fuels.

**System Access**
- Review parking access as well as multi-modal connections to the transit system from a system access viewpoint, as a strategy, and note potential opportunities for improved connectivity.
- Examine the use of ITS to promote access to transit and increase the ease of access from other modes onto the system.
- Review the stop locations and usage with a focus on high demand recreational access points and create a plan for improvements or adjustments to maximize the use of transit as an means of access.

**System Financing**
- Develop cost estimates of the proposed plan and identify sources of funding including local, state, and federal options. This may influence the prioritization of portions of the plan based on the probability of successfully winning funding.
- Explore options for transit funding from private sources (accommodations, ski resorts, etc.)

Approach to the Trans-Sierra Transit Strategy

The regional system will tie into the local system to create an integrated transit strategy. The geography and location of the Tahoe Basin means that non-resident visitors travel significant distances to reach the area using limited road infrastructure that is often at capacity. Airports and train terminals provide options as do regional bus transit options, however, tying separated transportation pieces into a cohesive and seamless whole is one challenge for the area. The ability to identify gaps in existing services and a methodology for filling those gaps will be the primary concern for this regional portion of the study.

Prioritization of Services

The long range plans for the Tahoe Basin and the Trans Sierra region will be created and identify where the systems should be moving in the future. In order to create the short range plans, we will use a filtering system to rank the needs of the systems in priority and create short range plans for service and infrastructure that can be used to seek funding in order to implement the recommendations.

We will use a standard approach to short and long range transit planning that will be supplemented with the understanding of event and resort based movements to create a set of plans that account for the local needs within and to the Lake Tahoe Basin. In addition, there has been substantial previous work undertaken on transit in the region that will form a basis of the background review that precedes the vision creation.

The above diagram shows a general approach to Item of Work B. This process recognizes that a review of existing plans and the collection of information about demographics, existing transit providers, and transit demand is carried out in Item of Work A.
**Create the Purpose and Needs Statement**

The Purpose and Needs Statement sets the stage for the system review as well as the creation of short and long term plans. It provides a high level statement that answers the question of what transit should be to the Tahoe basin and surrounding areas. This statement will include specific standards and evaluation criteria. These should be both quantifiable and repeatable so that the success and progress of the system can be examined in the future.

**Data Collection, Outreach Planning, and Execution**

The data collection and outreach plans will be finalized after the Purpose and Needs Statement is complete. However, our budget assumes certain actions as a starting point.

Good data is essential for designing transit services and other transportation amenities. Increasing transit modal share is not just about putting more vehicles on the road or running more hours of service. To be effective and attractive, transit service must go where people want to go, when they want to go, at a price that is reasonable, and with a vehicle and other amenities that work for their trip. With funding constraints, it is necessary that transportation investments be prioritized to deliver the greatest benefit per dollar expended both in terms of current and future conditions. Designing inter- and intra-basin transit services that will effectively and cost effectively address current and future projected travel patterns requires the following data: A statistically valid sample of Origin/Destination (O/D) data for all trips (I-I, I-E, E-I) by all modes to significant destinations in the Basin (i.e. employment centers, schools, shopping, hospitals, recreation sites/venues, special events, entertainment/gaming, etc.) by time of year.

Collection should capture the following:

- Origin/Destination
- Date and time of travel to/from
- Purpose of trip (i.e., active recreation type, passive recreation type, work commute, shopping, etc.)
- Number of persons in party
- Demographic information: ages, gender, place of residence, language, etc.
- Type and quantity of related equipment transported (i.e., bicycles, watercraft, coolers, shade structures, packs and bags, walkers, wheel chairs, scooters, service animals, non-service animals, etc.)
- Additional amenities or service features that could improve trip using current mode
- If trip was not done using transit, amenities or service features that would make using transit more likely
- Time value of money

In addition, data collection efforts could include capturing information on attitude and awareness regarding transit and transportation issues, most used sources of information (radio, TV, Internet, newspapers, etc.), and other elements that could be valuable for public outreach, marketing, etc.

Some of the above cited data exists for limited areas of the Basin but there is no comprehensive data set capturing all of this data for the entire Basin at the desired level of detail. The design and prioritization of transportation services and improvements should be data driven. Without this underpinning, proposed improvements and their priorities may be seen as lacking credibility. This lack of credibility will weaken TTD’s ability to answer critics (“Your ridership numbers are way too optimistic/pessimistic….., etc.) and to make the case for implementation support and funding to the public and federal/state/local funding agencies.

The Stantec team proposes an in-basin intercept survey of locals and visitors from designated zip codes at Tahoe Basin restaurants to collect this information, as well as Bay Area polling. The Bay area polling goal would be to collect a statistically valid sample of Origin/Destination (O/D) data as outlined in B2. The Bay Area is selected for polling because the bulk of visitors are from the Bay Area and previous research is available to validate results. The Stantec team proposes setting up a steering committee for this item of work as a means to gather input from local organizations and leaders prior to the data collection.

In addition, the data collection can include a peer review covering resort areas with common traits. Previous work in Whistler, BC included a peer comparison that showed standard characteristics for transit in resort based communities that experienced weekend and seasonal variations in population. These peer systems showed that it can be challenging to balance the distinct needs of the resident versus transient population within the budgetary constraints.

As this data could be of significant value to a number of public and private sector entities, approaching these stakeholders for funding and other support in the data collection efforts should be considered an option. The data collection efforts should also recognize that the data set could be used in Items of Work C and E.

Furthermore, local residents and business owners impacted by tourism will be interested in how the transit system impacts their lives and their livelihoods. As such, they should be consulted through the public outreach efforts.

**Create the Options**

The network options will focus on both the intra- and inter-regional components of transit as well as the access to the system. The movement between the Trans Sierra options and the local services in the Tahoe Basin must be coordinated to ensure a seamless travel...
experience. The options must also respect current and future land use plans and the operational considerations (such as transfer points, layover opportunities, access via walking, cycling and vehicle). The network options will support the Purpose and Needs Statement and be cognizant of the preceding work on transit in the area. The network must consider both intra- and inter-regional movements, connectivity, temporal and seasonal fluctuations and access into the system from various regional points.

**84 Finalize the Network**

This is an important step in the process because it is the review of the network options and the refining of the objectives based on the opportunities and constraints within the system. Public input into the options may produce a different emphasis on the system design based on the desire to balance access to the system versus the maximization of resources. Public input is critical to this step because there must be local acceptance of any plan in order to move it forward and seek local and state/federal funding. The disparate public will create a challenge because there is an inherent difference in local residential needs versus those of a transient population that visits and leaves. The plan must also make operational sense to the local and regional transport agencies.

**85 Creating the Supporting Infrastructure Plan**

The supporting infrastructure plan includes all transit related infrastructure including on-street stops, exchanges, layovers, maintenance facilities, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), vehicles and transportation related changes to increase the operational consistency of the transit system. It may also consider aspects of wayfinding and accessibility that create different infrastructure requirements for the system. The ability to have an infrastructure plan that accounts for access into the regional system by car, train or bike is key to making the total trip easy for users.

**86 Create Short- and Long-Range Plans**

The short range plan is created through a prioritization framework that examines the steps needed to move the existing system and infrastructure towards the long range plan. The prioritization may be a blend of activities based on what is achievable and fundable over the short-term.

**87 Marketing Plan**

The marketing plan for transit must be based on the economic analysis performed in Item of Work A as well as the information about customers collected through the data collection and survey efforts. A marketing plan must consider who existing and potential customers are, what messages they need to hear in order to continue to use transit or to try it, and where these messages need to be placed.

**Schedule**

This task is on the critical path for this project because it will serve as a foundational piece for Items of Work C, D, and E. Understanding the overall demand for transit services in the Tahoe Basin and a future network will provide important pieces of information for the development of a concept for Ferry Oriented Development (Item of Work C), and it will also develop the foundation for the analysis of various concepts for a transit facility (Item of Work D). Lastly, it will provide an important set of input into the Corridor Management Plans.

