



Incline Village/Crystal Bay Citizen Advisory Board

Minutes of the regular meeting of the Incline Village/Crystal Bay Citizen Advisory Board held on February 23, 2026, at 5:30 P.M. Incline Village Library (845 Alder Ave. Incline Village, NV 89451)

1. CALL TO ORDER/ DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

PRESENT – A quorum was present consisting of: Chair Roxanna Dunn, Vice-Chair Diane Becker, Denise Davis, Kevin Lyons and Chris Wood. Alternates Mark Sasway and Jody Wright were also present but not voting.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The pledge of allegiance was recited

3. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

4. ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM COMMISSIONER HILL

Alexis Hill provided updates on several items. She reminded the group that the Reno Housing Authority will hold a board meeting tomorrow to consider pursuing the old elementary school affordable housing project. The board chair submitted a letter in support of the effort, and more information on next steps may be available after that meeting. She also noted that the Tahoe Transportation District (“TTD”) board will review the status of the old elementary school at its April board meeting. Hill confirmed in addition that an appointment to the Advisory Planning Commission position as a “Lay Representative” for Washoe County has been reopened and the Board of Commissioners has received nine applicants, which will be discussed at an upcoming board meeting. She also shared that staff have been working to improve snow removal on sidewalks in Incline Village, so they are cleared sooner and to prevent ice buildup. Early feedback indicates the situation has improved, and she invited additional comments or questions from the community.

Roxanna Dunn said she planned to attend the upcoming meeting to provide public comment on the old elementary school (OES) project, noting that she feels she is “flying blind” because she is not aware of what discussions or work may be happening behind the scenes. She also raised concerns about major potential hurdles for the project, including the building’s earthquake issues and the possible cost of demolition, and asked whether the Reno Housing Authority is aware of those challenges.

Alexis Hill responded that the update on the OES will likely go before the TTD board at its April meeting rather than in March. She said the item will mainly be an update on the TTD agenda while the Reno Housing Authority continues working on the project in the background and evaluating possible next steps over the coming months. Hill explained that there will be multiple public hearings if the project moves forward with housing, and if it does not, the TTD board has directed staff to explore selling the property through a public process. She also confirmed that Reno Housing

Authority is aware of the seismic concerns and demolition costs and is working with TTD staff on those issues.

Ann Nichols of the North Tahoe Preservation Alliance asked why the Nevada Department of Transportation does not appear to enforce chain controls on State Route 431 during winter storms. She described recently seeing semi-trucks traveling without chains during hazardous conditions, which created dangerous driving situations with vehicles sliding and stalled along the roadway. Alexis Hill said she did not know the reason and would need to ask the state for clarification. She offered to follow up with the appropriate contact to get more information. Chris Wood added that chain controls have been implemented on State Route 431 at times, though they appear to be rare. Ann Nichols responded that despite living in the area for 55 years, she has never seen chain controls there.

Kathie Julian asked whether members of the public could provide public comment through Zoom at the upcoming meeting of the Reno Housing Authority. Alexis Hill responded that public comment must be made in person at the meeting, but written comments can be submitted by email to be included in the official record.

5. BOARD MEMBER ANNOUNCEMENTS/REQUESTS/DISCUSSION -

*This item came after item 7.

Roxanna Dunn announced that the next CAB meeting will feature a housing panel with local nonprofit organizations that help families find housing. The goal is for these groups to share the challenges they face with Reno Housing Authority attending to listen and respond. Dunn noted that while the county provides rental vouchers, many landlords are not using them because strong demand allows them to rent units without the program. She also shared that the Incline Village Crystal Bay Community Association has a housing committee seeking volunteers and asked if anyone in the group has experience researching or writing grants to assist with potential safety funding opportunities through NDOT.

Kevin Lyons suggested using AI tools such as ChatGPT, Claude, or Gemini to help with researching and writing government grant applications. He said these tools can explain grant requirements, draft proposals, and review or critique applications to improve them. Lyons noted that while AI can streamline the process, applicants should still review the content carefully before submitting.

Diane Becker announced that an upcoming IVGID meeting on the evening of the 25th may include public comment regarding the July 4 fireworks barge that sank and has not yet been removed. She noted the meeting could provide updates on the situation and who may be responsible for retrieving the float.

Roxanna Dunn said she plans to attend the Reno Housing Authority Board meeting to give public comment opposing the potential loss of the last remaining piece of public land in the area. She thanked those who submitted written comments and encouraged others to attend the meeting as well.

Denise Davis reminded attendees about several upcoming meetings. She noted that Washoe County and the Nevada Division of Insurance will host a community meeting on February 24 at 5:30 p.m. in the County Commission Chambers to discuss homeowner insurance changes related to

wildfire risk. She also announced a February 27 meeting of the Nevada Legislature's interim oversight committee on TRPA and the Marlette Lake Water System, encouraging the public to attend or watch online, and mentioned that the next community forum meeting is scheduled for March 6.

