The needs of the public are one of the most important foundations for transportation planning. Seeking comprehensive public participation is critical for developing meaningful transportation plans. The Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO) proactively strives to involve the public in identifying and addressing transportation issues, with the goal of creating a strong working relationship between the TMPO and its constituents. This plan is intended to ensure that public participation is an integral and effective part of the TMPO's activities and that decisions are made with the benefit and consideration of important public perspectives.
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## Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>Americans with Disabilities Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APC</td>
<td>Advisory Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAAA</td>
<td>Clean Air Act Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>California Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPO</td>
<td>Carson Area Metropolitan Planning Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHSP</td>
<td>Coordinated Human Services Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTS-MCO</td>
<td>Coordinated Transit System Management Company (BlueGO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>United States Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>English as a Second Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTIP</td>
<td>Federal Transportation Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTCC</td>
<td>Lake Tahoe Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDOT</td>
<td>Nevada Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA</td>
<td>National Environmental Policy Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTPUD</td>
<td>North Tahoe Public Utility District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWP</td>
<td>Overall Work Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>Public Participation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTTPC</td>
<td>Resort Triangle Transportation Planning Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETEA-LU</td>
<td>Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>Sustainable Communities Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSTMA</td>
<td>South Shore Transportation Management Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STPUD</td>
<td>South Tahoe Public Utility District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TACCD</td>
<td>Tahoe Area Coordinating Council for the Disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEA-21</td>
<td>Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>Transportation Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMPO</td>
<td>Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNT-TMA</td>
<td>Truckee North Tahoe Transportation Management Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRPA</td>
<td>Tahoe Regional Planning Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTC</td>
<td>Tahoe Transportation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTD</td>
<td>Tahoe Transportation District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

This document is the Public Participation Plan for the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO). The TMPO is the transportation planning agency for the Tahoe Basin, as designated by the federal government, and its goal is to provide for regional mobility. The TMPO is required to have a Continuing, Comprehensive, and Coordinated transportation planning process that considers all transportation modes, provides a forum for public input, and supports social and economic goals. The 3C process brings together transportation projects set forth by local agencies into one regional plan, prioritizes these projects and helps provide and locate funding for these projects.

Since the purpose of regional planning is to meet public mobility needs, a vital part of this planning effort is involvement of the public. Effectively involving different stakeholder groups in the regional transportation planning process is crucial for determining whether planned projects meet public needs, and for ensuring that public funds are directed to the areas of highest need. A clear planning process that facilitates a high level of public participation ensures well-prepared planning documents, which can then line the region up for funding and other opportunities.

Important considerations affecting participation of different groups are:
- Time, location, and accessibility of meetings
- Reaching people within their own communities and during existing meeting schedules
- Provision of food, childcare, and translation at meetings
- Presentations focused to specific interests of group
- Placement of announcements and flyers using different types of media

The TMPO aims to create a plan that outlines effective methods for reaching the many different groups of people and stakeholders in the Lake Tahoe Basin. The draft plan outlines feedback received from the public, and incorporates this feedback into the public outreach process for TMPO documents. Readers of this document should be able to learn of the many opportunities for public input, and how and when these opportunities occur. The goal of this plan is to invite greater public input into transportation planning, to make members of the public aware of all opportunities for input, to make clearer the sometimes complex planning process, and to cultivate interest in transportation planning in the Lake Tahoe Basin.
The TJPO is an advisory body to the TMPO. The core membership of the TTC is the board of the Tahoe Transportation District, created by the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact (Public Law 96-551) to own and operate intra-regional and inter-regional transportation services and facilities. The TTC and TTD boards share a membership that includes local jurisdictions, California and Nevada Departments of Transportation (non-voting), the US Forest Service, Transportation Management Associations, and an at-large position. In addition, the TTC includes a representative of the TRPA Advisory Planning Commission and a member of the Washoe Tribe.

The TMPO is charged with implementing a “continuing, comprehensive and cooperative transportation planning process among states and local communities.” By federal law, the TMPO is required to produce several documents, including a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), an Overall Work Program (OWP), a Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan (CHSP) and a Public Participation Plan (PPP). With the passing of California Senate Bill 375, California MPOs are now required to produce a “Sustainable Communities Strategy” (SCS) for reduction of greenhouse gasses as part of the Regional Transportation Plan.

Planning Factors
Federal regulations require that the MPO planning process provide for the consideration of projects and strategies that will:
• Support economic vitality of the area, especially enabling global competitiveness, productivity and efficiency;

• Increase the safety and security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users;

• Increase the accessibility and mobility options available to people and freight;

• Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation and improve quality of life;

• Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight;

• Promote efficient system management and operation; and

• Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system.

In addition, in accordance with both federal and state regulations, the MPO planning process shall:

• Include a proactive public involvement process;

• Be consistent with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964;

• Identify actions necessary to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990;

• Provide for the involvement of traffic, ridesharing, parking, transportation safety and enforcement agencies, commuter rail operators, airport and port authorities, appropriate private transportation providers, congestion management agencies, other transportation agencies and commissions, and, where appropriate, city officials;

• Provide for the involvement of local, state and federal environmental, resource and permit agencies as appropriate.
• Provide for the involvement of affordable housing advocates, transportation advocates, neighborhood and community groups, environmental advocates, home builder representatives, broad-based business organizations, landowners, commercial property interests, and homeowner associations;
Federal Requirements for Public Participation

The TMPO proactively strives to involve the public in identifying and addressing transportation issues, with the goal of creating a strong working relationship between the TMPO and its constituents. Several Federal laws and regulations guide the TMPO in involving the public in its activities. They include:

- **Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU)**
  SAFETEA-LU states that the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), in consultation with interested parties, shall develop and use a documented participation plan that defines a process for providing citizens, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation, representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties with reasonable opportunities to be involved in the metropolitan transportation planning process.

  SAFETEA-LU also requires that a minimum public comment period of 45 calendar days shall be provided before the initial or revised participation plan is adopted by the MPO.

- **Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964**
  Title VI states that, “No person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefit of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.” Title VI serves as the legal foundation for what is today referred to as environmental justice.

- **Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)**
  The American with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 encourages the participation of people with disabilities in the development and improvement of transportation and paratransit plans and services. In accordance with ADA guidelines, all meetings conducted by the MPO will take place at locations which are accessible to persons with mobility limitations.
• **Executive Order 12898 – Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations**
  Executive Order 12898 requires that disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority and low-income populations be identified and addressed in order to achieve environmental justice.

• **Executive Order 13175 - Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments**
  Executive Order 13175 was passed in order to establish regular and meaningful consultation and collaboration with tribal officials in the development of federal policies that have tribal implications, to strengthen the United States government-to-government relationships with Indian tribes, and to reduce the imposition of unfunded mandates upon Indian Tribes.

• **Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA)**
  The Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) of 1990 require the transportation community to improve air quality while sustaining adequate mobility for transportation users. CAAA and the transportation planning provisions of SAFETEA-LU (Section 6011 – Transportation Conformity) are intended to ensure that integrated transportation and air quality planning occurs among representatives of the MPOs, state and local air quality planning agencies, state and local transportation agencies, and other organizations in the areas designated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as non-attainment or maintenance areas.

• **National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)**
  The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 (as amended) outline requirements to carry out an environmental review process for implementing projects from a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). NEPA has its own set of public participation requirements for review period and notification of interested parties on a project basis.
State Requirements for Public Participation

The State of California is taking a pro-active approach to reducing greenhouse gas emissions. California has its own public participation requirements for MPOs in relation to legislation on greenhouse gas reductions.

- **Senate Bill 375 (SB-375),**
  Senate Bill 375 requires MPOs to adopt a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) and/or Alternative Planning Strategy (APS) as part of the regional transportation plan. Senate Bill 575 further clarified the role of the TRPA Regional Plan as the Lake Tahoe Region’s SCS. The SCS sets forth a forecasted development pattern for the region, which, when integrated with the transportation network will reduce greenhouse gas emissions from automobiles and light trucks to achieve greenhouse gas emission reduction targets approved by the state board. If greenhouse gas emission targets cannot be reached, then an APS shall be prepared. Each MPO shall adopt a public participation plan for development of the SCS or APS that includes:

  - Outreach efforts to encourage the active participation of a broad range of stakeholder groups in the planning process, including, but not limited to, affordable housing advocates, transportation advocates, neighborhood and community groups, environmental advocates, home builder representatives, broad-based business organizations, landowners, commercial property interest, and homeowner associations;
  - Consultation with congestion management agencies, transportation agencies, and transportation commissions;
  - Workshops throughout the region to provide the public with the information and tools necessary to provide a clear understanding of the issues and policy choices;
  - Preparation and circulation of a draft SCS not less than 55 days before adoption of a final regional transportation plan;
  - Public hearings on the draft SCS;
  - A process for enabling members of the public to provide a single request to receive notices, information and updates
TMPO Documents

The TMPO produces two major documents, the Regional Transportation Plan and the Transportation Improvement Program, that directly lead to the implementation of projects in the Lake Tahoe Basin. Smaller documents, such as the Public Participation Plan, Overall Work Program, and Coordinated Human Services Plan direct TMPO staff on how to create the RTP and TIP and identify priorities for work tasks and study areas. Public input is a vital component of each of these documents, and ultimately results in needed improvements to Lake Tahoe’s transportation system.