---

"Superman would have to be faster than a speeding bullet to address all of the challenges you faced (on the Pyramid Highway and La Posada/Eagle Canyon Intersection Improvements Project) ... My sincere appreciation for all your efforts. I believe it is a project we can all be very proud of. I am looking forward to (working with you on) future projects."

- Michele Dennis, Project Manager RTC, to Stantec’s Transportation Project Manager Joe Mactutis

"Stantec provided us with more than we asked, they stayed engaged regarding all items and were available when called. Cynthia Albright gets things done and always is available which is very important to me."

- Tim Carlson, TRPA Governing Board of Directors
**Item of Work C – Ferry Oriented Development**

**C1 Kick-off Meeting and Site Visit**

The Stantec team will attend a full-day kick-off meeting and site visit, including visits to up to four (4) total prospective sites for the ferry terminals in Tahoe City and South Lake Tahoe.

**C2 Attendance at Workshops and Meetings**

This task provides an allowance for attendance at community workshops and project meetings.

**C3 Market Demand Assessment**

In general, demand for TOD reflects underlying market trends that can be accelerated by the added benefit of greater accessibility to desirable destinations offered by transit as an alternative to driving. In addition, the TOD uses should reflect general market demand, but should also be able to generate ridership for the transit system. In the Lake Tahoe area, where most transit riders are commuters, but most travel demand is generated by visitors, TOD near a ferry on the Lake would be likely serve demand for housing and/or accommodations serving uses such as hotels, restaurants, and shops. The Stantec Team will use the demographic, employment, and visitor projections developed in Item of Work B as well as local real estate data and interviews with local experts to generally test demand for these uses in and around the proposed ferry terminal locations. This information will assist in determining general land use program potential for the ferry terminal areas, as well as inform access issues, including potential parking demand. In this task, locations at each ends of the Lake will be finalized.

**C4 Ferry Terminal Multi-Modal Access Planning**

The Stantec Team will assess the potential for multi-modal access for up to two (2) preferred ferry terminal sites, one in Tahoe City and one in South Lake Tahoe. For each site, a base map will be prepared illustrating existing and planned bicycle routes, bus stops and routes, and vehicular access routes within one-quarter to one-half mile of the ferry terminal site. Key pedestrian routes between the ferry terminal sites and destinations within the study area will also be identified.

A second map will be prepared for each terminal site, illustrating recommended multi-modal access improvements, such as new or improved pedestrian and bicycle connections, new street connections, and potential sites for ferry parking and transit facilities. Up to four (4) illustrative section drawings of conceptual street improvements (such as restriping streets to add bikeways, or widening sidewalks through curb extensions) will be prepared. A narrative summarizing the recommended access improvements will accompany each of the multi-modal access concepts.

**C5 Ferry Terminal Land Use Concepts**

The Stantec Team will develop land use concepts for up to two (2) preferred ferry terminal sites, one in Tahoe City and one in South Lake Tahoe. For each site, a base map will be prepared illustrating existing and approved land uses, building footprints, public space, pedestrian pathways and trails, and parking facilities. Potential opportunity sites for development, including vacant lots and existing surface parking lots, will be identified and mapped. Informed by the results of the market assessment (Task C.4), the Stantec Team will prepare one (1) diagrammatic land use concept for each site. Beginning with land use area diagrams sufficient to estimate development yield, the Stantec Team will refine the development concept and prepare an illustrative development concept, envisioned as a rendered site plan at 1”=200’ scale, for each terminal site and its immediate surroundings (up to one-quarter mile radius). The illustrative plans will illustrate the potential ferry terminals in the context of existing and potential development, street connections, recreation facilities, public open space such as plazas and parks, and pedestrian and bicycle trails and connections. The Stantec Team will also prepare a total of two (2) street-level perspective drawings, one for each of the potential ferry terminal sites, illustrating potential improvements to streets, pedestrian walkways and public space in the context of existing and potential development.

**C6 Draft Ferry Oriented Development Plan**

The Stantec Team will incorporate the results of the Task C work into an illustrated draft report suitable for incorporation into the Multi-modal Corridor Management Plan.

**C7 Final Ferry Oriented Development Plan**

In response to a consolidated and non-contradictory set of comments, the Stantec Team will revise the text and graphics to produce a final Ferry Oriented Development Plan for incorporation into the final Multi-modal Corridor Management Plan.

**Schedule**

The activities related to the development of a draft Purpose and Needs Statement will occur in November and December 2014. Upon reactivation of this task in March 2015, this statement may be revisited and revised in light of additional information gathered from the data collection effort. The remaining activities will be carried out over five months between March and July 2015.
**Item of Work D – South Shore Transit Facility Plan**

**D1 Needs Identification**

Transit facility planning must anticipate future needs and land use availability/suitability. The evaluation of sites must also consider the cost of deadheading to and from the starts/ends of routes. Though this cost may seem insignificant, the number of daily movements of buses can make small differences in cost significant on an annual basis. There is also a considerable environmental impact to non-revenue service. The number of bays, storage areas, office space, wash bays, paint booths etc are all a part of the identification phased that is based on the needs of the operator as well as the future size of the fleet.

**D2 Examine Existing Facilities**

Gaining an understanding of the current facilities, location and operational needs of the current operator provides an insight into how space is used, what doesn’t currently work well and what does work well. There is always room for improvement and to learn from other facilities that have been built recently.

**D3 Identify Options**

Many facility planning exercises requires a revisit of the needs and number of facilities based on land issues that force different options that may not have been identified as preferred at the start of the process. One of the keys is identifying the level of flexibility in terms of the arrangement, functionality and size of the facilities because those parameters then indicate the parcel of land required as well as the number of facilities required. Many transit agencies have a preferred maximum size for a facility based on peer and local practices.

Options development is a function of the basic agreed footprint, the potential sites, and the number of facilities required. The options are compared based on criteria such as life cycle costs, land costs, suitability of the site, and operating (deadhead) costs. Another area that has a significant impact on the facility design is the fuel type. CNG and Hydrogen Fuel Cell buses require different infrastructure than electric or diesel buses. This also impacts the distance buses can travel between fuel-ups and the method of refueling (batch or single). Fuel type may also be dictated by cost, the number of manufacturers offering the fuel type and Buy America considerations.

**D4 Evaluation**

The evaluation of a facility is based on a number of factors that center on the life cycle cost and ability to pay. The costs are for both maintenance and operations costs but must also be cognizant of funding opportunities. The evaluation will use a number of criteria to prioritize the options and provide the TTD with an opportunity to then measure the evaluation against internal desires.

**D5 Preferred Alternative**

The preferred alternative takes into consideration the evaluation as well as input into the land availability, the local desire for location and ability to build. The preferred alternative can then move into the design process.
**D6 Design Process**

Once a preferred alternative is chosen, the design process takes the basic footprint and turns it into 10% design plans for evaluation and alternation. The 30% design plans will also feature initial environmental review processes to ensure that the design and location of the facilities meets the California Nevada regulations as well as Federal requirements.

**Schedule**

The activities related to the development of a draft Purpose and Needs Statement will occur in November and December 2014. Upon the completion of the Coordinated Transit Master Plan, the draft Purpose and Needs Statement will be revisited and revised, as necessary, based on the outcome of that planning work. June and July 2015 will be used for the evaluation of different sites, while August, September, and October, 2014 will be used for developing 10% and 30% drawings. Completion of this piece of work in October 2014 allows for all Stantec Team members to focus on Item of Work E during the last three months of the project.

---

**E1 Create Purpose and Needs Statement**

In this task, the Stantec Team will develop a Purpose and Needs Statement for Item of Work E that focuses on creating a Lake Tahoe Corridor Management Plan for the six corridors identified in the RFA. This purpose and needs statement will be consistent with the overall purpose and needs effort for this project that addresses how the Tahoe Basin’s transportation network should function.

