



BOARD MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, May 7, 2008 – 8:30 a.m.

Tahoe City Public Utility District

FINAL MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER ATTENDANCE: Ron McIntyre, Jennifer Merchant, Tom Murphy, Roger Beck, Debbie Casey, Adam Wilson, Alex Mourelatos, and Deb Dudley

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Steve Teshara, Ron Treabess, Andy Chapman, Sally Lyon, Whitney Parks, Judy Laverty, Jeremy Jacobson, and Sarah Holster

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Curtis Aaron, Gretchen Ponto, John Wilcox, Jess Sheehan, Alanna Crete, Les Pederson, Alvina Patterson, Eric Brandt, Greg Gibboney, Christine Horvath, Kelly Houston, Pettit Gilwee, and Lolly Kupec

1.0 CALL TO ORDER – ESTABLISH A QUORUM

- 1.1 The Board meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by Chair Debbie Casey and a quorum was established. She read the NLTRA's mission and meeting ground rules.

2.0 PUBLIC FORUM

- 2.1 Debbie Casey introduced Curtis Aaron, the new General Manager of the North Tahoe Public Utility District. Mr. Aaron presented the NLTRA Board with a Resolution in response to its support given to the North Tahoe Community Conference Center. The Board welcomed Mr. Aaron.
- 2.2 John Wilcox announced upcoming events sponsored by the Squaw Valley Institute (SVI). On June 6th, Gavin Newsom, Mayor of San Francisco will speak about political courage. This event will be held at the PlumpJack Conference Center beginning at 6:30 p.m. On June 25th, Keoki Flagg will present photographs from his trip to Uganda. The presentation will be held at the Resort at Squaw Creek beginning at 6:30 p.m. John reported that in July, Geology Professor Frank DeCourten and Biology Instructor Derek Larson will host Geology Weekend in Squaw Valley. They will present information on the evolution and biology of the Tahoe Sierra in addition to guided hikes. The program series will begin July 11th and conclude on July 13th.
- 2.3 Andy Chapman announced that for 2008 TripAdvisor ranked Lake Tahoe as 1st in the U.S. as a travel destination and 10th worldwide. Andy anticipates significant media coverage of this ranking.

3.0 AGENDA AMENDMENTS AND APPROVAL

- 3.1 **M/S/C (Wilson/Merchant) (8/0) to approve the agenda as presented.**

4.0 CONSENT CALENDAR - MOTIONS

- 4.1 Steve Teshara reported that the Marketing Committee minutes within the Consent Calendar include approval of a special marketing grant for the Olympic Heritage Committee.
- 4.2 **M/S/C (Merchant/Mourelatos) (8/0) to approve the consent calendar as presented, including the approval of a Special Marketing Program Grant for the Olympic Heritage Committee, as recommended by the Marketing Committee and a Community Marketing Program grant for the West Shore Association, as recommended by the Chamber Advisory Committee. Tom Murphy asked that the phrase *and slow periods* be added to the last sentence in paragraph 10.2.4 of the minutes from the April 2nd Board meeting.**