Regional Transportation Plan (23 CFR 450.322)
The major document that the TMPO produces is called the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The RTP addresses a 20-year planning horizon. Through this document, the TMPO brings together transportation projects set forth by different local agencies into one plan, prioritizes these projects and provides funding for them. The RTP includes both long-range and short-range strategies that lead to the development of an integrated multimodal transportation system to facilitate the safe and efficient movement of people and goods. By federal law, this Regional Transportation Plan is required to be fiscally constrained and meet air quality conformity standards and other state and federal requirements. The RTP is revised every four years as the Tahoe Region is in an air quality maintenance area. Regions that are not in air quality maintenance or non-attainment revise their RTPs every five years. In accordance with California Senate Bill 375, passed in September, 2008, RTPs must also include a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) that outlines how the region will meet greenhouse gas reduction targets.

Transportation Improvement Program (23 CFR 450.324)
The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is a four-year document that includes all capital and non-capital surface transportation projects within the boundaries of the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization that are either federally funded, regionally significant, or require a federal action. For a project to be included in the TIP, it must be in the RTP. High priority projects from the RTP are selected for inclusion into the TIP through the public process and a final decision by the TMPO board. For each project or project phase, the TIP includes a project description, estimated total project cost, amount of federal funds to be obligated, agencies responsible for carrying out the project or phase, and other project details. The TIP also includes a financial plan that demonstrates how the approved TIP can be implemented and recommends additional financing strategies for needed projects and programs. Only projects with assured or reasonably expected funding may be included in the TIP.
Overall Work Program (23 CFR 450.308)
The Overall Work Program (OWP) is a statement of work produced annually by the TMPO that identifies the planning priorities and activities to be carried out within the metropolitan planning area. The OWP includes a description of the planning work and resulting products, who will perform the work, time frames for completing the work, and the source of funds.

Public Participation Plan (23 CFR 450.316)
The Public Participation Plan (PPP) is a document that defines a process for providing citizens, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation, representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties with reasonable opportunities to be involved in the metropolitan transportation planning process.

Coordinated Human Services Transit Plan
The Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan (CHSP) is a strategy for public transportation service delivery that identifies the transportation needs of individuals with disabilities, older adults, and individuals with limited income. The plan lays out strategies for meeting these needs and prioritizing services. All transit planning processes in the Basin should refer to the CHSP.

Special Planning Studies
The TMPO undertakes special planning studies that are listed in the OWP, for specific, large-scale projects such as a new transportation system or re-configuration of a downtown street layout. The studies identify feasibility of the project, impacts and benefits, and different alternatives. The public is asked to comment and be involved in the planning process for these studies.
Development of the Public Participation Plan

The development of this Public Participation Plan consisted of four major outreach components, intended to give the public a variety of mediums for providing input. These included a series of public workshops, a survey, targeted outreach to specific stakeholder groups, and follow-up phone calls to cooperating agencies that did not participate in any of the first three activities.

The goals of these outreach activities were:

- To learn from the public how they wish to be contacted and how they want to participate in the planning process;
- To generate interest in the transportation planning process;
- To educate the public on planning activities.

To generate interest and attract more participation, the public participation discussion and outreach was combined with initial outreach for the Regional Transportation Plan. Two “Transportation Roundtables” were conducted and an on-line survey was advertised along with the Roundtable announcements. A letter and a copy of the survey were sent to a list of approximately 500 individuals and agencies. The list included representatives from local, state, and federal government, natural and environmental resource agencies, churches, lodging associations, representatives of different transportation user groups, and participants in the Place-Based planning process. Notices were sent primarily through e-mail; however those without e-mails or those who were considered more effectively reached through mail were sent paper letters and surveys, along with pre-paid return envelopes. For a complete list of all groups contacted, see Appendix A. Additional outreach was carried out through newspaper ads in English and Spanish newspapers, press releases, flyers in English and in Spanish, and web advertisements.

Transportation Roundtables

Two transportation roundtables, one on the North Shore of Lake Tahoe and one on the South Shore of Lake Tahoe, were conducted in March 2008. Spanish translation and food were provided and advertised. Roundtable agendas included:

- Demographic and traffic information
- Summary of proposed major RTP projects and policies
- Interactive activities on walkable communities
- Discussion on the best ways to reach the public and stakeholder groups
Surveys
A total of 273 surveys were completed between February 14 and March 19, 2008. This includes both paper and electronic responses. Near the end of the survey, respondents were asked to choose the transportation topics in which they were interested, and to provide their address if they wished to receive more information. In addition, at the close of the survey, respondents were directed to the TMPO website where there is a link for signing up for the TMPO mailing list.

Outreach to specific groups
There are several stakeholder groups that have unique input into the transportation planning process, but may be harder to reach than other groups. These include minority and low-income communities, second homeowners, and disabled and special needs. Minority, low-income, and special needs users in particular have high rates of transit ridership, walking and bicycling. Second homeowners are not always as frequent users of the transportation system, but they often have concerns that their voice is not heard in the planning process since they are frequently absent from the Basin during public meeting times.

In addition to the Roundtable and survey mailing, these groups were reached through phone calls to representatives, and announcements and/or discussion at regularly scheduled meetings. For a detailed account of these communications, please see Appendix B.

Results
The surveys and Roundtable discussions showed that e-mail was the preferred method for receiving information about public input opportunities, followed by community meetings and presentations to community groups. Newspaper and Website were also popular ways of learning of opportunities.

Other methods mentioned at the Roundtables and on the surveys were:
- Flyers at transit shelters and in the buses, with tear-off tags to take home
- School newsletters, which are often translated into Spanish
- MySpace, Facebook, and other on-line communities
- Newspaper “What’s Happening” calendar
Suggestions from specific groups were:

*Latino community:*
  - Provide information at existing classes, meetings, and congregations such as churches
  - Have representatives of the Latino community give the presentations themselves
  - Provide food, childcare, translation at meetings
  - Go door-to-door with flyers announcing meetings
  - Announce meetings on “Radio Azteca”
  - Print announcements in local Spanish newspapers
  - Distribute notices in Spanish through the school district

*Disabled and Special Needs:*
  - Ensure that meetings are held at times and locations that are accessible by paratransit
  - Mail surveys to social service representatives

*Second Homeowners:*
  - Create mailing list from County Assessor Parcel database
  - Post web banners on websites with weather and ski report information
  - Request that local organizations such as non-profits and homeowner associations include information in newsletters and e-mail broadcasts to their membership
  - Consult with Fire Safe Councils--they have been successful in reaching the second homeowners

For complete set of survey results, see Appendix D.

*Follow-Up Contact*
Calls and/or personal e-mails were placed to several public agencies with whom the TMPO collaborates and who did not respond to the survey or attend the Transportation Roundtables:

- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- Nevada Division of Environmental Protection
- Washoe Tribe
- Tahoe City Public Utility District
- South Tahoe Public Utility District
- North Tahoe Public Utility District

A summary of the input received from these calls and e-mails is included in Appendix B.
Implementation of Public Participation Input

There were many new suggestions that came out of the Public Participation process. The TMPO selected those that staff feels can garner the most input from a diverse set of stakeholder groups, taking into consideration staff and resource limitations. The process itself, and future processes like it, will help to build the TMPO’s mailing list, so that over time it may reach an ever wider audience during transportation planning activities.

