



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)

MINUTES August 16, 2024

The sixth and final 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 Friday, August 16, 2024, at 1 p.m. in Room 3137, Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 165 of the Nevada Legislature Office Building, 7230 Amigo Street, Las Vegas, Nevada.

The agenda, minutes, meeting materials, and video recording of the meeting are available on the Committee's meeting page. The 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 or 775/684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT IN CARSON CITY:

Senator Skip Daly, Chair
Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod, Vice Chair
Senator Robin L. Titus
Assemblyman Ken Gray (Alternate for Assemblyman Rich DeLong)
Assemblywoman Angie Taylor

COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESENT VIA ZOOM:

Senator Melanie Scheible

COMMITTEE MEMBER ABSENT:

Assemblyman Rich DeLong (Excused)

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU STAFF PRESENT:

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

Lisa Creamer, Senior Research Policy Assistant, Research Division

Terese Martinez, Research Policy Assistant, Research Division

Erin Sturdivant, Senior Principal Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division

Jeffrey Chronister, Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division

*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

Chair Daly:

[Chair Daly called the meeting to order, and welcomed members, presenters, and the public to the sixth and final 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.]

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

[Chair Daly reviewed meeting and testimony guidelines.]

AGENDA ITEM II—PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Daly:

Let us go ahead to Item II, which is our first opportunity for public comment. We will start here in Carson City. I do not see anybody down in Southern Nevada, but we will get there eventually. When you are ready, please proceed and keep your comments to two minutes.

Ann Nichols, North Tahoe Preservation Alliance:

Good afternoon, Nevada Legislators, Tahoe businesses, and locals. Are you ready for another tax? If you are a Lake Tahoe citizen, you should be outraged. A compulsory tax you have never seen on a ballot is scheduled for a new draft Nevada bill. While you have had your hands full dealing with inflation—high cost of living—a new form of unelected substitute for government is coming to town with a new tax; 1 to 2 percent, who knows. They are trying to call it something else; Business Improvement District (BID). We used to call this “taxation without representation.” Maybe we still should. Business Improvement Districts have not been discussed in this forum. Why not? Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA), nine tourism groups, the Prosperity Center, Stewardship Tahoe, and Tahoe Fund are trying to form a BID at Tahoe that will tax every Tahoe resident to promote tourism, affordable housing, and transportation infrastructure improvements.

This scheme will dip into the pockets of every local since there will be a tax on just about everything, except for groceries and gasoline. This is a workaround on the requirement that a sales tax requires a two-thirds majority approval. The proponents were not elected and the governance structure that will manage this initial multimillion dollar pool of yearly money are not elected. The entity will be stacked with big resorts as it is with the BID in Placer County. A nongovernmental authority is going to tax your business if more than 20 percent of your customers are tourists. What gives them the right? They can call it a fee, or an assessment, or a tax; but you will pay it. In fact, the percentage will continue to increase as it has with other BIDs. Please hear the full story of BIDs before any approval. Do not listen to the TRPA echo chamber. Nevada citizens demand it. Thank you.

[\(Agenda Item II A\)](#)

Doug Flaherty, TahoeCleanAir.org:

Honorable Committee Members, cumulative impacts result from the tyranny of incremental actions when added to other past actions, resulting in the direct indirect compounding of

environmental degradation over time. Unfortunately, the workshop recommendations posted by this Committee today signal a green light to the TRPA and its partners to continue their tyranny of combined incremental actions without first completing a supplemental IR to the 2012 Regional Plan, considering significant new information and changes over the last 12 years.

Today, Tahoe degradation from 50 years of incremental TRPA project approvals, code changes, and mismanagement are on display for all to see. This as Tahoe waters and beaches flounder under tons of trash, tragic micro- and macro-plastic pollution, chemicals, uncontrollable algae and Cyanotoxins, and pro-TRPA visitor assaults, which endanger public safety on a daily basis. The boot of the TRPA environmental degradation on the Basin is heavy. An Agency caught up in regulatory capture, a pro-growth, pro-development, and pro-international destination project mindset whose arrogant behavior, lack of transparency, and demonstrated lack of consideration of public opinion is on full display.

With your recommendations today lacking any real measurement of accountability, your oversight simply cannot be measured. This, like the TRPA failing to any real measurements of threshold progress based on substantial data of which are simply modified at will, or timeliness, time, or kick down the road. Today, it appears that you are all cut from the same cloth. Our once pristine, now degraded Nevada Tahoe resources deserve better from the TRPA and this Committee. Thank you. ([Agenda Item II B](#))

Pamela Tsigdinos, Full-time Resident, North Lake Tahoe, Nevada:

I would like to quote from NRS Chapter 281A, Ethics in Government, "A public office is a public trust and shall be held for the sole benefit of the people." Yet, all we the people, your Tahoe constituents, have seen and heard is example after example of this Committee disregarding the public's fundamental concerns. Meanwhile, the Committee has cozied up to the very agency and its influence-seeking partners that the people trust you to oversee. This Committee has broken the public's trust by allowing commercial interests and tourism groups, many of which are here today and taxpayer TRPA-funded staff to shape agendas and curry favor.