5.0 PRESENTATION ON RESULTS OF NORTH LAKE TAHOE AD AWARENESS STUDY

- **STRATA RESEARCH**

- 5.1 Andy Chapman reported that consistent with direction from the NLTRA Board and support from the IVCBVB, the North Lake Tahoe Marketing Cooperative commissioned Strata Research to conduct a consumer advertising awareness study in Los Angeles and San Francisco. To date, the pre campaign study has been completed in both markets and a post campaign study has been completed in Los Angeles. A post campaign study will be completed in San Francisco once the summer television commercial has finished running in that market.
- 5.2 Gretchen Ponto with Strata Research reported on the results of the North Lake Tahoe Ad Awareness Study. She said the purpose of the study was designed to gauge the awareness and effectiveness of the 2008 media campaign. Evidence suggests that the campaign has been effective in generating positive opinions of North Lake Tahoe as a travel destination, particularly in Los Angeles. She noted in the study's documentation that overall awareness of the campaign increased from pre to post. Gretchen reported that the print campaign was the most recognized in both markets, but the TV campaign was more effective than direct mail in encouraging visitation to the North Lake Tahoe Web site. The study shows that the likelihood to visit North Lake Tahoe is far greater among residents in San Francisco than LA mostly due to proximity; however there was an increase from pre to post in LA. Gretchen said there is an opportunity to attract more visitors from LA by increasing the awareness that North Lake Tahoe is easily accessible by plane. She added that North Lake Tahoe was viewed more favorably by residents in LA and attributes that to the combination of print and TV ads. She said other challenges include the differentiation between North and South Lake Tahoe. She said only one in five LA residents indicated that they stayed in North Lake Tahoe while one half made accommodations in South Lake Tahoe. Bay Area residents are equally split between North and South Lake Tahoe. Gretchen suggested establishing more of a distinction between North and South Lake Tahoe and targeting those who are still unfamiliar with the Tahoe area or predominately stay in South Lake Tahoe. She also reported that when visiting mountain resorts, Los Angeles residents are more likely to plan longer trips than visitors from San Francisco. The findings also show that the majority of visitors book their accommodations online and travel mostly in the summer, followed by the winter, then spring and lastly in the fall. She noted that travelers who book vacations are primarily concerned with the actual destination and not necessarily with vacation packages.

- 5.3 Andy reported that the primary target market of our advertising is between the ages of 25-54 with the propensity to travel. Ron McIntyre asked for clarification regarding the geographic areas. Andy said the geographic areas targeted were Orange County and the Bay Area. He said they were chosen base on criteria consistent with our media plan and flight availability. Ron asked about the total people surveyed. Gretchen reported that 814 people were surveyed; 412 pre and 402 post. She explained that more surveys don't necessarily get better accuracy. She added that they targeted a specific market. Tom Murphy asked how the participants were chosen. Gretchen said professional panels were used. Strict criteria and incentive programs were used in forming the panels.
- 5.4 Gretchen gave an overview of campaign awareness and impressions. She said recall of Lake Tahoe advertising in general remained the same in LA and slightly increased in San Francisco. She noted that LA residents who recalled seeing ads for Lake Tahoe recalled the television ad specifically. Gretchen reported that awareness of the North Lake Tahoe campaign increased in both markets from pre to post with San Francisco showing a significant increase from 21% to 33%. She said both print and TV ads gave a strong impression that North Lake Tahoe is a premier ski destination. The TV ads resonated more with LA markets. Those aware of the advertising for Lake Tahoe recalled skiing, snowboarding, and snow conditions. She said an overwhelming majority recalled non-stop flights into Reno. 21% recalled *Pure Experiences* while 17% recalled the *N is for North* campaign. She noted that as a result of seeing the ads, residents were more likely to visit the North Lake Tahoe Web site and read direct mail. Gretchen noted that this campaign shows positive movements in every measure, which is rare. She clarified that the same individual was not interviewed twice which further underscores the impact of the ads. Deb Dudley asked for clarification with regard to the recall of the Reno/Tahoe non-stop flights. Andy reported that the RMC was also down in LA with a specific campaign focused on non-stop flights. He said Ski Lake Tahoe was also present with its campaign.
- 5.5 Gretchen reported on the resort awareness results. She said when asked to recall mountain resort destinations 78% recalled Heavenly, 74% Squaw Valley and 71% recalled Mammoth Mountain. Gretchen reported that LA visitors are more willing to leave the state on a ski vacation than residents in San Francisco. She said those who indicated they were unlikely to visit North Lake Tahoe within the year had a second home or timeshare in other locations, proximity to home, or have a preference for South Lake Tahoe. Those who are likely to visit North Lake Tahoe are closer to the destination, and likely to visit to ski or snowboard. In comparison to other resort destinations, Lake Tahoe was viewed more favorably from pre to post based on the variety of ski areas, snow conditions and the scenic backdrop. Those who rated North Lake Tahoe worse in comparison to other mountain resorts indicated dissatisfaction with snow conditions and the lack of après ski activities. She said this is a perception that needs to be addressed in advertising.
- 5.6 Gretchen reported on travel behavior of those who visit Lake Tahoe. She said San Francisco residents are more likely than LA residents to use a personal automobile. San Francisco residents are also more likely to make overnight accommodations in North Lake Tahoe. Visitors from LA typically do not make a distinction between North and South Lake Tahoe. Roger Beck asked if people who have been to Lake Tahoe make a distinction between North and South Lake Tahoe. She confirmed that they did not make a distinction between the two areas. Gretchen reported that the majority of visitors researching a destination use the internet. While younger visitors tend to book online, older travelers call resorts directly to book their accommodations. She said the vast majority of travelers who take vacations during the winter do so to ski and/or snowboard. They also tend to take an average of three trips to mountain resorts and stay 3 to 4 days.