At a minimum, public meetings and opportunities for public comment for all TMPO documents will be advertised and carried out in the following ways:

- E-mail and mailing to those on the mailing list.
- Announcements will be targeted based on interests indicated when signing up.
- Summaries of documents will be translated into Spanish where appropriate.
- Legal notices of comment periods will be printed in newspapers of local circulation, and mailed to U.S. post offices and libraries, and transit operators for posting on buses and shelters.
- Public notice of workshops will be provided at least 7 days in advance.
- Depending on the scale and focus of the document, specific stakeholder groups may be addressed at their regularly scheduled meetings, or specialized meetings to gain their input may be held.
- Input will be sought at regularly scheduled meetings of transportation entities around the Basin as appropriate, as listed in the “Ongoing Public Participation Forums” section of this document.
- Public meetings will be held at locations and times accessible by transit and paratransit, to the extent feasible.
- Public meetings for document input will set aside time specifically for hearing from the public, and will offer comment cards for those who do not wish to speak.
- Draft documents for review will be posted on the TMPO website, made available at the TMPO/TRPA front counter and available by e-mail or hard copy upon request. A small fee may be assessed for provision of hard copies.
- Techniques that help the public to better conceptualize and understand information will be used. This includes the use of large-format graphs, pictures and diagrams and maps in both documents and public workshops, and brainstorming techniques at public workshops.
- Through the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) and Tahoe Transportation Commission (TTD), the TMPO will consult with agencies and officials responsible for other planning activities within the Tahoe area that are
affected by transportation. Interactive workshops at TTC meetings will provide for due consideration of other related planning activities in the area.

Other methods that may be used:

- Flyers posted at restaurants, cafes, ski resorts, Laundromats and other community locations
- Hold brief workshops or comment sessions on transit
- Providing food, childcare and translation at meetings

For public input plans specific to each document, see Appendix C.

**Evaluation and Update of the Public Participation Plan**

Constituents and technology are constantly changing, so the Public Participation Plan must be updated periodically to reflect those needs. The Public Participation Plan will be updated every five years. An outreach effort based on the feedback from the previous plan will be implemented and could include surveys, public meetings, announcements at existing venues, and other outreach methods cited in this plan. At a minimum, the TMPO should seek to obtain feedback from at least two representatives of each stakeholder group, and in some cases many more. Additional feedback should be solicited through brief evaluation forms handed out at the end of public workshops and attached to surveys.

**Ongoing Public Participation Forums**

While each TMPO document has its own specific public participation process, there are also ongoing public forums that TMPO staff participates in and through which the TMPO has frequent opportunity to hear from and interact with the public. These opportunities provide timely information about transportation issues and decision-making processes to citizens and other affected and interested parties. Each group or board that meets is listed in the table below.

Also, from 2003 to 2008, a series of intensive workshops related to the update of 20-year planning documents in the region has been taking place. These workshops are called the Regional Planning Process and the Place-Based Planning Process. The process solicits information from stakeholder groups on what environmental, social, and economic standards should be set, and how these standards should be attained. The Place-Based Process invites the members of the public from different locations around the Lake to share their vision of the community. Both of these processes have identified major considerations related to transportation that will be incorporated into the TMPO Regional Transportation Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Forum</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Included Parties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Coordinated Transit System Management Company (CTS-MCO), also known as the BlueGO Board | The CTS-MCO board combines the existing transportation resources of public and private entities to provide more effective and cost-efficient services to both residents and visitors. The board meets the first Friday of every month. | Board members  
- TTD  
- TRPA  
- South Shore jurisdictions  
- South Shore casinos  
- Heavenly Ski Resort  
Invited parties  
- Public transportation employees |
| Resort Triangle Transportation Planning Coalition (RTTPC) | A multi-agency coalition whose function is to coordinate, plan, program, monitor and implement capital and operational projects in the North Lake Tahoe-Truckee “Resort Triangle”. | Member (MOU) Organizations  
- Placer County  
- Placer County Transportation Planning Organization  
- Town of Truckee  
- Nevada County Transportation Commission  
- Tahoe Regional Planning Agency  
Technical Advisory Group  
- Includes jurisdictions, North Lake Tahoe Resort Association, TNT-TMA, Northstar Community Services District, and Caltrans |
| South Shore Transportation Management Association (SSTMA) | The SSTMA is a non-profit community forum advocating transportation and mobility solutions. It meets the first Friday of every month. | - Community organizations, businesses and public agencies |
| Tahoe Area Coordinating Council for the Disabled (TACCD) | The TACCD addresses the needs of disabled persons through promoting advocacy, accessibility, senior housing, transportation, including bike paths, and other programs. Meets every fourth Monday. | Member Organizations  
- State and local social service agencies  
- Local transit providers  
- Local jurisdictions  
- Employment agencies |
| **Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO)** | The TMPO is the regional transportation planning entity for the Lake Tahoe Basin. The TMPO meets the fourth Wednesday of each month. | **Board members**  
- Elected officials of local jurisdictions;  
- State appointees;  
- Federal appointees;  
- US Forest Service  
**Invited parties**  
- General public |
| **Tahoe Transportation Commission (TTC)** | The TTC serves as a planning advisory body to the TMPO. The goal of the TTC is to link land-use planning issues with transportation. The TTC meets the second Friday of every month, after the TTD meeting. | **Board members**  
- Local jurisdictions, including the Washoe Tribe  
- California Dept. of Transportation  
- Nevada Dept. of Transportation  
- US Forest Service  
- Transportation Management Associations  
- At-large position  
- Representative from TRPA APC  
**Invited parties**  
- General public |
| **Tahoe Transportation District (TTD)** | The TTD was created through Article IX of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, Public Law 96-551. The TTD may own and operate public transportation systems and facilities, generate revenue, and provide inter- and intra-regional transportation service. The TTD meets the second Friday of every month. | **Board members**  
- Local jurisdictions  
- California Dept. of Transportation  
- Nevada Dept. of Transportation  
- At-large position  
**Invited parties**  
- Public transportation providers  
- General public |
| **Truckee North Tahoe Transportation Management Association (TNT-TMA)** | The Truckee North Tahoe Transportation Management Association is dedicated to fostering public-private partnerships and resources for the advocacy and promotion of innovative solutions to the unique transportation challenges of the Truckee-North Lake Tahoe Resort Triangle. It meets the first Thursday of every month. | **Board members**  
North Lake Tahoe Resort Association  
Town of Truckee  
Ski Resorts  
Other elected & appointed members |
|---|---|---|
| **Unmet Transit Needs** | Annual meeting held by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency to determine unmet transit needs. This is a California state requirement only, but unmet transit needs are ascertained for both the California and Nevada sides of the Lake. | **Invited parties**  
Users of public transportation |
| **Update of Bike and Pedestrian Master Plan project list** | Occurs every five years with the update of the Regional Transportation Plan. | **Invited parties**  
Local jurisdictions and planning entities  
Bicycle advocacy groups  
Users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities |
| **E-mail list** | Individuals can sign up by going to: [www.trpa.org](http://www.trpa.org) under “Transportation Planning” | The TMPO keeps an e-mail address list of all interested parties to notify them of opportunities for public input on TMPO documents. |
| **Mail, phone, fax** | Comments may be directed at any time to the transportation staff at the TMPO by contacting:  
Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization  
PO Box 5310  
Stateline, NV 89449  
Ph. 775-588-4547  
Fax 775-588-4527 |  |
**Requesting Notice and Information**

Members of the public may provide a single request to receive notices, information, and updates, by calling the Transportation offices of the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization at 775-588-4547, or by visiting the TMPO website, at [http://www.tahoempo.org](http://www.tahoempo.org) and clicking on the “sign-up” button.

**Integration with other Planning Agencies**

In developing the RTP and the TIP, the TMPO works very closely with other agencies responsible for planning activities within the Tahoe Area. Since the TMPO shares its board and staff with the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, there is a close linkage between local planning, environmental protection, and the transportation planning that goes into the RTP. In fact, much of the background planning that forms the basis of the 2008 RTP was gathered through the Basin-wide planning process called PATHWAY. This process combined the long-term planning efforts of four Basin agencies, including the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, the US Forest Service-Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection.

SAFETEA-LU also specifies that the planning process for both the RTP and the TIP shall include several specific groups.

I. Recipients of assistance under Title 49 USC Chapter 53 (Public Transit Capital and Operating Assistance). The groups that receive assistance under this Chapter are the same as those entities that serve on the Tahoe Transportation Commission (TTC) and Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization board, who are already involved in the public planning process.

II. Governmental agencies and non-profits that receive Federal assistance from a source other than the US Department of Transportation to provide non-emergency transportation services. The groups that receive Federal assistance for non-emergency transportation services from sources other than the US Department of Transportation are the same as those entities that serve on the Tahoe Transportation Commission (TTC) and Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization board, and are involved in the TMPO public planning process.
III. Recipients of assistance under 23 USC 204 (Federal Public Lands Highways grants). Recipients of Federal Public Lands Highways are the same as those entities that serve on the Tahoe Transportation Commission (TTC) and Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization board, and are involved in the TMPO public planning process.

IV. Indian Tribal governments. The Tahoe Metropolitan Area includes one Indian Tribal Government, the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California. The Washoe Tribe is integral in major planning activities, and was active in the PATHWAY process which set the stage for the transportation strategies to be proposed in the 2008 RTP. During the public workshops and comment period for the RTP and TIP, special care will be taken to contact the Washoe Tribe and invite them to workshops and to comment on the documents.