Chris Wood noted several upcoming meetings related to TRPA issues. He highlighted that evacuations will be discussed at the Nevada Legislature's interim TRPA Oversight Committee meeting and encouraged those interested to attend. He also mentioned the upcoming TRPA Board of Directors meeting and the Advisory Planning Commission meeting on March 11, where the Environmental Impact Statement will be discussed during the scoping period, which remains open for public input until March 16.

Denise Davis added that public comment at the Nevada Legislature's TRPA Oversight Committee meeting is limited to two minutes, reminding attendees to plan their remarks accordingly.

6. PUBLIC SAFETY UPDATES

There were no public safety updates.

7. TAHOE LIVING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Jacob Stock, a senior planner with the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, presented an overview of the environmental impact statement (EIS) process for the "Cultivating Community, Conserving the Basin" housing initiative. His presentation was given virtually with a slide deck shown to the CAB and room . He explained that the EIS is the agency's highest level of environmental review and will evaluate potential policy and code changes intended to support workforce housing while maintaining environmental protections in the Lake Tahoe Basin. Stock said the project is currently in the public scoping period, which runs through March 16, during which the public can provide input on what environmental impacts should be studied and how they should be analyzed. The EIS will examine a wide range of topics such as land use, water quality, transportation, scenic impacts, wildfire and evacuation, and neighborhood compatibility. He also outlined several policy concepts that will be analyzed, including ways to reduce development costs and timelines, allow junior accessory dwelling units, adjust development rights and fees, support multifamily and "missing middle" housing, and explore options such as a regional housing authority. Stock emphasized that the policies being studied are not final decisions but represent the range of options that could be evaluated. He encouraged the public to submit comments on the scope of the environmental analysis by email before the March 16 deadline, with additional opportunities for public comment expected when the draft EIS is released later in the process.

Diane Becker asked to revisit the slide listing the environmental topics to be analyzed in the environmental impact statement and suggested that wildfire and evacuation should be treated as the highest priority. She said wildfire risk affects many other environmental concerns, including wildlife, water quality, and the health of Lake Tahoe, and recommended that it be considered first or integrated across all impact categories. Becker also noted she had not yet reviewed the underlying documents but planned to submit additional comments she had previously shared with the county. Jacob Stock responded that the list of environmental topics was not presented in order of importance and that he was primarily taking notes on public input during the meeting. Roxanna

Dunn asked whether the environmental impact statement (EIS) being prepared by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency would evaluate the impacts of increased height, density, and coverage allowed under the previously adopted Phase 2 housing amendments, noting that some community members had previously raised concerns that those changes were not studied through an EIS. Jacob Stock responded that the Phase 2 amendments have already been adopted and incorporated into TRPA's Code of Ordinances, so they will not be analyzed as a new proposal in the current EIS. Instead, they will be treated as part of the baseline conditions against which the impacts of any new proposed policies will be evaluated.

Dunn expressed concern that this means the earlier changes which did not receive environmental evaluation at the time they were implemented are now considered "givens" and will not receive additional environmental analysis.

Diane Becker also raised two concerns about evacuation planning and development analysis. She cautioned against relying on the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency evacuation study because it modeled a planned evacuation with advance notice, which she said is not representative of how wildfire evacuations actually occur. She also suggested comparing population and traffic levels from the 2012 Environmental Impact Statement to the impacts of the new amendments, rather than comparing them only to Phase 2 conditions. Becker said using Phase 2 as the baseline could overlook the hundreds of housing units added since 2012 and potentially understate the cumulative impact. She added that the public would expect a clear explanation if that comparison method were used.

Ann Nichols of the North Tahoe Preservation Alliance questioned how growth and impacts are being measured in the basin. She noted that TRPA's Growth Management System tracks development units and floor area rather than actual population, which may not reflect real environmental or roadway impacts in a resort region where peak occupancy far exceeds the number of residents. She also raised concerns about TRPA's shift from measuring total vehicle miles traveled to measuring vehicle miles traveled per capita, saying the metric can show improvement even if total travel increases. Nichols urged planners to explain how these measurements reflect real-world conditions, especially as new housing policies are considered, and criticized what she described as piecemeal planning that repeatedly resets the baseline.

