



# **NEVADA LEGISLATURE LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE FOR THE REVIEW AND OVERSIGHT OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY AND MARLETTE LAKE WATER SYSTEM**

*(Nevada Revised Statutes [NRS] 218E.555)*

## **DRAFT MINUTES**

**January 23, 2024**

The first meeting of the Legislative Committee for the Review and Oversight of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and the Marlette Lake Water System for the 2023–2024 Interim was held on Tuesday, January 23, 2024, at 1 p.m. in Room 3137, Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412, Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada.

The agenda, minutes, meeting materials, and audio or video recording of the meeting are available on the Committee's meeting page. The audio or video recording may also be found at <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Video/>. Copies of the audio or video record can be obtained through the Publications Office of the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) ([publications@lcb.state.nv.us](mailto:publications@lcb.state.nv.us) or 775/684-6835).

### **COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT IN CARSON CITY:**

Senator Skip Daly, Chair  
Senator Robin L. Titus  
Assemblyman Rich DeLong  
Assemblywoman Angie Taylor

### **COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESENT IN LAS VEGAS:**

Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod, Vice Chair

### **COMMITTEE MEMBER ATTENDING REMOTELY:**

Senator Melanie Scheible, Chair, 2021–2022 Interim

### **COMMITTEE MEMBER ABSENT:**

Assemblyman Rich DeLong (Excused)

**LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU STAFF PRESENT:**

Alysa M. Keller, Senior Principal Policy Analyst, Research Division

Christina Harper, Manager of Research Policy Assistants, Research Division

Erin Sturdivant, Senior Principal Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division

Jeffrey Chronister, Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division

draft

*Items taken out of sequence during the meeting have been placed in agenda order.  
[Indicate a summary of comments.]*

## **AGENDA ITEM I—CALL TO ORDER**

### ***Senator Scheible:***

[Senator Scheible called the meeting to order, as the Vice Chair of the Legislative Committee for the Review and Oversight of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and the Marlette Lake Water System during the 2021–2022 Interim. She presided over the meeting until the Chair and Vice Chair for the 2023–2024 Interim were elected.]

Senator Scheible welcomed members, presenters, and the public to the first meeting of the Legislative Committee for the Review and Oversight of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and the Marlette Lake Water System.]

Will the Secretary please call the roll? [Roll call is reflected in Committee Members Present.]

### ***Senator Scheible:***

By my count, we do have a quorum. I understand that we have already filled the primary room in Carson City with people in the audience who are here either to give public comment or to observe our meeting. We have opened up an overflow room in 3138, so anybody who was not able to find a seat in the room with the Members can go next door and be able to hear, see, and participate in our meeting. It was also indicated to me that we have a number of people wishing to give public comment.

[Senator Scheible reviewed meeting and testimony guidelines.]

## **AGENDA ITEM II—PUBLIC COMMENT**

### ***Senator Scheible:***

Let us go ahead and take our first public comment section. I am going to limit this public comment to 30 minutes—total. And as a reminder we will have public comment at the end of the meeting. This will allow us to stay on schedule for all of the presenters who have taken the time out of their day to be here and join us. If Broadcast and my colleagues in both locations are ready, we will start with public comment with in-person in Las Vegas.

Is there anybody in Las Vegas wishing to give public comment in person? I do not see anybody in the room in Las Vegas.

### ***Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod:***

There is no one in Las Vegas.

### ***Senator Scheible:***

We will go to Carson City and take public comment in person in Carson City, starting with the first person seated at the table. You will have two minutes. Please begin when you are ready.

***Yolanda Knaak, Incline Village Resident:***

I was very disappointed with the vote of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) on December 13<sup>th</sup> to allow urbanization of Incline Village. This must, this vote must be reversed. We cannot do that in Incline Village. The problems we have in Incline Village is evacuation. I should just clarify; the vote was actually like an initial step. It was for 900 housing development, and I talked to one of the TRPA members recently and he said, oh, I did not vote to urbanize Incline Village. And, so I went back to relisten, and he did vote in favor of 900 new housing development with the plan. Their plan is to then, the next step is 6,000. And the problem we have in Incline Village is evacuation. If you look at the Caldor Fire in South Lake Tahoe—that was a nightmare. And that was a Caldor Fire that was headed towards South Lake Tahoe. If it had been a South Lake Tahoe fire, those people would have been toast. And in Incline Village, we have even fewer roads to evacuate on. And our Fire Chief says we can only go one way on the two lane roads. We cannot take up both lanes because he says he has to have people coming in to help fight the fire. I also looked into getting another, you know, widening the roads. You cannot widen the roads. I looked into other options and there are not any—not at this point. So this absolutely must—for the safety of the people in Incline Village—you know, we have 8,000, over 8,000 people registered to vote there. We have people that are nonvoters, we have children, we have thousands of people that come there every day during the summer—especially. And, you know, with new developments, they are not going to be able to, especially with the urbanization increased heightens density. (Agenda Item II A)

***Tess Opperman, The League to Save Lake Tahoe:***

Good afternoon, Chair and Members of the Committee, here on behalf of The League to Save Lake Tahoe, also known as the League or by our moto—Keep Tahoe Blue. The League is the oldest and largest environmental organization in Tahoe working to protect the Lake for over 65 years. Usually, it is Kyle Davis who is here on behalf of The League, and he has been working extensively in partnership with The League's CEO Darcie Collins for over ten years, and with this Committee, and with the State of Nevada to ensure the Bi-State Compact is upheld and State resources are directed to Lake saving projects and programs. We very much look forward to working with you all during the interim year and the upcoming session. The League staff of scientists and policy experts, specifically Darcie Collins and Gavin Feiger are available as resources for all things Tahoe. They work in partnership with the TRPA and other agencies around the Lake to address Tahoe's biggest threats and are grateful to represent the broader Tahoe partnership as a leading collaborative partner. We look forward to seeing you at future Committee meetings, especially those at the Lake. Thank you for your leadership through this Committee to help Keep Tahoe Blue.

***Brett Tibbitts, Tahoe East Shore Alliance:***

Good afternoon, I am with the Tahoe East Shore Alliance. I am here today to plead with you to actually oversee the TRPA. There is no effective oversight of the TRPA today. They come here often and ask you for money and then come back and give you a glossy presentation—that is not oversight. The TRPA cries out for oversight. A few examples. Number one, the TRPA has the most pathetic conflict of interest rules I have ever seen in 42 years as a lawyer. Cindy Gustafson, the TRPA Chair is married to Wally Auerbach, who owns one of the biggest engineering firms at the Lake. Many clients of Auerbach come to the TRPA for approval, but the TRPA conflict rules do not require Ms. Gustafson to disclose the conflict or ever recuse herself. Two, one lawyer, Lou Feldman represents virtually every developer before the TRPA. He knows more about the TRPA rules than anyone at the TRPA, and always gets what he wants. I have never seen one lawyer representing virtually all clients

before a governmental agency. Three, the TRPA wants to reduce roadway capacity around the Lake to add bike paths. It does not care about wildfire evacuations or reduced ambulance response times that come with reduced roadway capacity. We are sitting ducks to become the next Lahaina or Paradise, California. Four, the TRPA often approves massive new projects without any consideration for evacuation planning or parking; zero parking requirements—so people park on the street. Five, the 15 member TRPA Board is too big, barely one third live anywhere near the Lake; they fly in and fly out for Board meetings. Despite the Lake having 55,000 residents, not a single resident serves on the Board or any of its committees by reason of being a resident. Residents are constantly shut out and disregarded by the TRPA. I could explain much more if you would give me more than 120 seconds. Thank you. (Agenda Item II B)

***Alex Tsigdinos, Incline Village Resident:***

I am a full time resident of Incline Village on the Lake's north shore. We need TRPA to protect Lake Tahoe and the Basin. It is a national treasure under Nevada and California's stewardship. Yet, incredibly, you are the only government body with oversight responsibilities over that bi-state agency; California has none. Please use your oversight, influence, and budgetary control to refocus TRPA on the vital environmental mission it was formed to carry out. Many here have or will spell out in more detail, what we feel TRPA needs to do and how it should be reformed. I will focus solely on ethics. Long ago as a young officer in the United States Navy, it was drilled into me to ask myself two basic questions as a sniff test for ethical behavior and conflicts of interest. First, are you avoiding even the appearance of impropriety? And second, are you absolutely certain your tax dollar expenditures and your official and unofficial relationships are appropriate. If the answer is no to those questions or even if you find yourself equivocating, that is a big red flag. And on those grounds, I fear the red flag is waving at TRPA. Today, TRPA, governors, and county officials—misleadingly named nonprofits—that sometimes receive Nevada tax monies have a tangled web of leadership boards and cozy relationships. Many also have close ties to commercial developers. The governors have no term limits. There is even a financial firewall against Freedom of Information Act requests. Over the years this has resulted in the loss of checks and balances of TRPA's public credibility, its effectiveness in environmental policy making as well as in mission creep. I urge you to require TRPA to adopt a strict code of ethics and conflict of interest policy as a requirement of receiving State funding. Please help restore TRPA to the truly independent watchdog and publicly accountable agency it must be so that future generations of Nevadans and Americans can experience the natural wonder that is Lake Tahoe.

***Ellie Waller, Douglas County Resident:***

The 2012 TRPA Tahoe Regional Plan is stale, existing conditions have changed, and environmental impacts go unchecked. In my opinion, this needs to be remedied. We continue to get a barrage from the nonprofits TRPA about successes. But at what expense to the taxpayers and federal government. In 2010, two nonprofits emerged; the Tahoe Prosperity Center and the Tahoe Fund before the 2012 Regional Plan update. Each have unique but similar missions, and now we have the Tahoe Destination stewardship nonprofit emergence in June 2023. They are all connected and incestuous with TRPA members, nonprofits, plus agencies. Transparency is necessary. All these groups are trying to define the issues with more plans than one can keep track of with this resounding message from the TRPA—we still need more money from public private partnerships, the local jurisdictions, and the federal government. The 777 Plan was introduced and Assembly Concurrent Resolution 5 emerged. Things have gotten way too cozy with Tahoe governance. In my opinion, lots of special interests, nonprofits, stakeholder committees, and agencies are feeding at the Lake's TRPA monetized trough. I strongly urge you not to endorse

anything today until you review the most up to date annual audit required by NRS 277.220 available from the library; as I found it. I reviewed the 2022 and 2023 audits and found the 2022 audit with benchmarks and more thorough info on performance to be more comprehensive than the 2023 audit. This Committee is charged with the oversight in reviewing the budget, program's activities, responsiveness, and accountability of the TRPA. The public wants to ensure that there is not duplicity in the utilization of federal funds and grants. Thank you. (Agenda Item II C-1) (Agenda Item II C-2) (Agenda Item II C-3) (Agenda Item II C-4) (Agenda Item II C-5)

***Ralph Miller, Cave Rock Estates Resident:***

I am a resident of Cave Rock Estates. What is Tahoe? Because without a common vision of that, how can we provide governance and oversight over the Tahoe Planning Authority. Well, in a lot of ways, town might be like Las Vegas. It is a big draw, lots of visitors, lots of activities with one major difference. Before Tinsel Town was built, there was nothing but barren desert. That is not the case here. There is something here that is significant and needs preservation. And we need to make sure that preservation of this wondrous natural event—place is paramount in the planning, not development, not industrialization, not profit, not incestuous relationships that have been discussed. It took great vision and courage to establish the National Park Service. The National Park Service was established with a mission very similar to the mission that TRPA was established with—to oversee and preserve natural wonders for generations to come. I think that constantly thinking of national park when we are thinking about Tahoe is really critical, not economic development, not new features. So what do we have today, recently at [conKahle - unintelligible], we have a whole bunch of million dollar condos and high-rise construction directly on the shores of Lake Tahoe. Think national park.

***Robert Byren, Lake Tahoe Resident:***

Hello, I live along the east shore of Lake Tahoe. And like many, I am concerned by the pro-development posture that TRPA has adopted in recent years. As a member of the Tahoe East Shore Alliance Tech Team, we studied the wildfire evacuation problem in the Tahoe Basin and concluded that the Paradise, California and Lahaina disasters would pale in comparison to tens of thousands of lives lost should a Caldor like fire threaten the South and East Lake communities from the west. Our conclusions better forest management, reduced emergency response time, streamlined evacuation procedures, and improved capacity along U.S. 50 is the primary evacuation corridor, but without some control over new development, these measures will always fall short. TRPA's approval of new housing mid-rise condos, mixed-use zoning, and beach resort townhouse projects in an area already overpopulated will just add to the evacuation, traffic loading, and exacerbate the death toll. Voters Travel recently rated Lake Tahoe within the top ten resorts that vacationers should, and I quote "Reconsider," which is a nice way of saying avoid; as a result of overdevelopment and congestion. Our roads are unpassable. Our beaches overcrowded and littered, and our campsites bursting at the seams. TRPA needs to abide by its organizing mandate as stated in the Bi-State Compact which is to establish a balance between the natural environment and the human-made environment. As the TRPA Oversight Committee, it is your responsibility, and it is within your authority to hold TRPA to its original goals.

***Elisabeth Lernhardt, Zephyr Cove Resident:***

When the wish to look good prevents us from truly doing good. This [unintelligible] describes today's predicament for TRPA. With its longstanding restrictive policies on construction, the TRPA has been destroying development and tourism alike in the

Tahoe Basin. Sensible tourism is necessary for communities like South Lake Tahoe to survive. Rather than defining their environmental goals, ideology, and moral—grandstanding has been the agenda of the TRPA. They joined forces with a few large resorts to create entities that charge for everything from parking to just having the privilege to drive up to the Lake. Their 777 Plan wants to implement taxes for locals, local business, as well as tourists, and commuting employees. They have pushed through ARC 5 last year which gets this Plan one step closer to implication. This is TRPA bypassing the public vote on taxes as is required by the Bi-State Compact. Caldor Fire and the botched evacuation should have been a wake-up call. But when the Complete Streets, Road Diets, reducing vehicle miles travels are on the agenda, the reduced environmental impact and conducting a comprehensive emergency evacuation plan and environmental impact plan are just not their priority. Just like after the Angora Fire, it might require a class action suit to make the TRPA change course. I am asking you today to say no to any further funding unless these studies are performed. The TRPA is submitting to Governor Lombardo's decision to keep the four lanes on Highway 50. Thank you for your attention. (Agenda Item II D)

***Robert Aaron, International Children's Declaration:***

Hello, I am here representing the International Children's Declaration; the declaration on the protection on the human rights of children in a digital age. First, I would like to thank you for this meeting, and I thank the Legislative Counsel Bureau and the Legislative Committee for Review and Oversight of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency. I am a 30 year resident of the Lake Tahoe Basin, a proud father of two, married to my beautiful wife, Ann for 27 years, and an avid water enthusiast. I want to draw your attention today to a critical challenge facing Lake Tahoe. It is plastic pollution. I will make some essential points. As recently reported plastic is being discovered in places we never thought of—our blood and bodies. This material is appearing as plastic sewage on Lake Tahoe's pristine shorelines in all sizes. Also recently discovered is that Tahoe Regional Planning Agency approved cell towers disguised as trees containing approximately 10,000 pounds per tower of this material and have the potential—and have already—released these materials into the surrounding environment. I collected it and sent it in—it had lead in it. This is illegal. This material is entering our drinking water. What are the two agencies responsible for protecting the communities, the environment, the inhabitants, and the children doing? I believe a dereliction of duty and a failure to follow their Bi-State Compact. That means you—TRPA and the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board. These agencies are captured by commercial interests. They are refusing to lift a finger despite our multiple appeals and evidence; some of the important legal issues hopefully will soon be decided in the Federal Eastern District Court of Sacramento. In the case of Isaac Stucken versus TRPA and others, which I sent to you provided in the email in a PDF form. I believe each of you should intelligently and carefully read it. It is of the critical moment at this late stage of our entire Lake Tahoe regional communities to stand together to save and protect this vital resource. Our group has a strategic path forward, and we are here to share with everyone. Thank you for your time and your attention. (Agenda Item II E)

***Janet McDougal, Lake Tahoe Resident:***

Good afternoon, I am a 60 year resident of South Shore. I spent six long years leading a group concerned with the proliferation of vacation rentals around the Lake. We attended governing board and committee meetings to highlight the negative effects on our communities and the environment. I also contacted the former Executive Director's office to request a meeting to discuss our concerns, but was not given the courtesy of a response nor was a lower level staff member directed to contact me. So, I went to the Board to request that they direct staff to contact me; again crickets. Being dismissed by people charged with serving the public exudes an arrogance that is beyond inappropriate, while our

attempts failed the Basin's preeminent development attorney was granted repeated access including lunch meetings with the same Executive Director. As a former public servant, I cannot imagine blowing off a citizen in this manner yet, I am aware that attorneys for developers often go to great lengths to lobby staff. It happened to me while working for the City and the South Tahoe Redevelopment Agency. I am certain it occurs with TRPA staff. Many of the development projects that have been approved or are now in the pipeline present conditions that require significant environmental review. Yet in some cases, this essential review is lacking, and many projects seek to privatize public beaches and Lake access, and build luxury developments. The Lake belongs to everyone, not just those financially well off. Many of TRPAs actions appear arbitrary. In particular, many parcels of land that had been deemed environmentally sensitive and unbuildable now have been developed with large homes. Apparently, if you have money to sprinkle on that sensitive land, you can do whatever you like. I often wonder how the previous owners of this land who paid taxes for years, but we are denied the ability to build would feel upon seeing this new development. I could speak for hours concerning this Agency, the exceptional actions it took in the past to protect our fragile environment, and how it now is failing in its Mission on so many fronts. An overhaul is needed, and local residents need a seat at the table to aid in getting this wayward organization back on track. I thank you from the bottom of my heart for listening to our pleas.

***Natalie Yaniish, Kingsbury Grade Resident:***

Hello, I am a resident of Kingsbury Grade. I have been there since 2002. I wanted to give you some comments. I do not feel like the sky is falling like some of the others in the room here. I believe that there has been some good movement forward with the TRPA and specifically, I have been on the Tahoe Living Revitalization and Community Working Group for a number of years since it was founded. And we have had some regulations that were relaxed that is helping to increase density for a new housing development, which is needed for the workforce that lives in Lake Tahoe. We are a resort area. We have transient workforce that needs to be housed. And this also helps with going forward with the goals of the AIP as far as vehicle miles traveled—because a lot of these areas that these developments are going to be in, are going to allow people to live in the community, work in the community where they live, and be able to get transit locally. So I am pleased that the TRPA Board has passed a number of amendments that are going to help with that. We have an aging infrastructure. No one would have ever built Lake Tahoe the way that it is right now—if there was a planner who came in, they would scratch their heads at it, right? So what we need to do is we need to try to improve the access for people who want to redevelop in Lake Tahoe to deal with the aging infrastructure in the homes that we have that are there now because it is just not conducive to the community needs. I also want to say I serve on the Kingsbury General Improvement District as a Board of Trustee and storm water is a very large issue that we deal with at the Lake. As a small local jurisdiction, we do a lot of the heavy lifting as far as reducing sediment that goes into the Lake. And we are not getting a lot of funding that is coming back to our organization, which does a lot of that sediment removal, which is part of the TMDL, which is the sediment reduction levels that we are signed off by the counties—that is the Tahoe Maximum Daily Load of sediment that goes into Lake Tahoe, and that mainly comes off of the roads. So we are doing a lot of street sweeping. You know, we are investing in that, and our community does—and we pay for that as residents in our local area. And so it would be nice to see some of those funds coming back in so that we can continue that work. I appreciate your time.



**Senator Scheible:**

We are going to take one more commenter in-person in Carson City, and then we are going to go to the phones. We will go ahead and take that last person in Carson City. Go ahead whenever you are ready.

**Ronda Tycer, Incline Village Resident:**

I am an Incline resident for 34 years. Today, if TRPA wants State funds, it must meet State priorities by reducing cars in the Tahoe Basin. So far, what TRPA has done has not worked. In 2023, there are millions of Tahoe tourists driving millions of miles in their cars around Lake Tahoe. Most of these tourists did not reside in the Basin, and most of those miles are for recreation and sightseeing. Perversely, TRPA focused its 2023 car reduction efforts on Tahoe resident's use of their cars. Yes, TRPA voted to increase density in town centers so residents can walk to stores and take a bus to work. And TRPA voted to allow accessory dwelling units to increase the number of residents in residential districts. In 2023, we had 55,500 residents—but 15 million tourists. TRPA should focus on car reduction policies, not on our 55,000 Lake loving residents, but on those 15 million tourists. The obvious solution to minimizing cars in the Basin is to create high-tech shuttle services from Rim parking lots near or outside the Basin, and those shuttles should travel to specific tourist destinations. We do not need huge parking lots at mobility hubs inside the Basin—like the Tahoe Transportation District plans to create; we need free shuttle vans from Rim lots and on-demand micro transit inside the Basin. By all metrics so far, that is what has worked and will work best to save the Lake. Thank you. (Agenda Item II F)

**Senator Scheible:**

At this time, we will go over to the phones. I would like to remind everybody there will be another public comment period at the end of our meeting. Broadcast, if we could have the first caller, please.

**Broadcast and Production Services (BPS):**

If you would like to participate in public comment, please press \*9 now to take your place in the queue.