V. Federal land management agencies. Federal public lands in the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning area include US Forest Service lands. The Forest Service is a member of both the TMPO and the TTD, and so will be directly engaged in the development of the RTP and TIP. As mentioned above, the Forest Service was also a major participant in the PATHWAY process.
Timeline

The timeline for development and approval of the Public Participation Plan is as follows:

Announcement of Transportation Roundtables and Survey Released  February 14, 2008
Transportation Roundtables  March 11 – 12, 2008
Latino Community Outreach  March and April, 2008
Opening of Public Comment Period  March 24, 2008
Closing of Public Comment Period  May 7, 2008
TTC Recommendation to TMPO for Adoption of PPP  May 9, 2008
Approval of PPP at Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting  May 21, 2008
Appendix A -- Stakeholder Groups Contacted

Local Government
State Government
Federal Government
Natural and Environmental Resource Agencies
Economic Development Organizations
Churches
Lodging Associations
Homeowner Associations
Neighboring Region MPOs and COGs
Representatives of the Disabled
Social Service Agencies
The Washoe Tribe of California and Nevada
Representatives of Users of Public Transportation
Representatives of Public Transportation Employees
Representatives of Users of Pedestrian Walkways and Bicycle Transportation Facilities
Providers of Freight Transportation
Freight Shippers
Private Providers of Transportation
Transportation Management Associations
Chambers of Commerce and other local business organizations
Tourism Organizations
Citizens
Non-Governmental Organizations
Participants in the Place-Based Planning Process
Appendix B -- Outcomes of Outreach Activities

Each public forum or individual contact yielded specific suggestions for effective public participation.

North Shore Transportation Roundtable
- Distribute info to schools, and they will translate into Spanish and distribute in their newsletters.
- Papers—list the event more often than just once. One way to do this is to get the activity listed in the calendar of events.
- Advertise in transit shelters, and on buses. Make tear-off tabs on the flyers so people can take info home.
- Advertise that we will have Spanish translation at events.
- Send to the Parasol Foundation, who can forward to their list of non-profits.
- Send to ski areas, which have lots of bus users.
- Need to get the Latino community to the meetings.
- E-mail to the Place-Based list.

South Shore Transportation Roundtable
- High School kids at the workshop suggested MySpace, Facebook, and other on-line communities. They suggested that a kid design the page.
- Flyers at schools and colleges, music stores (Mad About Music), restaurants and cafes (Sprouts).

Latino Affairs Commission of City of South Lake Tahoe
- Contact churches: Iglesia de Cristo Verbo de DIOS, St. Theresa’s Catholic Church, Lake Tahoe Christian Fellowship. Flyers, make announcements there.
- Flyers, talk to people in person.
- Flyers at the two Mexican grocery stores and Mexican restaurants in South Lake Tahoe.
- Put a notice in Hispano de Tahoe (free newspaper delivered to all Latino households).
- Radio—AM, Radio Azteca. Hector Vazques—Sundays 4 – 12 (pm?).
- Notices through the School District.

Delicia Spees, South Tahoe Family Resource Center:
The main concern of the Latino community in South Lake Tahoe is sidewalks right on Pioneer Trail.
From Place-Based Meetings:
- Better web interface for reviewing documents. TRPA web is hard to use.

Tahoe Area Coordinating Council for the Disabled
- Mail them announcements
- Hold meetings in locations that are accessible for the disabled by transit. Be especially sensitive that flex routes end at 7 pm.

Jill Sarick Santos (former community member--South Shore; e-mail interview regarding outreach to Latino Community)
- Outreach to: Casinos, Ski Resorts, Family Resource Center, Churches, and the ESL program through LTCC (Specific contacts provided)
- Host a workshop with a native speaker or at least, someone fluent in Spanish to present the ideas for transportation.
- HAVE FOOD.
- Talk with them face to face.
- Child care for that meeting.
- Pay translators and facilitators.

Emilio Vaca (translator—North Shore; e-mailed regarding outreach to Latino Community)
- Go door to door with flyers.
- Hold specific, separate meeting with Latino Community

Kim Carr (second homeowner)
- Pull addresses out of Assessor Parcel database
- Announce through existing membership groups
- Connect with Fire Safe Councils—they have done successful outreach to second homeowners

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
E-mailed twice and called, did not respond.
Nevada Division of Environmental Protection
Preferred method of receiving and giving information is e-mail.

Washoe Tribe
Preferred methods for learning about public input opportunities are phone, e-mail, presentations to community groups and community meetings. Preferred methods for providing input are e-mail, mail and community meetings. They suggested a community meeting format that was a small group with community leaders and experts. Requested that the Washoe Tribe is treated like any other government (state or county) and is at the table.

South Tahoe Public Utility District
E-mail works fine. Make sure to include General Manager and Assistant General Manager in all e-mails with opportunities for commenting on transportation-related documents.

Tahoe City Public Utility District
E-mail is the preferred method for learning about opportunities and providing public input. Suggested holding open house workshops spanning workdays into evenings.

North Tahoe Public Utility District
E-mail, website, and structured presentations to community groups are the best ways to convey information.

Carson Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
E-mail is a fine way to distribute information to them.

The Tahoe Foundation™
The Tahoe Foundation provided extensive comments on the PPP draft, and offered to host community Planning Forums at the Sierra Nevada College specific to transportation and its relationship to architecture and planning.
Appendix C -- Public Involvement Procedures Specific to TMPO Documents

Each TMPO document has a public participation process associated with it. In addition to those public input methods outlined in the “Implementation of Public Participation Input” section, the following sections give specific details on public noticing procedures, information dissemination, use of the World Wide Web, and other ways that the public is involved in the development of each document.

Regional Transportation Plan (including SCS/APS development)

Public Input Opportunities

- Public workshops. At least one workshop shall be held in each county in the region for development of the SCS and RTP. The workshops will be held in central locations that are ADA accessible and accessible by transit and paratransit to the extent feasible. Workshops targeted to the Latino community will be held separately. Each workshop, to the extent practicable, shall include urban simulation computer modeling to create visual representations of the sustainable communities strategy.

- Public review of Draft RTP. There will be a minimum 30-day public comment period on the draft RTP. The Draft RTP, including the SCS, shall be circulated not less than 55 days before adoption of a final RTP. Public comment will be accepted through e-mail, written mail, and fax. If the final RTP differs significantly from the draft made available for public comment, an additional 10-day public comment period will be added for review. There will be a minimum of two public hearings on the draft sustainable communities strategy in the regional transportation plan. To the maximum extent feasible, the hearings shall be in different parts of the region.

- Amendments and Administrative Modifications. RTP amendments that trigger a conformity analysis will require a 30-day public review period. Amendments or modifications which do not trigger a conformity analysis will require a 7-day public review period.

Incorporation of Public Comments

The TMPO will incorporate public comments into the RTP during a two-month period following the close of public comment. Comments and an explanation of how they were addressed will be summarized and posted in a separate document on the TMPO website. If the final RTP differs significantly from the draft made available for public comment, an additional 10-day public comment period will be added for review.
Transportation Improvement Program

Public Input Opportunities

- Public input for the development of the TIP will be held through TTC meetings. All interested parties will be provided with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the TIP and the TMPO will provide at least one formal public meeting during the TIP development process to solicit public input. The meetings will be held in central locations that are ADA accessible, during the regularly scheduled Friday morning meetings of the TTD and TTC.

- Public review of Draft TIP. There will be a minimum 30-day public comment period on the draft TIP. Public comment will be accepted at regularly scheduled TTC meetings and through e-mail, written mail, and fax. If the final TIP differs significantly from the draft made available for public comment, an additional 10-day public comment period will be added for review. The Final TIP will be presented to the TMPO Governing Board for formal adoption.

- Approved Administrative Modifications to the TIP will be available to the public via the TMPO website. Hard copies of the amendment will be available upon request.

- TIP Amendments will be presented at the TTC for review and comment. There will be a minimum 7-day or maximum 30-day public review period depending on the type of amendment. All comments will be assessed and documented. Amendments will be presented to the TMPO Governing Board for final adoption. Amendments will be noticed and available on the TMPO website.

