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**Minutes of the regular meeting of the Incline Village/Crystal Bay Citizen Advisory Board held on March 24, 2025, at 5:30 P.M. Incline Village Library (845 Alder Ave. Incline Village, NV 89451)**

1. **CALL TO ORDER/ DETERMINATION OF QUORUM**

PRESENT – Roxanna Dunn, Chris Wood, Denise Davis, Carla Werner

ABSENT – Kevins Lyons, Diane Becker, Mark Sasway

1. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The pledge of allegiance was recited

1. **GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

Jon Davidson expressed concerns about the safety of pathways in Incline Village, citing the danger posed by silent motorized vehicles. He mentioned he had previously shared suggestions with Denise regarding potential countywide rules for pathway use. Davidson also noted the difficulty locating the meeting agenda online but understood the topic would be addressed later in the meeting.   
Pam Tsigdinos shared two announcements. First, she informed the community about the upcoming TRPA Governing Board meeting on Wednesday, March 26, where the Placer County Tahoe Area Plan will be discussed. She noted this is relevant to the ongoing Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan process, as TRPA often uses such plans as templates for other jurisdictions around Lake Tahoe. Second, she highlighted a recent investigative article in the *Reno Gazette Journal* on environmental and wildfire issues in Tahoe and encouraged everyone to read it. She offered to share both the meeting details and article link in the chat.

1. **ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM COMMISIONER HILL –**There were no announcements from Commissioner Hill.
2. **PUBLIC SAFETY UPDATES**

Washoe County Sheriff’s Office

Deputy Erik Pruitt from the Washoe County Sheriff’s Office provided a general overview of recent public safety activity. He noted that while statistics show a decrease in offenses such as assaults, burglaries, vandalism, and disorderly conduct, there has been an increase in DUI incidents. This rise is attributed to enhanced DUI enforcement, a priority under the sheriff’s four-pillar strategy. Pruitt described recent DUI-related incidents, including one where a suspect fled on foot, resisted arrest, and was tased, and another that involved a high-speed pursuit ending in a vehicle crash and arrest. These incidents have involved both alcohol and drug-related impairments, with substances including cocaine, marijuana, MDMA, and mushrooms. Most DUI arrests involve individuals from the greater Tahoe area—Incline Village, Kings Beach, and Truckee—who were returning from local bars or events. Pruitt encouraged the use of transit or rideshare services to avoid impaired driving.

Chris Wood asked about a recent article regarding a license plate scam, where thieves switch plates—often using stolen ones from other vehicles—to disguise stolen cars. Deputy Erik Pruitt confirmed this is a common tactic in vehicle theft. Thieves often steal front plates, which are less likely to be noticed missing, and use them to avoid detection. Pruitt explained that law enforcement can often identify suspicious vehicles when the back plate lacks a registration sticker. He noted that such crimes typically occur late at night in low-visibility areas like neighborhoods, rather than in places with heavy surveillance like Walmart. He advised residents to check notifications from home security systems (like Ring or Waze cameras), as they may capture criminal activity such as someone removing a license plate. While plate-switching is prevalent in the greater Reno area, Pruitt said it’s not commonly seen in Incline Village.  
  
Roxanna Dunn asked about receiving multiple messages claiming her FasTrak account was overdue and wondered if it was a known scam. Deputy Pruitt responded that while he hadn't specifically heard of a FasTrak-related scam, it's consistent with widespread scam tactics. He explained that most of these scams originate from overseas and use untraceable VoIP numbers. He advised community members to be reasonably skeptical of unsolicited messages and to verify any claims by contacting the company directly using official contact information. He also reminded everyone that legitimate businesses and government agencies will never ask for payment via gift cards or similar untraceable methods.