- 5.7 Discussion followed in regards to the ad awareness study.
- 5.7.1 Debbie Casey asked how the information will be used by the organization going forward. Andy said TV is a new advertising mechanism for the organization. The study proves that TV can be very effective for us. He said we will use the information as a planning tool in targeting issues such as accessibility. We hope budget resources will allow for future television advertising.
- 5.7.2 Roger Beck asked what percentage of those tested were skiers and snowboarders. Gretchen said it was not asked specifically whether they ski or snowboard, but they had to have a propensity to travel to mountain resorts to participate in the survey. Roger asked if they are familiar with the neighborhoods that make up North Lake Tahoe. Gretchen said it was not a priority question. Andy said that information will be tested as part of the focus group study scheduled for the next two days in San Francisco and Los Angeles. Ron McIntyre asked that focus groups also be asked to make a determination of whether the *N is for North* campaign recalls North Lake Tahoe. Andy said the focus group will be tested on five different concepts related to the *N is for North* campaign.
- 5.7.3 Jennifer Merchant asked about the margin of error and how that impacts the numbers. Gretchen said that because there is consistent positive movement in all measurements it is “directionally impactful.” Jennifer asked if the accessibility issue is a hurdle we can overcome. Gretchen said the question was asked of those who had not yet seen the ad campaign so there is an opportunity to educate them about our accessibility.
- 5.7.4 Tom Murphy expressed concern that our efforts are not targeting new customers, but the demographic we already have. Andy said 80% of our Web site visitors are unique to the site which is an indication that we are attracting new visitors. Steve Teshara said the research suggests that there is an opportunity to capture more of those visitors with the propensity to travel to mountain areas. Gretchen reminded the group that the study was focused on determining ad awareness. Debbie agreed and said Tom’s concerns should be addressed at the Marketing Committee level.
- 5.7.5 Alex Mourelatos said the research suggests that North Lake Tahoe’s identity is tied to the variety of our resorts. He said we need to promote that in our advertising. In addition, he said we need to really focus on how visitors book. Gretchen restated that in order to avoid identity theft; older people tend to call resorts direct after researching a property online. Younger people are more likely to book online.
- 5.7.6 Deb Dudley noted that campaigns with high recall were done in partnership with the RMC and Ski Lake Tahoe. She said our partners only strengthen our campaigns. Lolly Kupec noted that word of mouth is an important advertising mechanism. She said it is important that visitors have a good experience while here which is something the Chamber Advisory Committee is working to improve.
- 5.8 Andy reported that as part of the current marketing research efforts, staff and our agencies are working with Strata Research to conduct two sessions of consumer focus groups in each market. The purpose of the focus groups is to further determine the impact of North Lake Tahoe’s brand message (*N is for North*). Debbie Casey asked for a timeline to review the results. Gretchen said they would have a draft by next week. Andy will present the report at the next Marketing Committee and Board meetings.