Kathie Julian asked for clarification on the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), saying she was unclear about what specific project was being analyzed. Jacob Stock explained that the EIS is focused on policy amendments intended to reduce the time and cost of developing workforce housing and to ensure workforce housing is not held to stricter water quality standards than single-family housing. After the explanation, Julian expressed concern that the EIS does not appear to evaluate the impacts of increased building height, density, and coverage since the 2012 EIS. She also emphasized that wildfire evacuation and traffic should be analyzed as separate topics and voiced support for earlier comments about concerns with vehicle miles traveled metrics. Julian said she was surprised those broader growth factors were not included, arguing that without them the analysis may not fully capture the real impacts of development.

Helen Neff suggested that planners also consider the impact of population growth in surrounding regions when evaluating conditions in the Tahoe Basin. She noted that during extreme heat in nearby areas, many people travel to the lake, which increases traffic, recreation use, and pressure

on local infrastructure. Neff recommended that regional growth and visitor influx from surrounding cities be included in the analysis.

Roxanna Dunn asked for clarification about the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) being discussed and whether the project details could be shared during the meeting rather than only directing the public to the TRPA website. She questioned whether the EIS was a routine process or tied to a specific project. Jacob Stock explained that the EIS is not a routine review but is being conducted for a major policy project involving proposed amendments to TRPA programs. He said the purpose of the current meeting was to gather input on which environmental impacts should be studied, while the detailed project description is available online. Stock clarified that the EIS is a programmatic analysis of policy changes, not a specific construction project, though it may consider potential physical projects that could result from those policy changes. Dunn also noted confusion among attendees about why a similar EIS was not completed for Phase 2 before it was implemented. Stock responded that Phase 2 did undergo environmental review, but at a lower level of analysis that did not require a full Environmental Impact Statement.

Chris Wood asked whether the cumulative impacts analysis in the Environmental Impact Statement would include the effects of increased building height, density, and coverage allowed under Phase 2 policies. Jacob Stock responded that Phase 2 is an existing policy and could potentially be considered as part of the cumulative impacts analysis alongside new and existing policies. Stock said further that the cumulative analysis asks: "What is the result of all the policies existing and new?".¹ However, he said he could not definitively confirm whether it would be included during the EIS scoping period. Wood then requested that TRPA analyze Phase 2's increased height, density, and coverage as part of the cumulative policy impacts being studied.

Kathie Julian expressed concern that important issues such as wildfire evacuation could be overlooked if they are only analyzed under the broader category of cumulative impacts. She suggested these topics should receive focused attention rather than being buried within larger impact analyses.

8. NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT HUB & OTHER ENGAGEMENT OPPORTUNITIES -

Alexandra Wilson reported that there are no updates from the Neighborhood Development Hub for District 1. She noted that the application period for the TRPA Advisory Planning Commission has closed, with 10 applicants, and the item will appear on the March 10 Board of County Commissioners agenda. Wilson also reminded residents about the upcoming Nevada Division of Insurance meeting on wildfire-related homeowners' insurance and said she will monitor the online chat to help collect and summarize questions for presenters.

Denise Davis asked whether the list of 10 applicants for the TRPA Advisory Planning Commission could be viewed before the Board of County Commissioners agenda is posted so residents could contact commissioners about the candidates. Alexandra Wilson responded that the list will be available once the agenda is published but said she could check with the District Attorney's Office to see if the names can be shared earlier. Davis also suggested posting the information on the CAB website if possible so the public has time to review the applicants and provide input.

¹ Meeting minutes transcript at pp. 288-289.

9. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF January 26, 2026

Diane Becker motioned to approve the minutes of the January 26 Incline Village CAB meeting. Roxanna Dunn seconded the motion, and the minutes were approved unanimously.

10. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Ann Nichols raised concerns about the proposed 39 Degrees project in Kings Beach, a large development that includes condos, a hotel, and achievable housing units. She said the project will undergo design review and only an environmental checklist, which she argued limits public input. Nichols also criticized shifting terminology around housing categories such as workforce, achievable, and missing middle. She emphasized the broader cumulative impact of nearby developments, noting that projects like Boulder Bay, the Cal Neva redevelopment, and 39 Degrees could add hundreds of units and major commercial amenities within a short distance, which she believes should be more thoroughly analyzed.

Kathie Julian asked whether members of the public can submit written comments to the Nevada Legislature's TRPA Oversight Committee and whether the meeting agenda provides details about the topics to help guide those comments. Chris Wood responded that the meeting is expected to cover topics such as wildfire evacuation and environmental thresholds but said the full details of the agenda would need to be reviewed on the committee's website.

Helen Neff noted that the Nevada Legislature's TRPA Oversight Committee agenda also includes a presentation on insurance. She added that the Nevada State Insurance Commission does not regulate HOA insurance because it is considered commercial coverage. Neff also commented on the proposed Kings Beach development, saying increased growth and pedestrian activity could worsen already heavy summer traffic and further affect mobility in the area.

ADJOURNMENT- The meeting adjourned at 6:38 p.m.