As a starting point, a draft needs statement will be drawn from the goals outlined in the SR28 Corridor Management Plan. These may need to be adjusted given the wide scope of Item of Work E.

**E2 Data Collection and Outreach Plan**

The data collection and outreach effort to support item of Work E will be assessed after a review of the existing conditions and the development of the Purpose and Needs Statement. It will be coordinated with overall project data collection and outreach activities. Additional data collection will be carried out for Item of Work E if it is determined that there are gaps in the data that make it difficult to assess the impacts of any proposed improvement, such as a bicycle path, an additional parking lot, a no parking policy, or a parking availability system.

**E3 Input from Previous Items of Work and Public Outreach**

In this task, recommended investments and services from Items of Work A, B, C, and D will be inventoried and serve as the starting point for the Lake Tahoe Corridor Management Plan. Any additional solutions will need to complement these improvements that have already been developed.

This subtask will also review the public input received to date about required corridor investments in the Tahoe Basin. Specific outreach with staff/officials is expected in order to achieve buy-in on the plan. For budgeting purposes, the Stantec Team has also assumed two large public meetings as part of this item of Work, one in the South and one in the North.

**E4 Develop Framework**

The framework developed for SR28 Corridor Management includes public safety, highway operations, alternative transportation systems, user experience & aesthetics, and integration of resource management. Unless changes to this framework are required, the framework will be used in Item of Work E to categorize the different investments, policies, and services required to meet the needs of the transportation corridors in the Tahoe Basin as outlined in the Purpose and Needs Statement.

---

**CORRIDOR MANAGEMENT STRATEGY**

1. **CREATE THE PURPOSE AND NEEDS STATEMENT**
2. **DATA COLLECTION / OUTREACH PLANNING**
3. **INPUT FROM PREVIOUS ITEMS OF WORK AND PUBLIC OUTREACH**
4. **DEVELOP FRAMEWORK**
5. **IDENTIFY GAPS IN CURRENT NETWORK**
6. **DEVELOP SOLUTIONS**
7. **IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**
Identify Gaps in Current Network

An important part of this Item of Work will be identifying specific gaps and weaknesses in the current system, taking into consideration the investments that are already outlined in existing plans and from the previous Items of Work. The SR28 Corridor Management identified key weaknesses in the 11 miles of roadway between Crystal Bay and SR50, including shoulder parking that was causing erosion and safety issues.

Develop Solutions

The SR28 Corridor Management Plan included solutions to address these weaknesses in the form of expanded and new off-highway parking, new look out sites, new transit services, new parking facilities, and emergency pullouts. The Stantec Team can add to that toolbox by contributing more specific ITS solutions.

As was done with the SR28 Corridor Management Plan, solutions to the identified corridor weaknesses will be developed, recognizing that some improvements are already in the pipeline via approved projects. The coordinated inputs will be illustrated in map form.

Implementation Plan

An implementation plan will be developed to address the timing and packaging of individual improvements. This implementation plan will address the politics of the improvements and their financing. These improvements will be communicated in such a way that they can be easily incorporated into the long range planning efforts and the funding requests and action plan that will stem from this work.

Schedule

The activities related to the development of Purpose and Needs Statement will be carried out in November and December 2014, and the analysis, project consolidation, and additional outreach will be carried out over six months between August 2015 and January 2016.

“I have been very impressed with Stantec’s ability to understand issues, work with staff, local stakeholders and community leaders. Most recently I worked with Cynthia Albright and was very impressed with her organizational and leadership ability. She held productive and interactive public meetings...and always provided stakeholders, planning commissioners, and council members straight answers.”

- Peter Wysocki, Formerly City of Fernley Community Development Director
MEMORANDUM

Date: August 4, 2014

To: Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) Board of Directors

From: TTD Staff

Subject: Approval of the Creation of Transit System Program Manager Position to Lead, Develop, and Oversee a Regional Integrated Transit System for the Lake Tahoe Region, Starting with the Tahoe Basin Corridor and Integrated Transit System Planning Project

**Action Requested:**
It is requested the Board approve the creation of a Transit System Program Manager position.

**Fiscal Analysis:**
Staff has secured additional grant funding for the District’s transit operations fund, specific for the creation of the new Transit System Program Manager for a minimum of two fiscal years. The fund sources are Section 5303 transit planning, Federal Highways planning, and transit operation. This position is proposed for two years because of funding, but is anticipated to become a permanent full time position through the creation of more sustained funding.

**Work Program Analysis:**
The position will provide additional work program staff time to the corridor and inter-regional planning tasks identified and adopted in this year’s work program and overall transit operation.

**Background:**
Over the last five years, the District has advanced its transit and capital programs to the point where it is now progressing into planning for a regional transit system as evidenced by this year’s work program and budget effort for corridor and inter-regional transit system plan development. The Board has expressed its support for transit system development, and concern about workload and capacity of staff via the District Manager’s performance review. The District Manager and Staff have interviewed a number of candidates to replace the Transit Manager, and determined the time has come to expand the transit staff to address operations and planning.

Last month, the Board heard and discussed a request to create the position. Questions regarding the budget and what the proposed organization would look like were raised and the item was continued to provide more information.

**Discussion:**
With the increase in construction funds arriving as a direct result of the corridor planning work completed for the Nevada SR 28 Corridor Management Plan, TTD Capital Improvement
Program (CIP) staff will have limited resources available for the larger Tahoe Basin Corridor Planning effort. As the larger Tahoe Basin Corridor and Integrated Transit System planning effort will have a very large regional transit focus, the District Manager is proposing to utilize a new position, the Transit System Program Manager, as the Project Lead for this effort. The Transit System Program Manager will need to address transit system operational and planning needs, with the focus on system wide planning and development (see Attachment A). The current Transit Operations Manager position will participate in the facility planning, but will remain focused on the operational functions of the District’s transit system. This Transit System Program Manager position will oversee the entire transit program, bringing transit staffing level to three, with the Transit Operations Manager and Mobility Manager positions as direct reports.

The position will be the lead responsible party to assist the District Manager in the development of regional and inter-regional transit services for Tahoe, including the corridor and inter-regional plans, funding development, and regional transportation plan update. A proposed organization chart for the District is attached (Attachment B).

The position also provides a resource to other parts of the larger region to help develop and finance additional desired transit services.

**Additional Information:**
If you have any questions or comments regarding this item, please contact Carl Hasty at chasty@tahoetransportation.org or (775) 589-5501.

**Attachments:**
- A. Transit System Program Manager Job Description
- B. Proposed TTD Organizational Chart
JOB DESCRIPTION

JOB TITLE: Transit System Program Manager
FLSA STATUS: Exempt
REPORTS TO: District Manager
GRADE LEVEL: 15
SALARY RANGE: $73,308 - $93,835
HIRING RANGE: $73,308 - $85,037

ESSENTIAL FUNCTIONS:
The Transit System Program Manager oversees the development and management of the public transit system for the Lake Tahoe region. The Transit System Program Manager reports directly to the District Manager and is part of the District’s management team reporting to a Board of Directors. The person filling this vital position will be primarily responsible for the development and implementation of the District’s public transit program, meeting program objectives, and compliance with all pertinent local, state, and federal rules and regulations.