6.0 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON NLTRA REQUEST FOR INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDS FOR RESEARCH PROJECTS, INCLUDING: NLTRA SHARE OF FUNDING FOR THE PLACER COUNTY WIDE TOURISM IMPACT STUDY, INCREMENTAL FUNDS NECESSARY TO COMPLETE AN UPDATE OF THE 2003 REPORT, *THE ECONOMIC SIGNIFICANCE OF TRAVEL TO THE NORTH LAKE TAHOE AREA*, AND COMMUNITY AND VISITOR SURVEYS IN SUPPORT OF THE NLTRA'S 2012 INITIATIVE

- 6.1 Ron Treabess said staff is requesting an infrastructure allocation of up to \$80,000 for the purpose of completing research projects leading up to the NLTRA's 2012 Initiative. He reported that the NLTRA is working with the Placer County Office of Economic Development on the County-wide Tourism Impact Study. The NLTRA's portion of this study is \$15,000. Dean Runyan Associates was selected as the consultant. NLTRA staff has asked Dean Runyan what the cost difference would be to complete work necessary to fully update the *Economic Significance of Travel to the North Lake Tahoe Area (2003)*, a study their company prepared as part of the development of the 2004 NLTRA Master Plan. The cost for this project is up to \$24,000. Finally, staff has asked RRC Associates to submit a proposal to update the community and visitor surveys in support of the NLTRA's 2012 Initiative. The last surveys were conducted as part of the NLTRA Master Plan. The cost of this research component is up to \$41,000 which includes an Eastern Placer County resident mailback survey, a second homeowner mailback survey, and a North Lake Tahoe Visitor Web site survey. The Joint Infrastructure/Transportation Committee unanimously recommended approval of the allocation for the research package.
- 6.2 Ron McIntyre asked for clarification regarding survey questions. Steve Teshara said staff and a subcommittee of the Board will work with the consultants on developing contemporary questions for the surveys.
- 6.3 Steve noted that Placer County has suggested a combination of funds to be used for this project. Since TOT revenues now look better than previously anticipated, we may have marketing funds available. Specifically, he said it has been suggested to use marketing funds for our portion of the County-wide tourism study. Jennifer has suggested using research and planning funds for a portion of the Dean Runyan update with a balance coming from Infrastructure. Staff will work with the CEO's office to develop an appropriate funding mix for this project.
- 6.4 Jennifer Merchant feels the County-wide study should eliminate the need to update the 2003 *Economic Significance of Travel to the North Lake Tahoe Area* study. Secondly, she said it has always been the County's thought that marketing would fund the County-wide study. Steve said it was never planned for in the current year's marketing budget; however, it could be budgeted in 2008/09. Jennifer feels that elements of the RRC proposal benefit marketing. In addition, she noted that there are current balances in the research and planning budget that should be used for the project. Steve said based on current information, some of those funds are committed but there could be approximately \$15,000 available. Jennifer suggested we allocate a larger portion to research and planning next year. She said the County believes this is an important project, but they need to be comfortable with the funding sources. Ron Treabess confirmed that the information needed to update the Dean Runyan study is more detailed than what is called for in the County-wide study.
- 6.5 Discussion followed in regards to the research package.
- 6.5.1 Alex Mourelatos asked for clarification with regard to research and development funds. Steve explained that there are two categories of research and planning funds in the NLTRA's annual budget – one for infrastructure and one for transportation.