  Amendment Types:
  - Amendments requiring a **New** Air Quality Conformity Analysis: 30-day public review and comment period
  - Amendments that rely on the **Existing** Air Quality Conformity Analysis: 7-day public review and comment period
  - Amendment containing only **Exempt** projects requiring no additional Air Quality Conformity Determination: 7-day public review and comment period

I Incorporation of Public Comments

The TMPO will incorporate public comments into the TIP during a two-month period following the close of public comment. All comments and an explanation of how they were addressed will be listed as an appendix to the TIP, which may be posted separately on the TMPO website. If the final TIP differs significantly from the draft made available for public comment, an additional 10-day public comment period will be added for review.
**Overall Work Program**

**Public Input Opportunities**
- Public input on the development of the OWP will be accepted at regularly scheduled TTC meetings. The meetings will be held in central locations that are ADA accessible, at the regular Friday morning TTD/TTC meeting time.
- Public review of Draft OWP. There will be a minimum 30-day public comment period on the draft OWP. Public comment will be accepted at a TMPO meeting and through e-mail, written mail, and fax.

**Incorporation of Public Comments**
The TMPO will incorporate public comments into the OWP during a two-week period following the close of public comment.

**Public Participation Plan (PPP)**

**Public Input Opportunities**
- Public workshops. Public workshops will be held in combination with other transportation planning workshops. The workshops will be held in central locations that are ADA accessible and accessible by transit and paratransit to the extent feasible.
- Public review of Draft PPP. There will be a 45-day public comment period on the draft PPP. Public comment will be accepted through e-mail, written mail, and fax.

**Incorporation of Public Comments**
The TMPO will incorporate public comments into the PPP during a two-week period following the close of public comment. An appendix will summarize public comments and how they were addressed.

**Periodic Review of Public Participation Plan**
Every five years, with adoption of the RTP, the TTC and TMPO will conduct a review of the Public Participation Plan to ensure effectiveness of procedures and to ensure a full and open participation process.

**Coordinated Human Services Plan (CHSP)**

**Public Input Opportunities**
- Public workshops. Public workshops for development of the Coordinated Plan will be held through TTD/TTC meetings. The workshops will be held in central locations that are ADA accessible, during the regularly scheduled Friday morning meetings of the TTD/TTC.
• Public review of Draft Coordinated Human Services Plan (CHSP). There will be a minimum 30-day public comment period on the draft CHSP. Public comment will be accepted at a TTD meeting, Tahoe Area Coordinated Council for the Disabled meeting and through e-mail, written mail, and fax.
• Unmet Transit Needs Hearings are held bi-annually. One will be held on the North Shore of Lake Tahoe and held in conjunction with Placer County and the other on South Shore. The hearings will be held in central locations that are ADA accessible and at times accessible by transit and paratransit.

Special Planning Studies
Public Input Opportunities
• Depending upon the scale of the project, public workshops are often held to inform the public and receive feedback on project alternatives. The workshops are held in central locations that are ADA accessible, usually in the evening or at a time convenient for affected groups.
• Public review of draft studies. There is a minimum 30-day public comment period on draft studies. Public comment is accepted orally at workshops, through e-mail, written mail, and fax.

Incorporation of Public Comments
The TMPO incorporates public comments into the study drafts following the close of public comment. Summaries of comments received and how they were addressed are posted on the TMPO website.
## Appendix D – Summary of Public Comment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Provided by</th>
<th>Comment received</th>
<th>Page number or section in final version</th>
<th>How this comment was addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Draft</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/7/2007</td>
<td>David Kelly, TAACD</td>
<td>Add that the TACCD promotes senior housing and bike paths</td>
<td>p 17</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/19/2007</td>
<td>John Greenhut, City of South Lake Tahoe</td>
<td>I would suggest that you provide a definition section for the funding sources so that the casual reader knows what the acronyms mean, where the funds are derived, and how they can be spent.</td>
<td>p 20</td>
<td>Funding source references were expanded slightly to explain what they can be used for. Decided not to devote more of the PPP to funding guidelines--this is not the purpose of this document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second Draft</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/28/2008</td>
<td>Steve Teshara, At-Large Member, Board of Directors, Tahoe Transportation District/Tahoe Transportation Commission; Chair, Truckee-North Tahoe Transportation Management Association; Chair, South Shore Transportation Management Association</td>
<td>Please note that the correct name for the Truckee North Tahoe TMA is: Truckee-North Tahoe Transportation Management Association (not Transit)</td>
<td>p 4</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The core membership of the Tahoe Transportation Commission is the Board of the Tahoe Transportation District. You may wish to note this fact in paragraph two. Also note that the membership of the TTC includes the At-Large position (also on the TTD Board) and a representative of the TRPA Advisory Planning Commission (APC). The reference to the TMA’s should be that they are transportation management associations (not transit). Note that the California and Nevada DOT members of the TTD and TTC are ex-officio (non-voting).

It is my understanding that (as of FY-2007), development of a Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan is also a requirement of SAFETEA-LU. Accordingly, the CHSTP should be included in the list of documents required in paragraph three.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/28/2008</td>
<td>Steve Teshara</td>
<td>The core membership of the Tahoe Transportation Commission is the Board of the Tahoe Transportation District. You may wish to note this fact in paragraph two. Also note that the membership of the TTC includes the At-Large position (also on the TTD Board) and a representative of the TRPA Advisory Planning Commission (APC). The reference to the TMA’s should be that they are transportation management associations (not transit). Note that the California and Nevada DOT members of the TTD and TTC are ex-officio (non-voting).</td>
<td>p 6</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/28/2008</td>
<td>Steve Teshara</td>
<td>It is my understanding that (as of FY-2007), development of a Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan is also a requirement of SAFETEA-LU. Accordingly, the CHSTP should be included in the list of documents required in paragraph three.</td>
<td>p 6</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In reviewing the draft CHSTP (March 2008), the purpose appears broader than the current description on page 11. On page 4 of the draft CHSTP is the statement: "Transportation developed under a coordinated human public transportation plan could eventually unify all transportation services offered by public transit, private companies, non-profit and human services agencies." I am not clear if the CHSTP planning process must, by definition, be incorporated into the planning process for all other public transit services. It would be helpful if both the Public Participation Plan and the Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan were clear on this issue.  