POSITION SPECIFIC RESPONSIBILITIES:
- Leads in the development of system programs, budgets, objectives, and procedures in conformance with District policies and directives. Lead for implementing them.
- Leads the District’s planning and implementation efforts for transit system and services improvements.
- Plans, organizes, supervises, prioritizes, monitors and evaluates the work of staff engaged in transit, related to administrative duties, including preparing and negotiating contract services, EEO plan requirements, operating and funding agreements, budget expenditures, progress reports, etc.
- Leads the development and implementation of strategy for creating and funding regional transit services.
- Represents and promotes transit through presentations and other outreach to local and regional groups throughout the Tahoe region.
- Oversees the operation of the transit system in the most cost effective and efficient manner, including recommendations for commencement, improvement, modification, or elimination of transit service.
- Maintains channels of communication with City, County, Regional, State, and Federal officials, and public who may have a direct or indirect involvement with the transit system.
- Secures and manages grants and funding sources for transit operations and capital improvements.
• Oversees rider and system user surveys. Participates in the development and implementation of market surveys, marketing campaigns, educational and promotion programs.

• Oversees all documentation required by local, State, and Federal reporting requirements related to transit service, such as ridership, ADA usage, revenue, etc. Ensures compliance with Federal Transit Administration rules and regulations for grant administration and transit operations.

• Oversees transit-related procurements, including conformance to Federal Transit Administration regulations, project budgets, records, reporting, and schedules. Assists Capital Improvement Program staff with transit-related construction projects.

• Manages and maintains data and records in paper and electronic format, including databases, spreadsheets, word documents, and files, etc.

REQUIRED KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS AND ABILITIES:

MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS:

• Graduation from high school and bachelor’s degree from an accredited college or university is required; major course work in public administration, business, transportation, or related field preferred. College requirement may be waived with six (6) or more years of relevant experience.

• Minimum ten (10) years of progressively responsible work experience in public transit management required.

• Must have legal authorization to work in the United States of America.

• Must not have been convicted of, pleaded guilty to, entered a plea of nolo contendere to, or received judicial diversion for any felony charges or to any violation of any federal or state laws or city ordinances relating to force, violence, theft, dishonesty, gambling, controlled substances, or sex-related crimes.

• Must not have been convicted of, pleaded guilty to, entered a plea of nolo contendere to, or received judicial diversion for any misdemeanor charges involving DUI/DWI or alcohol, or use, possession, manufacture, or sale of controlled substances or drug paraphernalia within the past five (5) years.

• Must possess or have the ability to obtain a driver’s license valid in the State of California or Nevada and the ability to safely operate a motor vehicle.

• Must maintain personal automobile liability insurance on vehicle used to perform job duties for the District of at least $50,000 / $100,000 and $50,000 property damage, or such other amount that policies may require in the future. The District reimburses for business travel mileage.

KNOWLEDGE/SKILLS:

• Knowledge and experience to supervise, coordinate, delegate, and negotiate.

• Demonstrated ability to lead a multi-stakeholder effort to develop and implement a transit system program.
Demonstrated ability to seek resources and make continued improvements to transit service.

Demonstrated knowledge and ability to manage the many aspects of a transit operation.

Demonstrated experience in transit system planning and development.

Experience with budget management and sound financial and budgetary decisions.

Experience needed to establish and maintain effective, harmonious, cooperative, and productive working relationships with the public, elected officials, members of boards and commissions, department heads, other employees of the District, and employees of other government agencies.

Temperament and good judgment to effectively and diplomatically deal with the public, some of whom may be irate and unreasonable.

Literacy in English with the ability to understand, communicate to others, and carry out oral and written instructions.

Have a good reputation of, and ability to maintain, confidentiality, integrity and honesty.

Be available to work hours as needed or as necessary and perform the duties of the job for a complete workday.

Skilled in public speaking.

Flexibility to handle issues and projects with different completion schedules.

ABILITIES:

- Ability to lead the development and implementation of a regional transit program
- Able to work independently, and as a team member, balancing multiple priorities.
- Ability to work under pressure with numerous deadlines.
- Ability to analyze, problem solve, and develop win/win solutions.
- Ability to exercise good judgment in evaluating situations and making decisions.
- Ability to learn and follow District policies and regulations.

ANALYSIS:
Gathers and interprets data dealing with complex problems and situations. Use complex math. Requires some mathematical analysis.

DECISION MAKING:
Utilizes own judgment and own interpretation of general agency guidelines when making decisions. Has responsibility for establishing departmental, project or program practices, procedures and policy with District Manager approval.

DEPARTMENT MANAGEMENT:
Requires management of large unit, including strategic planning and budgeting of unit. May have several managers as direct reports.
PROJECT MANAGEMENT:
Manages a large project and/or program with high complexity and controversy, including many complex multi-agency and public relations issues.

COMMUNICATION LEVEL:
Requires ability to communicate detailed information either verbally or in writing. May make public presentations concerning project issues and recommendations. Answers questions and clarifies points.

WORKING CONDITIONS/PHYSICAL EFFORT:
1. Office environment
2. Bending, stooping
3. Lift up to 40 pounds
4. Use office equipment, key board
5. Some travel in area

BENEFITS:
Staff members receive 27 days of Paid Time Off (PTO), paid medical, dental, vision and life insurance plan. The District contributes to a money purchase pension plan and an optional 457 deferred compensation plan is available.

APPLICATION PROCEDURE:
Any qualified person interested in this position should submit their resume, a letter of interest and an application (available at http://tahoetransportation.org/doing-business/career-opportunities) as soon as possible to:

Judi White
Tahoe Transportation District
P. O. Box 499
Zephyr Cove, Nevada 89448

or email to info@tahoetransportation.org
MEMORANDUM

Date: August 4, 2014

To: Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) Board of Directors

From: Ron Treabess, Board Member

Subject: Presentation on the North Tahoe Truckee Transportation Vision Service Plan by the North Lake Tahoe Chamber/CVB/Resort Association

Action Requested:
No action is requested. It is requested the Board hear a presentation by Sandy Evans Hall, CEO/Executive Director, North Lake Tahoe Chamber/CVB/Resort Association, regarding the North Tahoe Truckee Transportation Vision Service Plan.

Background:
For the better part of two years, the Resort Triangle Transportation Vision Coalition has been meeting each month right after the monthly Truckee North Tahoe Transportation Management Association meeting. This group of transportation providers, planners, organizations, and interested business and environmental groups started as a result of its first annual Transportation Summit held in October 2012. The Summit is now an annual affair, with the third annual to take place this fall. The goal of the Coalition has been to expand the North Lake Tahoe/Truckee transportation systems to better serve visitors and residents alike, while reducing the ill-effects of the personal auto on the environment. The intent is to also make the North Lake Tahoe experience more competitive with other peer resort areas that currently offer more efficient transit systems. The vision is to have an integrated system, with one brand, that will enable the user to get from his/her pillow to destination in a fun, free, frequent, and friendly experience without having to drive.

Discussion:
The Resort Triangle Transportation Vision Coalition is now doing outreach to educate and receive comments.

Additional Information:
If you have any questions or comments regarding this item, please contact Ron Treabess at (530) 581-8735.

Attachments:
A. Technical Vision Plan Memo
B. Frequently Asked Questions
MEMORANDUM

To: North Tahoe Transit Vision Service/Cost Committee
From: Gordon Shaw, PE, AICP, LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.
Date: August 7, 2013
RE: North Tahoe Truckee Transportation Vision Service Plan and Cost Allocation

INTRODUCTION

This memo presents the operating plan, capital requirements and cost implications of a regional transit “vision” for the North Tahoe / Truckee region, that would increase service frequency, extend hours of service, brand and operate all services under a single banner, and make all services free to the passenger.

Note that this transit service does not include services provided within the resorts, shuttle services solely connecting ski parking areas with nearby base areas or between base areas, or the North Lake Tahoe Express. Other services not discussed in this plan may continue (such as the North Lake Tahoe Express, the Water Shuttle, skier shuttle, and connections to the East Shore or South Shore), with funding beyond this program. This plan assumes a single transit organization is providing all services discussed below.

OPERATING PLAN

The plan would combine and expand existing TART and Town of Truckee transit services. The following are the improvements over existing services:

- Service is provided throughout the year on SR 267 between Truckee, Northstar, Kings Beach and North Stateline. This addresses the long-term desire to provide year-round service on this key regional corridor.