**Aaron Vanderpool, Lake Tahoe Resident:**

I have been blessed to have lived at Lake Tahoe all my life, mostly on the Nevada side. I submitted written public comment (Agenda Item II G) for the minutes attached to this meeting, but I am calling in right now because I attended Katharine Hayhoe's presentation earlier today that was hosted in part by TRPA. Ms. Hayhoe's voice may resonate with those who attended. Inspired by Ms. Hayhoe and even Jeff Cohen of TRPA's comment at the end. I want to say that I am here providing public comment because I care. I do not believe we need more infrastructure or building more reasons for people to come to Lake Tahoe as TRPA lobbying or organizations are doing. These actions are harming us and the taxpayers outside of Tahoe that fund this stuff. As Katharine Hayhoe inferred, the more people and infrastructure in these settings and changing conditions, the more costs and risks associated with climate change. If you read my submitted comment, you will find the details to my reasoning here. TRPA and other agencies plan to supposedly make Tahoe better are often fake marketing or misguided by other people who care but are doing the things they think but are not correct. They think that paving sidewalks that also contain plastics throughout the forest will help traffic. It does not, it creates more reasons for people to come here and degrades the environment. There is too much money corrupting TRPA's Mission right now.

I believe TRPA's recent actions and those pushed by agencies surrounding them are destroying the very reasons people come to Lake Tahoe and destroying TRPA's Core Mission, making it more dangerous, less affordable. After attending this important talk hosted by TRPA of Ms. Hayhoe, I do not want her voice to be of action to be used as marketing for the wrong actions going forward. We need TRPA to protect ourselves by protecting the environment. They need to stop wasting money on projects that are in conflict with development and growth.

***Senator Scheible:***

Next caller, please.

***Fred Voltz, Nevada Resident:***

Good afternoon. Beyond glossy pictures and glittering generalities, you will soon hear about TRPA's claimed glories; yet TRPA staff and member agencies continue to abdicate key environmental responsibilities already mentioned. Here is one more instance, widespread and uncontained human trash attracts bears and other wildlife into urban areas while polluting the Lake. It also leads to high death rates as wildlife attempt to cross busy highways and ingest food laden plastic. For almost ten years, TRPA has hidden behind the excuses of local control which has not worked; enforcement, which is up to the individual jurisdictions, not TRPA, to perform; and cost without considering the cost of dead wildlife, deteriorating water quality, and wasting law enforcement resources. If humans are the most intelligent species, the excuse that bears and other wildlife have accessed allegedly secured trash containers disproves human ingenuity. Yosemite; Mammoth Lakes; Boulder and Durango, Colorado; Cranbrook, British Columbia have all widely implemented wildlife proof trash containers. Why not, similarly situated Lake Tahoe? The TRPA needs to pass an ordinance requiring universal wildlife proof trash containment throughout the Basin. No more stalling; no more abadaba. The ordinance allows each jurisdiction to modify existing trash hauling contracts. If TRPA continues to ignore sound environmental stewardship, Nevada's Legislature should materially withhold funding. (Agenda Item II H)

***Helen Neff, Incline Village Resident:***

Hello, I am an Incline Village resident and a person very concerned with road safety. First, on a positive note, the recently released comprehensive and well prepared TRPA draft Vision Zero Strategy identifies needed road safety improvements which we hope will be swiftly implemented. This is a needed step in the right direction and my gratitude to the TRPA transportation planners that addressed this issue. I submitted written comments (Agenda Item II I) for this meeting regarding transportation issues around Lake Tahoe. It is frustrating that rather than focusing on providing efficient solutions to integrate resident and visitor transit needs, TRPA and TTD continually proposed projects that do not best serve local residents and then wonder why people are disillusioned. TRPA supports Lake area parking lots for visitors such as Spooner Summit, yet eliminates the parking requirements for affordable housing. TRPA Governing Board votes for development that increases height limits and allows 100% coverage with the argument that more density will create a walkable town center, ignoring objections that amending development code without providing transit options does not create a walkable town center. Instead, the public is told that the buildings have to be built first to create the demand for transit. TRPA approved through a consent item, a 40-unit luxury condominium project in Incline Village directly next to an F-rated intersection, but took no steps to make the intersection safer for pedestrians or cyclists. Again saying the development alone will create a walkable town center. There are additional issues with the Incline Village mobility hub that is proposed and the Crystal Bay-Incline Village bike path that are detailed in my written comments. Without immediate and

effective action the transportation woes in the Lake Tahoe Basin are likely to persist negatively impacting the environment, the visitor experience, and most important, the overall quality of life for residents in the region.

***BPS:***

You have no more callers at this time.

***Senator Scheible:***

Thank you, that takes us to 30 minutes of public comment—actually, it is a little bit more than 30 minutes. I will now close the first public comment period.

**AGENDA ITEM III—ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR**

***Senator Scheible:***

This is required by Nevada statute 218E.555, according to the statute, the Chair should be from one house, the Vice Chair should be from the other house. I will accept a nomination for Chair.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TAYLOR NOMINATED SENATOR DALY FOR THE POSITION OF CHAIR.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD SECONDED THE NOMINATION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY WITH THOSE PRESENT.

\*\*\*\*\*

***Senator Scheible:***

I will take nominations for Vice Chair.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TAYLOR NOMINATED ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD FOR THE POSITION OF VICE CHAIR.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE SECONDED THE NOMINATION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY WITH THOSE PRESENT.

\*\*\*\*\*

***Senator Scheible:***

I am happy to pass over the symbolic gavel to my colleague, Senator Daly who will take over as Chair of this interim committee and of this meeting.

**AGENDA ITEM IV—OPENING REMARKS AND INTRODUCTIONS**

***Chair Daly:***

Thank you, Senator Scheibel and thank you Committee for the vote of confidence, and your able help in the beginning of the meeting today.

At this time, I will introduce myself, if you do not know me, My name is Skip Daly. I represent Senate District 13, which is entirely in Washoe County in Northern Nevada. I have lived in Nevada my whole life. I am familiar with Lake Tahoe and some of the issues, but I am learning; I am not an expert on all of it. I plan to ask a lot of questions and not taking anything at face value on either side, and try to get as much information as possible so we can make informed and meaningful recommendations out of this Committee.

As far as the how the Committee goes, I expect everybody, and this goes without saying, treat everybody even if you have a difference in opinion with respect. There is no need for any animosity or any of those types of things. We will do our best to make sure everybody has an opportunity to have their point of view heard so that we can gain information so we can make reasonable, instructive, and impactful decisions. Some of the other things on this for our fellow Committee Members and for the people making presentations, if we do get a question, feel free to go directly back to that Member asking you questions; you do not have to necessarily go through the Chair. For Committee Members when you are asking questions, the only rule is to wait to be recognized and then go ahead, but if you do have a follow up—within limitations, right—we are fine to go with that; if you go too long, we might say take it offline or, pull it back in, let other people speak, and maybe we will come back if you, if we need to.

At this time, I would like to have Committee Members take a few minutes to introduce themselves, their District number, and where their District is. Let us start with Vice Chair Bilbray-Axelrod.

***Vice Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:***

I am honored to be a member of this Committee. I too, am a lifelong resident of the wonderful State of Nevada. I was raised to really see the beauty in this State, and I think we really have it all. I remember when I was young, my mom coming back from a trip overseas and saying Nevada really has everything that the world has. I think Tahoe is one of those examples where we, we thought of Switzerland. I mean, it is really incredible. I am happy to be a part of this Committee, and I too do not know everything. We will ask a lot of questions and like the Chair said not take everything at face value, and we will dig in deep and take our time making sure these policies are correct for the people of the State of Nevada. Thank you for having me.

***Chair Daly:***

Senator Scheible if you wanted to go next.

***Senator Scheible:***

My name is Melanie Scheible. I am the State Senator for District 9, and I represent the southwest part of Las Vegas. I grew up in Northern Nevada in Reno, and I still have family there and love to visit Northern Nevada every time I get a chance. I feel connected to multiple parts of our State and that is one of the reasons that I have enjoyed serving on both the Natural Resources Committees during the regular sessions and on this Committee last interim, as well as this interim. I am looking forward to hearing from all of the folks that have been kind enough to give their time to present to us and to educate us on the issues facing Lake Tahoe. I know I am familiar with some of them, but of course, not all of them. I know that there is a lot of work to do to ensure that we have this cohesive and collaborative effort to protect the Lake and to serve the residents who live there. I appreciate being able

to serve on the Committee again. I look forward to working with all of you and to having a meeting where we will all be in-person soon and in the same room.

***Chair Daly:***

Senator Titus.

***Senator Titus:***

I appreciate the opportunity to introduce myself. I am Robin Titus. I represent District 17, which is six different counties in the State of Nevada—which is Douglas County, which is why I wanted to be on this Committee because that is a large part of my District is Lake Tahoe. I also represent Lyon County, Churchill County, Mineral County, Esmeralda County, and Nye County specifically—Tonopah. I have been on this Committee before; I am looking forward to serving on again. I was on in 2016 on the interim Committee, and it was interesting then that the biggest impact and conversation we had was about the Angora Fire, which actually caused major changes in the Tahoe Basin with that fire and to sit and hear of the concerns regarding the Caldor fire; things repeat themselves. It will be interesting to see, listen, and hear what we have learned from the Angora Fire, what we learned from the Caldor Fire because there we are definitely changes after the Angora. Many of you have already heard me tell this story, but some of you have not on my history with Lake Tahoe, since my family's been in Nevada since the 1870s; in Smith Valley since the 1880s. My mom growing up as a little child in the 1920s, her family would go—she, her parents and three siblings—go up to Lake Tahoe over Kingsbury Grade. They had an old Model A pickup truck that could not make it over Kingsbury Grade. So in those days, no such thing as a four-wheel drive—so they get almost to the top—all the little kids that have to jump out, and they would turn the pickup truck around and they would back up and over Kingsbury Grade, turn around and all the little kids that jump back in and they go over the top and enjoy Lake Tahoe. So, it has been part of my family, enjoying Lake Tahoe for a long time and boy have times changed. Thank you for allowing me to be on this Committee.

***Chair Daly:***

Assemblywoman Taylor.

***Assemblywoman Taylor:***

That is a great story

***Senator Titus:***

And it is even true.

***Assemblywoman Taylor:***

That makes it even better. My name is Angie Taylor, and I proudly represent Assembly District 27 in Northern Nevada—Reno—West University—around the Northwest area and some of the northern part of community. As a freshman legislator, I am really excited about my first term on this Committee. Tahoe is a gem—it really is. All of you are here because you know that and recognize that, and although I am a person who grew up in San Francisco—so I do not have a story like that—which is awesome. I do certainly appreciate Tahoe—love going there, and visiting there with friends and family when I can. I am really interested in learning. There are a lot of issues. Thank you for those of you who have emailed us and who have shown up to share your concerns. There is so much all of us

have said that we need to learn; I look forward to that. Many of you in this room, if not all of you know, I have forgotten more about this issue than I even know yet because it is so new to me, but I think you have a Committee—from what I can hear—that really wants to learn and wanted to hear from you. We thank you and look forward to our work.

***Chair Daly:***

Our final member who could not be here with us today is Assemblyman Rich DeLong. So everybody help remind me when he does make a meeting to put him in the hot seat and ask him to introduce himself.

At this time, I would also like to introduce our staff for this interim. Alysa Keller will be serving as our Committee Policy Analyst. We have Erin Sturdivant and Jeffery Chronister, serving as our legal counsel. And our Committee Secretary is Christina Harper.

Before we move on to our next agenda item, which Alysa will be giving an overview of the Committee. I wanted to touch base on a couple of things we are going to approach. When I reviewed the statute that enables this Committee, I looked at a couple of things. Basically, it provides that we can review and oversee the budget, programs, activities, responsiveness, and accountability of the TRPA and Marlette Lake water in such a manner as deemed necessary and appropriate by the Committee. We have very broad purview to look into things and then make recommendations to the Legislative Commission; we will make those. Another thing that we are able to do, I do not know if we have, we are going to attempt to reach out to our counterparts in California, to continue to communicate with members of the Legislature and the State of California; we are going to attempt to do that. We also are going to talk with Nevada's Department of Transportation and the Forest Division. We are going to talk to as many State agencies as we deem necessary within the time limits and restraints that we have. We will be having meetings; the Senator Scheible is hoping to make it up to Northern Nevada. We will be having meetings in the Basin, so keep an eye on what we are doing if you have a question or concern on various things. The best way to get hold of me is to call me and my cell phone number is on my website; you can look that up. You can send emails and various things, but I get so many of them, they become too much, so phone calls work.

**AGENDA ITEM V—OVERVIEW OF COMMITTEE'S STATUTORY DUTIES AND SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE 2021–2022 INTERIM**

***Ms. Keller:***

Thank you, Chair Daly and congratulations on your election. I am Alysa Keller with the Research Division of the LCB, and I will be serving as your Policy Analyst for the Committee this interim. I look forward to working with all of you. I have prepared a brief Committee Overview (Agenda Item V) and that Overview is available on our Committee web page and in the Members meeting packets. The Overview provides historical information, tentatively scheduled meeting dates, an overview of the duties and voting requirements of the Committee, as well as summaries of the Committee's recommendations for legislation from the prior two interims. The Overview also includes a list of Committee staff and their contact information. I will go over a few of these items right now, but please know that I am always available to Committee Members if you have any questions later.

The general duties of the Committee, as set forth in the statute, are to provide appropriate review and oversight of the TRPA and the Marlette Lake Water System (MLWS); review the budget, program's activities, responsiveness, and accountability of the TRPA and the MLWS

in such a manner as deemed necessary and appropriate by the Committee; study the role, authority, and activities of the TRPA regarding the Lake Tahoe Basin and the MLWS regarding Marlette Lake; and to continue to communicate with members of the Legislature of the State of California to achieve the goals set forth in the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact.

The Committee has been budgeted to hold up to six meetings during the interim. The Committee is authorized to submit up to ten requests for bill drafts. Those legislative measures must relate to matters within the scope of the Committee, and they must be submitted by September 1<sup>st</sup>. The Committee needs to finish with its work by August 31<sup>st</sup>. The tentatively scheduled meeting dates for the five remaining meetings are: March 8<sup>th</sup>; May 3<sup>rd</sup>; June 7<sup>th</sup>; July 19<sup>th</sup>; and August 16<sup>th</sup>—for the final meeting and work session. Please note that the May 3<sup>rd</sup> date replaces the previously proposed April date due to a conflict.

Last interim, the Committee's focus included such topics as environmental restoration, invasive species, wildfire and forest health, climate resiliency, economic development, water quality and clarity, and transportation issues in the Tahoe Basin; as well as MLWS updates concerning operation and various capital improvement projects. The Committee recommended two legislative measures both of which were enacted by the 2023 Legislature. The first recommendation which became ACR 5 of the 2023 Session was to request the drafting of a resolution expressing the Nevada Legislature's support for the Lake Tahoe Transportation Action Plan. The Action Plan includes State transportation priorities for the Lake Tahoe Basin in response to Senate Concurrent Resolution 8 of the 2021 Session. The second recommendation, which became Assembly Bill 424, was to request the drafting of a bill authorizing the release of the next phase of general obligation bonds in an amount of \$13 million to continue to implement Nevada's portion of the Lake Tahoe Environmental Improvement Program—also known as the EIP—for the 2025 Biennium. Representatives from the Division of State Lands will be providing a presentation today to provide more information regarding the Lake Tahoe EIP.

The Overview document also includes a list of recommendations for legislation from this Committee during the 2019–2020 Interim. Finally, you will find in the Overview document, a list of statutorily required reports that are submitted to the Legislature and may be of particular interest to our Committee members.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you would like assistance in acquiring any of these reports, or if you need assistance with any of the issues related to matters that come before this Committee. Thank you Chair, that concludes my summary of the Committee Overview.

***Senator Titus:***

A question for staff. It seems from the history of the last couple of interims, most of the things that were brought forward were mostly Resolutions and nothing really substantial or any real changes that this Body did. Simply they were Resolutions.

***Ms. Keller:***

Resolutions and the bill authorizing the EIP.

***Senator Titus:***

Specifically, last year there were two bills brought forward, but you said we have ten potential. Do you know any of the history? I have not looked at any prior Committee

meetings or the final one from that last interim. Were there not any? Did the Committee not come up with any other ideas? It would have been a good thing to make changes up there or was there a pathway of least resistance?

**Ms. Keller:**

Well, those were the recommendations that the Committee voted on at the work session. I will have to take a look for you.

**Senator Titus:**

You were not part of that Committee?

**Ms. Keller:**

I have been staffing it for the last two interims.

**Senator Titus:**

All right, I will look it up.

**Chair Daly:**

Any further questions. All right, seeing none. I would just comment, probably not your place to try to get in the heads of what the Committee did last time, whether there was two or ten. Anyway, we have to end; good to know and we will act accordingly, but only if we have good ideas.

## **AGENDA ITEM VI—OVERVIEW PRESENTATION BY TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY**

**Chair Daly:**

With that, we will move on to agenda item six, which is the overview presentation by the TRPA. We do have Julie, and then we will take questions. Let us go ahead and try to look through the whole presentation unless someone has an urgent question to interrupt, and we will ask it right then, but otherwise we will wait to the end.

**Julie Regan, Executive Director, TRPA:**

Chair Daly, and Members of the Committee, my name is Julie Regan, and I am the Executive Director of the TRPA. I am very honored to be in front of the Committee, and I am joined here to my left with Devin Middlebrook, our Government Affairs Manager, and Chris Keillor, our Chief Financial Officer. I have a few Board Members in the audience: Shelly Aldean, representing Carson City; Director James Settlemeyer from Department of Conservation and Natural Resources; and I may have some on line as well.

I appreciate the chance to be here. I have been with the agency for 20 years, and I have worked with the interim Committees for those couple of decades. I have been the Director for the last year. What I thought I would do since we do have new members on this Committee—welcome—to give you a big picture overview (Agenda Item VI). I think it is really important to have some foundational background because it really does touch on a lot of the public comment that we heard. During my couple of decades working with this Committee, we have had a lot of interest from the community. This is a great showing



today, and I want to thank those members of the public who spoke. We work with many of these stakeholders—we look forward to doing more of that.

With that, a basic acknowledgement, which I think is important to talk about acknowledging Lake Tahoe as the homeland of the Washoe people—the people from here. The Washoe are the aboriginal stewards of the land in and around the Lake Tahoe Basin since the beginning of time, and as a sovereign nation, the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California continues to advocate for the protection and preservation of the Washoe people's homelands. We are very proud to work with the Tribe on many programs and projects.

In context of looking at the history of the Basin, the TRPA is a Bi-State Interstate Compact that was formed in the late sixties, but before that Lake Tahoe was on an important path of growth and development that happened after the 1960 Olympics—but Tahoe was always a summer getaway. We had skiing, we had recreation, small cabins—the Olympics changed everything in 1960, and then there was a building boom that happened—the advent of gaming occurred. Our Agency was formed in 1969, but then we saw still a lot of growth and development over time. When you look back at where the small population was back in 1950. Senator Titus, that was a great story about your experience coming over the hill at Kingsbury—where our office is located. You can see there was a great boom and bust cycle of Tahoe, and there was a lot even preceding modern history with the Comstock Era of logging. There was a big debate about making Tahoe a national park. We heard some comment around that today—about 100 years ago because Lake Tahoe had been such an altered waterscape/watershed and damage from the Comstock Load—the tree removal in the Basin where two-thirds of the trees were logged for the mining operations in Virginia City—the determination was made not to make Tahoe a national park. We have this new innovative opportunity with our Bi-State Compact, that is really unique in the United States. It is one of it is kind. There are over 100 interstate compacts that protect natural resources across the country, but none that are structured exactly like ours. We were the first Bi-State Compact in 1969 signed by Richard Nixon. The two states passed substantially similar/identical legislation that then was ratified by Congress. So California and Nevada at that time came together; Governor Laxalt at the time in Nevada and Governor Reagan of California—before he went on to be the President—got together and said we do not want this Lake to turn gray on our watch. Then over time, there have been a number of amendments. I will say we heard public comment around the makeup of the Governing Board. The 15-member Governing Board is intentionally set as it is very specific in terms of the representation, and it is required in the Compact that the majority of our Board be nonresidents of the Lake—that was important at the time. We have local elected officials; we have seven from Nevada, seven from California, and one nonvoting presidential appointee. I also want to say, I am very proud of our Board—it is a volunteer Board. They meet monthly; our meetings are open to the public, and perhaps we can invite some of you to participate in them as well.

Our Mission is to balance this incredible resource of Lake Tahoe and protect Lake Tahoe so we can enjoy it today, but also those coming after us can enjoy it. But also realizing that we are not a national park and there is private land in Lake Tahoe. That has always been the healthy tension and the framers of the Compact recognized that. Our goal is to achieve these environmental goals and standards for the region while allowing for orderly growth and development. That is part of the concern that you are hearing today, and we are going to dig into that a bit. The Compact was amended. I think it is important to recognize the two states came together between 2011 and 2013 and passed updates to the Compact, and Congress consented to that. One of the considerations in the updated and amended Compact of 2016, was to require us to consider economic issues when doing regional planning and had provisions related to litigant's burden of proof; so a couple of changes that

happened fairly recently. We have heard about the complexity of the watershed, but when you see it visually, I think it bears without saying, that it is a complicated landscape in terms of political, geography, two states, we have five counties, one incorporated city, and then we have an abundance of public land—almost 80 percent of the land is managed today by the United States Forest Service. It was not the case in 1970—that has grown over time—all told we have about 90 percent public land in the Basin, which people have a right to enjoy. Then there is 10 percent private land that we moderate development.