1. **PLACEMATE: LEASE TO LOCALS**Chase Janvrin, the General Manager of Placemate, provided an overview of the company and its mission to support thriving communities by helping local employees secure stable housing, particularly in tourism-driven economies where vacant homes are common and housing costs are disproportionate to income. Placemate partners with local governments to convert unused or underused properties into long-term or seasonal rentals for local workers by offering a one-time cash incentive to property owners. Most participants continue renting long-term even after the incentive ends, which helps address the "missing middle" housing gap—those who don't qualify for low-income assistance but still struggle to find affordable housing. The program works by verifying property and tenant eligibility based on local guidelines, including income caps and employment criteria. Once approved, property owners receive incentive payments directly from the county. Placemate manages tenant outreach, supports the application process, and serves as the face of the program, offering marketing, a dedicated webpage, and local staff support. Tenants can create profiles, receive alerts, and communicate with property owners directly. The company emphasizes that owners retain full control over tenant selection. Since launching in February in Incline Village and Crystal Bay, the pilot program—funded by Washoe County with input from community feedback sessions facilitated by the Tahoe Prosperity Center—has seen promising results. There is an eight-month onboarding period for new properties, followed by a compliance period linked to the duration of leases. Key program policies include requiring properties to be newly converted rentals within the planning area, capping rent at $4,000, and offering incentives up to $18,000 depending on lease length and number of qualified tenants. As of the update, 31 property owner leads had been generated, with seven properties already listed and seeking tenants. Only one property owner was found to be uninterested—a strong indicator of local support. The program has a budget to support 20 to 30 properties and is already making significant progress in less than two months into operation.   
     
   Chris Wood asked how many of the seven currently listed properties or the 16 interested ones were previously used as Airbnbs. The presenter responded that while they do track that information through intake forms, they didn’t have the exact number on hand but could follow up. They confirmed at least one of the properties was previously an Airbnb. Wood also asked whether this shift from short-term to long-term rentals has been seen in other jurisdictions. The presenter explained that it varies by market. In South Lake Tahoe, for example, Measure T limited Airbnbs, which initially led to many joining the program, but that tapered off once restrictions were in place. In Placer County, it's more common to see former Airbnb owners converting to long-term rentals due to burnout from managing short-term stays, neighbor complaints, and operational challenges like cleaning and staffing.

A citizen asked what percentage of property owners renew their leases after the initial one-year term, especially considering the incentive of up to $18,000. They questioned whether owners tend to take the incentive and then stop renting. The presenter responded that, on average, 70–80% of property owners across all markets renew their leases. In some areas, like South Lake Tahoe, renewal rates have been as high as 93%. They emphasized that many participants are first-time landlords who are initially hesitant but often realize after a year that the experience is positive, leading them to continue renting even without additional incentives.

Roxanna Dunn asked how the program accommodates second homeowners who want to use their property for a few weeks in the summer. The presenter explained that personal use during the lease period isn’t allowed, as it would displace tenants. However, the incentive could be used to cover alternative accommodations during those visits. They added that the program offers a seasonal lease option, which works well for owners who only use their properties during specific times of the year, such as summer or winter.   
  
Denise Davis asked for clarification on who issues the incentive checks to property owners, since they don’t come from Placemate. The presenter confirmed that the Washoe County Grants Department handles that process, with Gabriel Enfield serving as their main point of contact. Placemate prepares and submits the mini grant applications, which the county reviews before issuing the payments directly. Placemate does not handle any of the funds themselves.   
  
Aaron Vanderpool asked who pays Placemate and its staff, since the county issues the incentive payments directly to property owners. The presenter explained that Placemate is under contract with Washoe County and is paid by the county using the last remaining federal ARPA funds (American Rescue Plan Act), which were allocated in response to COVID-19. Placemate was one of 19 recipients to receive funding from that final allocation.

Alex Tsigdinos asked what happens when the ARPA funds run out and whether Washoe County would be responsible for continuing to fund the incentives. He also commented that, before short-term rentals (STRs) were reclassified as residential, Washoe County zoning required occupants in residential areas to stay at least 29 days, effectively supporting long-term housing without a cost. In response, the presenter explained that the program is currently a one-year pilot funded by ARPA, which is standard for new markets. Continued funding beyond the initial year would depend on whether Washoe County deems the program successful and chooses to extend it. If so, the County would need to identify new funding sources. In other states, a common model is using a portion of transient occupancy tax (TOT) revenue—collected from hotel and short-term rental stays—but the presenter noted it’s unclear if that’s permitted under Nevada law.