- 6.5.2 Deb Dudley expressed concern that Placer County has asked the NLTRA to participate in the County-wide study, but now have stipulations as to the source of our funding for this study. She feels the expenditure of marketing funds should be vetted through the Marketing Committee. Jennifer stated that the NLTRA Board and Placer County decide where money is spent, not the Marketing Committee.
- 6.5.3 Alvina Patterson asked why RRC was chosen to conduct the surveys. She asked if other firms were approached. Ron explained that RRC and Dean Runyan are experienced firms that we have used in the past. He said they are the most economically feasible firms because they are familiar with our community and needs. Steve added that neither one of the contract amounts reached the \$50,000 threshold requiring a bid process.
- 6.5.4 Lolly Kupec asked if the County has asked for our input for the County-wide study. Steve confirmed that Andy Chapman is our representative on the study. Andy participated in the development of the scope of work and continues to work with the County on the project. Lolly asked for further clarification about why the budget expenditure for the study is being questioned by Placer County. She said Placer County has approved the budget and should not question how money is spent. Steve explained that the allocation was not originally budgeted. He said staff is comfortable with including the allocation in next year's marketing budget since invoices won't be paid until next year. Deb asked for clarification regarding the funding. Jennifer clarified that the County proposes \$15,000 from research and planning from this year's budget, \$31,000 from the 2008/2009 marketing budget (\$16,000 for the RRC component and \$15,000 for County-wide study), with the remaining \$30,000 paid from Infrastructure next year. Lolly expressed concern about process of funding projects. She feels we should be reporting back to the County on how we are going to spend the money. Debbie Casey explained our budget has a contractual component with the County that is very specific. If we want to make a change to the contract as in this case, it has to be approved by Placer County.

- 6.6 M/S/C (McIntyre/Murphy) (8/0) to approve the allocation of up to \$80,000 for research projects, including: NLTRA's share of funding for the Placer County-wide Tourism Impact Study, incremental funds necessary to complete an update of the 2003 report, *The Economic Significance of Travel to the North Lake Tahoe Area*, and community and visitor surveys in support of the NLTRA's 2012 initiative using a combination of funds developed by further discussions between the NLTRA and Placer County.**

7.0 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO APPROVE MARCH 31, 2008 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

- 7.1 Sally Lyon reported that the Finance Committee recommended approval of the March 31, 2008 Financial Statements. She noted that group commissions are up from budget.

- 7.2 M/S/C (Dudley/McIntyre) (8/0) to approve the March 31, 2008 Financial Statements.**

8.0 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO APPROVE PROPOSED FY-2008-09 PLACER COUNTY/TAHOE TOT BUDGET FOR SUBMITTAL TO PLACER COUNTY

- 8.1 Sally Lyon reported that just recently she received information related to 3rd Quarter TOT. Numbers show that we are up significantly from last year. She anticipates that the 4th Quarter will also be up although not as significantly. Sally said it is difficult for staff to

project funding without having adequate TOT information from Placer County. Accordingly, she has prepared two budget scenarios for Board review and direction; one based on \$4.2 million and the other on \$4.4 million. Sally feels that had the Finance Committee received the TOT information earlier they would have recommended a \$4.4 million budget. Ron McIntyre, Finance Committee Chair, agreed and said there will be money available for a \$4.4 million budget in FY-2008/09.

- 8.2 Alex Mourelatos asked about the budget timeline. Sally reported that the budget and scope of work need to be submitted to the County no later than May 31st. Steve said that will form the framework for discussions with Jennifer Merchant and Placer County Chief Assistant CEO Rich Colwell to finalize the TOT budget and scope of work. He noted that the TOT budget forms the basis for the overall NLTRA budget. The Board is scheduled to review and consider approval of the budget in June. Debbie Casey added that the Executive Committee is working to schedule a date with Placer County to begin preliminary budget negotiations.
- 8.3 Deb Dudley suggested we inform the community that we had a strong 3rd Quarter.
- 8.4 **M/S/C (Beck/Wilson) (8/0) to approve the proposed FY-2008/09 Placer County/Tahoe TOT budget of \$4.4 million for submittal to Placer County.**

9.0 DISCUSSION AND REQUEST FOR BOARD DIRECTION – PROPOSED DISBURSEMENT PROCEDURE OF PLACER COUNTY TAHOE TOT FUNDS FOR NEW INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