It requires the TRPA as a Compact Agency to have what we call epic collaboration. Nothing happens in Tahoe without partnership, and we have multiple partners that we work with on a day-to-day basis. The heart and soul of what we do revolves around the Compact—our North Star, our regional plan—which was first adopted in 1987; after litigation, we have been to the U.S. Supreme Court and back—settled that. There is a lot of history that as we get out into the field and talk with you more over the course of this interim that will become clearer. In the interest of time, I will recap what the Regional Plan is all about. Back in 2012, when the two states came together to renew their commitment to the Compact—a Regional Plan—our Board updated the Regional Plan, and it continues a limitation on growth and development. Back in 1987, development was capped—there are numbers for everything—single family homes, commercial, all sorts of commodities that we call tourist accommodation units—that was capped. We still have development from the 1987 Plan that has not been built yet in Tahoe, and we will talk about that, but those development caps continued. For example, we have an allocation of 130 homes around the entire Lake Tahoe Basin per year and that is all there is; there is a waiting list for building allocations for single family homes today. We have to ensure that development is consistent with the Plan and our environmental goals. What was a huge thrust of that update back in 2012, was to make Tahoe more bike and walkable because we developed, before TRPA and our partners in local jurisdictions, had conservation measures in mind. We are an auto-oriented community, and we cannot build any bigger roadways around the Lake; we have to go back and retrofit roads, build new trails, and improve transit. That is a challenge in a rural small area. We also have the Regional Transportation Plan; what we called a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). There is an alphabet soup in Tahoe, we will give you a cheat sheet for all the acronyms. The MPO is a special designation that we got over 20 years ago because our year round population is not large enough to even qualify to get federal funds. But fortunately, we are able to get that amended in federal statutes. We do get more than the average small town in America, but it is not nearly enough for the transportation challenges that we have. We have an obligation to reduce dependency on the private automobile, reduce vehicle miles traveled, protecting Lake clarity at the same time while recognizing that we are a tourism-based economy—a \$5 billion annual tourism-based economy. We are working with our community to harmonize that and to leverage the power of tourism to help our local residents and support Lake Tahoe. But in any community—transportation is a challenge—it is very costly, expensive. But at the Lake, what happens on the land and the roads affects our beautiful water clarity and water quality. Sometimes you will see Departments of Transportation engaging with Natural Resources agencies, which does not happen in every jurisdiction in the country.

I will transition into this epic collaboration and partnerships that we talked about. You will hear much more from our colleagues from the Department of State Lands and DCNR about the EIP. In a nutshell, the first Summit of 1997 is what put us on the map in terms of this incredible partnership where the federal government; two states—California and Nevada; local governments; the private sector; the Washoe Tribe; our science community; and many, many partners have worked together to have a capital investment strategy to address the legacy development impacts of the past. It is only through that partnership that we are making progress in the Basin's preservation and restoration. This slide shows is this

vast partnership at the various levels: ten federal agencies; multiple agencies within California and Nevada by State agencies like ourselves; the TRPA; our sister agency—the Tahoe Transportation District, which is also authorized in the Bi-State Compact—you will be hearing from them later in the interim—and then all the local jurisdictions; private sector members; and the science community, as I mentioned. There are four focus areas that make up what we call the EIP, watersheds, and water quality—that is our famous clarity. Last year, we were delighted to hear clarity was better than it had been since the 1980s. We do not expect that trend to continue, sadly, because there are a number of pressures on the Lake; but we do track that with our partners at U.C. Davis, University of Nevada-Reno, and a consortium of scientists that work on the Lake. This is where our invasive species program comes in—you will be hearing about that in future meetings, as well. Forest health, you heard from public comment, the severity of the situation in Tahoe. We had the Angora Fire of '07 where we lost 254 homes. Fast forward 15 years later in the Caldor Fire, where absolutely fortunately, we did not lose one full-time residence in the Tahoe Basin. I was affected. I still am finding embers in my backyard in Christmas Valley from that Fire, and live with that scar every day. It is very poignant to all of us who love the Lake, live at the Lake, and we share those concerns. I am happy to answer questions further in the interim, and talk with fire officials about what is the latest on evacuation planning. Our role as TRPA, is to support our law enforcement and fire professional partners. The last two focus areas; sustainable recreation and transportation. That is the crux of this booming economy that we have in terms of outdoor recreation. We will explain a little bit of what is shifting in the visitor pattern and the infrastructure that we need to improve in that space, science stewardship, and accountability working with the Tahoe Science Advisory Council with the community and with nonprofit partners. You have heard from some of those partners from the League to Save Lake Tahoe. There are Board Members and representatives of the Tahoe Fund here, and other entities that are working to engage the community and improve education, or what we need to do collectively to improve our Lake and our communities. If you think of the scale of the funding that we have been able to amass in Lake Tahoe—it is impressive. We are now approaching \$2.8 billion invested since that first Summit when President Clinton and those partners came together to celebrate the Lake; each Sector has made substantial contributions. Nevada has fulfilled its share of what we call the EIP by bond sales. Senator Titus asked the question about this Committee's role. It has been critical to have this Committee support those bond sales, because that is how we have been doing the watershed restoration, the investments in shuttles to Sand Harbor State Park, and other capital investments that we need to continue. You will hear more about that.

I think the takeaway from this is that we have all locked arms together to move forward and achieve the vision of the Regional Plan in a small community that does not have the tax base to support these investments. We will continue to tell you more about that as we move forward.

It is important to recognize that the EIP not only is here to protect the Lake, but it is also an economic engine for our community. We have about 1,700 jobs a year that our studies have shown are directly related to investments in those bike trails, in those watershed restorations, and some of those big capital projects. There is an economic benefit to the investments that the public sector has made, and a very important private match that has benefited the Lake and our communities. We do track all of this. It is an open platform called [LakeTahoeinfo.org](http://LakeTahoeinfo.org) or [LTinfo.org](http://LTinfo.org). You can go on any of these different icons and click on the EIP project tracker. You can click on the button to see what is going on in watersheds and water quality. What are the projects that are going on around the Lake? How are they getting paid? What is the federal share? What is Nevada's share? What is the private community's share? I invite you to take a look at that. We update in real time—it is

constantly changing and evolving. But importantly, we must recognize what are the challenges of today, and what are the priorities of our Governing Board and of our 70 member staff? I believe we are facing unprecedented challenges. You heard that same sentiment expressed.

I was personally at Ms. Hayhoe's talk this morning. She is the Chief Scientist of the Nature Conservancy. We are proud to collaborate with the University of Nevada, Reno and U.C. Davis and other partners to bring her to Lake Tahoe. She had a great analogy when she looked at the Lake and she said, "We all love the Lake like it is a family member, and when we see changes in that, it is like we are being affected ourselves or our family is being affected." I think that you will hear that passion in the community, and we share that as well. Our staff live in the Basin, work in the Basin, and in the region as a whole. We are dedicated to making sure that this Lake remains pristine. But there are differences of opinion that I think will be flushing out over the course of this Committee's work.

A couple of key stats I wanted to leave you with before we wrap up here. That is what has been happening with population. We are at 55,000 persons in the Basin—that is Nevada and California. We are down 12 percent from where we were in 2000. So, our population has diminished. That is not the same as visitation—and we are going to talk about that. Where has that population changed? If you take a look at the next chart you will see, and this was affected from the Zoom town/boom town effect of the pandemic. Nevada has actually grown in population around the Basin versus California shrinking. We saw more of an influx during the pandemic and people could work remotely. That created a whole new set of challenges that we are still working through. Where is this population change really coming from? I have been at the Agency for 20 years, and I remember when Governor Schwarzenegger negotiated treaties with Native American tribes in the late nineties. Immediately as Native American casinos started opening throughout the State of California—Tahoe's jobs started to plummet. You can see the number of jobs in green, the revenue in blue and occupied rooms in red. We started hemorrhaging community and jobs, schools start closing—that was before the recession—and then the recession hit and compounded issues. And then it rebounded, but this change in what people do when they come to Tahoe has had real lasting impacts. You will see one of those impacts is the change of where people go. They used to come and gamble and what we like to say—they have moved from being on the casino floor to the great outdoors—patterns have shifted. These small corridors around 28 around Sand Harbor, 89 around Emerald Bay are seeing increased traffic and interest because outdoor recreation went through the roof during the pandemic—nationally. People have discovered the great outdoors, and we have abundant public lands. So, we have this changing visitor pattern of our visitors in terms of total numbers; we are not seeing through the roof changes, but where they go has changed and that has put more stress in our recreation areas. When you look back at what we did in the 2012 Regional Plan; what was exciting was that we address this issue of mobility and trying to move people around differently—making Tahoe more bike and walkable. The two states came together to say the old legacy development is dilapidated and run down; we need reinvestment to improve the environment. One of our previous directors, Jim Bichi, who is a renowned environmentalist said the project is the fix; we do not have a lot of new growth, when we get reinvestment and redevelopment, we leverage environmental benefits. Over the last decade, over \$400 million has been invested in the Lake. But at the same time, we have transferred development from sensitive areas into town centers where it is close to transit, trails, and more walkable. Today, a conservation success story of the Basin is we almost have 9,000 to 10,000 parcels that were protected from development in our urban areas. My home in Christmas Valley has a forest service lot on either side. There are checkerboard lots around the Basin that will be protected forever and that has been attributed to the partnership.

Going forward, you are going to hear about these in future meetings, but we have three key strategic priorities that our Governing Board has set. The Tahoe Living Working Group, which you heard public comment around, is looking at housing. How can we, as TRPA, affect what is a national crisis of affordability? We are taking a hard look at our policies. We are thinking of the people that work in the Basin; people that are cleaning rooms in hotels, people that are cooking food, and serving drinks and food and making housing more affordable for those local members of the community. That is a big piece of work.

The restoration and resilience is continuing—the EIP and Keeping Tahoe Moving is focusing on transportation investment. I must thank the Committee for your support in the past. I want to welcome the new members. We did get Nevada up to it is one-third share. We request our appropriations to the two states in a two-thirds, one-third funding arrangement. Since the recession, Nevada's share had been short of one-third. I want to thank the Members of the Legislature, the Governor's Administration for supporting us to have Nevada back at its one-third share, and to work on the main talent pool of TRPA. We have nothing if we do not have a workforce that is talented to execute the vision of the Compact. We have an incredible staff and some of those dollars have been used to improve our retirement and our staffing. We thank the Committee for the work on the bond sales and for supporting transportation investment through those resolutions.

We have a lot of work ahead. We have a lot of challenges—some of the biggest challenges I have seen in my 20 years at the Agency's history; but it is through that epic collaboration where we make the most progress. We will have disagreements, we will listen, and we will work through it. You have my commitment to work with all of you and with our communities to harmonize as best we can and move forward. I thank you for your time, and we would be happy to answer any questions.

***Chair Daly:***

Does your colleague have anything to present? Any questions? Senator Titus first.

***Senator Titus:***

In your presentation, did you tell us how many employees you have?

***Ms. Regan:***

We have about 70 employees. I am proud to say that in my year, we only lost one staff member, and we are hiring a new attorney. We hope to be at about 72 staff within the next month or two.

***Senator Titus:***

What has changed when you started? Last time I was on this Committee; how many did you have in 2016?

***Ms. Regan:***

When I started at TRPA, there we are about 90 plus employees with seasonals—just under 100. We seriously changed our organizational size and only recently have tried to get more right size. We have been very fiscally responsible, but it is taken a toll on our staff. That is the rule of thumb.

***Senator Titus:***

I ask because one of your final comments was supporting salary adjustments and to enhance staff retention. Terms like fiscal responsibility is music to my ears, but I appreciate that you have tried to make sure that you can function number one and do a good job but not become too bloated on that.

***Chair Daly:***

Assemblywoman Taylor.

***Assemblywoman Taylor:***

A question, one of the things that I have always been aware of is the gap between those who work in the Basin—the front line employees, many of which you gave examples when you spoke, the need for affordable housing for them. Any idea on what that gap looks like? I know that is been on the radar for quite a while—something I have been aware of. Do you do studies or anything? Whether what we need versus what we have?

***Ms. Regan:***

I am going to call on my colleague Devin Middlebrook. We have done extensive work in that space.

***Devin Middlebrook, Government Affairs Manager, TRPA:***

Yes, that gap is something that we are very aware of in the region. Prior to the Coronavirus Disease of 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, the Basin's median home price was around \$450,000 over the last seven to eight years—has jumped to \$750,000 to \$800,000. We have seen that great growth in the housing price—that is wages have not kept up. Prior to the pandemic there was a study—the study for the South Shore area; Zephyr Cove to Myers on the California side. There was a need for around 3,500 housing units, currently in the works in South Shore are over 1,000 of those potential units. We are consistently looking at updating that data given the recent trend in the last several years. So, that is one of those factors—increased housing cost. We also have commute patterns. We have up to half of our workforce that commutes in from outside of the region, mainly from the Nevada side. We are working on reducing transportation costs and barriers, and ensuring there are park and rides and shuttles from the Valley up to those employers, and working with the private sector to ensure that their employees know about those programs. We have the housing cost gap, transportation problems, and then general lack of potential supply in housing and quality of housing in all areas that we are addressing.

***Assemblywoman Taylor:***

I appreciate that.

***Chair Daly:***

Any other questions from the Committee, Vice Chair, or Senator Scheibel? No.

I have a couple. We will have other discussions when they have a lot of questions, but not all of them are appropriate for today. You did mention that 90 percent is privately owned, forest division, municipalities, counties, et cetera, and 10 percent is private. The gentleman said that there is a shortage of housing, and then there are 1,000 houses that are in the

works. I thought you said there were only 130 permits a year; am I mixing those two things?

**Ms. Regan:**

We track all of these units—affordable—there are units set aside for affordable housing and you heard a comment about 950 units—those do not count, they are exempt from that allocation, but they have been banked and waiting for projects to happen. Some of those units have been carried over since 1987, but because of the cost, and the discussion that we had earlier, they have never been brought to fruition. Those units are separate and the 130 is for market rate, single family homes per year that get distributed throughout the Basin to the various jurisdictions. We have a cap on all of those units, and we track them and there are ways to transfer some of those development rights. That is the work that our Governing Board did a matter of years ago—about five to six years ago. Again, we are not seeing the investment in our town centers where we need the workforce housing to occur so that people do not have to rely on a car. We have about 1,000 households in the Basin that do not have automobiles. We are trying to concentrate the workforce housing in areas that are more walkable and bikeable for people to get to work. There is an accounting system for all of that—that is online—and we can dig into that a little deeper in the future.

**Chair Daly:**

You use the term affordable housing—there is a definition—we could spend the whole afternoon discussing how that works and various things. You have to have private investment; is some of that looking to be in an urban area or on public land. Is there some exception where that may be utilized? Because I understand it may have to be that way. But if it is already a parcel that is not up for restoration or any of that type of issue because it is already in the city center, is that something that is on the potential to be done?

**Ms. Regan:**

Yes, the largest affordable housing—and there is affordable, there is moderate housing, there is achievable, and we can go through those different definitions later. But Sugar Pine Village, my team took a tour yesterday, it is modular construction of 248 units on the California side on the South Shore—that was donated state land from the California Tahoe Conservancy through the State of California. What we are finding is that our local jurisdictions—City of South Lake Tahoe, Placer County, various jurisdictions—have parcels that are helping to make those projects so-called pencil out—to be economical to build. Because the cost of land is so high that often is a barrier. So, we are working on what we can do with our rules to incentivize private markets and private investment in those town center areas. But yes, public land is a big topic at the State level and also at the federal level. In Colorado, there was a provision in the Farm Bill; one community in Colorado is doing a test on federal land to do housing and a lot for their own workforce. We have been in talks with the United States Forest Service, we are not set up to do that yet in Lake Tahoe, but that is a conversation that is happening; because again, 80 percent of the land is U.S. Forest Service and some of that is in town center areas that we want to look at strategically as a potential solution to help with the problem.

**Chair Daly:**

Looking for trades or various other possibilities. I am trying to think ahead and logic but if there is only 10 percent of the land left that is private, and there is pressure on it to develop it and various things, I am assuming you have rules against subdividing. If someone has 10 acres, you are not going to let them subdivide into 100 parcels or third acre parcels or

whatever—I am assuming you have rules on that. So at some point, you are going to get to where there is not any more private land available for development. Then it all becomes a matter of who has enough money to buy out somebody, enough to sell their parcel, or I am going to buy up. Are there rules against, for instance, I know there are several Raley's up there and various things around the Lake—so you are going to say the grocery stores got a parking lot—got 10 acres—if someone has enough money, they could buy that and then potentially build on that—residential or whatever. Are there rules against that?

I know that you have zoning laws and land use planning and various things, but are there safeguards and say no, you are not going to be able to change these things. We have to have so many grocery stores—we do not want to create food deserts and the rest of the issues that could possibly come with that. Are all of those safeguards in your plans that you have, because you will run out. And then it will be a matter of who has enough money to make somebody sell out.

**Ms. Regan:**

Yes, we do not have typical subdivisions happening in Tahoe where 500 to 1,000 to 2,000 homes are being developed all over—both states. You cannot do that because we have this metered system of development. We have something called a two-step subdivision process, but it is very different than what you might experience around the two of the states, the State of Nevada, and there are rules in area plans. The compromise of the Regional Plan of 2012 allowed for each local jurisdiction to have what we call local area plans, and they have very detailed site specific areas. There is not a one size fits all. The idea was that local governments could show that their plans meet the requirements of the Compact and the Regional Plan and the standards, but can be customized to address things like that. We also have something called land coverage, where we count every square foot of impervious surface—parking lots, structures, anything that is covered—you can only have a certain percentage of that—and for a residential home, it might be 30 percent. That was part of the discussion in housing to try to get more incentives in town centers. There are a number of factors, there are scenic requirements that we have in place. It can get site specific, but happy to dig into examples with you and the Committee; to better answer your question.

**Chair Daly:**

I think there is something like 175 local area plans.

**Ms. Regan:**

There is something called community plans and plan area statements—I think is what you are referring to. But no, there are about a dozen area plans. For example, Placer County has one area plan for the whole North Shore on the California side; Douglas County has one; Washoe has one. It covers areas and then there are districts within the area plan, so each jurisdiction has done it a little bit differently—the city has multiple area plans.

**Chair Daly:**

I thought I looked up and read that there was a number.

**Ms. Regan:**

The plan area statements was sort of the 1987 framework, the area plans are the more modern 2012 framework, but the main takeaway there is that local jurisdictions have more



flexibility, which is what we heard in the compromise of the 2012 Plan, but they have to add up to achieving the goals of the Compact and the Regional Plan. That is what our Board ensures when our Board votes on those area plans to approve them and to recertify them.

***Chair Daly:***

I understand you do not have traditional subdivisions like you would have in Reno, Sparks, or Carson City and other areas. More probably what I see are multimillion dollar houses by ultra rich people that come in and say, "Oh, I want to build my house," and then they want to say, "I do not want anything else to come because I might be impacted." I was trying to figure that out. My analogy is you are going to run out of space. I am a Viking's fan, but we use the Green Bay Packers as an example. There are only so many season tickets, and they are all sold. The only way you get in on that is to be on a waiting list and wait for someone to die, right? Or if you have enough money, then you can get in, right—make it worth somebody's while to sell at least one or two. There is a finite amount, and we have to address that eventuality.

Two final questions. One, you mentioned an amendment that was made by the two states, 2012, 2011—somewhere in there—where it was added in your considerations and planning to consider economic considerations. So there is a hierarchy—and maybe this is one question with both elements—I saw it in reading the Compact, of what I read in it—what I gleaned out of it—is you have the environmental concerns, that was number one—that was the genesis of it. We do not want to see the Lake turn gray on our watch. The two governors get together consent to Congress, which was to make sure we are not degrading the environmental aspects of. The second was in the hierarchy—if you ask me—was to make sure that you have access, preserve, and restore the Lake, the scenic routes, various things for visitors, for the public people that may or may not live there. The 15 million that come to enjoy the Lake, same as if it was a national park—I know it is not. Further down on the list, and all of those things would be the economic considerations. Now you have to have it and I understand you have businesses there and the tourists have to have accommodations and you have to have that. I believe the word that is in there, everyone keeps saying balance, but it is equilibrium. What was the change there in the economic considerations? And then where on the hierarchy is that, with the change in the law?

***Ms. Regan:***

Yes. The Compact specifies five mandated categories for threshold standards. Now we have ten; so things like air and water quality, scenic resources—actually, recreation is one of those ten categories—vegetation, scenic resources, et cetera. We have these categories and underneath that we'll have over 100 to 150 individual standards, that we have to show are not degraded for the orderly growth and development. The Compact, as you rightly point out, it is not the word balance—it is equilibrium and harmonizing. Therein lies the challenge, harmonizing a community with this natural resource. It is the community, utterly that relies on this natural resource to live, for quality of life, and for the economic vitality. In terms of our legal obligation, yes, the standards are the standards. The truth of the matter is we have always had the economic lens because we understand that we have a community, and we have a lot of small businesses that have struggled over the years. That was a big conversation in previous interims of the rules that we have can be challenging—they are very complex. We have been working overtime to make them more transparent so that people can be excited about following the rules and not afraid to walk in the door, into the TRPA office, to say, "What will someone find wrong with my property?" We have been working on that for many years. It is like a pendulum. I feel like in my early days in front of

this Committee, there was a lot of concern that our rules we are too burdensome. We have been able to enhance the standards and the acceleration of achieving our standards, at the same time making our regulations more understandable for the public. We have invested in that and then the economic consideration is part of analysis that is done in environmental reports. On the California side, you have the Environmental Quality Act; we have our own environmental reviews that happen on any significantly large size project. It is a complicated mix, but there is a very detailed environmental checklist that goes with various projects. I know folks have concerns about that, but again, happy to dig into that in more detail should you request that.

***Chair Daly:***

We will probably have to so that I can ask some of these questions; we are going to move on here quickly. But I would say because when I was reading through—and you have the Planning Commission, which is a sub part of this—who is on that; you have a lot of your planners from each of the counties having to spend more time than I care to remember over what the issues are around development and various things in different settings. In other words, I think the TRPA may have more ability than say the City of Reno to say, “It does not meet all of these other extra requirements.” We have that a city or somebody could not put in Reno on a development, right? Because people have the right to develop land for the highest and best use. Cities regularly get sued if they deny it for arbitrary capricious reasons. Where I think you are unique and have a little more standing to put more criteria on top of that; they have the right to develop, maybe not to the best, highest use, you have to only develop it to this extent. I think you would stand a better legal challenge on that. But yes, I would like to see and answer the final question—first half of my question. What are the hierarchies that the TRPA views those considerations—what is the hierarchy?