Chris Wood asked what happens next with the seven property owners currently participating in Incline Village and Crystal Bay. The presenter explained that the next step is for those property owners to identify tenants. They can do this by listing their property for free on Placemate’s website, using other platforms like Zillow or Facebook, or through personal networks. Owners are given guidelines to assess whether potential tenants qualify, and Placemate can provide a second review to confirm eligibility. While the program isn’t retroactive, there is a 60-day window after a lease starts to submit a grant application. Property owners are encouraged to consult with Placemate before signing a lease to ensure tenant eligibility. Chris also asked whether tenants are already listed on the Placemate website. The presenter clarified that tenants aren't publicly listed; instead, when tenants create profiles, they can see available properties and reach out to landlords directly. Landlords do not browse tenant profiles—contact is initiated by the tenants.

Roxanna Dunn asked if Placemate monitors posts on Nextdoor where people express desperation in trying to find housing, and whether any outreach is done through that platform. The presenter responded that he doesn’t personally don’t check Nextdoor and would need to confirm if the team does. They noted that Placemate actively uses Facebook, Instagram, and LinkedIn for outreach but were unsure about activity on Nextdoor. Roxanna mentioned that such posts appear frequently, suggesting it could be a valuable channel.

Denise Davis asked for clarification on the timeline for participating in the program, confirming that new properties must be onboarded by the end of September, given the February 1 start date. The presenter confirmed that September marks the end of the onboarding window. They added that with seven properties already listed—and a 90% conversion rate from listing to full participation—it’s possible the program could reach full capacity before the deadline, though that’s not guaranteed.

Chris Wood asked whether there is a cap on the number of properties that can participate in the program. The presenter explained that while there's no fixed cap on the number of properties, the total participation depends on how many qualified tenants each property houses—since incentives are paid per tenant. Based on available funding, they estimate the program will support between 20 to 30 properties.  
  
Aaron Vanderpool criticized the Placemate program as part of a larger systemic issue, arguing that government-funded initiatives like this ultimately funnel taxpayer money upward, enriching property owners and the wealthy while deepening inequality. He expressed concern that temporary programs create instability, leaving renters vulnerable if funding ends. Vanderpool likened the process to a form of economic laundering and called for grassroots efforts to address wealth concentration and promote fairer systems through taxing the rich and limiting asset accumulation. In response, Chase Janvrin acknowledged Vanderpool’s concerns and explained that this program is one of many tools in the broader housing policy toolbox. He emphasized that, compared to new construction or other housing initiatives, this program is far more cost-effective and can be implemented quickly. Janvrin also clarified that Placemate is not considered an “affordable housing” program in the traditional sense but rather an “available housing” initiative aimed at increasing the local supply of rental homes, which the program has successfully done.

Chris Wood clarified that property owners receive only one cash incentive payment through the program and that the 70–80% lease renewal rate is not tied to ongoing payments. He emphasized that continued participation by property owners is voluntary and not dependent on receiving additional incentives. The presenter confirmed this was correct.