- Evening hourly service is provided throughout the year around the 89/267/28 triangle as well as on the West Shore, with service until 2:00 AM in the summer and winter, and until 9:00 PM in the spring and fall.
Service frequency is improved to consistent half-hourly service around the 89/267/28 Resort Triangle and on the West Shore, during both summer and winter daytime periods. (Existing half-hourly service between Crystal Bay and Incline Village would remain.) Hourly service is provided in the off seasons.

The peak summer season is expanded from the current 68 days (June 27 to Labor Day) to 93 days (June 15 through September 15).

Consistent local service is provided in Truckee throughout the year, along with winter service between Truckee and Donner Summit. This eliminates the existing service plan that reduces service within Truckee during the winter.

While the existing Placer County Cab Coupon program remains (providing ADA service throughout the year), it is enhanced with an additional paratransit van operating in the summer and winter daytime periods. The existing Truckee Dial-A-Ride program also remains.

Transit fares are eliminated. To provide adequate capacity, additional winter peak-period runs are provided along SR 28, on SR 89 between Tahoe City and Squaw Valley, and on SR 267 between Kings Beach and Northstar.

Advanced technologies will be deployed to improve the convenience and efficiency of transit service, including automatic vehicle location, real-time traveler information displays, and enhanced communication systems.

The vehicle-hours of service required to operate these services is summarized in Table A. As shown, a total of 65,679 vehicle-hours of service would be operated each year. As a point of comparison, the TART program currently operates 25,800 vehicle-hours per year, while the Town of Truckee is roughly 6,800 vehicle-hours per year. The new consolidated program would therefore be equal to just over a doubling of the scope of these existing transit programs.

**OPERATING / ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS**

Operating costs are based upon the following:

- Most operating costs (such as fuel, driver wages/benefits, and vehicle maintenance costs) vary directly with the quantity of transit service providers. These “marginal” operating costs are estimated using a unit cost per hour of service.
  - For buses, the 2012/13 budgeted TART costs and quantities were used. Dividing $2,255,624 in annual marginal operating costs by 25,796 total vehicle service hours yields a unit cost of $87.44 per vehicle service hour. It is important to note that this rate reflects the current proportion of non-service (“deadhead”) to service hours of existing TART services. As TART has a relatively high proportion of non-service to service hours (reflecting the deadhead time needed for the long routes), applying this rate to other services yields conservatively high estimates of overall costs.
Vans and small buses ("cutaways" 30 feet in length or shorter) have a lower marginal unit operating costs than do buses. As TART does not operate vans, a factor was determined based upon the contractor costs for the BlueGO transit program in South Lake Tahoe, which operates both buses and vans. A review of vehicle operating costs and vehicle-hours of service indicates that vans required 19 percent less expenditure per hour of service than do full-sized buses. Applying this factor to the TART bus rate, a marginal unit cost of $71.40 per vehicle-hour of van service was used.

- The regional transit entity would require additional staffing for expanded functions, including Board presentations, expanded grants administration, capital improvements, etcetera. While this will depend on decisions regarding governance of the program, as a "placeholder", the following is assumed to be necessary to fulfill these functions:
  - Full time Tahoe-based Transit Manager
  - Expanded administrative staff for data analysis, reporting, etc.
  - Incidental expenses (travel, memberships, Board expenses, etc.)

A reasonable estimate of the annual costs of these administrative functions, based on a review of existing costs for similar programs, is $200,000 per year. This assumes that existing office space is available.

- Administrative costs would add to existing costs. These existing costs are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TART fixed annual operating costs</td>
<td>$791,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truckee fixed annual operating costs</td>
<td>$83,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMA annual program management costs</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$949,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In addition to the current fixed operational costs, fixed costs would be incurred for the following:
  - Supervision/dispatching for the additional evening hours of service.
  - Dispatching for the dial-a-ride program.
  - Marketing costs would be expanded. Based on transit industry standards, ongoing marketing costs are assumed to equal 3 percent of operating costs.

A figure of $45 per additional dispatcher hour is assumed, reflecting salaries, benefits and additional utility costs.

Even with these additional staff positions, the administrative effectiveness of the Vision Program would be an improvement over the current administrative effectiveness of existing programs. At present, the TART and Town of Truckee transit program have a total of 4.1 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) employees performing administrative tasks (excluding operations and marketing staff). This equates to 7,958 annual vehicle-hours of service for every administrative FTE. In comparison, under the Vision Plan there would be 6 administrative FTE's, equivalent to one for every 10,946 vehicle-hours of service. By this measure, the administration of the Vision Plan transit program would be 38 more effective.
Acting the fixed operating costs to the marginal operating costs, the total annual operating costs of this plan would be $7,146,500.

**CAPITAL COSTS**

Capital costs are summarized in Table B:

- The number of buses and vans are calculated by summing the requirements of the individual routes (from Table A) and identifying the peak requirements of the three operating seasons. A 20 percent space ratio (proportion of spare vehicles to vehicles required in peak operation) or a minimum of two vehicles of each type (whichever is greater) is then added. Average annual capital costs are then calculated by multiplying by the unit costs and dividing by the useful life, as presented in Table B. While in the short-run the remaining useful life of the existing fleets can be used to put off vehicle costs, in the long run these costs (totaling $986,000 per year) would be incurred.

- Improvements to Administrative/Operations facilities under this alternative would be modest, as existing facilities (TART and/or Town) would be adequate in size. Expanded CNG fueling would be needed at the Cabin Creek TART facility, estimated to cost $100,000.

- A “North Stateline Transit Center” consists of improvements to existing bus stops at North Stateline. This location make for a better transit center/transfer location than Kings Beach, as it provides direct access to North Stateline from the North Shore and 267 corridor without the need to transfer in Kings Beach, it provides direct service across Kings Beach without the need to transfer, it works well with running times for North Shore, Incline Village, and SR267 routes, and it provides a good location to turn buses around, on streets without residences (which could be a problem in Kings Beach). In addition to enhanced shelters, the bus bays would need to be lengthened to accommodate two buses at a time, on both sides of the highway.

- Improvements would be needed at Truckee Train Depot. At this service level, there is the potential need for passengers to transfer between up to four transit buses in downtown Truckee (Truckee – Tahoe City, Truckee – North Stateline, Truckee – Donner Summit, and Truckee Local). Combined with the need to accommodate Greyhound and Amtrak Thruway buses, there is not adequate existing capacity at the Truckee Train Depot to park four buses at a time. Either modifications to the driveways and/or adjacent parking areas would be needed to provide adequate bus capacity, or an entirely new site for a transit center would be required.

- Other bus stops are improved. Key locations for enhanced bus stops would include:
  - East end of Tahoe City
  - Other locations along SR 28 in Kings Beach
  - Entrance to Squaw Valley
  - Truckee Senior Center
  - Replacement of existing shelter on Donner Pass Road across from Gateway Center
  - Replacement of existing shelter at West End of Donner Lake
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- Bus pullouts on Brockway Road at Cedar House and the Regional Park

In addition, other bus stop improvements would occur as part of developments, over time.

- Advanced Public Transit Systems (APTS) technologies would be implemented. This would include Automatic Vehicle Location (AVL) tracking on all vehicles, Automatic Passenger Counters (APCs), and real-time traveler information distributed over the internet and at key bus stops.

On an annual basis, assuming that all improvements are funded for full implementation in 10 years, this option would incur an average capital cost of $1,153,800 per year. Some of these costs can be accommodated through Federal capital funding programs. It is assumed that Federal programs would fund 80 percent of replacement of the existing transit fleet, and 50 percent of other capital needs. Applying these factors, the "local share" for these capital improvements would average $409,500 annually.