***Ms. Regan:***

Sure, we have had this question. My Board Members in the audience could probably wax poetic on this. We have had debates. Is the water quality threshold standard more important than the scenic resource standard or the vegetation standard? The truth is we have to harmonize all of them. There is not an order to that. We have to find that they all are maintained or achieved. So all together, I think it is a real good analogy of the human body—you need your lungs to work, you need your brain to work, you need your heart to work—so we need it to all work together. We are a living ecosystem at the Lake. We try to harmonize all of those various programs. We have been set up internally where we had different quality program managers for one topic area, and we hit roadblocks. We have approached it more as a resource integration area at the Lake of how we do business at TRPA. I will say the main change that occurred around how we think about all these issues was the total maximum daily load. I know you will hear a briefing from Nevada’s Division of Environmental Protection. We recognize that the built environment is actually contributing negatively to the environment with runoff. We mentioned storm water as part of that, so we have adjusted how we are looking at the built environment as a result of what we need to do to reduce fine sediment, nitrogen, and phosphorus flowing into the Lake. But we harmonize that with all the other standards on a project by project and a program by program basis.

***Chair Daly:***

That is it for me, unless anybody else has a follow up question. I look forward to hearing from you between now and the next meeting.

## **AGENDA ITEM VII—OVERVIEW PRESENTATION BY STATE LANDS, DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES REGARDING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND RELATED NEVADA PROGRAMS**

### ***Chair Daly:***

We will move on to Agenda Item VII, which is the overview presentation by the Division of State Lands (NDSL), State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR) regarding the environmental improvement program and related Nevada programs. We have Charlie Donohue and Ellery Stahler.

### ***Charlie Donahue, Administrator, NDSL, DCNR:***

With me here today is Ellery Stahler, she is the Agency's Deputy Administrator. Ellery is going to be doing the lion share of this presentation (Agenda Item VII), but I wanted to give you a little bit of history and more of the foundation and build on what Executive Director Regan discussed with you from a Nevada perspective as we move into talking about the environmental improvement program.

Before I do that, I wanted to introduce the Committee to our new Tahoe Program Manager, Kevin Fromherz. I wanted to recognize that the DCNR Director James Settelmeyer is present in the Committee room, as well as our Deputy Director Chad Stephens. I think Dominique Etchegoyhen just took off.

One of the things I wanted to raise the question, why the NDSL when it comes to implementing the EIP in the Lake Tahoe Basin. The NDSL has a long engagement in the Lake Tahoe Basin that started particularly in the 1970s with the Attorney General's opinion in 2004. In 1976, where Nevada asserted it is sovereign land ownership of the bed of Lake Tahoe. That is a principle considered under the equal footing doctrine when the State became a State in 1864. The navigable bodies of water in the State transferred to the State in it is sovereign capacity. I wanted to then fast forward to 1985. In the mid-eighties, the Legislature in the 1985 Session passed Chapter 585, which created the original Tahoe Bond Act, which established a Land Commission to look at the sensitive nature of lands in the Lake Tahoe Basin. The Legislature allocated \$31 million of general obligation bonds at that time to secure sensitive lands in the Basin and retire those parcels from development. The Legislature requested that went before the voters in 1986, and it was approved by the voters. The Legislature and the NDSL has a long history of engagement within the Basin. In the 1990s, the Legislature created the Lake Tahoe License Plate Program. That is a program where we actually receive revenue from the Department of Motor Vehicles—with the sale of the Lake Tahoe license plate. We hold grant rounds and provide funding agreements and funds to entities within the Basin to do high-quality environmental work, as well as interpretive educational outreach as well. In 1999, the NDSL was authorized to carry the first portion of the State's EIP. That was a commitment of Nevada's request of \$82 million, which I had the pleasure of being engaged in when I first started State service.

In the early 2000s, the Nevada Tahoe Resource Team was created—you are going to hear more about this from Ellery. It is a critical team of resource professionals that deliver the EIP on behalf of the State of Nevada. In 2009, AB 18 was authorized for the EIP Phase II, which established \$100 million in authority of general obligation bonds for Nevada's Phase II commitment of the EIP. You will hear from Ellery that we have a significant amount of those funds still available. We typically come back to this interim Committee to ask for a

bill draft request (BDR) to have a draw against that \$100 million. With that Chair Daly, I would like to turn it over to Ellery to carry the lion share of our presentation, but we will both be present to answer any of your questions along the way.

***Ellery Stahler, Deputy Administrator, NDSL:***

I am happy to be here. As Charlie mentioned, the NDSL has a long history of environmental improvement in the Lake Tahoe Basin. That history has been largely carried out through the Nevada Tahoe Resource Team (NTRT); that is an eight member team housed in the NDSL, but it is a special team because it has members from multiple State agencies including the Division of Forestry, Department of Wildlife, and the Division of State Parks, as well as the NDSL. Each member of the team contributes their special expertise to create more holistic project planning and more effective projects to help the environment at Lake Tahoe. We like to say that the members also carry their Agency along with them, so they do not work independently or as that eight member team, but they also work in close consultation and with the backing and the support of their home Agency. That is done along with the support of obviously NDSL and DCNR. Since its inception in the late 1990s, the Team has implemented or funded 170 EIP projects; 138 are complete; and 32 are in various stages currently of planning, design, or construction.

I would like to dive in to our various program areas. The first being recreational enhancements of the recreational infrastructure at Lake Tahoe Nevada State Park. There are four units of Lake Tahoe Nevada State Park including Sand Harbor, Spooner, Cave Rock, and Van Sickle. The team focuses their efforts to enhance the recreational amenities there. Most recently, you may be aware of a new visitor center that was constructed. We call it Spooner Front Country Visitor Center along with an amphitheater, trails, and other amenities. We hope to do something similar in the near future. We are currently working on design plans for the Van Sickle Unit of the State Park to create a new visitor center there as well.

Moving on to forest health and restoration. The forester, who serves from the Division of Forestry on our team, focuses on forest health and resilience projects within the Lake Tahoe, Nevada State Park. We also have an NDSL urban forester who works on forest health treatments on the nearly 500 State-owned lots that are scattered among communities and neighborhoods within Nevada Lake Tahoe. They work together to prescribe treatments to help mitigate the threat of catastrophic wildfire while also improving forest health and resilience. We recently completed defensible space work around infrastructure at Sand Harbor, completed 84 acres of treatment at Bon Pland, which is a drainage south of Tunnel Creek, but north of Sand Harbor. We are looking forward to a rather large implementation project to treat over 450 acres near and around Marlette Lake; that is to initiate in spring of 2024—in the next couple of months.

Our water quality program is a little bit different than our other EIP program areas in that we primarily get work done here in this program category through a grant program. We administer a water quality grant program. We solicit projects from local jurisdictions, special districts, and other entities requesting that they submit their high-priority projects to help mitigate the impacts of storm water to Lake Tahoe's clarity. We recently funded a large capital project called Lure Wood Creek in Incline Village; that was a partnership with Washoe County and Nevada Tahoe Conservation District. We are looking forward to providing future funding opportunities for our local jurisdictions. We know that high-priority projects include Upper Third Creek, Rosewood Creek in Washoe County, and then storm water infrastructure improvements along Kahle Drive in Douglas County. The NTRT continues to be a member of the Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Coordinating Committee.

We are currently a funding partner in the planning and design of a permanent AIS inspection station near the intersection of Highways 28 and 50. You will see a photo of what our bottom barrier mats at Sand Harbor, near the boat ramp, and those are deployed in order to help control Asian clams. We are in the process right now of working with U.C. Davis Tahoe Environmental Research Center to determine the effectiveness of that treatment in controlling that invasive species.

We have a busy season ahead of us—two seasons ahead of us. Here is a handful of the projects that we are working on, many of which I have already mentioned. While the focus of our work is within the Lake Tahoe environment, we are aware that Lake Tahoe Nevada State Park has both a west slope and an east slope. I wanted to mention the Team does look for opportunities to work outside the Basin boundary to help promote more landscape scale benefits, especially in terms of recreational trail connectivity and also with forest health treatments.

As Charlie alluded to in his opening remarks, we are currently within the reauthorization of the EIP that was initiated in 2009, with a \$100 million commitment. That legislation provided for the NDSL to come back to the Legislature as needed to request EIP bond authorization in installments under that \$100 million commitment. Those requests, we are very pleased and grateful, have traditionally been supported by this Committee through sponsorship of BDRs. I will note that we have about \$58.5 million of authority remaining under that \$100 million commitment. This is a graphic representation of the previous bullets which show in the orange bars that is the legislative authority—those small commitments under that \$100 million authority; the gray bars are the bond sales from the State Treasurer's Office; and then the blue line shows the Team's ability to expend those bond funds to get important projects completed on the ground. What the takeaway here, for me, is that our Team averages about \$4 million of expenditures every year. Through our experience, we have recognized how helpful it is for the Team to have a reliable continuous source of funds. It helps us span the gap between planning, design, and construction. Then also helps us move through multiple construction seasons if we have large-scale projects that require extra time.

Finally, we are proud to report our program updates and accomplishments on a semi-annual basis to the Nevada Interim Finance Committee. You heard Julie Regan, Executive Director of TRPA, mention her Lake Tahoe info website and that is where our Team provides project level updates and reporting. We also stay in close coordination with the State Treasurer's Office to keep them apprised of our current expenditures and also projected spend of our bond funds. We provide quarterly updates as needed to the Governor's Office. That concludes our remarks. If you have any questions, we would be happy to answer them.

***Chair Daly:***

Committee Members, any questions? Senator Titus.

***Senator Titus:***

Does it require a bill biannually to reissue bonds?

***Mr. Donahue:***

Yes, that is correct.

**Senator Titus:**

Has there ever been a Legislative Session where there was not a bill put in to reissue bonds because there we are still bonds remaining?

**Mr. Donahue:**

I believe there is one instance when we did not request an additional draw. I would be happy to research that and get that information to you.

**Chair Daly:**

If no one else has any questions, I have a couple. You went through the Nevada side of forestry, NDOW, et cetera, et cetera. Is there a similar committee on the California side? Do you interact with them, or do they not have the same deal? I know you do not have jurisdiction over the whole Lake.

**Mr. Donahue:**

First to Julie Regan's comments, the partnership in the Basin is very strong. We actually are meeting collectively on Friday. The lead entity I would say in California is the California Tahoe Conservancy—we coordinate with them. They do not have a model like us, but they have resource professionals, and also the California Department of Parks implements projects on their side. But the uniqueness of the NTRT is unique and how it was packaged.

**Chair Daly:**

I was curious on that. I have not been on this before, so I do not know if it has been asked. Both of those agencies you mentioned in California are public agencies, they are not nonprofits; they are public agencies.

**Mr. Donahue:**

Yes, they are public agencies. As you heard in public comment, one of our partners are nonprofits who are engaged in implementing the private share of the EIP as well. We try to stay as well coordinated as possible.

**Chair Daly:**

Excellent. The last question is not really a question, it is more a comment. When the State implemented its sovereignty over the Lake bed, did they get it at rim level—just kidding.

**Mr. Donahue:**

I would be more than happy to answer that because it actually was; the Legislature has proclaimed that the State's ownership lies lakeward of 6,223.

**Chair Daly:**

So at the Lake level.

**Mr. Donahue:**

Without the dam in effect.

***Chair Daly:***

People that have served on the served on the Natural Resources Committee are familiar with that argument over the years. So just asking, if there are no further questions from the Committee. Thank you for your presentation.

**AGENDA ITEM VIII—OVERVIEW PRESENTATION BY MARLETTE LAKE  
WATER SYSTEM OVERVIEW PRESENTATION BY TAHOE REGIONAL  
PLANNING AGENCY**

***Chair Daly:***

We will move on to Agenda Item VIII, an overview presentation on the MLWS. We have David Dutra. Go ahead and proceed when you are ready.

***David Dutra, Deputy Administrator, Public Works Division, Buildings and Grounds,  
Department of Administration:***

We have oversight over the MLWS. With me today is Brian Walker, Deputy Administrator of Professional Services for the State Public Works Division. I would also like to introduce the Project Manager over some of the more significant capital improvement projects (CIP); Brian Crosby in the audience, and also Blake Gudmundson, who is the certified operator of the System. We have been asked to provide you with a general overview, which will consist of a historic significance of the operation as well as key features, major components for the historic water collection storage, and conveyance system. We are going to identify stakeholders, customers, and benefactors; and talk briefly about recent improvements, planned improvements, and future improvements. (Agenda Item VIII)

The infrastructure primarily consisting of the dam at the MLWS was constructed in 1873 in support of the logging industry and was later transferred over to support the collection, treatment, and conveyance of raw water for domestic and industrial use in the Comstock District and Carson Valley. In fact, it is the sole source of water for Virginia City, Gold Hill, and Silver City. Carson City, in the valley, also benefits by consuming roughly 90 percent of the water that the System generates and that represents about one-third of the water for the Carson Valley that is used. In fact, in Fiscal Year (FY) 2023 the System delivered over 659 million gallons of water to Carson City and Storey County. The System was engineered in 1873, as I mentioned, and it was later purchased in 1963 by the State of Nevada for a cost of \$165 million. The System is recognized by the American Society of Civil Engineers, and is on the list of the National Register of Historic Places.

Annually, the System has the capacity of generating roughly 8,077 acre feet of water or about 2.6 billion gallons of water. Currently, as of 2013 through 2021, we averaged roughly 1,500 acre feet of water or about 19 percent of the capacity. Initially, the System relied on a flume that was an outflow from the Marlette Lake that flowed in a northeasterly direction to a tunnel. The Marlette Lake Incline Tunnel was 3,994 feet long, that was completed in 1877. However, in 1966 the Tunnel was abandoned after a collapse and the installation of a pump system was put in place. Water is actually pumped from Marlette Lake to Hobart Creek where it flows into the Hobart Reservoir. I will share a little more about that here in a second. The Flume Trail today is used as a walking trail—I will share with you a little later on. The site is frequented by a lot of hikers, bicyclists, and equestrians.

In terms of the operation's major components, on the State side, Marlette Lake itself is 11,000 acre feet of water behind an earth-filled dam. We rely on the pump station, which

I mentioned, and also the Hobart Reservoir. The Reservoir is about 2,700 acre feet of water. We also rely on the east side of the divide. We rely on six catchments which catch spring water and divert that to the diversion dam. The diversion dam combines the outflow of Hobart as well as the catchments where it is then combined, metered, and sent to the Lakeview tank. The Lakeview tank meters the water into what has been described as the world's largest inverted water siphon. Our inverted siphon which provides water to Storey County and also diverts water to Carson City. In that process, we reduce the pressure because of the fall, and we rely on three pressure reducers and the inverted siphon. We maintain the section up to Interstate 580 then east of that to Storey County. However, Storey County and the State partners on the maintenance of that line, and we rely on one another—it is a great partnership.

This next slide is a topographical map identifying the major components that I mentioned. East of Lake Tahoe, you are looking at Marlette Lake, which is considered one of the second jewels of the Sierras. The pump station at its shoreline—that is a submersible 230 horsepower fully submerged electric pump, which is supported by the pump house that flows to the Hobart Stream which flows into the Hobart Reservoir. Again, it is combined with the catchments that flows to Lakeview. Lakeview then will flow down to Carson City and the inverted siphon. I mentioned the generator powerhouse that was a significant CIP project in 2009—that was a \$7.5 million CIP project. It houses a 12 cylinder 3412 Caterpillar motor that provides power. It is also supported by other generators and solar systems for a very remote location that we from literally today through likely probably June will not be able to access because of the snow load. If we do access it, it is done by snow cats. We rely on helicopters. Last year, we had four trips in order to spill Marlette Lake, given the excessive precipitation that we had in water accumulation. It also houses our Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition(SCADA) system which is a computer controlled system that enables us to remotely control our distribution of water. This water that is pumped then flows into Hobart. Hobart is a 35 million gallon or roughly 107 acre feet of water that is relied upon. That represents roughly 1 percent of Marlette Lake in terms of size. The reservoir dam is a rubble- and earth-filled dam; it was constructed in 1877. It is 1,300 feet long and 28 feet tall.

I spoke briefly about the catchments that are on the east slope. There are six catchments with plans to add three additional catchments, because we still have a surplus of surface water and spring water runoff. The capacity currently is at about 600 gallons a minute and that is conveyed to the diversion dam. The use of the catchments is critical to the System because it allows the water to stop, slow down, and suspended solids to settle out of the water, which greatly improves the turbidity and clarity of the water. It is award-winning water that we are providing to Virginia City, and they have been the benefactors of that System. From Incline, the catchments extend east about 4.5 miles. These photographs show the before and after—this was a 2014 CIP where we replaced the older catchments for something much more new, increased capacity, and serviceable as well.

These photographs show the consequences of a significant weather event. The catchments were significantly overwhelmed, and it was required after the storm to bring in crews to clean and restore that. We have operators on a daily basis. We have three operators that are assigned to managing what amounts to about 27 miles of roadway and the infrastructure that I am referring to today.

I spoke briefly about the diversion dam. The diversion dam was upgraded in 2017. We just finished a CIP project in excess of \$1 million to further upgrade this infrastructure to include added SCADA control systems, monitoring systems, flow monitoring systems, increased security measures, and also new valving at this site. The photograph shows the Lakeview



tank, so it flows from the diversion dam, what portion of water were in need of, some of it spills into Washoe Lake, but the portion that is captured and diverted to the Lakeview tank allows for additional suspended solids to settle out before being metered to Carson City and the inverted siphon to Virginia City.

This System has a rather significant drop to it—the Lakeview tank location, elevations, and locations of the air boxes. Again, those air boxes allowed the System to reduce the pressure—so we do not have so much head pressure, by the time it reaches the reservoir in Ash Canyon. We have a reservoir of 1 million gallons. We have an aboveground tank of 3 million gallons as well. Carson City has an aboveground tank, and they are relying upon these Systems for further treatment before the water is sent to their quill treatment facility. This is a photograph of the old air boxes and newer boxes that were replaced in 2015 through a CIP. This next is a topographical slide showing the location and significant aspects of that portion of the System that is east of Interstate 580, which is under the management of Storey County. Shown here is the inverted siphon and the end of the inverted siphon where water then gravity flows around to the five mile reservoir before entering the treatment facilities that Storey County has.

We have a number of stakeholders, customers, and benefactors—two primary customers; Carson City and Storey County, both of which are not only customers but partners in the System. We conduct regular meetings and there is a great deal of transparency. In fact, both entities are able to view our SCADA systems in order to better manage their downstream systems. I mentioned many beneficiaries. It is an all-season access to some 2 million visitors. Some of the more significant benefactors and partners in these properties would be Nevada's Department of Wildlife (NDOW), backpackers, hikers, anglers, overnight campers, wildlife support groups, and educational visits. All of this would not be possible if it were not for the support that we received from our customers and stakeholders, which include the Division of State Parks.

Shown here are the spawning gates that are managed by NDOW. This is essential for our fisheries generating over 1 million fish annually, it is my understanding, they are in the process of refreshing the structures. We are also working to improve access during lower lake levels for those fish to spawn. So that is a real jewel of the lake.

Recent improvements, those would include the recent upgrades to the diversion dam that I spoke of. That is a little over a \$1 million CIP. We recently rebuilt the top end of the generator. We have increased our use of the SCADA system. We are going to rebuild the catchments in 2014, those six that I referred to and also the air boxes. Planned improvements include the east slope transmission line this year, as well as adding three additional catchments. That is going to be a significant increase in the amount of water that we convey to the Lakeview tank system. Proposed projects include the sawmill transmission line; a 3.5 mile line increasing from 18 inches in diameter to 24 inches in diameter. Again as we increase the collection of water through those added catchments, the conveyance systems also need to be increased. Lakeview 580 transmission line update is planned and the Carson City transmission line. From the Lakeview tank, it will enable us to transfer and convey more water to Carson City.

We have a number of significant CIP that have been underway for several biennium. The Marlette Lake Dam Restoration Project is greater than 60 percent completed in its design, and Brian is available to discuss that project if you have any questions. The Hobart Reservoir Dam Reclamation Project that was recently approved by Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)—matching funds that project is moving forward. The Diversion Dam East Slope Project is now 100 percent completed and then we have the additional

catchments which are planned for 2024–2025. Future proposed budget items might include: the Marlette Lake Level Dam Reclamation that is going to have certain fiscal impacts that we are working through; rebuilding the bottom end of the generator is a matter of consideration for future years; raising the Marlette Lake pump, again I talked about a 230 horsepower fully submerged pump that needs to come out of the water—we need to rebuild its impellers; we would like to also increase the intake which is at lake level now—that needs to be raised off the lake level that will reduce suspended solids that might be captured in that pumping process; and there are thoughts of replacing a front end loader, as well as constructing an equipment shed. That wraps up a general overview of the System in its entirety. We are available to answer any questions.

***Chair Daly:***

Questions from the Committee?

***Vice Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:***

I do have a number of questions, but I am going to take it off line; I am having some technical issues.

***Mr. Dutra:***

We will be happy to answer those.

***Chair Daly:***

Very good. Senator Titus.

***Senator Titus:***

Curious about the interface where the State stopped at 580 and Storey County takes over? In the past, I have heard about the condition of that piping, and it has been improved—I would assume. Who is accountable for making sure that it works. It seems like, is Storey County paying for 100 percent of that?. I know they buy the water. It would seem we are obligated to maintain that. How does that work?