While that may sound harsh, read Recommendations 2 and 12 in your packet today. Two focuses on funding more tourism activities by taxing residents as well as visitors. Do not be fooled, this Destination Stewardship is TRPA's fancy way to attract more visitors than the infrastructure in the Lake can handle. Number 12, enhancing the visitor experience, is above mitigating the impacts on residents. That appalling Recommendation gives permission to sacrifice resident's safety, needs, and quality of life. How about we share and transport some of Tahoe's 25 million visitors to your neighborhoods? Requests for business and transportation projects require huge sums of money. That means unfettered growth, economic development to serve TRPA's tourism-driven partners recommending such funding before determining the Tahoe Basin's carrying capacity—the number of people Tahoe can safely accommodate without hurting the environment—is frankly irresponsible. Public safety is an obligation. Thank you for listening.

Ronda Tycer, Incline Village Resident:

First of all, I would like to thank the Committee Members for your consideration of our public input. As Margaret Mead once said, "Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has." As a last comment today, I take exception to your 12th Recommendation, asking TRPA to reset its priorities in its decision-making processes, work, and resources. You have asked that

TRPA first prioritize the Lake, but next you ask that they prioritize enhancing the visitor experience, and you make that a higher priority than mitigating impacts on residents or economic considerations. Perhaps I do not understand exactly what you mean by “enhancing the visitor experience or mitigating impacts on residents,” but I remind you that we residents are the full-time on-the-ground stewards of the Lake. We are the ones carrying out the best management practices and paying TRPA an inspection fee to do so. We are the ones picking up the trash from the beaches and plastic from the Lake bottom. We are the ones putting up with the noise and disturbance from a flood of TRPA-approved short-term renters. We are the ones paying taxes and fees to repair the roads and the ones dealing with traffic congestion and parking throughout our neighborhoods. We are the ones giving you the most unvarnished information about the real state of the Lake. Most importantly, when the tourists leave, we are the ones left to love the Lake. Perhaps you may want to rethink the order of those two priorities in your number 12 Recommendation. Thank you.

Robert Aaron:

Hello, thank you Committee for your time and all your meetings. Lake Tahoe would like to thank you—especially the South Shore, where I reside—and all of the children that will be future users of this water as drinking water. I think it is up to 12 million people this Lake feeds. Again, a moment of silence for the Lake. How about ten seconds for everyone to think about the Lake and the body of water that you guys are here to protect? My motto: learn something, know something, do something. I hope all of you act like Mark Twain or John Muir would in your decisions.

I believe the TRPA has looked towards economic vitality over environmental vitality, and I think when you lose the second, you lose both. All the industries that are trying to bring more and more people into the Basin are damaging it—it is obvious. Some of the towers that had been led up by the TRPA Board and their things—this is just the material since our very first meeting; this is all material that I have collected off of it. I wanted to bring pinecones and a pineapple, signifying hospitality for a pineapple and enlightenment for a pinecone, but I did not get any of this, but I want to offer these as a gift. I would like to give them to you guys, but I think I want to give them to the TRPA members. ([Agenda Item II C](#))

Chair Daly:

—not make personal attacks. Your time is up. Next speaker.

Mr. Aaron:

Skip, really? Wow. I thought this was a public.....

Alex Tsigidinos, Full-time Resident, Incline Village:

Over the past months, you have seen a barrage of TRPA's PowerPoint presentations, had numerous collegial exchanges, and taken a few bus tours—snacks included. I trust you also posed hard questions to TRPA about rezoning for so-called walkable town centers in a place where snow falls by the foot for a dense urban planning model that allows for five-story buildings with no parking for its intended workforce residents, many of whom need a car or truck as a tool of trade. The congestion in missed vehicle miles traveled (VMT) targets associated with a tenfold increase in annual visitation from 2 to 20 million people in just 20 years.

The implications for wildfire evacuation planning as TRPA green lights large commercial developments, ever more trails, and tourist attractions. They are selling a product that Tahoe's limited infrastructure cannot support. The decrease in Lake clarity from 105 feet in 1967 to just 53.5 feet this summer—despite \$3 billion in spending in the past 20 years—and the regulatory capture and ethical issues associated with TRPA Governing Board Members serving on multiple Tahoe-related boards of organizations to which they can funnel tax dollars.

I urge you to attach strings to TRPA's funding. Specifically, ask TRPA to conduct an updated comprehensive environmental impact study and determine the current carrying capacity of the Basin, independently validate the cumulative environmental traffic and evacuation impacts of new developments rather than regarding each on an ad hoc basis. Finally, adopt a strong conflict of interest in our code of conduct for TRPA Board and Governors. We do not need yet another Chamber of Commerce or tourism agency promoting Tahoe. We do need TRPA to be a truly independent watchdog agency. Thank you.