ALLOCATION OF COSTS

Total annual local costs of the Vision Plan program, including local share of capital costs, would equal $7,556,000. As no passenger revenues (fares) would be collected, this figure is also the total local subsidy that would be required for the program. The subsidy is allocated to individual jurisdictions and ski resorts as follows:

1. Allocation of marginal operating costs is based on the costs incurred in each jurisdiction, as shown in Table C. For services operating along SR 99 between Tahoe City and Truckee and long SR 267 between Kings Beach and Truckee, the existing funding allocation agreement between Placer County and Truckee is applied. Specifically, all costs south of Squaw Valley Road and Northstar Drive are allocated to Placer County, while costs to the north are shared 50 percent / 50 percent between Placer County and the Town of Truckee.

2. The additional dispatcher costs associated with evening transit service expansion is allocated between Placer County and the Town based on the proportion of evening vehicle-hours of service operated in each jurisdiction.

3. Similarly, the additional dispatcher costs associated with Dial-A-Ride service is allocated based on the proportion of Dial-A-Ride vehicle-hours of service operated in each jurisdiction.

4. Marketing and administrative costs are allocated between eastern Placer County and Truckee/Donner Summit based on the proportion of total vehicle-hours of service operated in each jurisdiction.

5. As shown in Table B, Capital costs are allocated to the individual jurisdictions based on the number of vehicles required to serve each jurisdiction (for fleet), the number of bus stop improvements in each jurisdiction, the increase in vehicle-hours of service (for CNG improvements) and the total number of vehicle-hours of service (for communication improvements). As the need for improvement to the North Stateline transit stops is
driven by improvements in service in eastern Placer County, all of these costs are allocated to eastern Placer County.

6. Summing the operating, administrative and capital costs as shown in the top portion of Table D, total annual costs are found to be $5,427,700 for eastern Placer County, $1,759,300 for Truckee/Donner Summit, and $369,000 for Washoe County.

These figures do not reflect any financial participation on the part of the ski resorts, lodging properties or special districts, nor do they reflect existing funding requirements (such as funds generated as part of mitigation requirements). Specific funding levels from these sources, and associated reductions in other funds that would need to be generated in each jurisdiction, have yet to be determined.

SUMMARY

Table D presents the summary of all costs associated with the plan. Including local operating and capital costs, average annual costs would total $7,556,000. This program would increase ridership from an existing total of 449,000 passenger-trips per year to a total of 861,000 per year (including a 50% estimated increase associated with the elimination of transit fares). This overall increase of 412,000 passenger-trips is equivalent to a 92 percent increase over current ridership.
### TABLE A: NORTH TAHOE REGIONAL TRANSIT VISION PLAN -- Marginal Operating Costs and Ridership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Service Period/Service Area</th>
<th>Day: 6:30 AM - 6:30 PM</th>
<th>Ridership Analysis</th>
<th>Performance Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Ridership with Plan</td>
<td>Increase in Ridership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-Peak Volumes</strong></td>
<td>200 runs/hr</td>
<td>Marginal Operating $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe City - Truckee</td>
<td>30 Min</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truckee - Crystal Bay</td>
<td>30 Min</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe City - Crystal Bay</td>
<td>30 Min</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Shore</td>
<td>30 Min</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Bay - Incline Village</td>
<td>30 Min</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truckee Local</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Placer 24H Van</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truckee Dial-A-Ride</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ridership with Plan</strong></td>
<td>200 runs/hr</td>
<td>Marginal Operating $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe City - Truckee</td>
<td>30 Min</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truckee - Crystal Bay</td>
<td>30 Min</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe City - Crystal Bay</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Shore</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Includes two additional AM and two additional PM runs to address vehicle overcrowding between Tahoe City and Squaw Valley, Tahoe City and North Shoreline, and Northstar and North Shoreline.
- Impact of Elimination of Fares: 50% of $244,000.
- Total Ridership: 861,000.
- Increase over Existing: 412,000 (82%).

**Marginal Operating Costs by Route**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Marginal Operating Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe City - Truckee</td>
<td>$1,468,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truckee - Crystal Bay</td>
<td>$1,468,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe City - Crystal Bay</td>
<td>$755,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Shore</td>
<td>$714,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truckee - Donner Summit</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Bay - Incline Village</td>
<td>$362,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truckee Local</td>
<td>$299,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Placer 24H Van</td>
<td>$113,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truckee Dial-A-Ride</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$5,591,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE B: Capital Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Local Share</th>
<th>State Share</th>
<th>Total Annual Average Capital Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Light Rail (35-feet and up)</td>
<td>Shelters</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key Transit Stop Improvements</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional CHS Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Cost over 10 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Vehicle Capital Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Vehicle O&amp;M Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Vehicle Revenue Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Vehicle Total Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,189,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Service Period/Service Area</th>
<th>Annual VHS</th>
<th>Seasonal Marginal Operating Cost</th>
<th>Annual $ by Jurisdiction</th>
<th>% of Responsibility (1)</th>
<th>Truckee/Donner Summit</th>
<th>Washoe</th>
<th>Eastern Placer</th>
<th>Truckee/Donner Summit</th>
<th>Washoe</th>
<th>Eastern Placer</th>
<th>Truckee/Donner Summit</th>
<th>Washoe</th>
<th>Eastern Placer</th>
<th>Truckee/Donner Summit</th>
<th>Washoe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day: 6:30 AM - 6:30 PM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe City - Truckee</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>$106,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truckee - Crystal Bay</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>$53,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Shore</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>$53,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day: 6:30 AM - 6:30 PM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe City - Truckee</td>
<td>1,782</td>
<td>$156,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1,782</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>156,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truckee - Crystal Bay</td>
<td>1,782</td>
<td>$156,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1,782</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>156,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Shore</td>
<td>1,782</td>
<td>$156,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1,782</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>156,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Bay - Incline Village</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>$78,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truckee Local</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>$78,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary Placer DAR Van</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truckee Dial-A-Rides</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Existing allocation procedure. Allocation of 89 and 267 Routes 100 percent to Placer County south of Squaw Valley and Northstar, and 50 percent to the north.
## TABLE D: Summary of Annual Costs and Subsidy Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Allocation Factor Values</th>
<th>Annual $ by Entity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Eastern Placer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal Operating Costs</td>
<td>$5,591,000</td>
<td>$3,896,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County Taxi Coupon Program</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed Annual Operating Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>$375,900</td>
<td>Existing Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Dispatch Costs -- Evening Service Hours</td>
<td>$91,600</td>
<td>Evening VHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Dispatch Costs -- Dial-A-Ride Dispatch</td>
<td>$180,200</td>
<td>DAR VHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$647,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Annual Operating Costs</strong></td>
<td>$6,268,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marketing</strong></td>
<td>$84,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration</strong></td>
<td>$489,700</td>
<td>Total VHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>$489,700</td>
<td>Total VHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Tahoe Manager, Support Staff</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Total VHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$689,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating/Admin/Marketing</strong></td>
<td>$7,146,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Annual Local Capital Funding Required</strong></td>
<td>$409,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Annual Local Funding Required</strong></td>
<td>$7,556,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passenger Fare Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Annual Subsidy Required</strong></td>
<td>$7,556,000</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Funding from resorts, special districts and other sources would count towards these figures. To be determined.
Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)

1. What is the quick summary of the Vision Plan improvements?

   - Establishing one single brand for all public transit services in the region.
   - Doubling of transit service to a bus every 30 minutes [rather than the current hourly service on most routes].
   - Initiation of year-round evening transit service around the Resort Triangle and down the West Shore – till 2 AM in the summer and winter, and till 9:30 in the spring and fall.
   - Expansion of winter service connecting Donner Summit with Truckee from 5 runs a day to 13 runs a day.
   - Finally, year-round transit service on 267 between Truckee, Northstar and Kings Beach.
   - Elimination of all transit fares – all services will be free to the rider.
   - Improvements to transit center and bus stops
   - Advanced technology to make transit easier to use

2. Who is leading this effort?

   The North Lake Tahoe Resort Association initiated the effort, as expanding public transit is an important element of their Tourism Master Plan. Since then, a wide range of organizations have become involved, including the Town of Truckee, Placer County, the Truckee North Tahoe Transportation Management Association, Truckee Tomorrow, Squaw Valley, Vail Associates, and JMA.