***Mr. Dutra:***

We have had a number of failures. They tend to be catastrophic. They are increasing in frequency. The pipeline is an original pipeline, at times it is exposed—fully exposed. It tends not actually, it never leaks, it just explodes when it does because it is under about 600 pounds of pressure. Up to 580, if we experience a failure, generally, both entities, Storey County Public Works will respond as well as ourselves in a partnership to make repairs. We have parts on hand to repair, as do they, and it is a vice versa. If it is a blowout on their side, we will bring what is needed, they will have crews available as well. It is a pipeline that is in planning to be replaced, it is the section from Lakeview tank to 580, I believe is \$14.5 million for 3.5 mile line; it is quite expensive, but it is at the end of its life.

***Senator Titus:***

To follow up on that if I might Chair. Who gets the bill for that? Do you share the bills for these repairs on either side of the highway, do we bill Storey County, or do they bill us?

**Mr. Dutra:**

We share the cost. They will bring in equipment, we will have equipment as well as manpower and the parts are again relatively inexpensive compared to the labor and the excavation that is needed—and that is a shared cost.

**Chair Daly:**

A couple of questions; how old is the oldest pipe that is still in use?

**Mr. Dutra:**

I believe it is 147 years old.

**Chair Daly:**

Back to 1873.

**Mr. Dutra:**

1877, that is correct.

**Chair Daly:**

I think that is it. I think we are going to try to tour and go up and visit Marlette Lake. Where would you recommend the best place to see.

**Mr. Dutra:**

We are happy to accommodate a full systems tour. We generally do two or three tours a year beginning in the summer months, sometime late July-early August; when we can actually access it.

**Chair Daly:**

I do not know if we will have time to do the whole thing.

**Mr. Dutra:**

We will pack lunches and it is generally, round trip it is going to be a four hour journey into the lake and back out.

**Chair Daly:**

Well, some of us may take you up on that separate from our field trip.

**Mr. Dutra:**

We will look forward to that.

**Chair Daly:**

Any additional questions? Thank you for your presentation and we look forward to interacting with you further as we move along.

## **AGENDA ITEM IX—PRESENTATION REGARDING COUNTY PRIORITIES FOR THE TAHOE BASIN AND MARLETTE LAKE WATER SYSTEM**

### ***Chair Daly:***

Agenda Item IX, a presentation regarding county priorities for the Tahoe Basin and MLWS. I believe we are going to go with Carson City first. Is that correct? Proceed when you are ready.

### **A. Carson City**

#### ***Darren Schultz, Director, Public Works, Carson City:***

Good afternoon Chair, Members of the Committee; I am here to give a brief overview of our water system as it relates to the MLWS. With me today is our City Manager Nancy Paulson; our Utility Director Andy Hummel; and our Water Operations Manager Joe Rena. Some of the items that I am going to go over today double up on what we heard from David. I will go through them quickly. (Agenda Item IX A)

My presentation is a quick overview of Carson City's current water system. It is rather complex mostly due to the way we develop our water, both from the surface and from groundwater; also because of the variance in topography for our City. We have a large number of different pressure zones, so every time water crosses from one zone to another, it has to be regulated. The different colors on the screen represent the different pressure zones. All of our information in terms of the size—we have just over 18,000 accounts that we serve. It does depend on the year and where we get our water. We use conjunctive use, which is a combination of groundwater and surface water. Last year, obviously, we used a lot of surface water. But a few years before that, when we were in a drought, we were using our groundwater wells much more often. We go back and forth depending on what Mother Nature gives us. Our dependence on the MLWS, depends on the type of weather that we are having, but it can be anywhere from supplying 10 percent of our yearly water up to 25 percent. We are also connected with two other counties around us—Douglas County to the south and Lyon County to the east.

A little bit of history of the surface water in Carson City. Some of this is a repeat of what you heard, in 1869 is the earliest record we have of someone in Carson City, actually on a commercial level, supplying water to businesses and residents. It should be noted that in the advertisement he put that the rates were moderate. That original water system was filled by the Quill Ranch Ponds, which is by Kings Creek and Springs; and we are still using that water today—155 years later. In terms of the State and some of what David mentioned of the State system being purchased by the State and then water starting to flow down to Carson City. The State actually owned their own water system within Carson City; and State buildings and facilities were served by that water system—it was independent of Carson City's water system. That water was provided by this MLWS. In the late 1980s when the discussion started to happen about the State to abandon their system and to be served as a regular customer of Carson City. As part of that agreement, it was agreed upon that some of the Marlette water that was available from the mountain system would come to Carson City to be used to serve the State customers as well as other customers. Shortly after that, our Quill Water Treatment Plant opened in 1992, to correctly treat that water.

General overview map; I am going to skip this one since you saw it, and talk about our Quill Water Treatment Plant upgrades that are underway. As I mentioned, conjunctive use, we need to treat our water from all sides so that we can use groundwater at times and

use surface water at times. Our Water Treatment Plant allows us to blend the groundwater which is often high in things that we do not want with surface water that does not have that; and then all of the water is usable. We also want to meet future demands. That is another big part of our Quill Water Treatment Plant upgrade—the need for eight million gallons a day (MGD) further of production to meet our build-up population of 80,000 people. Current Plant is rated for 4.5 MGD. We can actually only treat 1 MGD due to the standards—the water standards having gone up and the degradation of our plant. It is over 30-years-old and the way we treat water is outdated—it no longer will treat to meet the standards that are required. We are under design of our new Quill Water Treatment Plant package filtration system with ultraviolet (UV) disinfection—we anticipate it to cost about \$17 million. We are planning to be under construction later this calendar year and complete in late 2025.

So where we are today. We are currently working under an interim agreement with the State on water purchase—it is a year-by-year agreement. We are working on a long-term agreement similar to what we have had before to meet the needs of the City, as well as Storey County and the needs of what the State needs to operate the system. During the Marlette Dam rehabilitation project, that David mentioned, we will—here in Carson City—have to depend on other sources of water to get us through that time when the lake is not functioning in terms of sending water over the hill. As I mentioned, we can take more water than we can treat, but the City continues to buy our full allotment of water even though it cannot be served to our customers. We do that in an effort to make sure we keep the State operation budget whole to function, and so we are purchasing more water than we are actually putting out to our customers. We are able to use that water and get credit for it to put back into our groundwater storage to pull out of our river induction wells. Then we exchange with ranchers that we still have here in Carson City. That concludes my presentation. I am open to any questions.

***Chair Daly:***

Questions? Senator Titus.

***Senator Titus:***

I am curious. I am the County Health Officer of Lyon County, so I am always interested in public health issues and water treatment especially. It comes up a lot with contamination, always concerned about the groundwater, arsenic, heavy metals—those kind of exposures. I get that you have to treat the arsenic, there are minimal standards, and you would have to do that with all the groundwater. Curious about your statements about the surface water and environmental concerns—not just of contamination with bacteria, Giardia, and multiple other things that get into that on the surface. There are other contaminants that you mentioned here in your statement that you are not able to treat—most of our surface water sources with current filtration process, but you are using a lot of the surface water now, but you cannot treat it with your current process. Is that what you said?

***Mr. Schultz:***

I understand the confusion, the technology that is in our plant right now, because it is behind the curve, we can only treat a lower amount of water than is actually available to us at that source because we have to continue backwashing back and forth to allow us to treat. That is the difference in it. It is the water that is there for us to treat. Our technology is not to the current standards to where we can treat it all. We can only treat a small portion at a time, the rest goes past us.

**Senator Titus:**

So that is the only portion that goes to your citizens is a part that you have treated.

**Mr. Schultz:**

That is correct.

**Senator Titus:**

In your new capacity, in advancement of treating more surface water, will you treat and have a different filtration system to take out some of the contaminants that we are looking at now that are indeed in some of our water.

**Mr. Schultz:**

That is correct. Our new treatment system will be able to—it is very modern and will keep up with everything that is current, and even thoughts of future treatment that will be needed; it will be prepared for that. The goal is to make sure that all the water that is available to us can in fact be treated and served to our customers.

**Senator Titus:**

I am concerned in a previous comment was made during this Committee hearing about contaminants, plastic contaminants, other type of chemicals that we never anticipated before. Hopefully when we do some modernization, we will be able to anticipate that.

**Mr. Schultz:**

We will, a lot of that is out in front of us. There is still not even standards for some of those contaminants that we have. We are aware of it. We are ready to jump on it. But until some regulations and laws get put into place, we do not know what we are dealing with a number of those, but it is on our radar.

**Senator Titus:**

One more train of thought here. That is a forward thinking—that is important because we do not even know what chemicals are out there. Just making sure the new processes would perhaps capture some of that.

**Mr. Schultz:**

That is correct.

**Chair Daly:**

Assemblywoman Taylor.

**Assemblywoman Taylor:**

I want to make sure I heard correctly. You are in the process, you are getting the new treatment—the capabilities to treat a greater number of gallons; so we cannot only meet the needs, but treat the water that you have that right now. There is so much of it we cannot treat, we are on that road, right.

**Mr. Schultz:**

That is correct. We are almost at 100 percent design, and we plan to go to construction with this new project this spring-summertime; it will be under construction.

**Assemblywoman Taylor:**

Do you know what is the estimate? ETA? How about how long?

**Mr. Schultz:**

It will be ready in about 12 to 18 months total. What is interesting is we anticipate our plant being up and ready and right at that time, or around that time, is when the construction of the dam is going to happen. We will not be treating Marlette water right away, but we also treat the two creeks that come in off of the west side, Ash Creek and King—that is also surface water that flows through our new treatment plant as well.

**Assemblywoman Taylor:**

And that will meet your demand?

**Mr. Schultz:**

What we will do is during that time when the Marlette Lake water is dry for a period of time, we are going to have to depend more on our wells and get through—yes.

**Chair Daly:**

Any questions Vice Chair?

**Vice Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:**

I wanted to ask, you said something about the water that was unused was still being purchased and then resold for ranching, I believe. What is the thought behind that? I guess it would not that make more sense to, are we not...I know the goal is to store that unused water. Is it a use it or lose it situation? Which I know that has been an issue in Nevada, or what is the thought behind that?

**Mr. Schultz:**

What is happening is, we as Carson City and Storey County, we purchase water as it comes off the mountain and a large part of that purchase money goes to funding the State operations of the MLWS. If we, at any point, say we are not going to take that water that is coming off the lake then that overall budget, it is not going to pencil out—the revenue that is not coming in to match the expenses. What we are doing, even though our treatment plant cannot treat all of the water that we are purchasing from the State system, we are continuing to purchase it so that the operation budget of the State remains whole and that gap of water that we cannot treat, that is going past us; we are looking for ways to reuse that within the community to get some sort of credit for it. That is where I mentioned, we are resupplying our groundwater and we are also exchanging it with the remaining ranchers in Carson City for some of their creek rights—that water that we can treat. We use their creek rights and then we send the Marlette water to the ranchers. We are trying to do an exchange to make up the difference until we can treat all of the water that is coming.

***Chair Daly:***

I understand Carson, much like Storey, as a part of the MLWS, which is the two parts of our Committee, but Carson said he does have a little sliver that goes out and you have some shoreline, et cetera. I do not know if you can answer these questions or not on what is your population? Washoe and Douglas have the populations and more of the issues surrounding the Lake, and transportation—various things. Is there any concerns for Carson City on that side of it? Do you have residents or any significant number of people on your little stretch of the Lake that is within the Basin on the TRPA side?

***Mr. Schultz:***

I will do my best to answer. That is not my expertise, but we do not. Carson City's property that is lakefront, there is very minimal development services offered. We are a little bit of a hands off approach. We do not have any plans for the portion of Carson City that abuts the Lake. We are included in the various committees and discussion about what is going on, especially as it relates to transportation. There is a large number of people that commute both to the Lake for work or from the Lake to Carson City for work. So we are we are part of those discussions as well, but we do not have any big plans for any of Carson City's land that goes up in the Basin.

***Chair Daly:***

I appreciate that, and I suspected as much when you look at the development of Carson City; it goes up that west slope, it does not get over the top and very little on the other side. My understanding is you do have the Thunderbird Lodge in Carson, but other than that, I trying to think what is there?

***Mr. Schultz:***

Not too much.

***Chair Daly:***

I appreciate that. That was my only question. I know we are going to have a Storey come up next and we will get more information on the Lake side of it.

Thank you for your time and we will move on to Agenda Item IX B.

**B. Douglas County**

***Jenifer Davidson, County Manager, Douglas County:***

Joining me today is Scott Morgan, Assistant County Manager and longtime resident of the Lake. For clarification, I will note that Douglas County's comments are going to be limited to the TRPA. We do not have anything to do with Marlette Lake. It is our pleasure to present on behalf of the Douglas County Board of County Commissioners and Douglas County Lake Tahoe's residents, businesses, and visitors to address critical aspects of environmental stewardship and resource management in the Lake Tahoe Basin (Agenda Item IX B). We aim to provide this Committee, through our comments here today, with an overview of the achievements, challenges, and proposed priorities for the Tahoe Basin that warrant your thoughtful consideration and oversight. It is through our sustained partnership with the TRPA and our fellow counties that we will be able to continue implementing sustainable development initiatives, preserve our natural resources, address critical health and safety



issues, and enhance the quality of life at and around the Lake. Thank you for your time and dedication to the betterment of our region.

As you know, Lake Tahoe is one of the world's greatest treasures with lush forests, meadows and marshes, pristine beaches, and majestic mountain peaks that surround the famously clear blue Lake in the Sierra Nevada. It has attracted visitors from across the globe for generations. Today, its proximity to major metropolitan areas in northern California and Nevada make it a natural outdoor playground for millions of people looking for summer and winter recreation opportunities. The complex biodiversity of flora and fauna at the Lake reminds us of the delicate interplay between residents, visitors, the economy, and the environment; and our collective responsibility to become good stewards of this remarkable place. The need to strike a careful balance between people and place will be a reoccurring theme in many presentations by our partner agencies here today; and for many obvious and important reasons.

During peak times of visitation, Tahoe's roads clog with traffic and parking demands exceed capacity at recreation sites. Sanitation facilities become overwhelmed with trash overflowing into the environment and littering the otherwise pristine landscape—especially troubling is the amount of trash left behind on beaches and in the Lake. Douglas County will continue to work with our partners to educate visitors to recreate responsibly, and to address the impacts of tourism on the facilities we manage in the Basin. Additionally, many nonprofit agencies, such as the League to Save Lake Tahoe, have also stepped up with an army of volunteers to fill in critical gaps, collecting hundreds of pounds of litter annually from beaches, parking areas, and trails. The data collected from their Lake clean of events stretching back more than a decade have led to litter prevention policies, improved land management, and heightened awareness and public engagement to address the pollution challenges facing Lake Tahoe. However, Douglas County is concerned and believes that all concessionaires, and public and private property managers must also be held accountable for their inability to manage negative impacts from visitors on Lake resources. This seasonal influx of visitors is important to our economy and needs to be supported and managed with the utmost care and consideration for our delicate environmental balance; and those whose livelihood depends upon on a world-class experience at the Lake. There is consensus in Douglas County that to meet the growing travel demand in the Tahoe region, there needs to be a robust and innovative transportation system and a coordinated parking strategy that does not stop at county lines. To truly reduce vehicle miles traveled, transportation initiatives cannot be undertaken in a vacuum. That includes those decisions and strategies implemented by the states of Nevada and California. The U.S. 50 Corridor acts as an important local connection for a wide range of recreation, employment, and residential centers while also being an important regional connector for commerce and through connectivity. Highway 50 is the main access to many popular public recreational areas such as Van Sickle Bi-State Park, Nevada Beach, Round Hill Pines Historic Resort and Beach, Zephyr Cove Resort and Beach, Cave Rock State Park, Logan Shoals Vista, and Spooner Lake State Park. It provides access to numerous trails, including the famed Tahoe Rim Trail, the Tahoe Trail and other U.S. Forest Service state and local public lands. Most importantly, Highway 50 is the only access to many residential properties and smaller businesses located along the Corridor, as well as the primary access from the east to businesses and the Casino Corridor of South Lake Tahoe. The Corridor experiences high volumes of traffic, not only in peak summer season, but throughout the year from a mix of users including commercial trucks and passenger vehicles, pedestrian, and bicyclists. Safety is a major issue on this Corridor as it experiences a high rate of fatal vehicle crashes, a large number of shoulder parked cars, pedestrians, and bicyclists crossing or traveling along the highway and little transit service to this Corridor. On January 20, 2022, Douglas County entered into a charter agreement regarding the U.S. 50 Corridor Management Plan Project. The Project

Charter is an agreement between the project sponsor Nevada's Department of Transportation (NDOT) and the following agencies: Douglas County; the Nevada Division of State Parks; NDSL; the Tahoe Transportation District; TRPA; the Washoe Tribe; U.S. Forest Service; and the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit. The purpose of the Project Charter is to document key agreements between the project sponsor and the partnering agencies on the essential elements of the U.S. 50 Corridor Management Plan. The Project Charter is a nonbinding agreement that sets forth a partnership of cooperation for the planning process. It demonstrates the commitment necessary for accomplishing multi agency coordination within the Corridor in developing a single document and improving the U.S. 50 National Scenic Byway—America's most beautiful drive.

During the spring of 2022, an NDOT study team conducted additional listening tours to receive feedback on potential backbone concepts to further advance the study of Highway 50. A wide range of feedback was received, most of which was passionate and primarily negative regarding lane reductions, bike paths, and bike lane enhancements. As a result of the significant public feedback, NDOT which had intended to come to Douglas County Board of Commissioners in February 2023, was delayed in order to analyze alternatives and additional public input. Douglas County received notification in July 2023, that NDOT was going to implement a temporary demonstration project on a one mile section of Highway 50 from Zephyr Cove to Round Hill Pines—without public input. Douglas County immediately protested and invoked the conflict resolution protocols of the January 2023 Charter; that had been previously approved. After some dialogue, NDOT agreed to postpone the temporary demonstration project, and Douglas County supports this decision. However, County officials remain concerned that proposals to reduce the number of lanes on Highway 50 may still be considered in the future, and may create a separate set of unintended public health and safety consequences for users; especially when the road in question serves as the only evacuation route for many areas of the Lake. Alternatively, Douglas County supports the continued funding of a robust network of public transit, parking systems, trails, sidewalks, and bike lanes that will ensure that every Tahoe resident and visitor has access to safe, reliable, and convenient alternatives to travel throughout the region to homes, workplaces, schools, commercial areas, and recreation sites. Most importantly, there needs to be day access to the Lake without having to drive as the proportion of day visitors versus those who choose to visit the Lake and stay overnight continues to increase. We support making it easier for visitors to arrive and leave their cars parked while exploring everything Tahoe has to offer. Building separated multimodal trails, instituting parking management solutions, and providing transit service within the U.S. Highway 50 Corridor will create a gathering place for visitors and residents with connections to mountain and lakeside recreation, nearby neighborhoods, convenient parking, and cost effective transit.

Also consistent with matters related to public safety, we applaud TRPA for their support of the emergency management and fuels reduction programs in the Basin. The Caldor Fire served as a recent reminder that fuels reduction and emergency preparedness continue to be an important issue for Douglas County residents and visitors of the Lake. We support TRPA's approach to encourage innovative management of forest resources on public land, and we support more delegation of these responsibilities and authority to the local fire districts.

In December of 2012, the TRPA Governing Board adopted an updated Regional Plan that included new goals and policies to guide future land use decisions in the Tahoe region and an updated TRPA Code of Ordinances, which included new provisions that allow for local jurisdictions in coordination with TRPA to prepare coordinated area plans to implement the updated Regional Plan. Douglas County has two area plans; the South Shore Area Plan and

the Tahoe Douglas Area Plan that will need to be updated to further the goals and policies in the Regional Plan and meet the provisions of Chapter 13 Area Plans, and the TRPA Code of Ordinances, as well as other TRPA regulations. There are many important policy considerations in the South Shore Area Plan and Tahoe Douglas Area Plan that align with the Douglas County priorities briefly discussed here today. These area plans will be drafted to further build upon the concepts identified previously and the soon to be adopted in the Douglas County Strategic plan. They will include the continuation of successful strategies used to further accelerate environmental improvements and restoration in partnership with TRPA; including environmental redevelopment, the transfer of development rights from environmentally sensitive areas to high-density areas, requiring water quality improvements for projects, and maintenance and further implementation of regional area-wide storm water improvements. These documents will undergo significant public feedback and engagement process prior to final adoption.

Additionally, an important component of regional planning moving forward will be the region's response to the housing needs in the Basin. Douglas County supports TRPA's effort to provide sustainable and affordable workforce housing in walkable communities. This strategy, in the Lake Tahoe region, will help reduce car travel and improve public safety by providing housing costs for employees and employers who find it difficult to live in the Tahoe Basin because of the increased housing costs. We support and encourage workforce housing solutions. We support TRPA's implementation of their workforce housing goals in the Lake Tahoe Basin.

Lastly, we encourage TRPA to continue its support of the Tahoe Blue Event Center, which was recently opened in the Douglas County portion of Lake Tahoe. The Event Center was constructed to support the Lake Tahoe economy in an environmentally responsible and safe manner. The Visitor's Authority which operates the facility is committed to perfecting the entertainment environment in the Basin by conserving precious resources through the implementation of smart-transit management practices. Douglas County encourages the modification of some of the restrictions that limit the number of activities and events that are allowed each year in an attempt to restrict or reduce visitation in the Tahoe Basin. This has had an unintended consequence which restricts local use by community groups and local agencies such as ours; thing such as dance recitals, local sporting events, fundraisers, and of course public meetings hosted by Douglas County are restricted from using the facility because of an arbitrary event restriction. Our request is to exempt local events that already take place in the Tahoe Basin at nearby facilities. Douglas County residents would enjoy the use of the Event Center for these local events and would support the Event Center through it is use and patronage.