1. **IN-TOWN TRAIL USAGE ISSUES AND SUGGESTIONS**

Denise Davis gave a presentation focused on improving safety on local pathways and bike lanes while supporting a variety of uses.[[1]](#footnote-1) She framed the discussion around actions the county could take or support. Davis highlighted ongoing confusion caused by unclear and inconsistent signage along bike paths and walking trails, particularly where signs do not clearly indicate whether bikes are permitted or where bike lanes are located. She proposed simple fixes like adding directional arrows, clearer wording, or pavement markings such as “no bikes” on pedestrian paths. Using several photo examples, Davis showed how signage placement near roads and paths adds to the confusion for both residents and visitors. She emphasized that some of the issues—like inconsistent bike lane widths and poor winter path maintenance—create safety hazards, especially on heavily traveled routes like State Route 28 and Lakeshore Boulevard. She pointed out that bike lane widths vary dramatically within short distances and are sometimes too narrow to be practical, especially near high-traffic areas such as Natural Grocers, where congestion is common. Davis also noted how poorly marked or narrow lanes contribute to unsafe conditions, particularly when bicycles and vehicles must navigate tight spaces together. She raised concerns about areas like Lakeshore Boulevard, where pedestrians and cyclists often share space uncomfortably. Cyclists avoid the path because it’s crowded with walkers, while some pedestrians avoid the path thinking it's for bikes only. These misunderstandings are worsened by mixed signage and are exacerbated in winter when uncleared paths force everyone into the street. She stressed the need for safe, clearly designated spaces for walking, biking, scooters, and other alternative transportation, especially if local goals include reducing car use. Davis suggested that some improvements, such as signage updates or painted messages, could be supported by community groups or Eagle Scout projects if county resources are limited. She concluded with a concern about winter path maintenance, stating that even school routes had been left uncleared during the season, despite the county identifying them as a priority. She urged the county to follow up on those issues, particularly when subcontractors are involved.

Max Jones, who operates Flume Trail Bikes, expressed agreement that signage and path use in town are confusing, particularly for cyclists. He noted that experienced cyclists prefer riding on streets because the bike paths can be unsafe. Jones also raised a concern about e-bikes, pointing out that there are many different types and that current rules aren't always clear or enforced. He suggested adding speed limit signs for e-bikes on certain paths and emphasized that only Class 1 e-bikes—which require pedaling—should be allowed on bike paths. Higher-powered e-bikes, which resemble electric motorcycles, should be treated like motor vehicles and confined to streets, in his view.   
  
Denise Davis asked Max Jones if he often hears feedback from bike renters about issues on local paths. Max responded that most renters use the East Shore Trail, and while he doesn’t get many direct complaints, that area does present its own safety concerns. He emphasized the need for speed limit signs and better signage to educate users about e-bike classifications, especially the distinction of Class 1 pedal-assist bikes. At his shop, they tune the e-bike motor assist to lower speeds (around 10–12 mph) for safety. However, he acknowledged that educating users is challenging because there’s such a wide variety of bikes and riders on the paths, and clearer signage would help.

Roxanna Dunn shared her perspective on the challenges related to e-bike use in the community, describing it as a three-pronged issue involving infrastructure, tourists, and local youth. She echoed earlier concerns about the poor state of bike lanes and confusing signage, contrasting it with her experience in the Bay Area where shared paths had clear speed limits and behavior-based signage, such as “cut your speed in half if pedestrians are present.” She emphasized that with the growing variety of personal transportation devices, signage should focus more on behavior than specific vehicle types. Roxanna also pointed out that the influx of tourists unfamiliar with e-bikes has added new safety concerns, as many haven’t ridden a bike in decades and lack the experience of navigating the area safely. She urged rental shops to play a stronger role in educating renters. For the local population, she focused particularly on children, expressing concern that some are riding powerful e-bikes without proper training or understanding of the rules, often because parents don’t know the differences between e-bike classes. She shared that the local middle school will host a mountain biking clinic, and she’s working with the sponsor to incorporate road safety education into the program. Her hope is to expand the education beyond mountain bikers to include all students—and ideally their parents. Roxanna also noted that misinformation and lack of knowledge, even among parents buying secondhand e-bikes, is a key challenge. She concluded by expressing support for the planned street-located bike lane on Lakeshore Boulevard and emphasized the importance of improving signage as part of that project.