3. Where will the money come from?

   Much of the funding for buses and facilities (capital funding) can come from federal and state sources. The challenge is where the ongoing operating subsidy funding will come from. This is still being studied, but it will definitely be a combination of private and public sources. The most common public source for transit funding is sales tax, but other options are lodging taxes (TOT) and real estate transfer fees that are already in existence or being considered voluntarily by new development.

4. How do we know that increasing transit service will lead to increased ridership?

   There have been many studies conducted regarding how increased service leads to increased ridership. The ridership seen at similar resort areas reflect how both visitors and locals increase their use of transit services when the quality of service improves. Locally, when the Tahoe City – Truckee TART service was expanded from 5 runs a day to 10 runs a day, ridership grew by 94 percent.

5. Aren't the buses already empty anyway?

   While it is true that many runs have plenty of available seats, at peak times TART is overcrowded. For instance on the winter commute runs across the North Shore, extra buses need to be operated to avoid leaving passengers on the curb due to full buses.
6. Isn’t it true that Californians will never get out of their cars?

Not when taking transit makes their lives better. The US city with the second highest total transit ridership is actually LA (behind New York). And about 40 percent of Mammoth Mountain skiers take transit from their lodging to the lifts—because it is more convenient than driving. As parking gets tighter at Tahoe winter and summer resort, and as fuel costs go up, we can expect to see more people get out of their cars.

7. Doesn’t the fact that many visitors stay in vacation rentals or ski leases mean that transit does not work here?

An NITRA study indicates that roughly half of visitors stay in a motel or hotel—virtually all of which are on a transit route. Of the other half that stay in a vacation rental or home, 80 percent of these units on the North Shore are within a convenient 5 minute walk of a bus route, along with 58 percent on the West Shore. It is true that there are some vacation rentals that realistically cannot be served by transit, but it is a relatively small percentage of the total visitor bed base.

8. Wouldn’t combining the existing transit systems save a lot of money that could then be used to expand services?

We found that the existing transit service operate quite “lean” with minimal administrative staff that could be combined or cut. For instance, TART’s manager shares his position with the transit program in western Placer County, and Truckee’s bus mechanics also work on other Town vehicles.

9. Won’t all the benefit just go to the major resorts?

Benefits will accrue at both ends of the transit trips. Expanded transit will allow more people to get to the major resorts without a car, but it will also encourage visitors staying at the major resorts to get out and explore other corners of our broad region, such as visiting a lakeside beach or restaurant. Locals also benefit from expansion of economical access to jobs, health care, etc.

10. Why does the plan not call for greater service frequency than it does, like service every 10 minutes?

The plan balances the benefits of expanding services with a reasonable chance of developing funding. We considered transit expansions beyond those in the Vision Plan, but decided that they would be too costly to fund.

11. How quickly can it be implemented?

Once funding is established, extending service hours, providing year-round service on SR 267, eliminating fares and providing a single brand can happen relatively quickly (like within a year). Increasing service frequency will take a bit longer, as buses would need to be ordered and the capacity of the maintenance facility expanded—roughly 3 years. Improvements to transit centers and stops would occur gradually over a longer period.

12. When traffic congestion is bad, why would I want to be on the bus?

It is true that buses get caught in the same traffic delays as other motorists. Even then, the bus has benefits in that it allows you to avoid parking hassles, can drop you closer to your destination, allows you to play on your smartphone, and saves on gas costs. Besides, you can feel good that you are helping to solve the traffic jam yourself. Taking a longer view, while the current plan does not include them specifically, future steps that build on the Vision Plan might include strategies to speed bus movements, such as adjusting signals to reduce delays or provide exclusive turn lanes for buses.
MEMORANDUM

Date: August 4, 2014
To: Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) Board of Directors
From: TTD Staff
Subject: Approve Resolution Adopting Policies and Procedures Regarding Conflict of Interest and Disclosure Rules

Action Requested:
Staff requests that the Board approve a resolution adopting policies and procedures regarding Conflict of Interest and Disclosure Rules for the TTD Directors and Staff members (Attachment A) with any changes directed by the Board. This section will become Article 4 of TTD’s Policies and Procedures Handbook.

Fiscal Impact:
All staff and legal counsel time for preparing the policies and procedures is captured in the approved FY15 budget.

Background:
TTD Staff has been developing a comprehensive policies and procedures handbook and bringing the handbook to the Board in phases for adoption by resolution.

Discussion:
Legal Counsel has prepared a section regarding conflicts of interest and disclosure rules for Directors and Staff members. These rules clarify the ethical standards to which TTD Directors and Staff members will be held. These rules are based on provisions of the Compact which explicitly apply to TRPA Board members and staff. The Compact rules are similar to the rules in the California Political Reform Act (Gov. Code Sec. 87100 et seq.) which apply to California public officials.

Under these rules, Directors and Staff members will be required to file a written disclosure of certain economic interests in the Tahoe basin which is the same disclosure required of TRPA board members and Staff members. The form of the economic interest disclosure is attached as Attachment B. Directors and Staff members will be disqualified from decisions where the decision would have a material adverse effect on the economic interests of the Director or Staff member. Directors will also be disqualified from decisions when there is a conflict between TTD’s interests and the interests of the entity that the Director represents. Finally, the section includes rules regarding the acceptance of gifts and other benefits by Directors and Staff members. The form of the gift disclosure is attached as Attachment C.

Additional Information:
If you have any questions or comments, please contact Adam Spear at (775) 589-5500.
Attachments:

A. Resolution 2014-005 – A Resolution Adopting Policies and Procedures for Conflict of Interest and Disclosure Rules
B. Economic Interests Disclosure Form
C. Personal Gift or Service Disclosure Form
RESOLUTION NO. 2014-005

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND DISCLOSURE RULES FOR THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS AND COMMITTEES

WHEREAS, the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) is in the process of updating, amending and supplementing its existing policies and procedures in order to accurately reflect the manner in which TTD conducts business; and

WHEREAS, TTD is expressly authorized by Art IX(e) of the Compact to adopt procedures for the adoption of its budgets, the appropriation of its money, and the carrying on of its other financial activities, and impliedly authorized to adopt all other necessary policies and procedures; and

WHEREAS, policies and procedures must be established by resolution of the Board and must conform, insofar as practicable, to the procedures for financial administration of the State of California or the State of Nevada or one or more of the local governments in the region pursuant to Art IX(e) of the Compact; and

WHEREAS, TTD staff has prepared the policies and procedures section attached hereto as Exhibit A, which is entitled “Conflict of Interest and Disclosure Rules.”

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the TTD Board of Directors hereby adopts the policies and procedures attached hereto as Exhibit A and directs that they be incorporated into the TTD Policies and Procedures Handbook.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the TTD Board of Directors at its regular meeting held on August 8, 2014 by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstain:

Absent:

_____________________________
Steve Teshara
Chairman
4.0 CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND DISCLOSURE RULES

4.1 PUBLIC INTEREST

Directors and Staff members serve the District and the people of the region and have a responsibility to work diligently and competently to develop the regional transportation system envisioned by the states of California and Nevada. In carrying out their official duties, Directors and Staff members are expected to place a priority on their loyalty to the regional public interest rather than succumbing to the temptations of private or parochial interests. For the purposes of this Article, any reference to Directors also means alternates that are designated to serve on the Board in a Director’s absence.