In conclusion, Douglas County supports policies and improvement projects that will conserve and restore Tahoe's environment revitalize communities; improve the quality of life for residents and quality of experience for visitors; improve mobility and safety for people walking and biking; and improve recreation and Lake access and overall sustainability. On behalf of the Douglas County Board of Commissioners, we are thankful for this opportunity to present our priorities, and look forward to a continued successful relationship with the State of Nevada and the TRPA.

***Chair Daly:***

It was a lot. Questions from the Committee? Senator Titus.

***Senator Titus:***

I appreciate your presentation. Just curious where we stand with the Microtransit development, now that has been a center of contention. I think is really critical.

***Ms. Davidson:***

The Event Center has implemented the Microtransit Program. Douglas County does contribute an amount of dollars to that program; I believe we have committed \$600,000 this year, and I think it was around the same in previous years. That program has been expanded both on the California side and the Nevada side to increase ridership—and they are seeing some success. We are encouraging the Event Center to continue to expand it, and look for opportunities to tie in with many of the public transit options that we have in place in Douglas County.

***Senator Titus:***

Good to know it is moving forward.

***Chair Daly:***

Any questions down South? Vice Chair, go ahead.

***Vice Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:***

You made a lot of recommendations. I tried to jot notes down as you were going, but I was wondering if you had those written so we could see those as well. I am not sure I caught everything—you really did cover a lot.

***Ms. Davidson:***

Yes, we did provide written comments; I apologize for the lengthiness. You give Douglas County a microphone and we have things that we would like to see addressed at the Lake as evidenced by many of our residents in attendance today. We are a passionate group who loves Lake Tahoe, and we want to see good decisions made at the Lake. Yes, my comments have been submitted today here in writing.

***Chair Daly:***

I have a couple of questions, and it was a lot. I will have to look at your stuff. I wrote down a couple of notes. On the Highway 50 Charter Agreement you listed off a bunch of the same people; TRPA. How much of that is duplicative of some stuff that is already being done. You have the Tahoe Transportation District, you have TRPA, you have NDOT—we are going to be speaking with NDOT later in our proceedings. I am concerned that there is another entity that is going to come up with opposing ideas or different considerations based on what is good for one area of the Lake and not the other. In conjunction with that, if you are the closest ones to the only municipality at the Lake in South Lake Tahoe. Are they involved in these discussions at all or is it just the Nevada side?

***Ms. Davidson:***

I will defer for a response to my colleague, Mr. Morgan.

***Scott Morgan, Assistant County Manager, Douglas County:***

The Charter Agreement you are referring to is specific to one particular project initiated by NDOT, in order to collaborate with a number of players on the Nevada side. We do participate in many groups, some of which seem duplicative whether it is the bike path projects or the loop road project. There are many players, and it takes a lot of meat to make sausage in Lake Tahoe. This particular Agreement was specific to the Corridor Management Plan to identify ways to enhance the safety on Highway 50.

***Chair Daly:***

Understood, I get concerned over a lot of duplication. People say, well I do not like the answer I get from mom, so I will go to dad and try to get a different answer. It is just some questions; I will review this, and we will probably catch up with you on this because we did want to get the priorities from the county perspectives. I know we will have a presentation from Washoe County coming up as well. But my understanding is that the Tahoe District have a Convention and Visitors Authority which built the Event Center and some of the funding that comes from there—all of the money that generated to that, is it specific to South Shore Lake Tahoe? Is it Douglas county wide? How much of it stays in the Basin? Are there resources available for this other implementation? I think that is where you have this divergence of where priorities are on the funds. Obviously, you have an Agency for the Visitor's Convention and Authority that have the resorts and various things behind that in order to help them versus the transportation for the other issues. The question I asked earlier of the TRPA, where the hierarchy of the deal, which is protecting, restoring the environment, visitors access, and everybody getting to enjoy the Lake, economic concerns or further down on those questions. How well do you work with that group? That is more development orientated or more on the economic driver side of the equation? And are they putting in a fair share towards addressing these issues? Obviously, they have an interest in the transportation part in those vehicle travels and making sure more people can come and enjoy the Lake, but not their sole purpose or probably even their first.

***Ms. Davidson:***

What a complicated onion you are referring to, and we are starting to peel back the layers.

***Chair Daly:***

And what is it, all of the presentations we have heard today.

***Ms. Davidson:***

And what is this onion that we are looking at? I think, as this Committee is focused on TRPA oversight, and I do not want to lose sight of that. But there is so much going on in the dynamic at the Lake that to look at one piece of the puzzle without speaking to these other layers—it is an incomplete picture. Certainly, there are a wide variety of problems that each of the jurisdictions around the Lake are encountering and having to manage. When we talk about issues of travel, housing—all of these pieces are things that TRPA touches on, and are certainly problems that we cannot solve on our own. I mentioned not being able to even begin to scratch the surface on transportation issues in a vacuum. Douglas County can put pieces of the puzzle in place, but without playing well with our partner agencies, we are not going to be able to solve these problems and that includes industry leaders at the Lake. The economic piece of this puzzle is a huge driver of solutions at the Lake, and they have been very engaged in the conversation with Douglas County; very engaged with TRPA; and very interested in shifting the negative public perception around so much over loving Tahoe

tourism—being drawn in the Lake and using that economic driver to solve these problems. I think we consider the Event Center to be a successful recent project; that did it well. There was a portion of the permitting process that required a funding of Microtransit—each ticket that is sold at that Event Center; I believe \$4 comes back to Microtransit. But that is just one means of trying to address this public transportation monster—so many entities are players. The more that we can bring to the room and join the conversation, the more effective our problem solving approaches are going to be. Our comments today regarding NDOT and Highway 50, is we are concerned that not enough players are being involved in a conversation to try to solve an important public safety problem. And that sometimes when we try to solve problems, when we do not consider all aspects of the problem, we can create larger unintended consequences. I understand that you do not have oversight over NDOT, but certainly TRPA has a voice in the conversation. Douglas County has a voice in the conversation and Highway 50 public transit. We are going to have to come up with solutions here—regional approaches to this are needed.

***Chair Daly:***

I know that resorts and those types of economic people—overnight stays and various things; room tax, the rest of it is an important economic driver and makes the Lake visitable—enhances people's experience, if that is the route that they go, if they are not day visitors. So we are not trying to say anybody is bad on that. I was curious on how much their investment was to address these issues. It may not be to their core issue. Businesses are in business to make money and stay in business, right? But in order to increase that, make investment in other things. And you are right, we do not have in our title, the oversight of Douglas County's issues at the Lake, but I think they all mesh together, which is why I wanted to hear from the counties. What are your priorities? What are their concerns? Is it working? What is working? What is not working? So hopefully, we can, like I said in the beginning, make some meaningful recommendations and try to make this work together. Everybody has their own concerns and their own issues. And there has to be this equally—not everyone is going to be happy. I learned a long time ago, you cannot make everybody happy, some people you can never make happy. So you have to recognize your limitations and then do the most amount of good for the most amount of people, the most amount of the time you are probably going to be OK. But we do have in my mind, those hierarchies: protect the environment; restoration; enhancing the visitors' experience; and some of the economic concerns—obviously, you cannot have one without all the rest.

On that last question, at least for me, you talked about an exemption for local events. Who has to make that exemption? Is that a State issue, or is it the city, the county who gets to make that decision?

***Ms. Davidson:***

That issue is a condition that was placed on the operating permit for the Event Center that caps the number of events that can occur at the Lake. We think that condition was well intended. Obviously, the goal is to reduce overall vehicle miles traveled and TRPA's condition on the operating permit at the Lake. If the goal is to reduce overall vehicle miles traveled at the Lake, which appears to be counterintuitive, is local events are going to happen at the Lake regardless—community events are going to happen at the Lake regardless that traffic is going to be there. We would like to see a carve out for local events. We think it is going to be important for the community to see this Event Center as a community center as well, and to embrace it or there is going to be a build-up of resentment towards this Event Center and the community will begin to look at it and wonder why did we ever allow that to happen. This is a really important in balancing act.

When we are turning away high school bands from being able to do their winter performance in an Event Center because of a condition we placed on a permit; perhaps we need to rethink our conditions and make sure that they are logical.

***Chair Daly:***

I did not know who put the condition on where you would have to go to do that. I am generally not a fan of having a rule and then creating carve outs and exceptions. That is one of the questions I will have for TRPA when I meet with them before they can relax restrictions and various things. But at the same time, the reason that language is in the Compact and you are asking for that is sometimes it makes sense. A lot of what we do in Carson City is to fix unintended consequences or close loopholes that we did not anticipate. In regard to NDOT, maybe not this Committee, but I know the Legislature has some say over what NDOT does.

Any additional questions, Committee? Thank you for your presentation.

We will move on next to Storey County; Agenda Item IX C, whenever you are ready.

**C. Storey County**

***Austin Osborne, Manager, Storey County:***

Here with me here today is Steve Walker from Walker and Associates; he is our foremost authority and understanding of the MLWS, as well as the Storey County side of the System. Also with us today, Commissioner Mitchell; Jason Wierzicki, our Public Works Director; Will Adler from Silver State Government Relations (SSGR) also works with us in water related matters.

An overview of what we want to present today is a discussion about the System as it pertains to the Storey County side of the overall water program (Agenda Item IX C). I want to bring to your attention that we recently completed our 2023 countywide Water Resources Plan; a majority of that plan focuses on this System. Today, we will talk about the capacity of the System, capital improvements that we are making, needs, fiscal obligations, and a discussion about the future in the region. For orientation on our side; this is a map of Storey County—and the focus of the area we are talking about today, because the MLWS is part of the Comstock under the Franktown Decree, the communities of Virginia City, Gold Hill and Silver City, which is located in Lyon County; our part of this System and our plan of potential considerations for future expansion of water into areas that are currently not covered under the Franktown Decree—that is not the nexus of today's discussion, but it is a note that should be mentioned today as we look at housing opportunities in other areas as well as addressing a community to the north of us that has dry wells.

The State presentation earlier where their System goes to I-580, and then from that point over where you talked about that pressure of 600 pounds per square inch and the siphon system from that point to the east is our side of the System. When you look at that area from the highway over to about the first green tank that is roughly about seven miles. At that point, that is the siphon where the water is going from one basin to another, and then from those green tanks to that point is gravity feed over to our water treatment facility. Then everything that you see beyond is the water treatment facility, and more of the distribution and the storage facilities in Virginia City and Gold Hill. I want to make a little bit of attention to that middle area that looks like a valley—that is American Flat. That area was included in the original water system—in 1963 it was removed. We would like to discuss the potential of adding that back into the System. As we know, there might be housing

opportunities there that might be served by this System. It is important to note that for Virginia City, Gold Hill, and Silver City it is our only source of water comes from this System. There are no wells, there is no river, there is no nothing else. This is it for us. In this area, we are looking at about 1,300 population and roughly about 800 connections. Those are residential, commercial—there are some small industry as well that would be a connection or two in that System. Then you can see, I will talk about a little bit later, the potential for this to double in size based on current capacities.

We work under the Water Use Agreement with the State of Nevada. As you heard earlier in a presentation, we are still working under that Agreement of 2002. While we are negotiating a successor Agreement with the State. Right now, we use about 221 acre feet of water, and there is the potential for that water to double in capacity based on the existing System as it is today. The uses in this area are pretty typical residential and commercial. The downtown Virginia City Corridor, for example, there are industrial properties in the area that have been zoned industrial for quite some time; our water master plan addresses the potential need for that type of use.

I think what is equally important for us is fire suppression. We rely solely on this water for both wildland and urban fire suppression. We are in a Tier I and Tier II wildland interface area and then also as a historic district—a lot of our buildings lack the modern building codes for fire protection. The picture you saw earlier of the pond with a fountain, that is an improvement we have made recently to the System—it is actually a fire dip. You can take water out of there and provide for that service. This is our current and our build out numbers; so you look at Virginia City, Gold Hill, and Silver City we are currently using about 221 acre feet of water. The expansion would double that—you are looking about roughly 700 acre feet that would be needed for a build out of existing parcels without any other changes made to the community. Adding American Flat to the System based on the acreage it has and the potential that we have for the houses that would fit in the available acreage, you would be adding another 300 acre feet to that. Roughly the total altogether is about 1,500 acre feet. If you did nothing else that we would need from the System to be fully built out. Of course, that may not account for if we are to do further subdivisions of parcels and things like that.

Some of the challenges that we have are highlighted in this picture—this is a blowout on the Silver City Water Line about 2016. Our Public Works Department is very familiar with this event; this is about a 2,030 feet geyser. This is not even the high pressure water line going to the Comstock. This is a regular feed going down to Silver City. These types of things happen often, they are usually scheduled on weekends and holidays when these types of things happen. But we get blowouts, geysers, water boil notices, and all of those sorts of things happen very often—this is a very important picture to include in this slide. Some of the challenges also include staffing. Like all organizations, we are going through today trying to keep staffing, especially in a Water Department where they have to be highly-specialized, highly-certified, and skilled, sometimes they get taken by other agencies once they get to that point; this is a real challenge for us, and I am going to talk a little bit about that later. There are only 800 people paying into the System, and with that, you have a very small pool of people paying rates that are being transferred into maintaining all of this. It is an everyday challenge for all of us to maintain this. So far, we have been working on this despite our challenges.

This is an overview of our System and one picture you see there is the divide reservoir that is a replacement of what existed in the 1800s and been rehabilitated—mainly a firewater dip, but it is also for other emergency use. Generally is about \$61 million that are needed overall in the System; \$12 million is needed for that transmission line that was talked about earlier in a prior presentation, and you can see the other needs up to the point of build out.



We have done about \$12 million worth of upgrades to the System; on our side of the pipeline. We have a new treatment plant that is from the 1990s, it has the capacity to double in size—we are looking at that in our capital improvement plan. There are water lines for transmission, water lines for distribution reservoirs, and a B Street water line. As you see the tank there, hillside tank has been replaced recently. Most of this is being paid for either by bonds, or by transferring those costs over to the local ratepayers, other capital improvements, as well as through several U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) grants that we have gotten as well as the State Revolving Fund. What is needed is about \$61 million more. You see the B Street Water Line Project that was finished a month ago. But you can see from that siphon, the transmission, getting everything up to the point of build out and then the potential for further division of land that may occur within the service area would be included in this. This does not include the potential of moving water to the Highlands or to Mark Twain, which are outside of the Franktown Decree. That would be additional costs from this if that were to be considered.

For rates and debt, to give you an idea where our finances are on this. Our water rate comparisons to the region; I highlighted Storey County, which is about \$47.59 for typical residents compared to the region. You can see we are approaching the cap of about how far you can go with charging residents for improvements as well as operating the System. We are exceeded by the Silver Springs General Improvement District (GID) a little bit, but we are pretty close, and we are certainly exceeding the other jurisdictions. As far as debt and revenue, it costs us about \$600,000 a year to operate the System. It brings in roughly about \$600 million in revenue to do the same. It is a very close and tight budget. We believe potentially by adding residents to the American Flat area and also by potentially adding these two other communities to the Water System as well as continuing to reach build out in the Comstock area that this will add more ratepayers to the System, more connection rates, and other revenues that might help offset these costs; allow us to hire more staff to operate, seek more grant funding, and other opportunities for improvements.

The next steps at this point, there are four. At this point, we are in negotiations with the State of Nevada in cooperation with Carson City, as well as the Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA) with potential surplus water elements. We are working under the 2002 Water Agreement. Now we expect that a successor Agreement will be reached soon in completion of our master plan and our neighbors doing the same. Secondly, we are continuing to build our capital improvement plan for the necessary improvements and looking at tax revenue grants and other funding sources in Washington—right now working on to get funding for those. And then really to look at potential out-of-the-box, regional ideas on what could we do together between the State of Nevada, Carson City, and the users to come up with ways that we could work together for a mutually beneficial programs for improvement. And lastly, we certainly would offer you a tour as you are looking up to the State of the MLWS on the State side. We would be happy to accommodate you on the Storey County side of the System to get acquainted with these programs. If you have any questions, we are happy to discuss this with you.

***Steve Walker, Walker and Associates:***

If I may Chairman, I would like to add a comment for the record. I have been monitoring this Committee since 2001, and we have always had this discussion about the MLWS, but we really do not talk about it is resource potential. How much water is there? There are very few times we even talk about the water rights. The basic water right for Virginia City is in the Franktown Decree. Franktown is a creek that goes through Little Valley, and it is 10 CFS—a CFS is 448 gallons a minute, 24-hours a day, 365 days a year. You do the math at 7,000 acre feet. The last water assessment that I know of that area was done during the reconnaissance reports by the State Engineers during the 1960s and 1970s. The

reconnaissance report for Washoe Valley was done in April 1967, and there was 256 basins in the State of Nevada. Most of them do have these reconnaissance reports. But if you look at the measurement of actually Franktown Creek during that period, the flow of Franktown Creek—and this was measurements from about eight years in the 1960s—shows that it is the largest creek on the whole Washoe Valley System; that in May it had 20 CFS; June – 5 CFS; July 1.69 CFS. So again, we are in a situation that we find ourselves in Nevada. Yes, we have water rights. Do we have the resource? And so what I am proposing is that there is going to be new demands on this System—there will be new and additional resource use, particularly I think in Storey County. We need to have that assessment and maybe work together the State, the county users, the cities, Carson City, Storey County; the users to actually know what kind of resource we actually have. Since 1967 there has been a Snow Telemetry (SNOTEL) site put in at Little Valley. There is another 50 years of data; 60 on the Marlette SNOTEL. So there is additional information that we need to gather and make a better resource assessment.

***Chair Daly:***

Questions? Senator Titus.

***Senator Titus:***

I appreciate the comments and information. I have been reading some interesting history books about Nevada and especially mining and history of that water siphon from Marlette Lake to Virginia City was quite the accomplishment in engineering. You have many other developments in Storey County besides Virginia City, especially in the Industrial Park, and with Tesla and some of those areas. Is that water all coming from Agreements with TMWA.

***Mr. Osborne:***

I am not quite sure exactly what you are asking.

***Senator Titus:***

You are saying that 100 percent of the water in Virginia City comes from the MLWS, and that you have only 800 residents on that System, correct?

***Mr. Osborne:***

Correct.

***Senator Titus:***

The population, I was curious because Storey County certainly has huge developments in the rest of your county. And so for Storey County overall water usage, do you come through the Carson District, TCID, or TMWA, or what is your capacity? Where does that break down?

***Mr. Osborne:***

There are about 1,300 residents in Virginia City, Comstock area. The County as a whole has about 4,200 residents give or take. There are General Improvement Districts serving the Lockwood Community; The Canyon GID; The Tahoe-Reno Industrial Center is served by the Tri-General Improvement District; and then our Highlands Community, the Mark Twain Community, and Painted Rock are served by domestic wells. Those are the other water sources that are happening in the County if that answers your question.

**Senator Titus:**

Exactly. That is what I was looking at. You may be able to give us a little bit more, and you know the history, but I was curious about the other residential developments, the industrial developments, and how you spread that water around and where you are getting water. So the 800 that are served by the water from Marlette Lake. If I do my math—is less than 20 percent. I think about 20 percent of your population is served by the Marlette Lake.

**Mr. Osborne:**

You are right, looking at the distribution of population, our population is about equal. When you look at the Lockwood Community, the Highlands, and then the Comstock, and a little bit with Mark Twain, it is roughly a third, a third, and a third with a little bit of difference in the Mark Twain Community as far as human population and not industrial.

**Senator Titus:**

Having asked that question, my next question and it is related to the MLWS when you pay, where is expenses on your cost to pay for water for the MLWS versus the other water resources? And my point is, are those folks on the MLWS where Franktown Decree, are they having—when you gave us an example of what folks are paying on rates—is that rate all your citizens or those on that Decree? I am curious if part of your citizens are paying an exorbitant rate versus what do you pay the rest of your citizens?

**Mr. Osborne:**

Yes, the residents that live and the businesses that are part of the Comstock area—Virginia City, Gold Hill, and Silver City are paying into the System that we just talked about. Our other community members are not, but the Canyon General Improvement District is a similar situation where those ratepayers are paying into their System. Then the Tri-GID also is a similar situation where the members are paying into their Systems independently.

**Senator Titus:**

Just final question. On your presentation, page 13, you gave us all those rate comparisons of \$47, \$19, \$26; I would appreciate a follow up. Perhaps you could send it obviously to all the Committee Members, what the others in your county what rates are they paying? Because you do not compare those rates within your county; you compared to them in the other Districts—not all in your county.

**Mr. Osborne:**

In response to your question, be happy to provide this as well as other elements of our water resources master plan, as well as our infrastructure master plan that includes these numbers including for the Canyon GID and for the Tri-GID.

**Chair Daly:**

Does anybody down South have any questions? Not seeing any.

Just a couple. Right now the Highlands are on domestic wells, right?

**Mr. Osborne:**

Correct.

**Chair Daly:**

And if I was looking at your numbers, and I am trying to remember a presentation from Marlette Lake and a couple of things that were said, you have 495 acre feet or whatever you are paying for or what your allocation is. But you said your build out would be 1,500. Can you get the rest of that difference? 1,000 acre feet from Marlette Lake or where would that come from? If you we are able to do your build up?

**Mr. Osborne:**

In response to that, the 1,500 acre feet that I discussed today would be to do the build out of the current Comstock System. So if we were to just fill out every existing parcel and then add American Flat to that your time of 1,500 acre feet to get water to the Highlands where there are several dry wells and where water is a problem. We have wells in that area that are 1,200 feet/1,700 feet—that is not unheard of that do not have water. That would be in addition to that. We also have a water master plan that talks about the infrastructure—potential cost to make that happen. It is substantial over \$100 million to get water to the Highlands. For example, to do what is necessary to provide that community the water that they would need, for roughly the 700 residents that are there now, as well as doubling that for the existing parcels that are in that area.