Denise Davis asked Alexandra Wilson to be vigilant for any bike training opportunities for the community. Alex informed the CAB that May is national Bike Month and implied that training likely be a part of Ride Reno and Spin Sparks events. Roxanna Dunn advocated for local retailers like Max to help with setting up bike clinics to teach the rules of the roads, especially for middle school students who haven’t yet had driver training. In addition, the bike clinics could also teach defensive cycling tactics by pulling training that is offered in an Oregon pamphlet that explains defensive cycling.

Chris Wood asked Max Jones if he or other bike rental businesses provide a standard safety talk to e-bike users, particularly about defensive riding on the East Shore Trail or town paths. Max responded that his shop does give renters instructions on how to use the bikes and how to be courteous on crowded trails. While they try to cover this with everyone, some renters may occasionally slip through the cracks. He acknowledged that emphasizing defensive riding techniques—like slowing down when passing others—is a good idea and said he plans to incorporate more of that into their standard safety talks moving forward.

Denise Davis asked about the possibility of the county helping make a video on bike/skateboard/scooter safety. Alex said she would get back to them with options as a video with the contractor can cost upwards of 5,000 dollars.

Chris Wood asked Denise Davis whether she had investigated national or engineering standards for mixed-use bike paths, such as those from professional engineering associations, particularly regarding appropriate path widths. He was curious if paths like the one on Lakeshore meet these standards and whether they’re safe for both pedestrians and cyclists, including e-bike users. Denise responded that such standards do exist, but her hope was that Washoe County could assist by coordinating with NDOT, especially since State Route 28 is under NDOT’s control. She acknowledged that standards may vary between NDOT and the county and admitted uncertainty about whether there is a county standard established standard for mixed-use use. Chris Wood explained that the path along Lakeshore seems inconsistent in width, which raises safety concerns for those walking the path. Denise Davis asked Alexandra whether that information would be county roads or planning and Alex responded that she would reach out to the planning commission and Assistant County Manager to get these questions answered at the next meeting.

Carla Warner commented that NDOT has been involved in local efforts, such as the East Shore Trail opening, and is active in promoting safety, often distributing safety materials. She suggested that NDOT is likely already addressing issues related to e-bikes and motorized bikes and may even have existing safety videos or resources available.

Roxanna Dunn shared that she searched NDOT’s website for materials similar to those available in Oregon regarding bike and pedestrian safety but found nothing. Although NDOT has a designated Bike and Pedestrian Safety department, the online page is blank. She mentioned she has been in contact with NDOT and is waiting to connect with someone there. While her focus remains on safety education for middle school students, she encouraged others to take the lead on organizing broader safety clinics for the general public, as she sees value in expanding outreach.

Denise Davis expressed that gaining a clear understanding of the specific requirements and restrictions from both NDOT and Washoe County would help in developing effective solutions for shared path use. She noted that currently, it feels like everyone is frustrated trying to navigate the same limited space without clear guidance. Her hope is to initiate discussions that clarify these requirements and explore how to meet them within the existing infrastructure.

Aaron Vanderpool clarified that his earlier economic reference was to *Gary’s Economics* (a YouTube channel) and then shared personal reflections on his long history of biking to school in the area since 1994. While he generally doesn’t complain, he expressed strong opposition to e-bikes on trails. He used his comment to advocate for his neighborhood near Oriole Way, where he’s raised concerns for over two decades—particularly about vehicles regularly parking on sidewalks and a lack of enforcement. He invited anyone to visit his neighborhood to see the issues firsthand and noted ongoing disagreements with law enforcement about enforcing local laws. He closed by thanking the CAB for giving the community a platform to voice concerns to the county.

**\* Ronda Tycer submitted an email comment on e-bikes. The comment is attached to these minutes.**

Pamela Tsigdinos praised Denise Davis's presentation and emphasized the importance of sharing it with key decision-makers, including the Washoe County Commissioners, the Reno-Sparks Convention and Visitors Authority (RSCVA), and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA). She pointed out that while these entities promote the area as walkable and bikeable, the actual infrastructure is severely lacking and presents serious public safety risks. Pamela argued that this reality contradicts the assumptions being used to justify development and amendments to the Tahoe Area Plan. She strongly urged Commissioner Alexis Hill—who sits on all three relevant boards—to advocate for this issue and bring it to the forefront. She concluded by warning that the current conditions, such as families walking along Highway 28 with strollers and wagons, could lead to dangerous outcomes, and this topic deserves more attention at the policy level.