4.2 SOURCE OF RULES

This Article is based on provisions in the Compact which mandate conflict of interest and disclosure requirements for board members and employees of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency. Compact, Art. III(a)(5). Those provisions in the Compact are similar to provisions in the California Political Reform Act, Cal. Gov. Code § 87100 et seq. This Article shall be interpreted and applied in accordance with relevant and applicable (i) case law regarding the Compact and the California Political Reform Act, (ii) regulations, opinions and informal advice letters of the California Fair Political Practices Commission, and (iii) published opinions and letter opinions issued by the California Attorney General.

4.3 WRITTEN DISCLOSURES

4.3.1 Each Director and Staff member shall disclose his economic interests in the region within 10 days after taking his seat on the Board or being employed by the District and shall thereafter disclose any further economic interest which he acquires, as soon as feasible after he acquires it. Compact, Art. III(a)(5).

4.3.2 The disclosure must be in writing in a form to be provided by the District. An updated disclosure form must be filed with the District no less than annually.

4.3.3 Economic interest means:

A. Any business entity operating in the region in which the Director or Staff member has a direct or indirect interest worth more than $1,000. Compact, Art. III(a)(5)(A).

B. Any real property located in the region in which the Director or Staff member has a direct or indirect interest worth more than $1,000. Compact, Art. III(a)(5)(B).
C. Any source of income attributable to activities in the region, other than loans by or deposits with a commercial lending institution in the regular course of business, aggregating $250 or more in value received by or promised to the Director within the preceding 12 months. Compact, Art. III(a)(5)(C). This provision does not apply to Staff members.

D. Any business entity operating in the region which the Director or Staff member is a director, officer, partner, trustee, employee or holds any position of management. Compact, Art. III(a)(5)(D).

4.4 DISQUALIFICATION

4.4.1 No Director or Staff member shall make, or attempt to influence, a District decision in which he knows or has reason to know he has an economic interest. Directors and Staff members must disqualify themselves from making or participating in the making of the decision when it is reasonably foreseeable that the decision will have a material financial effect, distinguishable from its effect on the public generally, on the economic interests of the Director or Staff member. Compact, Art. III(a)(5).

4.4.2 Economic interest has the same meaning as in Article 4.2.3 above.

4.4.3 Making a decision means determining to act, or not to act, on the following:
A. Voting on a matter.
B. Appointing a person to a position.
C. Obligating the District to a course of action.
D. Entering into a contract for the District.

4.4.4 Participating in the making of a decision means:
A. Negotiations without significant, independent, intervening substantive review by other Directors, Staff members or consultants.
B. Advice by way of research, investigations, or preparation of reports or analysis for the decision maker, if these functions are performed without significant, independent, intervening substantive review by other Directors, Staff members or consultants.

4.4.5 Participating in the making of a decision does not mean:
A. Action that is solely ministerial, secretarial, manual or clerical.
B. Appearances by a Director or Staff member before the Board for the purpose of representing the Director or Staff member’s personal interests.
C. Action by a Director or Staff member with regard to the Director or Staff member’s compensation for services or the terms or conditions of the Director or Staff member’s employment contract.

4.5 DISQUALIFICATION PROCEDURE

4.5.1 Directors
A. When a Director has an economic interest that may be affected by a decision of the District, the Director must notify the District Manager and Legal Counsel prior to the meeting of the Board.
B. The Director will consult with Legal Counsel and determine whether the Director is disqualified from the decision. Whenever possible, a decision will be segmented to limit the scope of the disqualification.

C. At the meeting of the Board, the Director must publically announce the economic interest and explain whether it is reasonably foreseeable that the decision will have a material financial effect, distinguishable from its effect on the public generally, on the economic interest of the Director.

D. If the Director is disqualified from a decision, the Director must leave the room during any discussion or deliberations on the matter in question and may not participate or be counted for purposes of a quorum.

E. Disqualified Directors will be legally required to participate and be counted for purposes of a quorum if an insufficient number of Directors remain to constitute a quorum, unless the Director was disqualified due to receipt of gifts from a source aggregating $250 or more in value.

F. If multiple Directors are disqualified, only the number of Directors needed to constitute a quorum will be allowed to participate. Disqualified Directors will be selected to participate by random drawing.

4.5.2 Staff members.

A. When a Staff member has an economic interest that may be affected by a decision of the District, the Staff member must notify the District Manager and Legal Counsel.

B. If the District Manager and Legal Counsel determine that the Staff member is disqualified from a decision, the District Manager and Legal counsel will determine a course of action to ensure that the Staff member does not participate in the decision. Whenever possible, a decision will be segmented to limit the scope of the disqualification.

4.6 COMPETING DUTIES

4.6.1 Directors represent both the District and the members of the Board. In certain circumstances, members of the Board may have interests that conflict with the interests of the District. These conflicts of interest may result in disqualification for Directors even if there is no disqualification under Article 4.4 above.

4.6.2 When a member has an interest in a decision of the District, its Director must publically announce the interest and explain why the interest either does or does not conflict with the interests of the District.

4.6.3 In the event that the interests of the member conflict with the interests of the District, the Director must disqualify himself from making or participating in the making of the decision, but may participate in discussion or deliberations on the matter.
4.7 **BENEFITS TO DIRECTORS**

4.7.1 Directors may not seek or accept gifts or services aggregating $250 or more in value during a calendar year from a single individual or company that seeks or does business with the District.

4.7.2 Directors must disclose the receipt of gifts and services in excess of $100 from a single individual or company that seeks or does business with the District. The disclosure must be in writing in a form to be provided by the District.

4.8 **BENEFITS TO STAFF**

4.8.1 Staff members and their immediate family members may not seek or accept any gift, service, favor, employment, engagement, or economic opportunity that would tend to improperly influence a reasonable person in his position to depart from the faithful and impartial discharge of his duties. TTD Human Resources Policies and Procedures, Sec. 4.16.

4.8.2 Staff members and their immediate family members may not seek or accept any gifts or services from individuals or companies that seek or do business with the District unless the transaction:

A. Is consistent with accepted business practices and gives no appearance of impropriety, such as meals with vendors, gifts of small value, tickets to events with vendors, and perishable items during the holidays;

B. Does not impose any sense of obligation on either the giver or the receiver;

C. Does not result in any kind of special or favored treatment for the giver;

D. Cannot be viewed as extravagant, excessive, or too frequent; and

E. Is given and received with no effort to conceal the full facts by either the giver or the receiver.

4.8.3 Staff members must disclose the receipt of gifts and services in excess of $100 from a single individual or company that seeks or does business with the District. The disclosure must be in writing in a form to be provided by the District.
ECONOMIC INTEREST DISCLOSURE FORM

Name: ____________________________________________

Position: ____________________________________________

1. List any business entity operating in the Tahoe region in which you have a direct or indirect investment worth more than $1,000.

   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________

2. List any real property located in the Tahoe region in which you have a direct or indirect interest worth more than $1,000.

   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
3. List any source of income attributable to activities in the Tahoe region, other than loans by or deposits with a commercial lending institution in the regular course of business, aggregating $250 or more in value received by or promised to you within the preceding 12 months.  *Note: Staff members do not need to list these interests.*

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

4. List any business entity operating in the Tahoe Region in which you have a position as a director, officer, partner, trustee, employee, or any other position of management.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

NOTICE: Acquisition of any new economic interest or modification of a prior-reported economic interest shall be reported within 30 days after the acquisition or modification of same.

**VERIFICATION**

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Nevada/California (as applicable to my residency) that I read the foregoing disclosure form and the contents are true and correct.

___________________________________
Signature

___________________________________
Date
Personal Gift or Service Disclosure Form

Date: __________________

Name of Recipient: _____________________________________________

Description of Gift or Service: ____________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

Giver of Gift or Service: __________________________________________

Reason for Gift or Service: _______________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

Estimated Value of Gift or Service: _________________________________

Attachment C