- 9.1 Sally Lyon reported that staff has been utilizing current infrastructure funds to pay for existing or new infrastructure projects, as directed by our current contract with Placer County. She pointed out that by the end of the fiscal year, the amount of infrastructure funds held by the NLTRA will be just over \$300,000. She provided a list of project funds that have been approved and held by the NLTRA along with funds being held by the County. She said staff is proposing two alternatives for the disbursement of Placer County/Tahoe TOT funds for new infrastructure projects. The first is that the County release funds for all approved projects that they are holding. This amount is just under \$1.7 million. Sally feels a significant amount of the \$1.7 million will be spent in the next year. She said this alternative would insure timely and professional fund management by the NLTRA for approved infrastructure projects. The Finance Committee also suggested that staff prepare a quarterly request based on anticipated project expenditures in each Quarter with a minimum balance of \$500,000 in to be maintained in the infrastructure account for cash flow.
- 9.2 Steve Teshara explained that this issue will be discussed with the County, but staff seeks direction from the Board. He said staff has complied with the County's recommendation to spend down infrastructure funds. The proposed alternatives insure that the NLTRA will not hold significant infrastructure funds for long periods of time. The Board directed staff to bring forward both options to the County for review and discussion.

10.0 STATUS REPORT/BOARD DISCUSSION – TRUCKEE MARKETING EQUITY ISSUE

- 10.1 Debbie Casey updated the Board on the progress of the NLTRA Marketing Equity Group related to the Truckee marketing equity issue. She reminded that in November 2007 a special meeting was held to discuss the inclusion of Truckee in the NLTRA's marketing efforts. As an outcome of that meeting, a working group was established to examine the issue of equity further with a goal to make a report and recommendation to the Board. Several scenarios were discussed including charging a higher click through rate for lodging properties outside Placer and Washoe counties in addition to higher membership rates for tourism businesses. Discussion also focused on an equitable contribution from

Truckee based on the IVCBVB and NLTRA's contributions to the North Lake Tahoe Marketing Cooperative. Staff determined that Truckee's 45% share would be approximately \$63,900. It was suggested to reach this amount by charging higher click through rates, but ideally it was the committee's hope to secure the entire marketing contribution from the Town of Truckee. Debbie Casey has met with Truckee Town Manager, Tony Lashbrook, and Lynn Saunders with the Truckee Donner Chamber of Commerce, to discuss the 45% scenario. Tony explained that the Town was too far into its FY-2008/09 budgetary cycle to significantly contribute to the NLTRA's marketing efforts this year. He noted that in order for the Town to change the scope of their budget allocations, support must come from Town constituents. Debbie explained that her second meeting with Tony and Lynn again demonstrated that although they recognize the need to cooperatively market our region, they have to be responsive to the needs of their constituents. She said Truckee feels they are marketing the entire region. Debbie said that although she did not receive a definitive answer from Truckee, the general feeling is that there is a benefit to marketing the region as a whole.

10.2 Discussion followed with regard to the Truckee Marketing Equity Issue.

10.2.1 Alvina Patterson said there are currently 500 rooms in Truckee competing with our lodging and another 900 new rooms projected. She feels Truckee's contribution should be the same as North Lake Tahoe. Alvina noted that Truckee's visitors guide does not feature any North Lake Tahoe properties.

10.2.2 Lolly Kupec expressed concern with Truckee's lack of enthusiasm about participating in a collaborative marketing effort. She feels Truckee should not be a neighborhood of North Lake Tahoe until they contribute to our marketing. She said that for national marketing it is important to include Truckee, but not as a neighborhood of North Lake Tahoe. Lolly feels we should be focusing our dollars on distinguishing ourselves from South Lake Tahoe. Debbie clarified that Truckee does understand the value of marketing as a region. She agreed that we need to determine stratification of our overall marketing. Debbie suggested that we review feedback from the focus groups as it relates to the *Neighborhoods of North Lake Tahoe* before making a decision. Deb Dudley noted that Truckee contributes funding to our visitor guide.