**4/28/2008**  
Steve Teshara  

Added that all public transit planning processes should refer to the CHSP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/28/2008</td>
<td>Steve Teshara</td>
<td>Resort Triangle Transportation Planning Coalition (RTTPC). Please change the RTTPC description to read as shown below, and adjust the list of &quot;Included Parties&quot; (taken from the executed RTTPC MOU): A multi-agency coalition whose function is to coordinate, plan, program, monitor and implement capital and operational projects in the North Lake Tahoe-Truckee &quot;Resort Triangle.&quot; Included Parties: Member (MOU) Organizations: Placer County, Placer County Transportation Planning Organization, Town of Truckee, Nevada County Transportation Commission, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency. Note: RTTPC has a Technical Advisory Group (TAG) (listed members of TAG).</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/28/2008</td>
<td>Steve Teshara</td>
<td>Tahoe Transportation District. The description of this &quot;public forum&quot; should note that the TTD was specifically created in Article IX of the Compact (PL-96-551).</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Revised Notice</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/28/2008</td>
<td>Steve Teshara</td>
<td>You may also wish to note that Article IX was amended in 1997 by &quot;substantively identical enactments&quot; approved by California (Senate Bill 815) and Nevada (Senate Bill 24). The primary purposes of the amendments was to: 1) include private sector representation on the TTD Board; and 2) to expand TTD1s capabilities to include the authority to &quot;own and operate support facilities for public and private systems of transportation or facility owned by a county, city or special purpose district or any privately owned transportation system or facility within the region.&quot;</td>
<td>p 18</td>
<td>Not incorporated--PPP is not designed to provide this level of detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/28/2008</td>
<td>Steve Teshara</td>
<td>Adjustments to the summary list of Board members should be made, consistent with previous notations in this letter.</td>
<td>p 18</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/28/2008</td>
<td>Steve Teshara</td>
<td>On this and several other pages, reference is made to the PATHWAY 2007 planning process. I believe the correct current reference to this planning process is PATHWAY. The name no longer includes a reference to the year 2007.</td>
<td>p 19</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Author/Assignee</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/28/2008</td>
<td>Steve Teshara</td>
<td>For purposes of clarity, please reference the specific type of assistance provided under Title 49, USC Chapter 53 (page 19, # I); also, please reference the specific type of assistance provided under Title 23, USC Chapter 204 (page 20, # III). Note, these are the transit and highway titles, respectively.</td>
<td>p 20</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/28/2008</td>
<td>Steve Teshara</td>
<td>Please add the following Stakeholder Groups to the list of those contacted: Chambers of Commerce and other local business organizations, Tourism organizations, Transportation Management Associations</td>
<td>p 22--Appendix A</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7/2008</td>
<td>Wade Hobbs, FHWA CADO Planning Team</td>
<td>Concerning the discussion of the Federal Requirements for Public Participation on Page 8 of the PPP Document. In the first sentence of the first paragraph under the first bullet titled Safe, Accountable, Flexible… I recommend that the sentence be revised to read: “SAFETEA-LU states that the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), in consultation with interested parties, shall develop…”</td>
<td>p 8</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7/08</td>
<td>Wade Hobbs</td>
<td>Appendix C – The appendix title in the TOC and the title in the appendix are different. You may want to consider removing the word ‘plan’ from the title in the actual appendix to be consistent with the title in the TOC.</td>
<td>p 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art George, Tahoe</td>
<td>Please extend the comment period for both drafts of the Public Participation Plan as well as the Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan. There is not adequate time to get these drafts to the number of Washoe Tribal Members who are impacted by these issues. We would greatly appreciate your serious consideration of this request.</td>
<td>Added the word “Plan” to the Appendix C line of the Table of Contents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board Representative to the Washoe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7/08</td>
<td>Alexandra Profant, Founder/Director, The Tahoe Foundation ™</td>
<td>The name, &quot;Public Participation Plan&quot; is vague. Suggest changing to &quot;Public Opportunities to Participate in Transportation Planning in the Tahoe Basin MPO&quot;</td>
<td>While we agree that the name does not convey the full scope of the document, we feel that it is concise, and follows federal guidelines. We do refer to the plan as the &quot;Transportation Public Participation Plan&quot; whenever possible to clarify that this document relates to transportation planning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7/2008</td>
<td>Alexandra Profant</td>
<td>In the Introduction paragraph it would be helpful to outline how Public Opportunities to Participate in Transportation Planning in the Tahoe Basin MPO effects such things as land use/zoning, building allocations, and the ability to compete with other areas for money to fine tune or enhance existing service and/or change/add different service opportunities.</td>
<td>p 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7/2008</td>
<td>Alexandra Profant</td>
<td>Also, to acknowledge the complexity in the unique planning process.</td>
<td>p 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7/2008</td>
<td>Alexandra Profant</td>
<td>There is no mention of the TTD in the Introduction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7/2008</td>
<td>Alexandra Profant</td>
<td>There is no definition section...to define the terms &quot;Planning&quot;, &quot;Transportation Planning&quot;, &quot;Implementation&quot;, &quot;Plans&quot;. It would be helpful to laypeople to define these concepts and how each apply to which certain outcomes. For instance RTP Plan---&gt; participation---&gt; Outcomes</td>
<td>p 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7/2008</td>
<td>Alexandra Profant</td>
<td>The TMPO will consider adding an organizational chart to its website, which will undergo an overhaul in the next year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Added to Introduction, second paragraph: &quot;A clear planning process that facilitates a high level of public participation ensures well-prepared planning documents, which can then line the region up for funding and other opportunities.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Added to Introduction, fourth paragraph, that one of the goals of this document is &quot;to make clearer the sometimes complex planning process&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is not appropriate to mention the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Added to introductory paragraph on this page: &quot;Public input is a vital component of each of these documents, and ultimately results in needed improvements to Lake Tahoe’s transportation system.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7/2008</td>
<td>Alexandra Profant</td>
<td>ADA. It would be helpful to point out that in Nevada a disabled person who can utilize paratransit has to be designated disabled by an MD.</td>
<td>This is not within the scope of this plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7/2008</td>
<td>Alexandra Profant</td>
<td>Appendix A: Stakeholders. I would like the Tahoe Foundation ™ to be mentioned, if not specifically, then in a separate APPENDIX with others who contact you.</td>
<td>Added &quot;Non-Governmental Organizations&quot; to Appendix A, added The Tahoe Foundation ™ to Appendix B and noted some of the communication from the comment letter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7/2008</td>
<td>Alexandra Profant</td>
<td>To include the names, addresses, and phone numbers to the offices we as constituents need to contact to further our participatory efforts is paramount to include in this plan.</td>
<td>Included TMPO address, phone, and fax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7/2008</td>
<td>Alexandra Profant</td>
<td>The public comment period to respond to this draft needs to be extended.</td>
<td>The 45-day comment period is longer than most comment periods on planning documents. Also, extensive solicitation of input into the public planning process began in mid-February.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E -- Survey Results
## Public Participation

### 1. What group/groups do you consider yourself to represent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public agency</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transportation Employee</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight shipper</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider of Freight Transportation Services</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Providers of Transportation</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User of Public Transportation</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicyclists and Pedestrians</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen/s (please skip to question #4)</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Answered question:** 270  
**Skipped question:** 3

### 2. Have you heard of the RTP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Answered question:** 235  
**Skipped question:** 3
### 3. If yes, have you ever commented on this in a meeting, on a website, or some other way?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question | 193
skipped question | 80

### 4. Would you be interested in learning about this plan and providing comments on it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question | 233
skipped question | 40

### 5. Have you ever heard of the FTIP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question | 215
skipped question | 58
6. If yes, have you ever commented on this in a meeting, on a website, or some other way?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 156

skipped question 117

7. Would you be interested in learning more about the FTIP and providing comments?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 204

skipped question 69
8. Through which methods would you be interested in learning about public participation opportunities for the RTP and/or FTIP? (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blog</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations to Service/Community Groups</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Meetings</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 203

skipped question 70
9. In what format would you prefer to provide comments on the RTP and FTIP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email</strong></td>
<td><strong>79.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>160</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blog</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations to Service/Community Groups</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Meetings</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 202

skipped question 71

10. What is the best time for you to attend a public meeting? (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekdays</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weeknights</strong></td>
<td><strong>70.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>134</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekends</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 189

skipped question 84
11. If you were to attend a community meeting, would you like to see any of the following features or formats?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open House</td>
<td>85.5% (118)</td>
<td>14.5% (20)</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured Presentation with Community Discussion</td>
<td>97.3% (180)</td>
<td>2.7% (5)</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Group Discussion</td>
<td>81.5% (106)</td>
<td>18.5% (24)</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>33.3% (7)</td>
<td>66.7% (14)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please specify.

12. What topics are you most interested in receiving information about? (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional and Local Transportation</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike and Pedestrian Paths and/or Facilities</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods to reduce driving, including rideshare programs</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Issues - Air Quality and Global Warming</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Funding and Programming</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection between Transportation and Land Use</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify)

Answered question: 83

Skipped question: 190
### 13. What is your primary method of travel to work, school, etc.?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combo of 2 or more</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*answered question 190*

*skipped question 83*
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SURVEY – OPEN ENDED RESPONSES

What group/groups do you consider yourself to represent?

AAA
Action Watersports of Tahoe
Alta Alpina Cycling Club
Alta Alpina Cycling Club
Alta Regional Center
bijou school, barton hospital
CA State Parks
California Department of Rehabilitation
California Tahoe Conservancy
Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority
Chart House
Choices for Children
Choices Transitional Servicers
City of South Lake Tahoe -- Fire Department
City of South Lake Tahoe Ice Arena
Consolidated Municipality of Carson City
Design Workshop
DLF GLOBAL
Douglas County
El Camino Trailways
El Dorado County
El Dorado County Air Quality Management District
El Dorado County Development Services Dept.
Embassy Suites Hotel
Fehr & Peers
Fireside lodge
Granlibakken
Great American Stage
h2d communications
Heavenly Resort
Horizon Casino-Resort - MontBleu Resort
Casino & Spa
Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition
Incline Village General Improvement District
Incline Village GID
Lahontan Water Board
Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition
Lake Tahoe bicycle coalition
Lake Tahoe Horizon Casino-Resort & MontBleu Casino Resort & Spa
Lake Tahoe Unified School District
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.
LTSS Chamber of Commerce
ltusd
ltusd
LTUSD
NDOT
Nevada Division of Environmental Protection
Nevada State Office of Energy
Nevada State Parks
North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District
Northstar Property Owners Association (NPOA)
Pearl Izumi
Placer County Transportation Planning Agency
Quality Technoloty
Self Employed Business Owner
Sierra at Tahoe Snowsports Resort
Sierra Community Church
South Tahoe Lodging, South Tahoe Tourism District
STHS
TACCD and NAMI S.L. Tahoe
Tahoe Area Regional Transit
Tahoe City Downtown Association
Tahoe City Public Utility District
Tahoe Mountain Sports
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Tahoe Tallac Association
Tahoe Valley Campground
TahoeRimTrailAssn/SierraFrontRecreationC coalition
tax payer and citizen
The Workforce Housing Association of Truckee-Tahoe
TKPOA
Town of Truckee
TTC
TTD & PCTPA
USDA Forest Service
USDA Forest Service
user of public transportation
W.R.A.P. (Walk, Ride and Pedal) Incline Village/Crystal Bay
Washoe County
Washoe County
Washoe County Regional Parks & Open Space
Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California
Through which methods would you be interested in learning about public participation opportunities/providing comments for the RTP and/or FTIP? (check all that apply)

- TACCD
- Flyers posted in key locations around town and at bus stops
- Pathway 2007 and LTFAC meetings
- Need easy access in an interactive way so I don't get too bored.
- Video Conference
- REQUIRE VALID ID FOR BLOG AND EMAIL, NAMES!
- Memorandum
- Surveys like this

Do you have any other suggestions for involving the public in local and regional transportation planning and programming?