Ronda Tycer commented on the legal framework surrounding e-bikes, clarifying that Nevada state law allows e-bikes to be ridden in the same places as traditional bikes, but also permits local jurisdictions to set their own restrictions. She emphasized that this means both Washoe County and IVGID have the authority to regulate e-bike use locally. Ronda argued that because e-bikes are motorized, they should be classified and treated like motorcycles and therefore should not be allowed on pedestrian-focused paths or sidewalks. She urged that clear signage be installed—particularly on Village Boulevard and Lakeshore trails—stating that motorbikes and e-bikes are prohibited on those paths. She called for immediate action by IVGID or the County to implement these signs before the summer season, when the influx of e-bike users could pose safety risks.

Jon Davidson shared several suggestions to improve safety and courtesy on shared-use paths. He began by noting that someone is painting signs on trails to encourage riders to slow down and be considerate, which he sees as a good start. He proposed that Washoe County establish countywide rules, including a 15 mph speed limit on all pathways and a 5 mph limit when passing others. Rather than creating rules specific to e-bikes, he suggested applying regulations to all wheeled conveyances, given the variety of new transportation devices being used, such as hoverboards and electric skateboards. Davidson emphasized the need for all wheeled users to have an audible warning device, like a bell or horn, especially since many electric vehicles are nearly silent and can startle or endanger pedestrians. He recommended requiring rental shops—like those operated by Max Jones—to install such devices on their bikes intended for use on public paths. Lastly, Davidson suggested the county create a “Trails Are for Everyone” leaflet to promote shared-path courtesy and explain local rules. This could be handed out at bike rental locations or posted along trails, as he noted that most riders are unlikely to research local regulations on their own.

Helen Neff thanked Denise Davis for her presentation and emphasized how confusing the current bike and path situation is in Incline Village. She clarified that bicycles, whether motorized or not, are not allowed on the pathways along State Route 28, they're supposed to use the road. However, as Denise pointed out, the bike lanes along 28 are often too narrow and unsafe, especially through the town center. Helen cited the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), which recommends a bike lane width of five to six feet and questioned why NDOT isn’t adhering to those standards along 28. She also highlighted the inconsistency in bike path access—bikes are allowed on some paths like Village, Lakeshore, Northwood, and Southwood, but not others—making the rules unclear for users. She agreed with earlier points about how these shared-use paths weren’t designed for electric vehicles and reiterated her longstanding call to reduce the speed limit on State Route 28 and enforce speed limits on other streets to improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians. Lastly, Helen suggested that the Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition might be a helpful resource for safety education materials or videos, as they already produce bike lane maps and focus on bike-related safety around the lake.

Jeanne Orellana, representing Big Blue Bike Rentals at the Hyatt, expressed full support for the concerns raised about inexperienced riders using high-powered e-bikes. She emphasized that their shop only rents standard bikes, kids’ bikes, and Class 1 pedal-assist e-bikes, which require the rider to pedal and do not have throttles. For safety reasons, they avoid renting high-speed or throttle-controlled models (Class-2 and Class-3). Like other rental businesses, Big Blue provides a thorough orientation covering how to use the bike, including gears, brakes, and safety bells. All bikes come equipped with bells, and renters are instructed to use them when passing pedestrians. Due to their location and a focus on rider safety, Big Blue primarily recommends the East Shore Trail route and provides maps on the handlebars to guide riders. Most of their customers are families, not aggressive cyclists, and Jeanne reiterated their commitment to safety. She welcomed feedback and offered to make improvements if there are any community concerns.