10.2.3 Roger Beck said that if Truckee hasn't participated by June 30, 2008, then we should "drop them" from our marketing. He also feels we should have been asking for more than the \$63,900. He said we should be requesting 45% of their total TOT (similar to NLTMC contributions) which is \$300,000. Roger clarified that Truckee lodging properties should be dropped from the Web site and they should be eliminated from the *Neighborhoods of North Lake Tahoe* campaign. Steve Teshara suggested we allow them to respond by June 30, 2009 to give them time to respond to a specific proposal. He said Truckee is currently considering a contribution to our new "In Market" map and brochure. Steve added that there is a perspective that it is a benefit to Placer County to have Truckee included. Debbie said it is not just a timing issue; Truckee needs to hear from their constituents before they contribute funds to the cooperative. Roger Beck added that it is not fair to the IVCBVB. Steve clarified that the IVCBVB is in favor of keeping Truckee in our marketing. He suggested we approach Truckee lodging properties with the higher click through rate option before eliminating them from the Web site. He said this may encourage the properties to pressure the Town of Truckee to participate in our marketing efforts.

10.2.4 Jennifer Merchant feels that we have given Truckee ample time to respond to our request for marketing funds. She said Placer County will not subsidize business development in another local jurisdiction. In addition, the County will not wait

until 2009 for Truckee to contribute funds. She said the County sees the value in working collaboratively with Truckee, but there is also value in maintaining equity. She agreed with Roger that the funding request should be higher. According to her calculations, we are subsidizing \$11 per click for Truckee properties on our Web site. She requested up to date click through data from the NLTRA. She also requested the Board take action so staff can work on a click through plan in the interim.

- 10.2.5 Tom Murphy said it is important to include Truckee because they round out our destination. He said even a limited contribution could be very valuable to our overall marketing. Alex said we need to be more proactive with Truckee. He suggested we put a proposal together explaining our position with a timeline to respond. Ron McIntyre understands the need to be equitable, but feels we should not create a division in our community.
- 10.2.6 Deb Dudley said Truckee is a wonderful visitor attraction and a key advantage to our destination. Roger Beck clarified that Truckee should be included in our marketing as an attraction, as long as we don't promote Truckee lodging properties. Ron McIntyre said we should narrow down the cost of what we spend on booking Truckee properties instead of charging them a percentage of their TOT. Adam Wilson said Truckee is part of the North Lake Tahoe experience for visitors. He suggested we come up with a "Pay to Play" model with which to approach the lodging properties. He feels we need to look at more than just click through fees, but what we are doing in total on behalf of Truckee to drive visitors to the Web site. He feels we need to inform the Truckee lodging properties on the situation.
- 10.2.7 Debbie summarized that Truckee is part of the North Lake Tahoe area. She said we need to maintain an open dialog with Truckee because they are an important gateway to North Lake Tahoe. Debbie noted that regional amenities benefit both counties. She reported that Truckee puts more of its TOT into their General Fund and so are currently limited to what they can contribute. In the meantime, the NLTRA will approach Truckee properties about click through charges and encourage them to press the Town of Truckee to contribute on their behalf. We also need to analyze the feedback from the focus groups related to the effectiveness of the *Neighborhoods of North Lake Tahoe* campaign. Roger asked staff to bring back further analysis of the "Pay to Play" rate. Steve said staff will bring that information to the Marketing Committee and Board next month. Debbie said we need to inform the Truckee Donner Chamber of Commerce and Truckee lodging properties about our intent. Deb Dudley suggested that we also approach the Truckee Downtown Merchant's Association. Roger said we should continue to promote Truckee as an attraction including its retail and restaurants. Jennifer said the Tahoe City Downtown Association may not feel the same way. Debbie again expressed the need for stratification of marketing. She said different messages go into different markets.

11.0 CHAMBER OF COMMERCE REPORT

- 11.1 Steve Teshara reported that the May Chamber newsletter is being printed and will be mailed to members immediately thereafter.
- 11.2 The next mixer is scheduled to be held at the Loran Loran Salon in Incline Village on Thursday, May 8th beginning at 5:00 p.m.