### AREAS FOR PARKING

Ask people to make suggestions as to what they think should be done to improve transportation. I found that pathway 2007 meetings often didn't provide a place for people to make suggestions. I would go to meetings wanting to suggest something and found no place or time to do that.

Better public transport up and down Hwy 50. More regular routes, MODERN, natural gas buses with open space inside, and clean so guest will use. Much more frequency (every 15 minutes at standard stops) to get more ridership. Perhaps FREE service??? This is the method in Park City UT, Breckenridge, CO and others. Why can't we make our services free with govt subsidies for public transport?

Community Meetings are most effectual. Advanced noticing of at least 2 weeks and holding them in the evenings

Community meetings seem to be the best forum for obtaining community input, but varied times would be nice for people that work so that more people could attend. Also, providing transportation solutions for those who have difficulty getting to the meetings.

Continue to involve public and private sectors to plan and operate high quality, service oriented, and cost efficient public transit, that is sufficiently convenient and nice enough to compete with the private automobile — and that reduces road congestion and is more healthy for the environment.

### COOPERATION -- Less talk, more action

Educate the public on Dual-Mode Guideway System Capacity and State Evacuation Systems

Get the kids involved, they are going to need to make these changes

Hold specific meetings about cycling in- around the Tahoe Basin

Hold workshops/or brief comment sessions on transit (of all types) so you reach the transit user community. This has been good PR for us, and insight.

Interactive website

More bike and ped paths and connections

More publicity via the local media. If locals don't know about the meetings, they won't show up with their opinions and input. Surely, that's not a good idea.

Need to find ways to capture those who don't live in urban core areas. For example, Meyers residents. Most transit related focus has been on the more developed areas, so people in less developed areas may be less apt to pay attention.

need to involve/engage second home owners by creating more options for them to 'leave car at home' when they visit Lake... think bus, van, train, smart carpool/ridesharing... and then providing incentives for such behavior (think parking fees, free bus passes, free drink vouchers
at bars, dollar off coupons from merchants...let's reward those sacrifice the convenience of the car
Need to serve late hour employees and area visitors
Notices/questionnaires (English/Spanish) on buses and posted in bus stop shelters.
Please make sure the Washoe Tribe is treated like any other government (state or county) and is at the table.
Posters in stores, restaurants, ski resorts
Postings of meetings at public locations (such as the post office). Attach a loudspeaker to a car and visit the neighborhoods in the evening.
Provide food
Public education such as newspaper articles
Reach our visitor markets (Sacramento and Bay Area, Northern Nevada) in addition to local needs/concerns.
Sidewalks and bike paths/lanes have long been the facilities most requested by the community.
Some of the money TRPA is paid needs to go to the locals.
Study of Light Rail
survey tourists seasonally, survey residents and tourists about parking needs
use local groups to help educate and increase involvement in planning
We need to get the community excited about its design and meet their needs so it becomes something for them, not only for those who live outside the community (visitors, service workers, etc). We must make it fun, fast, frequent, friendly and for us all! It needs to be part of what we are most proud of here in the Basin and each community must have local transport that really works if we expect regional and intraregional transportation to be successful. Let's be remembered for our outstanding transportation system which is designed for and by those who want to use it, will use it and also those who don't know at this time how proud they will be of it and WILL want to use it because it works!

**What needs or gaps in service do you recognize for elderly, disabled or low income transit riders?**

1) Curb to curb public transit is sometimes impacted so heavily that our developmentally disabled consumers are unable to use it reliably for work. 2) Access to county is limited.
All gaps. Not enough frequency, terrible buses. Bad service overall.
BLUE GO is a horrible name for our bus service. It should be called something like "Public Bus". People don't even know that it's a public bus. Bus routes should be posted at bus stops. Bus stops should have shelter from the weather. Sidewalks to the bus stops should be plowed in winter. DUH!! Bus stops should have a place where the bus can pull out of the traffic lane so that the bus doesn't cause traffic jams when it stops to load or unload people.
Blue Go is simply not user friendly enough. Even getting to bus stops is very difficult in the winter.
Distance to bus stop. Snow removal. No sidewalks in winter. Pedestrians forced to battle the cars walking in the road. Get splashed with road slush. No service to Stateline/Meyers.
For low income workers, the housing to job distance, and lack of service external to Tahoe. For other user groups, there are probably unmet needs. Our service is minimal to Tahoe and unable to become any sort of gap to such needs.
Getting to Site locations and their accessibility
Increase in service hours would be helpful, as well as improvement of service connections in the Truckee area.
Irregular transportation hours. Needs to be more routine so the bus can be used at all hours.
Lack of regular public transit in South Lake Tahoe. Dangerous for cyclists and walkers on Hwy 50
| Lack of service after dark, especially in winter | Lack of service that goes all the way around the Lake | Lack of service to Reno and Carson City |
| Lack of timely transportation to and from work. | It currently takes too long to make connections between routes to easily get to work. | |
| lack of walkable community in the North Shore for able or disabled pedestrians | late hour employee transit | |
| Limited hours of service for Blue Go Door to Door outside the city limits. | Limited routes in the community and limited after hour service and horrendous maintenance of current transit busses | |
| need later door to door service for disabled public riders. | now the cut off time is 6PM for Blue Go. | |
| Night time service in El Dorado County. West slope links to Tahoe. | Reduced headways on fixed route service | |
| Nights year round: Lighting. | NO WALKWAYS -- do the Hwy 50 project, PLEASE. | |
| PARKING | poor or no sidewalks for walking, sierra house school gets very upset about walkers interfering with car traffic | |
| Possibly need more options for those outside of urban core areas. | I don't know enough about services to really identify gaps for these groups. | |
| public transit for the region | Return to Door-to-Door service and extend hours of operations. | |
| services are not equal to what these people receive in the other parts of Washoe County. | sidewalk snow removal. visually attractive transit vehicles. alternative fuels transit vehicles. | |
| TART provides absolutely no services in our community for senior, disabled or low income transit riders. | TART stops in the winter are not cleared well and streets in Kings Beach do not have sidewalks and are unsafe to walk to the TART stops. | |
| The best option for elderly or disabled is oftne special paratransit or taxi | The overall services could be improved. Clients have had many complaints over the years. | |
| There are many needs for tribal members, especially because so many are low income and can not afford to have a car. | There are many tribal members who work in Dresslerville but have trouble getting back to their homes in Carson City or Woodfords. Public transit to provide transportation to down-town areas may help more people enter the workforce. | |
| Too costly, lack of area coverage, no security and lack of cargo and wait times! | Twice daily transport to Reno for employment and/or shopping. | |
| Very poor transportation here at the Lake | We are a private sector charter company. We get many calls for service from Sacramento to Lake Tahoe. Since Greyhound canceled its service there are no transit or schedule buses to the region. We offer only day trips in to a casino. | |
| Karen: I can only help with knowledge we have that people wanted public transportation to Lake Tahoe have no options. If they can't drive a car, they can't get there. If the agency had a pick-up from Placerville in the AM and return in the PM, it might meet this need. | We could do the Tahoe Loop easy enough, we need an effective branch to our lesser covered routes. | |
| We need local transportation to be free to the riders and work out some other manner of funding to support it! | We need to get pedestrians and wheelchair-bound people off of highway 50 and onto sidewalks or busses. | |
What types of transportation would residents be likely or very likely to use that is not provided?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) sidewalks with street lights, maintained year round for pedestrian use, 2) park and ride lots for users of Amtrak and South Tahoe Express bus services, 3) park and pool lot in Meyers for outdoor enthusiasts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/2 hour buses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A boat transportation system to get people around the lake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a bus or two that circle the lake in a clockwise direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Bus to and from Meyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A light rail system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a more reliable bus system for locals and tourists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a variety of local choices that are frequent, free, and access according to need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air transportation into and out of the Lake Tahoe area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better bike lanes, an efficient bus or van system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better bus stops and sidewalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bicycle lanes would facilitate greatly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bicycle trail on West Shore (Homewood to South Lake Tahoe) and in Crystal Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle, if safe bike routes available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike if better paths/sidewalks are provided. I live 5 miles from work but won't ride because of winter-caused narrow roads and lack of paths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike if the bike lanes were better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike if there was a separate bike path.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bike path around lake public transit around the lake public transit to Reno and Carson City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike path network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike paths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bike paths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Paths and Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Routes, if there were more bike routes, residents would choose them over driving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bike trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikes, bikes bikes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikes, on a safe, well-planned, and integrated bicycle path system. Walking on snow-plowed pedestrian paths. Buses or light rail if it was convenient, timely, and inexpensive. Since this is my chance to comment, I would like to see the TMPO enforce that bicycle paths that are part of the Tahoe Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, be built out when NDOT and Caltrans do road improvement and water quality projects in the Tahoe Basin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikes, walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikes, with safe bike paths interconnecting all points; comprehensive coverage of public transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boat shuttle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boat transit. bus transit that is more frequent, on time and reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bus - nearest bus stop is 2/3 mile from my house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bus line to Meyers...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus services that run later in the evening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus, bike,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections from Kingsbury Express. Tahoe Youth and Family Services clients are users of public transportation regularly. The transportation barriers create barriers to receiving services and being consistent. Please come to the Lake Tahoe Collaborative, a meeting of human</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
services agencies each 2nd Monday at 1 pm at Al Tahoe.