Chris Wood asked Jeanne Orellana whether her shop provides a standardized orientation for renters on how to behave, particularly when encountering pedestrians on shared-use paths. Jeanne confirmed they do, explaining that renters are given a detailed orientation both indoors (with maps and safety information) and outdoors (with demonstrations on the bikes). Riders are instructed to use their bells, respect pedestrians, and understand they are on a shared-use path. She also noted that her staff is thoroughly trained and that safety information is included on the bike handlebar maps. Chris then asked if renters are ever directed to use the bike lane on Lakeshore Boulevard instead of the shared-use path. Jeanne responded that they specifically recommend the multi-use path due to safety concerns with vehicle traffic. She explained that the proximity to cars, especially with families or riders with kids and trailers, makes the road less safe. If the county were to require use of the bike lane, Jeanne acknowledged it wouldn’t align with their current safety practices and would only be acceptable if significant infrastructure improvements—like better lane markings or barriers—were made to protect riders from traffic.

Roxanna Dunn emphasized the need to present the group’s safety concerns to Commissioner Alexis Hill, agreeing with Pamela Tsigdinos that this is a multi-agency issue. She noted the community is marketing a walkable, bikeable environment that doesn’t actually exist, putting locals and visitors at risk. Roxanna offered to co-author a summary of the meeting with Denise Davis and asked Alexandra to alert the commissioner. She highlighted serious infrastructure challenges, including 39 driveways along State Route 28 that create constant safety risks, but encouraged starting with smaller, actionable steps like improved signage. She also asks to confirm that a dedicated bike lane is still planned for Lakeshore Boulevard this summer.

1. **NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT HUB & OTHER ENGAGEMENT OPPORTUNITIES**

Alexandra Wilson provided several updates and engagement opportunities for the community. She began by sharing the latest from the Neighborhood Development Hub, noting that the only recent development relevant to the area was the Sky Taverns Trails project from December 2024. She reminded attendees that feedback can still be submitted and that materials like meeting summaries and recordings are available. She also mentioned Article 904 on nonconformance, which was posted in February, and said she could provide additional information by email upon request. Alexandra then introduced *Wordly*, a language accessibility tool now available in the county chambers. This program allows attendees who are non-native English speakers, hard of hearing, or visually impaired to follow along via translated audio or on-screen text on their personal devices. She highlighted that there are currently two open positions on Washoe County boards—Board of Adjustment and Planning Commission—specifically for District 4 (including Sparks, Hidden Valley, Spanish Springs, and East Truckee Canyon). She encouraged residents to share this opportunity with eligible individuals. Finally, Alexandra showcased the county’s new online *Community Input Portals*, including a dedicated page for Incline Village and Crystal Bay. These portals allow residents to engage with Washoe County 24/7 by submitting ideas, feedback, or questions. The page includes CAB meeting dates, a feedback survey, and in the future will host idea boards and moderated discussions—designed to function like a focused version of Facebook where users can upvote ideas and help prioritize community needs. The county team will regularly review submissions and determine whether they can be acted upon or shared through CAB meetings or other channels.

Pamela Tsigdinos thanked Alexandra Wilson for her presentation and praised the county’s new engagement tools as an excellent way for residents to stay connected and offer input. She then asked if there were any county updates on the Waldorf Astoria property in Crystal Bay, which is reportedly undergoing a second foreclosure. Pamela expressed concern over its condition, citing it as a potential fire hazard due to its prominent location in the community. Alexandra responded that she did not have current information on the property but noted Pamela’s question and said she would follow up by email or provide an update at the next CAB meeting.

1. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF January 27, 2025**

Chris Wood motioned to approve the minutes for the meeting of January 27, 2025. Denise Davis seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

1. **BOARD MEMBER ANNOUNCEMENTS/REQUESTS/DISCUSSION AND REPORTS BACK ON ANSWERED REQUESTS**Denise Davis reminded attendees that the public comment period is now open for the Sand Harbor Master Plan. She explained that comments were previously collected in the fall, and a new proposal has since been developed to improve the Sand Harbor experience. While she didn’t have the exact URL on hand, she noted that the plan and its history can be easily found by searching for “Sand Harbor Master Plan” online. The page includes background on Sand Harbor and outlines proposed ideas to help maintain its usefulness into the future.
2. **GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**Aaron Vanderpool suggested that any future flyers about trail usage should include a reminder that breaking the rules or laws can ruin the experience for everyone. He noted that it often just takes one person to cause problems for the whole community .  
     