- 11.3 Steve reported that the Tahoe Maritime Museum Ribbon Cutting, with support from the North Lake Tahoe Chamber of Commerce, is scheduled to be held on Saturday, May 24th beginning at 11:00 a.m.
- 11.4 The 22nd Annual North Lake Tahoe Chamber of Commerce Business Expo and Mixer is scheduled to be held June 5th beginning at 5:00 p.m. The event will be held at the Hyatt Regency Lake Tahoe in Incline Village.
- 11.5 The Annual Summer Recreation Luncheon is scheduled to be held on Wednesday, June 11th beginning at 11:30 a.m. at the Sunnyside Resort.
- 11.6 Steve reported that the Chamber Advisory Committee had reviewed and approved the updated Chamber Business Plan and recommended approval by this Board. The Board will be asked to consider and approve the document at next month's meeting.

12.0 ACTIVITY REPORT

- 12.1 Ron Treabess reported on the status of Infrastructure and Transportation projects.
 - 12.1.1 The Squaw Valley wayfinding signs are being installed this week.
 - 12.1.2 Ron reported that Web Management Services has been selected as the consultant for the Arts and Culture Feasibility study. The Partnership Selection Committee is now working with the consultants to finalize the contract. Ron reported that the Placer County Board of Supervisors approved the allocation for this project at its April 14th meeting. Jennifer Merchant asked for clarification in regards to contract negotiations. Ron explained that the consultant's proposal was based on the scope of the RFP and that needs to be refined. He said the contract will not exceed the amount allocated and raised for the project.
 - 12.1.3 Ron said the remaining balance of the NLTRA's Infrastructure allocation for the Friends of Squaw Creek has been transferred to the Truckee Tahoe Community Foundation, as previously discussed with the Board and Joint Committee.
 - 12.1.4 Ron reported that the Placer County Board of Supervisors approved the recommended North Tahoe Community Conference Center infrastructure allocation at its April 14th meeting.
 - 12.1.5 The Joint Infrastructure/Transportation Committee reviewed the Infrastructure/Transportation portion of the budget. He noted that the amount of flexible funding for Transportation will increase to \$732,770 plus the amount to be added for rising fuel costs. Staff is researching the appropriate amount to be added.

13.0 PRESIDENT AND CEO'S REPORT

- 13.1 Steve Teshara gave a status report on the SAFETEA-LU corrections bill. President Bush is scheduled to sign the bill prior to the Memorial Day weekend. The purpose of the bill is to fund transportation project development at Lake Tahoe.
- 13.2 The North Lake Tahoe Chamber of Commerce, in partnership with the Lake Tahoe South Shore Chamber of Commerce, is hosting a Watershed Sustainability Indicators Project presentation and lunch on the South Shore on Wednesday, May 21, 2008. Steve encouraged Board members to attend.

- 13.3 Steve announced that he will soon be appointed to the Placer County Economic Development Board, serving in the Tourism industry seat.

14.0 DIRECTORS' COMMENTS

- 14.1 Debbie will contact Tony Lashbrook and Lynn Saunders about today's discussions and encourage continued open dialog.
- 14.2 Ron McIntyre thanked Steve Teshara for taking the lead on the SAFETEA-LU Corrections Bill and securing a new source of federal transportation funds for Lake Tahoe.
- 14.3 Jennifer Merchant reported that specific Placer County TOT data was requested by a rate payer in Nevada County. She said Nevada County lists TOT collections by property. Jennifer reported that in Placer County that information is confidential, although this policy may be superseded by disclosure requirements. She encouraged the lodging properties to submit feedback in regards to this issue. Roger Beck said listing TOT by property would negatively impact the industry. Steve suggested that the lodging properties submit a letter explaining the disadvantages to making this information public.

15.0 MEETING REVIEW AND STAFF DIRECTION

- 15.1 NLTRA staff will schedule a meeting with Placer County to begin discussions related to FY 2008/09 budget and contract negotiations. Staff will also continue to work on the Truckee marketing equity issue and bring further analysis to the Marketing Committee and the Board next month.

16.0 ADJOURNMENT

- 16.1 The Board meeting adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

Submitted by,
Sarah Holster
Executive Assistant