**Chair Daly:**

What I understand, I am looking at slide six, it says Water Use Agreement 2002—that 20 years ago obviously. It says 495 acre feet, is the Comstock limit.; you are using 221. Where is the difference between that 495 limit—or maybe I am misunderstanding it—and the 1,500 if you are to do the build out; where is the other 1,000 acre feet come from? Is there opportunity to get more from Marlette Lake? If I remember, the Marlette Lake people said that there is much more capacity for the lake than being used by either Carson or Storey. But I also heard them say sometimes in the summertime it is dry or not providing anything. I am assuming you have storage tanks to get you through those stretches.

**Mr. Osborne:**

Looking at that slide here, so there is about 221 acre feet that are being used now—currently. If we are to build the System out, and our water master plan does provide a little bit of discussion about the different types of uses that could occur and each of them have a different amount of water. A residence in our plan, for example, is about 0.3 acre feet where an industrial use could be over 1 acre foot. Looking at the existing parcels—the existing zoning—and what potentially could happen and then adding American Flat into that would be about 1,500 acre feet. We believe for that full build out—if the entire community was built and American Flat. But right now, we do not have the ability under that 2002 Agreement to get to that number. We would have to negotiate that Agreement to get to a higher number in order to have a full build out of that capacity, and also to add the American Flat area back into the system—it was excluded in 1963.

**Chair Daly:**

I understood. You do not have the water now; you have to negotiate more from the MLWS. If I heard correctly—if I remember that there is potential capacity there, I think they said something around 7,000 acre feet; might be a different number, but nevertheless, there is opportunity there and Highlands would be a lot more—that is another deal; let them stay on their wells for now. I understand that you would have to negotiate more from the MLWS. Does it go dry occasionally?

**Mr. Osborne:**

You are correct in that. As far as what goes dry, I would be happy to answer that question. I am not sure what you are asking with the System going dry. We have not gone dry. We seem to have a reliable source of water right now for our communities.

**Chair Daly:**

Any other questions from the Committee?

Committee will bring us to our last fourth county—Washoe County.

**D. Washoe County**

**Chair Daly:**

Proceed when you are ready.

**Alexis Hill, Chair, Washoe County Commission:**

This is an honor to be before this Committee. I am looking forward to sharing with you our piece of Lake Tahoe and some of the issues that are happening in Washoe County. I also have on the line is Ms. Matijevich, who is our Legislative Affairs Liaison. We are going to tag team this presentation today. I will be controlling the slides and Ms. Matijevich will be doing the first part of the presentation, and then I will be covering the last part.  
(Agenda Item IX D)

**Cadence Matijevich, Government Affairs Liaison, Washoe County:**

Please forgive me for not being able to be with you today. Unfortunately, I am a victim of the latest COVID wave. So, while I had hoped to see all of you, none of you wanted to see me today except virtually; my thanks the Chair, Ms. Keller, and Ms. Harper for helping accommodate me under these less than ideal circumstances.

You have heard a lot today about the collaboration that takes place in the Lake Tahoe Basin, particularly amongst Nevada's local governments, TRPA, and the State. We wanted to start our presentation though with giving you an overview about Washoe County's portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin, our community there, and the services that Washoe County provides in the Lake Tahoe Basin to both residents, businesses, and visitors. You will see on the first slide an overview of Washoe County's facilities and services that we provide in the Lake Tahoe Basin. Those range from our Sheriff's office, our library, community centers, we operate a justice court in Incline Village, and we also operate vote centers during election seasons. We have a Public Works Department that has dedicated staff in the Incline Village-Crystal Bay area; you will see the variety of services that they provide. You have heard a lot today about how transportation and things that happen on our roads affect the quality of the water in Lake Tahoe, and so the Washoe County's Public Works team is an important part of that in the Basin—our portion of the Basin.

In addition to Washoe County, there are other local government entities that operate in our portion of the Basin. There is information for you on the Washoe County School District; enrollment in the schools—that is for the current school year. The North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District is not a county fire district, but they do provide the fire protection, emergency medical services, and other services you see there in the Washoe County portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin. You have heard referred to earlier—general improvement districts

and within our portion of the Basin; the Incline Village General Improvement District, which provides water service, sewer service, solid waste through a franchise service provider, and also a variety of recreation services to the residents of Incline Village.

Demographic information on our community. The U.S. Census Bureau divides our portion of the Tahoe Basin into two census areas—Incline Village and Crystal Bay. You see the population information; I think you will find some interesting ties between the population and housing unit information. The median age as we talk further about our priorities particularly related to affordable housing and workforce housing in the Basin. You may find interesting ties between that demographic data that is available, and that later discussion that Chair Hill will cover.

A little more information about our community profile as it relates to land use in the Basin. You will see the number of our total assessor's parcels, the numbers that have exemptions and some interesting information. For those Committee Members, I know most of you understand the complexities of Nevada's real property tax system and tax caps. And so there is insight to be gleaned there with respect to designation of residential parcels as low-cap status and high-cap status. That helps provide additional insight into how many of the residential properties in Nevada are occupied full time versus part time versus being available for rental on a semi-permanent basis. Then you will see that we have currently 665 short-term rental permits in the Tahoe Basin, which represents 93 percent of all the short-term rental permits in unincorporated Washoe County. A great deal of those, nearly all of them, are for us in the unincorporated area in the Washoe Basin.

With that, I will turn it back over to Chair Hill.

***Ms. Hill:***

I will talk about Washoe County's current priorities at Lake Tahoe. We like to refer to the Lake Tahoe portion of Washoe County as Washoe Tahoe—you may hear me say that today. Please remember that there are many priorities in Lake Tahoe. I know you have heard from constituents today and you will hear from them after this presentation in public comment. This is not all encompassing of every single priority, but there are immediate priorities that we see that Washoe County can play a role in. We conducted the Washoe Tahoe Transportation Plan study, and I will be going over that study and elements of that study, and why we are excited to implement recommendations from it. The main things that we will be discussing is the Crystal Bay to Incline Village Trail connection; Sand Harbor to Spooner Lake Trail; and Incline Village mobility hub. Additionally, we did a workforce housing study, and in 2021 had great outcomes from that study; and now have recommendations and a road map moving forward with those. We initiated the Washoe County Tahoe Transportation Plan in early 2022; and it was approved by the Board of County Commissioners in 2023. The main goals were to improve safety. The main street of Incline Village and Crystal Bay is on a highway; how can we improve safety on this highway and work with NDOT? There are great recommendations that are coming out of that. Expand connectivity—so many residents, we had hundreds of residents that participated in the study, talked about how trails end and then there is no trail, so you have to walk on a roadway and/or landscaping. So, working on investing in our trail system, which we call a trail system in Washoe County. If you were in the incorporated city, you would call it a sidewalk. That are some of the things that we are looking to invest in. Optimize mobility and parking. Parking is a huge issue in town, and figuring out how we can support both the visitors coming in and reducing them from driving into the Basin. Also how we can support our working community members who are coming in to do the good work—really the backbone of Washoe County and Washoe Tahoe—and then strengthening our community

vitality. You will see that we are looking at working with a partnership on a main street program as well.

The Washoe County Transportation Plan—the recommendations. We would like to see improved bus stops in the community. We have two fixed route transportation options that come into the community as well as a Microtransit Program, which you heard a lot about when Douglas County discussed their Microtransit. We also have a similar program in Incline Village and Crystal Bay. We are working with the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), who is our partner. As you can hear, there are many partners in Lake Tahoe. The Washoe County RTC is a partner with these bus stops and with our transportation plan with Placer County, who runs the fixed route portion that goes year round in Incline Village and Crystal Bay. Additionally, multi-use path connectivity not only through the town of Incline Village and Crystal Bay, but to connect Crystal Bay and Incline Village. One major issue that we are seeing is Incline Village becomes the thoroughfare for visitors to Sand Harbor coming out from Highway 431. We want to see how we can ensure this Highway is not being clogged up by vehicles and creating emergency issues or evacuation issues. We have proposed solutions that you will see later in the presentation. And then winter multi-use path maintenance. This is something that we struggle with every year, both with staffing and ensuring that our equipment is kept up to date with ensuring that even if we have the path that we are clearing it from snow. I hear from residents, “you have not cleared the path yet,” our priority is to get to the roads and then the paths; but I would like to see Washoe County do the roads and the paths on parallel—because we have so many people that do not drive, we have youth in the community—these are major highways—we do not want people unsafe, walking in the highways, and then transit service and parking. We can do so much better with transit, but we just have to fund it. So figuring out those funding formulas is something that I know you heard from TRPA. I would love, as Chair of the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD), if we could make a presentation because there are many transportation needs to this Committee in the future. We would be honored to do so.

Additionally, we are working with NDOT on State Route (SR) 28 intersection improvements to slow the traffic down to ensure there is better pedestrian connectivity on that highway and then improve local intersection and roadway safety. We have a main street program. We are working with the Incline Village, Crystal Bay Business Association. The County gave them a grant to support a main street coordinator and they are working to bring recommendations to Washoe County on what that main street program could be and bringing in grants as well.

Then there are technology and data needs that we also need to collect. On the Incline Village mobility hub, this is one of many hubs that are proposed throughout the Lake Tahoe Basin for both visitors and our locals. We support a Microtransit Program in Incline Village and Crystal Bay. Right now, there is no place to even park those three vans. We have them parked at the substation. We need a place for electric vehicle (EV) charging, vehicle parking, and then we also need a public bathroom for people to go. Right now, we are using the old elementary school that was sold to the TTD by the school district—and Assemblywoman Taylor I think was on that Board during that time; you remember that all too well. We are doing some discovery to see what the best location for this mobility hub. We started a Mobility Hub Committee, received a lot of input, and now it has been brought back to the TTD Board. We will be considering that input and bringing forward proposals in different locations. We are trying to see if we can work with the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) and other partners because there are concerns that the community has that location for a permanent mobility hub and trying to find the right use.

The other great thing about that location is it could possibly be a workforce housing location. I know that Senator Daly, was asking about public properties for workforce housing. That is also something that the TTD Board heard loud and clear from the community, and could be a potential partnership down the road.

The Crystal Bay to Incline Village Trail connection. When I lived in Lake Tahoe, I worked at the Lake Tahoe Shakespeare Festival and many of our actors, stage managers, and different workers lived in Crystal Bay temporarily for the summer and then commuted on bicycles to the Sand Harbor. Well, as you can imagine, that is a very dangerous commute. We actually received a grant to do a study on what this trail connection will look like. This is a priority to support people from having to drive to Incline Village, people to walk, and another opportunity for bicycles as well. It is a major safety issue, and it will also help with parking and trail access because Incline Village is getting inundated with that. I am sure you will hear from the community on that.

The other piece of the puzzle is our Sand Harbor to Spooner Trail Summit connection. So, right now everyone who wants to get on the East Shore Trail—and I do not know if this Committee has been on that trail yet. It is a gem of the Lake, but they are all coming into Incline Village. None of that traffic is actually being distributed throughout different parts of Lake Tahoe; the community is feeling that in a real way. We would like to see that there are plans for a mobility hub at Spooner and to connect a trail from Spooner to Sand Harbor, so there is less pressure on the Incline Village and Crystal Bay communities to carry all of the folks who are coming to, I think, our most visited, or second most visited, State park in Nevada.

There is also going to be parking planned. When you hear from the Forest Service, you will hear about how we are planning on parking on Forest Service properties to further distribute the parking and ensure that there is safety. I know there has been articles about public safety on Highway 28 when folks want to get on the beaches and there are kids running out and there is barely a spot—if you could even call it a spot. We want to get rid of a lot of that shoulder parking, create proper parking lots and perhaps even incentivize people to use public transit to get into the Basin.

I have a quick video on workforce housing if you will allow it.

### ***Washoe Tahoe Housing Partnership Video:***

I really love my community. I love being able to go anywhere there, and I see someone I know. I like the small town. It is gorgeous, and it is serene. I go back a long ways here in '78. I bought a little house up here. It is good community, but I see change in a different way. There are people who are up here, who retired, or they do not have to work anymore, and they are living their best life. And then there are the community of people that are working all the time and who struggle to live here. We call it poverty with a view. I know many, many people-friends and mostly teachers who have had to move to Reno and Carson. We do not have subs; the schools here have a really hard time finding subs. The real estate market is outside of what we can afford. Being first responders. We have four employees that live in town. Every seasonal employee commutes from Reno or Carson. There is a possibility that we may not get resources to an incident in a reasonable amount of time. It would be great if they had housing that was designated for teachers, firefighters, local restaurant workers, people who serve the community. Housing—it gives people an opportunity to be part of the community. We need to create a sense of community for everybody. For the future, I have more of a togetherness, more of a not what I had done or what I have, but what I can contribute to help the community grow.



**Ms. Hill:**

If you saw that was the Washoe Tahoe Housing Partnership. It is a partnership of our business leaders, our local community members and Washoe County to see how we can support workforce housing in the community. We had a really cool graphic, but it was not accessible to the new requirements for the State of Nevada. I will walk you through this graphic. Essentially depending on what you make in Incline Village or Crystal Bay—you cannot afford to live there. If you are in hospitality, you can afford about \$1,000 a month; the current cost is \$1,500—just for a studio. If you are a manager or supervisor, professional staff, it is the same thing \$2,000 per month; it is \$2,600 for a one bedroom. Then high tech, medical professionals, and executive staff could afford \$3,400 a month; and the cost per month now is \$5,900. It is a real issue in all major mountain communities, but certainly we are feeling it in our portion of Washoe Tahoe.

Our goals is to build community understanding and support for housing, to finance housing, raise public and private dollars for housing, and to look at redevelopment and development possibilities and properties. Then update policies, because even though TRPA, they are the main guide of the Washoe Tahoe area plan, Washoe County has an opportunity to make changes within our own plan. We will be conducting those policy changes to support workforce housing in the next year, and there will be a lot of community engagement. I am looking forward to making those changes on the Washoe County side, and then programs to support workforce housing needs. Placement, I am hoping we will be executing a contract with them through Washoe County, and our RPA dollars. What they do is they give one-time funding to people who have short-term rentals—the Airbnb's or Vrbo's or folks who do not even open that; they barely use their house. We give them an incentive, a cash incentive, to improve their house or to do what they want with their house, then we support them with getting a workforce into the home. This is being used throughout the Basin, and Washoe County is working on executing a contract with them. That is one of many programs that we will be looking to engage with.

I have links to all of the transportation plan, the TTD mobility hub information, as well as the housing road map; if you want to check that out at a later time. It has been an honor to present. I have learned a lot listening to the other counties and their issues, and look forward to engaging with any questions you may have.

**Chair Daly:**

Questions from the Committee. No.

**Senator Titus:**

Just curious about the bike path that was put in. It has been really well-intentioned, well-received, well-used; but the whole concept about parking is really a question. Was there never a thought about where are these people going to park when they come up to visit this?

**Ms. Hill:**

I think the one problem that I am finding doing a deep dive on Tahoe issues, as a Commissioner, is that all of these projects are done piecemeal. There is one vision about how this will all be connected, but it is only as the funding comes in. Sadly, the idea of Spooner—that is going to be another mobility hub working with the RTC Transportation, I am on that Board, and I am pushing for us to do a park and ride up to Incline Village and Crystal Bay and incentivize people to not drive up there. Yes, there was an idea that we do

not need as much parking because they have the transit, or they will park at Spooner. But of course these projects are slowly coming online. And so, yes, it is as the funding comes in. Long term, I think the vision is that we are going to get fewer vehicles on the road because we are going to incentivize that public transit, but it takes time, and it is a very difficult thing. I am like, why has not anyone figured this out? And now that I am in it, I am like—oh it is because, it is very hard.

***Senator Titus:***

Quick question about the elementary school that was closed. Are you having a drop in your student population in that area that you would close the school?

***Ms. Hill:***

The school district is looking at that for the middle school. I cannot speak to that in detail because that is not my realm. But that is an issue that I am hearing, but we do have other private schools in the community and other private schools that are actually asking to open in the community.

***Chair Daly:***

Any questions down South? I am not seeing any.

I will ask a question similar to the one I asked Douglas County regarding their Convention and Visitor Authority. I know the Reno-Sparks Convention and Visitor Authority (RSCVA) is a different deal. Washoe County part of that Incline, major population on the Nevada side at least is all Incline excluding South Lake Tahoe—that is in California. But a similar question, how do they view the development side versus the environmental side? How much are they saying? Because they want to pull some of that away, or a majority of it away, or even significant resources that are generated in the Basin into Reno-Sparks. Where are they at on that?

***Ms. Hill:***

That is a great question. I sit on the RSCVA Board, and we have asked for the RSCVA to give additional funding to microtransit. The Board has approved our first fiscal year request. I think we will be bringing another request to the RSCVA Board. But the need is so great. Right now, and you will hear that if the TTD Board comes to present to this Committee, we do not have a dedicated source of revenue for our public transit. So RTC, it is a gas tax and also our sales tax. There is an issue that we have not figured out a way to pay for transit. The need is much greater than the \$300,000 some odd that RSCVA gave us. We are trying to pull together funding as a partnership. I think the issue is that the North Lake Tahoe Visitors Authority, who is in Incline Village and Crystal Bay, they receive only a small portion of the portion that is generated by our tourists to their Visitor Authority. I think there may be opportunities for the RSCVA to put a little bit more into destination stewardship long term because that is really what the focus needs to be for Tahoe. We have got the visitation. I do not think we need to market Tahoe. We know that Tahoe is a place that people want to go to. The issue is managing the visitation and managing the impact of the visitation. Washoe County, we put about \$400,000 into microtransit this last fiscal year. I do not know if my Board will support that again; we need to find a funding source. So whether it is tourism, whether it is a sales tax situation, there has to be a dedicated source of funding.

The other issue is our transit is free in Tahoe. I think that is a discussion that we need to have in Reno and Sparks—you pay to take the bus, not a lot, but you do pay. Is that something that we need to look at? These are big questions and issues. I think that it would be great if the Visitors Authority wanted to give a bit more to Incline Village and Crystal Bay for all of our major needs—including housing.

***Chair Daly:***

Understood. You mentioned \$300,000 that RSCVA puts in towards your deal, which was your request. How much is generated in the Valley versus what they are putting in? Obviously, you probably do not need to market the Lake is the way you are saying. I know that there is the Biltmore is going to be doing renovations and opening; there are going to be more rooms and that is already established. So it is not like there is going to be that great of an impact. They will have to do the modernization in various things and limit their impact through the TRPA rules. Same thing with Cal Neva is coming back online. So there is additional expansion, there is going to be more revenue. Is the RSCVA saying no, we are going to keep it all down in Reno and spend it to get people to come to Reno-Sparks, which is not a bad thing; we want that. What are they making the proper or fair investment in the Lake, is the question? And you will take that message back that I asked that question, right?

***Ms. Hill:***

I am going to take it back. We have a meeting on Thursday. They are part of the Destination Stewardship Committee that was created for Lake Tahoe; that I think Julie touched on. They are supporting in that way, understanding that our visitors and our locals are making an impact at Lake Tahoe. I think that there is opportunity to certainly do more and support additional cleanups at Lake Tahoe, transit, and housing. I will say, I do not know if there is going to be more revenue generated. It will be interesting to see with the Cal Neva coming online and the Biltmore redevelopment coming online, if there is going to be more tourism revenue coming in or if people will move from short-term rentals to going to hotels and hopefully that use will decrease as well. It will be an interesting thing to see. We are really in a transition time right now, but I will take that back.

***Chair Daly:***

I think you are going to see an increase, not a decrease or a shift. That is my prediction. We will see; time will tell. I know you talk about funding for RTC in Washoe County. We have had the various questions, and I sat on a Blue Ribbon Committee years ago trying to look at transit—it is a western thing. People do not like it as much. Reading the Compact, I know you cannot put a fee for entering the Basin, and you would not want a toll anyways, but I know we did, I think it was WC5 many years ago that put in the gas tax, which we have in Incline and Washoe County. But as for specific roads and various things, I do not know that is an opportunity or not. I know it was very specific when they pass that on what the drivers were for that, and transit was not part of it. When we tried to separate measures for transit, it failed, wanted like a 0.25 percent or it was even less than that on sales tax; and it did not pass. We do have to get past those, maybe another ballot question on that side for the base and transportation. I know you had a couple of other ideas. I look forward to exploring what they might be if it takes legislation.

***Ms. Hill:***

Thank you. That is great.

***Chair Daly:***

Any other questions from the Committee? Seeing none.

We will move to Agenda Item X, which is closing remarks. That concludes our presentations. Thank you everybody for coming.

**AGENDA ITEM X—CLOSING REMARKS**

***Chair Daly:***

Having heard some of that, I wanted to put on the agenda to hear from our Members. If there are any other ideas, topics, various things that you would like to see addressed this interim. As I said before, we are going to talk to NDOT; we are going to follow up with the counties and TRPA. We may ask them to come back and give us more information. I know we are going to hear from Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW) about invasive species, issues, and various things. I think we reached out to the Washoe Tribe if they wanted to participate. I did not know if there was somebody else now in having heard these questions, if there are other issues, agencies, or people you would like to invite to give us other information. I think maybe we want to talk to the RSCVA, the Douglas County Visitor Authority to get their perspectives on what their priorities are. I will ask the rest of the committee if they have any ideas or suggestions.