   Alexandra Wilson announced that the April CAB meeting will likely focus on fire safety, specifically defensible space and home hardening, in collaboration with the North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District and UNR’s Living with Fire program. She also mentioned that the May CAB meeting conflicts with a session of the Washoe Tahoe Academy and asked whether the group wanted to consider rescheduling. Roxanna Dunn responded that she is considering attending the academy but would not move the CAB meeting, opting instead to miss the academy session and catch up on her own.

Roxanna Dunn emphasized the importance of home hardening as a key fire prevention strategy. She shared that she has been watching educational videos and plans to install 1/16-inch mesh screens over her home vents this summer. She expressed a desire to hear from local experts—rather than relying on advice from places like Marin County—about fire-resistant vegetation suitable for the area. Roxanna urged community members to attend the upcoming defensible space and home hardening session, stressing that while evacuation planning is important, individual efforts to fireproof homes can make a major difference in protecting the community.

**ADJOURNMENT-** The meeting adjourned at 7:33 p.m.

Email from Ronda Tycer

**THE SOLUTION TO THE CONFLICT BETWEEN PEDESTRIANS AND E-BIKES**

**The basic problem is one of terminology. E-bikes are not bicycles. They have a motor. They are motorized vehicles and are a class of motor-cycle. In fact, the original motorcycles were simply bicycles on which were affixed small engines. ["In the early period of motorcycle history, many producers of** [**bicycles**](https://urldefense.com/v3/__https:/en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bicycle__;!!KDQzAAmjlQ!cO7M3vqM8P2DoeNnFCQY0kz0iqRqxxmwmCmKmsFpM5dDQ_fq3b3PhV-xj4z0nG02LupOL7PvAw-x-EH31l81Uw$) **adapted their designs to accommodate the new internal-combustion engine. As the engines became more powerful and designs outgrew the bicycle origins, the number of motorcycle producers increased.” [**[**https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History\_of\_the\_motorcycle**](https://urldefense.com/v3/__https:/en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_motorcycle__;!!KDQzAAmjlQ!cO7M3vqM8P2DoeNnFCQY0kz0iqRqxxmwmCmKmsFpM5dDQ_fq3b3PhV-xj4z0nG02LupOL7PvAw-x-EGw_AN4gA$)**}**

**Whether the motor is electric or gasoline is immaterial… in the same way that the same rules of the road apply for electric powered cars as for gas-powered cars.**

**Because e-bikes have a motor, they must be subject to the same laws as all other motorized bikes. This means they should only be used on streets and trails specifically for motorbikes or motorcycles. That means they should NOT be on TRPA trails designed for pedestrians and bicycles. They should be on the street or on trails designated for motorbikes. And they should never be on pedestrian-only sidewalks.**

**IVCB should insist Washoe County put up signage around town saying that e-bikes are NOT allowed on bike paths used by pedestrians. Signs should be put up along the Village Blvd bike trail and the Lakeshore bike trail indicating that motorbikes and e-bikes are not allowed.**

**Any basin trails on which motorbikes are allowed through the wilderness should be clearly marked with signage at the entrance instructing hikers to move aside for motorbikes to pass. I believe the Tahoe Rim Trail allows bikes only on specific days of the week. A similar policy can be used for other wilderness trails. Hikers on these trails can take photos and report bikers for infractions.**

**Until Washoe County redefines e-bikes as the motorbikes they are, the problems with them will persist.**

**Ronda Tycer**

**Richard Miner**

1. Davis gave a slide presentation showing inconsistent signage and other situations of concern. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)