consistent free or reduced cost shuttle services between visitor opportunities such as from Tahoe City to Squaw valley etc

Door-to-Door, Destination-to Destination

Dual-Mode Guideway Vehicles and Guideway Systems, because a six foot wide Guideway replaces twelve lanes of highway traffic! You save $110 Million dollars for every mile you implement!

efficient economic bus service to and from the reno airport from incline; current taxis and shuttles are too expensive

expand bus service/public trans to meyers and xmas valley

expanded bus service (more frequent service going later in the day). year-round clear bike paths for walking/biking

Expanded public transit -- higher frequency (in particular) and longer hours of service Cleared sidewalks and multiuse paths in winter

Free bus service on modern, natural gas buses.

Free or low cost buses

Free, consistent (timing) transit service

Free, frequent jitney or bus service to key points of interest.

Frequent dependable service.

frequent, free, and far reaching public transit, like buses or small vans

Getting people out of their cars is going to be extremely difficult in Lake Tahoe. This area is not built for public transportation.

home/destination pick-up (seniors/disabled), casino workers bus service, elevated light rail

hybrid buses

If sidewalks and bike lanes were kept clear in winter, more people would bike for longer portions of the year.

I’m not sure you want to exclude visitors

inexpensive bus scheduled for 8AM 5 PM an Casino shift change times

Just more frequent and organized service to places like Meyers.

late night employee transportation

Light rail down the center lane of Hwy 50

light rail?

modern buses that run on time and have more scheduled routes that INCLUDE the county...Tahoe Paradise, Myers, Christmas Valley

mono rail system along hwy 50

Monorail

Monorail

more bike paths all over the city, using bike paths for walking on east end of pioneer

More bike paths and bike lanes - if Truckee is included, especially along Glenshire Dr

More bus stop routes throughout the City

more busing, more bike lanes, more pedestrian access throughout Truckee

More complete bus service

More convenient, inexpensive local, small transit.

more fingers into the neighborhoods rather than just main roads. Also regular year round transportation over 267 between North Shore and Truckee

more frequent

More frequent bus schedule would help what is already in place

More frequent schedule of bus services. The span between the bus time schedule is not user friendly.

More frequent service, wider use of routes, more efficient buses, some network of continuous
service completely around the lake connecting on one route all communities and major recreation areas.

More frequent service; also, focus on providing more options to/from less urbanized areas. Need to provide more options during late night hours, perhaps with a focus on weekends, for those staying out late, including tourists. Many options I've heard of tend to end well before midnight. Bike lanes (Class 1) should be provided along every highway as possible. For example, when Caltrans did work along hwy 50 between Meyers to the Y, they could have added a bike lane off to the side, providing a safer option for bicycle travel than what currently exists. This would likely be used by many Meyers/Xmas Valley residents. This is just one example of where highway projects are done without using the opportunity to add bike lanes. Need emphasis on clearing paths for bikes/peds in the winter months.

**more frequent shuttles**

MORE MORE MORE. that's what is needed, more bus routes, availability, access etc. Cable cars, something cute

More regular bus service that goes into the evenings. Late night bus between N Shore/Truckee and vice versa. We need to get the ferry to happen. Transit has to be "cool" for visitors to use it and if it's regular enough for visitors then it will be more than sufficient for workers.

More ski shuttle stops along pioneer trail between ski run and highway 50

motorcycle, running, taxi

North Lake Tahoe - South Lake Tahoe  North Lake Tahoe - Reno  
North shore to Carson Valley or Reno

north to south and vice versa shuttles

Off Road Bike Trails  Buses on more frequent schedule

On occasion, I would use a bus or some coordinated carpooling from Stateline to Incline Village.

**Open-Ended Response**

Overhead Gondola from one end of town to the other

Programs similar to Citi Lift provided by the RTC in Reno and Sparks

public transit from Meyers to South Lake Tahoe scheduled to run on 15 or 30 minute intervals...

recreation based transit - buses equipped with bike racks, kayak carriers, etc. that circulate and stop at key beaches

regional public transit

regular cost effective services that provide easy access

Regular transport from North Shore to South Shore. Regular, clean, and cheap Hwy 50 transport. Regular transport from outside the basin to inside the basin to reduce traffic, emissions, and NPS pollution. Regular public transport to the Bay Area in a dreamworld.

Relative to other towns/cities/regions, there are no major new transportation options that residents are not being offered. The land use pattern of Tahoe does not provide cost effective options for residents, especially given changing demographics, and job to work locations.

Safe contiguous sidewalks of standard width with benches for resting and free of snow in the winter.

Safer means of walking and biking to work. Sidewalks and bike trails that are clear of snow and connect our communities more strategically. It is a crime that our most financially challenged members of our communities have to take their lives in to their hands every time they walk to work or walk to get groceries. Priorities should be identified for our neighborhoods that have the greatest need for pedestrian amenities based on income, proximity to transit stops, businesses and schools.

**Shuttle off pioneer blvd. Car pooling**

Shuttle to work and back. I'd use a train if one was available, but that seems like just a dream.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sidewalks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks for walking, bike lanes, short loop consistent and reliable small buses for residents and tourists, mass transportation from Reno and Sac for tourists etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sidewalks sidewalks sidewalks!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SIDEWALKS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sidewalks and cohesive and connected bike path system and bike lanes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks for walking on. Better bike trails. Better bus transportation to the neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sidewalks in entire city area....cleared in winter... and safe bike lane...with NO bikers on highway!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sidewalks, bike paths/lanes, low cost, efficient public transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since my home is located in the county not the city, it would be helpful for blue go to have home pick up in the county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ski lifts from parking in tahoe city to ski areas!!!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Some form of bus or train from Sacramento to Truckee, with wi-fi, safe, costing maybe 15 or 20 bucks and with free shuttle to Tahoe City plus positive incentives in form of coupons, vouchers, etc. or negative incentives in form of toll on private car (eg at Squaw Valley along river road)once they arrive at Lake. |
| Sr. Vans to Doc. Visits Door to door vans in County area Keep Blue Go expand to County area where there is no service out beyond Meyers |
| summer: electric open air cable/bus, similar to what is offered, additional routes and equipment |
| There is no transportation provided in the Keys. bus service from the business park at Venice and Keys Blvd or 15th street and 89 for instance might be frequently used. |
| there is only bus transit provided so there is not much of a choice. My clients would use bike lanes, sidewalks, crosswalks, pretty much anything that will SAFELY get them from point A to point B and none of those options exist in Kings Beach. |
| Train, Vanpool |
| transportation to work or school outside of regular business hours. |
| Ultimately, people will be using cars to get around. Developing bike trails, carpooling, buses, boat travel, etc., will not solve any of the issues because of the way people travel and recreate. I would be curious to know how many of the people involved with this effort actually utilize alternative transportation methods - I suspect a few do, but the vast majority do not, which says something. |
| Unless the Counties are willing to commit endless streams of dollars to public transit it will remain unreliable and unuseable. |
| water shuttle |
| water taxi more and better bike trails public transit focused on specific events |
| waterborne |

**Waterborne**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waterborne</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waterborne around the lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need an infrastructure that reflects our values as an environmentally aware community of outdoor enthusiasts. This means improved bicycle and pedestrian paths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well demarcated bike lines and sidewalks seem like a good place to start. It's incredible that we have folks walking down Hwy 50 or Pioneer with no sidewalks in the year 2008. It is very unsafe and arguably racist/classist for the working people in our community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What types of transportation would residents be likely or very likely to use that is not provided?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>year-round transportation that serves the entire basin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>