***Senator Titus:***

I appreciate all the presentations today. Definitely need a deep dive into the transit authorities and their plans for sure. And then you already mentioned it, but definitely need to get on the list, I would like to hear from the Tahoe Special Event Center and South Lake Tahoe, I think it is critical. One fun thing. You mentioned it, I think not just fun but really important; on my drive in this morning, as I live in Smith Valley and came up today, I drove by the Gardnerville area. I go through the Washoe lands and one of the workers was in one of the work trucks and a sticker on the back said, "Keep Tahoe Washoe." We see so many of the stickers that say, "Keep Tahoe Blue." And when I saw that and how appropriate for me to come to this Committee and see that. Having the tribes get a chance to share their hopes, their concerns would be great.

***Assemblywoman Taylor:***

I think the list of agencies you mentioned covered those areas that came up today that I think generated more questions and concerns that would help me, as a new Committee Member, to learn more as we make these decisions going forward. I think you got it.

***Senator Scheibel:***

I agree. I think that we have a great start today with this meeting. I will echo Senator Titus's request that we hear from the Tribal leaders and members of the Tribes that occupy this area or have occupied this area—historically. I look forward to our next meeting.

***Vice Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:***

Everything that has been stated, I agree with. I look forward to our future meetings.

***Chair Daly:***

If you think of something else between now and the next meeting, or even a future meeting, feel free to reach out to me or Committee Staff, and we can get that in the works. I know we did already reach out to the Tribes, speaking with our Policy Analyst to get that done. We have not heard back yet, but maybe we will.

We are looking at having our next meetings in the Tahoe Basin—all of the rest of our meetings in the Tahoe Basin. We are going to plan a field trip in the first half and then regular meetings similar to this in the afternoon, as we move forward. So keep in mind that if you do think of something later, we want to hear about it as far as an idea for the Committee to look over.

We will move on to Agenda Item XI, which is the continuation of our public comment.

**AGENDA ITEM XI—PUBLIC COMMENT**

***Chair Daly:***

I do not know how many people we have here still. What I am thinking is we will take 30 minutes of public comment in person and then we will go to the phones if there are any, and then we will come back if there are still people that want to make a public comment.

We will start with Southern Nevada first. If there is anybody in person that want to give public comment. I see an empty room; nobody is there.

***Vice Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:***

We are all alone.

***Chair Daly:***

We have plenty of people up here in the North. Please state your name for the record, spell it if it is complicated, then you have two minutes. It is going to be timed. You may begin when you are ready.

***Pamela Tsigdinos, Nevada's North Shore, Full Time Resident:***

First of all, it is lovely, and I am delighted to be here with all of you today. An answer to who to meet with—please come meet with the residents of the Tahoe communities. We would love to host you. Please come. Really, we would love to have you. I am one of many residents, many of whom had to leave today, encircling the Lake. We feel a deep responsibility to be caring stewards of this national treasure. We are also not compensated to be here. In a completely bipartisan effort, many of us have volunteered thousands of hours to attend public meetings, and to offer constructive well-researched testimony with two goals in mind. The first to protect Lake Tahoe from pollution and harm, and the second to ensure the public safety of residents and visitors. I really want to underscore public safety. Chair Daly, you asked a very important question earlier. I can answer it for you. What are the two priorities? The answer to your hierarchy question; public safety and the safety and wellbeing of the Lake. Those are the two priorities. We look to our government to provide those things for us. You would think that TRPA would be our biggest ally, but that is not the case. When we asked TRPA directly, why is not it doing more to prioritize the Lake's health and the public safety? We are told and I quote, "The developers are the TRPA customers." That would make the originators of the TRPA roll over in their graves. The

Agency has lost any pretense of being an independent environmental agency. In the past decade, TRPAs leadership has retooled to prioritize developers. They are bringing harm to the Lake. (Agenda Item XI A-1) (Agenda Item XI A-2)

***Chair Daly:***

Wrap it up, you are at two minutes. If you can wrap it, you can submit the rest of whatever you have in writing.

***Ms. Tsigdinos:***

I just want to say this Agency does harm by creating greater demand. We really need your oversight. Please dive in. We want to spend time with you, all of you, please. We beg you. We are here because we care about the Lake. We need your oversight. Thank you. By the way, if you have not read my article, I encourage you to do so.

***Dana Tibbetts, Tahoe, East Shore Alliance:***

Thanks for your patience. I hope you hear what we have stayed all day to say to you. In my opinion, we are quickly approaching a tipping point into deep economic and environmental collapse from which Lake Tahoe may not recover. TRPAs failure to manage the fundamentals is leading to total brand crisis. As Fodor's No List has told the world. Let us be clear—Tahoe is just a brand to TRPA; it is not a national treasure, but a golden calf. There are not enough consultants in all of Wood Rogers to reverse this trend. They are all too busy creating big plans, grand schemes, and dazzling visual aids for TRPAs next big overreach. Spending millions in taxpayer dollars on things most of us taxpayers do not want. Judging by Wood Roger's 28 page contract for the U.S. 50 CMP, we have talked about today, they are bound by that contract to deliver only plans in full compliance with those TRPA objectives. So multimodal bike paths on U.S. 50 align nicely with their safety first campaign but evacuation considerations, they are not even mentioned. Farming out planning to consultants enables TRPA to avoid accountability, liability, environmental reviews, and meaningful public interface. By running projects through multiple agencies and a complex of auxiliary or organizations, TRPA is able to operate under the radar, unencumbered by messy regulatory constraints, public opinion, or transparency requirements. Hence the flurry of these public private partnerships that have sprung up in recent years. So many you cannot even count them. These veiled entities shield TRPA development schemes and financial transactions from public view and your oversight. They also obscure the only kind of trail that TRPA wants to keep hidden—their money trail. (Agenda Item XI B)

***Chair Daly:***

Wrap up, please.

***Ms. Tibbetts:***

As the Oversight Committee, you are only and perhaps last hope of turning this ship of state before it is too late. Thank you. And please add my comments to the record.

***Chair Daly:***

Give them to our staff, and we will make sure we put your full remarks in. If you give a copy to our staff, they will put the full remarks in the minutes.

***Richard Minor, Incline Village Resident:***

I am a 25-year resident of Incline Village and past President of the Incline Village and Crystal Bay Historical Society. In 2004, in retrospect, was one of the most controversial and ill-advised decisions ever, the TRPA handed down a determination that using a private residence as a commercial lodging for short-term rentals was a permitted residential use of the property. It left it to the counties around the Lake to work out the details. You have all heard of the peril of unanticipated consequences. This decision was made without benefit of an environmental impact assessment or study—EIS they are called—on the basis of planning, staff research, and the use of so-called environmental checklists. And it must be said it had copious lobbying by real estate and building development interests, and a minimum of public input and debate. That said there are currently several major projects pending at Lake Tahoe, which should require by law approval by the TRPA. TTD's bus hub initiative—which is a boondoggle in the making right now, mitigating the impact of tourism on the Tahoe Basin, promoting affordable housing, the building of accessory dwelling units supposedly to provide workforce housing. The TRPA Oversight Committee needs to request that the Nevada Legislature require an EIS before any of these projects can be permitted. Period. Finally, every time an area plan is amended or modified; the TRPA needs to conduct an environmental impact assessment. They continue to refuse to observe their own rules to do this.

***Chair Daly:***

You are wrapping up.

***Mr. Minor:***

Thank you, Ms. Titus for your comments. They are right on.

***Janine Nyre, Tahoe Basin and Douglas County Resident:***

Good afternoon, Members of the Committee. Thank you for the opportunity to address you today. I am here today because I have technical concerns with how TRPA is driving decisions that are counter to the health of the Lake and the community. Having spent a career as part of teams developing and designing highly complex systems. The key for each successful program was the function of systems engineering. The function which looks at the effects of each part on one another to optimize and balance the requirements. It is critical because if you do not have systems engineering, you will have unintended consequences. As an example of approving developments including the Tahoe Blue Center, new housing units in South Lake Tahoe without regard to evacuation is going to be a problem. Both were built with inadequate parking to cover the occupancy. Obviously, there was no thought given to evacuations. In fact, it is clear that the inadequate parking provision was partly driven to further justify the urgency for funding for various transportation systems. We were very lucky in Caldor. But next time, we may not be so lucky. If a fire starts in Tahoe during an event at the Tahoe Blue Center—where no one has driven, they have all taken buses. How do we evacuate those people? Whose responsibility is it? If an evacuation is called at 2 a.m. near the low-income housing who evacuates the people in the low-income housing; if they have no provision for any transportation. On another front, you know it is funny, people talk about reducing the vehicle miles driven by residents, but yet no one has asked residents what they could do to help vehicle miles travel. I am not sure if you are aware, but every one of us in Douglas County has to drive to the post office every day to get our mail. Why cannot somebody talk to the postmaster and say, get a couple of those really efficient vehicles and deliver mail to the neighborhoods; that would keep a lot of locals off the street every day. Just a thought.

***Elisabeth Lernhardt, Zephyr Cove Resident:***

I would like to tag on to the Jenifer Davidson and Scott Morgan's presentation about microtransit at the South Shore. I would like to expand the background; how it came about and what I as a resident ask you to do, because this is a quick thing that you can fix. The Douglas County contributes the lion's share per year, \$600,000, to the funding of the Lake Link, which is the company that provides the ride service. It is free, as was mentioned by Alexis Hill. This money comes from the TOT, or transient occupancy tax, that is generated at the Douglas County Lake District. The TRPA has mandated that part of these funds—the exact amount is variable, it is 0.5 to 1 percent of the TOT be given to Tahoe Douglas Visitor Authority, the sole owner of the South Lake Tahoe new Event Center. They in turn distribute it to the South Lake Tahoe nonprofit called SSTMA, which is the operator of Lake Link. As a resident of Zephyr Cove, I must object to the neglect of our locals by not being included in the service area of Lake Link. This Committee has the authority to direct TRPA to mandate Lake Link to serve Nevadans. Why else would we send our tax money to California? And as a resident in Zephyr Cove, I was ill after major surgery for two months in 2022, and could not travel. There was absolutely zero transportation. Thank God for Safeway delivering home goods and groceries and my friends—that I could get taken care of.

***Niobe Burden Austere, Property Owner in Tahoe Vista:***

Hello, legislative Committee. Thank you for your time and consideration. I have been a property owner in Tahoe Vista since 1998, and a conservation photographer. I wrote six or seven public comments, which I submitted by email to all of you—a couple of times probably now—and so I am not going to go over those. Obviously, there is a lot of details in those public comments. They were comments that were submitted to TRPA in previous months and remain unanswered in a lot of cases. I just want to make sure that TRPA is made accountable for their responsibilities. I do want to point out the housing amendments that were passed last month. And whether they are truly making affordable housing available versus achievable, which I saw as a loophole. Achievable being what they say is the missing middle, but there is no study saying exactly who those people are—what income levels they are. It just was—I see it as a loophole for market rate housing, and this needs to be looked at very carefully. In addition to that, why do not we rather than support an orderly growth—as I keep hearing—why are not we addressing sustainable growth? Consider the 80,000 people that the water districts are saying they are planning for just in Carson alone. We have a huge number of lots of population growth in the area, not only in—not so much in Tahoe, but in Truckee, and Reno, and Carson. All these areas also affect the Lake. In 2012 is when that development cap was put in place in the Regional Plan. That is when the last environmental study was done. Maybe this needs to be reevaluated considering the capacity changes as a result of climate change as well, as the area. Please, please make sure that they are being accountable. Thank you very much and speak to the community. (Agenda Item XI C-1) (Agenda Item XI C-2) (Agenda Item XI C-3) (Agenda Item XI C-4) (Agenda Item XI C-5) (Agenda Item XI C-6) (Agenda Item XI C-7) (Agenda Item XI C-8)

***Ellie Waller, Lake Tahoe Resident:***

I strongly urge you to request the Bi-State Consultation on Transportation be reconvened. Transportation issues were front and center here. Much has changed since their last meeting, and review of their past recommendations and up-to-date funding strategies required their attention with possible guidance from this Committee. I requested information on their last report. TRPA provided me the date 2019, as the last report.



Additional information is available on the TRPA Transportation Program page—sustainable transportation funding. The Bi-State Consultations do not have seated members. They are called by representatives of the two states on an ad hoc basis for advice to be given and views to be exchanged about a specific topic. Participants are selected depending on the topic. There may or may not be any sort of a report from that consultation. I believe any meeting by the Bi-State Consultation group, when convened reports should be mandatory allowing the public and agencies to access their work. In an upcoming Committee session, an update on the status of the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act funding is appropriate before this Committee; this will be the last issuance as it sunsets in 2034. The need for this funding was touted at the Lake Tahoe Summit. The Summit highlighted the collaboration of the Bi-State, state, federal, private, et cetera. With so many issues rising to the level of importance and not addressed—in my opinion—how does the TRPA and local jurisdictions continue to spend millions and millions of dollars on unresolved issues? (Agenda Item XI D)

***Robert Aaron, International Children's Declaration:***

Chair and your Committee. Please, I want to let you know how much all of us appreciate all of you. The number one thing, I think, that has been stated here and why we are all here is the Lake and the Lake's health period—100 percent. I just wanted to bring it to your attention. If none of you know, one of there was 38 lakes around the world tested for microplastics and pollution. Can any of you tell me what place Lake Tahoe came in? Where would you think that it would be out of 38 lakes globally that were tested? Where do you think Lake Tahoe would be; because of TRPA's great, you know, saving of the Lake. We are the third most polluted lake in the world for microplastics that were studied. I do not think Ms. Reagan can smile too much under her watch to be number third. I would hope for us at least to be up above the thirties. Thank you for your time today and all of your effort. And please look into that case Isaac Stucken versus TRPA. I think you will find it very enlightening, and I would like to say for the Children's Defense Initiative appreciates your time and thank you so much for your attention. (Agenda Item XI E)

***Alex Tsigdinos, North Lake Tahoe Resident:***

I would like to finish by saying, please use your oversight, influence, and budgetary control to get TRPA focusing on the vital environmental mission it was formed to carry out. Specifically, we need TRPA to do the following; conduct an updated comprehensive environmental impact study and determine the carrying capacity of the Basin that reflects the dramatic changes in the Basin's population, visitation, and climate to develop a single comprehensive wildfire evacuation plan in concert with responsible federal, state, and local agencies. Three independently validate the cumulative impact of the environmental traffic evacuation of large developments rather than regarding each solely on an ad hoc basis, which is what they do now. And finally, as a public serving agency that receives State and federal monies, TRPA must adopt a strong conflict of interest and a code of conduct.

***Chair Daly:***

Any other in-person public comment? Seeing none, BPS, if we can go to the phone, I understand we have three callers on the phone; whenever you are ready.

***BPS:***

If you would like to participate in public comment, please press \*9 now to take your place in the queue. Again, if you would like to speak in public comment, please press \*9 now.

***Caitlin Meyer, Chief Program Officer, Tahoe Fund:***

I am so sorry; I could not be there in person tonight. I am on the road, but I did want to call in to let you all know that the Tahoe Fund since 2010, has been committed to providing a consistent source of philanthropic funds and representing the private community in supporting the environmental improvement project. We have environmental improvement project programs. We have already committed upwards of \$2 million to the State Route (SR) 28 for improvement projects. We are eager to see additional parking spaces added off highway so that we can get rid of that super dangerous on highway parking. That is a priority of ours, as is supporting our public agencies as they increase the pace and scale of forest health treatment and contributing as much as we can to the destination stewardship efforts. I just wanted to call and let you all know that we are standing ready to continue to provide philanthropic funding to the EIP efforts. To date we have raised upwards of \$20 million in philanthropic funds, and we have helped to leverage over \$100 million in public funding with that \$20 million. So keep us in mind, and please know that we are standing by to support some of the incredible projects that we have talked about here today and others moving forward.

***BPS:***

If you would like to speak in public comment, please press \*9 now. Chair, you have no more callers wishing to speak at this time.

***The following written public comments were received:***

- Diane Becker, Incline Village, Full Time Resident (Agenda Item XI F)
- Doug Flaherty, President, Tahoe Sierra Clean Air Coalition (Agenda Item XI G)
- Andrew Huckbody, Chairman, Lakeridge GID and Lakeridge Resident (Agenda Item XI H)
- Tony Risso, South Lake Tahoe Resident (Agenda Item XI I)
- Larry Schluer, Lake Tahoe Homeowner (Agenda Item XI J)
- Judith Tornese, President, Friends of the West Shore (Agenda Item XI K)
- Alan Miller, Professional Engineer (Agenda Item XI L-1) (Agenda Item IX L-2)
- David McClure, North Shore Lake Tahoe Resident (Agenda Item XI M-1) (Agenda Item XI M-2)
- Jim Lyon, Friends of the West Shore (Agenda Item XI N)
- Monica Eisenstecken (Agenda Item XI O)
- Kathie Julian, Incline Village Resident (Agenda Item XI P)
- Ann Nichols, North Lake Tahoe Full Time Resident and Property Owner (Agenda Item XI Q)
- David Jinkens, MPA, Good Government Advocate (Agenda Item XI R)
- Melisa Soderston, Director, Tahoe Forests Matter (Agenda Item XI S)
- Kristina Hill (Agenda Item XI T)

***Chair Daly:***

Well, that went relatively quick. We are up to our last agenda item which is adjournment. This concludes our meeting for today.

Our next meeting is scheduled for March 8, 2024. Likely be held offsite within the Tahoe Basin. We are looking at the TRPA's conference room in Stateline. Feel free, Committee Members, to reach out to staff or myself if you come up with other groups or topics for us to discuss.

draft

## **AGENDA ITEM XII—ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 5:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Christina Harper  
Manager of Research Policy Assistants

---

Alysa M. Keller  
Senior Principal Policy Analyst

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator Skip Daly, Chair

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## MEETING MATERIALS

AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER/ENTITY	DESCRIPTION
Agenda Item II A	Yolanda Knaak, Incline Village Resident	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II B	Brett Tibbitts, Tahoe Shore Alliance	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II C-1	Ellie Waller, Douglas County Resident	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II C-2	Ellie Waller, Douglas County Resident	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II C-3	Ellie Waller, Douglas County Resident	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II C-4	Ellie Waller, Douglas County Resident	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II C-5	Ellie Waller, Douglas County Resident	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II D	Elisabeth Lernhardt, Zephyr Cove Resident	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II E	Robert Aaron, International Children's Declaration	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II F	Ronda Tycker, Incline Village Resident	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II G	Aaron Vanderpool, Lake Tahoe Resident	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II H	Fred Voltz, Nevada Resident	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II I	Helen Neff, Incline Village Resident	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item V	Alysa M. Keller, Committee Policy Analyst, Senior Principal Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB)	Committee Overview
Agenda Item VI	Julie Regan, Executive Director, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency	PowerPoint Presentation

<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>PRESENTER/ENTITY</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>
Agenda Item VII	Charlie Donohue, Administrator, Division of State Lands, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR)  Ellery Stahler, Deputy Administrator, Division of State Lands, DCNR	PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item VIII	David Dutra, Deputy Administrator, Public Works Division, Buildings and Grounds, Department of Administration	PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item IX A	Darren Schultz, Director, Public Works, Carson City	PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item IX B	Jenifer Davidson, County Manager, Douglas County	Written Testimony
Agenda Item IX C	Austin Osborne, Manager, Storey County	PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item IX D	Alexis Hill, Chair, Washoe County Commission Washoe County  Cadence Matijevich, Government Affairs Liaison, Washoe County	PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item IX A-1	Pamela Tsigdinos, Nevada's North Shore, Full Time Resident	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item IX A-2	Pamela Tsigdinos, Nevada's North Shore, Full Time Resident	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item IX B	Dana Tibbetts, Tahoe, East Shore Alliance	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item IX C-1	Niobe Burden Austere, Property Owner in Tahoe Vista	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item IX C-2	Niobe Burden Austere, Property Owner in Tahoe Vista	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item IX C-3	Niobe Burden Austere, Property Owner in Tahoe Vista	Written Public Comment

<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>PRESENTER/ENTITY</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>
Agenda Item IX C-4	Niobe Burden Austere, Property Owner in Tahoe Vista	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item IX C-5	Niobe Burden Austere, Property Owner in Tahoe Vista	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item IX C-6	Niobe Burden Austere, Property Owner in Tahoe Vista	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item IX C-7	Niobe Burden Austere, Property Owner in Tahoe Vista	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item IX C-8	Niobe Burden Austere, Property Owner in Tahoe Vista	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item IX D	Ellie Waller, Lake Tahoe Resident	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item IX E	Robert Aaron, International Children's Declaration	Chart
Agenda Item XI F	Diane Becker, Incline Village, Full Time Resident	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item XI G	Doug Flaherty, President, Tahoe Sierra Clean Air Coalition	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item XI H	Andrew Huckbody, Chairman, Lakeridge GID and Lakeridge Resident	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item XI I	Tony Risso, South Lake Tahoe Resident	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item XI J	Larry Schluer, Lake Tahoe Homeowner	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item XI K	Judith Tornese, President, Friends of the West Shore	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item XI L-1	Alan Miller, Professional Engineer	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item XI L-2	Alan Miller, Professional Engineer	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item XI M-1	David McClure, North Shore Lake Tahoe Resident	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item XI M-2	David McClure, North Shore Lake Tahoe Resident	Written Public Comment

<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>PRESENTER/ENTITY</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>
Agenda Item XI N	Jim Lyon, Friends of the West Shore	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item XI O	Monica Eisenstecken	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item XI P	Kathie Julian, Incline Village Resident	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item XI Q	Ann Nichols, North Lake Tahoe Full Time Resident and Property Owner	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item XI R	David Jinkens, MPA, Good Government Advocate	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item XI S	Melisa Soderston, Director, Tahoe Forests Matter	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item XI T	Kristina Hill	Written Public Comment

The Minutes are supplied as an informational service. All meeting materials are on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Carson City, Nevada. For copies, contact the Library at (775) 684-6827 or <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Division/Research/Library/About/Contact/feedbackmail.cfm>.