Andy Chapman, President/Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Travel North Tahoe Nevada (TNTN):

Thank you, Senator Daly, and Committee Members. I am a full-time resident of Incline Village and a 35-year resident of Lake Tahoe. Travel North Tahoe Nevada is the official destination management organization representing the Washoe County portion of Lake Tahoe and our many tourism-related businesses.

Travel North Tahoe Nevada's mission is to encourage destination experiences that support a vibrant economy, enhance community character, and foster environmental stewardship. Travel North Tahoe Nevada and the tourism-related businesses we represent support Item II B on the agenda to allow BID formations in the Lake Tahoe Basin to provide sustainable funding for transportation and mitigation of visitor activities in the Tahoe Basin. Washoe/Tahoe has seen increased pressures on resources within the jurisdiction, originally stemming from pandemic-induced travels that continue today. Mitigation of these impacts is vital to keep Washoe/Tahoe and the Lake Tahoe Basin a vibrant destination for residents and visitors alike. Furthermore, TNTN and the tourism-related businesses we represent support the concept of a surcharge on overnight stays, Item IV D on your agenda, and is grateful to the Washoe County Commissioner, Chair Daly, and this Committee for bringing forward this concept for consideration.

As previously mentioned, there exists a significant and growing need to enhance transportation elements in Washoe/Tahoe and the Tahoe Basin as a whole. Similar surcharges are currently in place in other regions for the same purpose. Of utmost importance to TNTN and our constituents is that the revenue generated in Washoe/Tahoe are returned to our community to be invested in the transportation enhancements. While it is not clear that the language thus far achieves this, we would like to work with Chair Daly and the Committee in Washoe County in regards prior to and during the legislative process.

Again, thank you, Senator Daly, and the entire Interim Committee for your support of the Lake Tahoe Basin and the importance of protecting this natural treasure for future generations.

Richard Minor, Full-time Resident, Incline Village:

Chairman Daly and Committee Members, I am Richard Minor, a 24-year resident of Incline Village. First, let me thank you for the work you do on behalf of the voters and other

residents of the Lake Tahoe Basin. It appears in your list of recommendations that you have listened to those who have offered public comment and are taking seriously some of our suggestions for action by the Nevada Legislature. That said, I am disturbed, actually appalled, by a wishy-washy—and that is being kind—words from your Chair who is apparently bending over backward to curry favor with Julie Regan and the TRPA Board of Directors—with Items 11 and 12, in particular.

I know there are statutory limitations on the requests for a bill that this Committee can make, but frankly, those two items are much more important for the protection of Lake Tahoe and the residents of Nevada who live and work here than most of the other requests for drafting of bills presented in items one through ten. To actually fulfill this Committee's required responsibilities for the oversight of the TRPA, you must ask the Legislature to require—not to think about—the TRPA update the environmental analysis conducted for the 2012 Regional Plan and cease to use that plan as a basis for any so called threshold standards in approving any activities requiring the same until a new environmental threshold analysis is completed and the necessary public hearings held. I will defer to others for comments on Item 12, which is also appalling. Once again, thank you for your service to the citizens of Nevada.

Brett Tibbitts, Tahoe East Shore Alliance (TESA):

The Committee has shown a lack of interest in holding TRPA accountable for what it does with the billions of dollars it has received over time. The TRPA comes before you today with its hand out yet again for millions of dollars from the State of Nevada. Yet, no one seems interested in actually measuring whether the TRPA is achieving any results with all this money.

Two—Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your effort to steer the TRPA into better management by prioritizing its goals and place the Lake first. That is certainly better than the TRPA's current mode of placing the Lake and tourism equally. However, by placing tourism second in your list instead of environmental and safety concerns, in my opinion, you are giving the current crew running the TRPA a Mack truck to do what it wants.

Three—wildfire and evacuation issues failed to merit a place in the Committee's final report of recommendations. Chairman Daly is asking for the State of Nevada to contribute a fixed \$2.5 million a year to the TRPA Lake Tahoe Transportation Action Plan. Chairman Daly, can you confidently state that you understand this plan? I believe no one can as it keeps changing. Given TRPA's free hand with Nevada's money and its continued passion to reduce roadway capacities, you could well be helping to make Lake Tahoe the next Lahaina or Paradise, California.

Four—it should be clear by now that the TRPA does not want to engage with residents. Ms. Regan says we are prohibited from participating. Yet strangely, residents who are developers, members of the Chamber of Commerce, and casino owners have full access and participation rights in the TRPA. Residents who are focused on the Lake and its health are banned. Thank you. ([Agenda Item II D](#))

Ellie Waller, Nevada Resident:

The TRPA has lost their way. Without a healthy Lake, no amount of funding matters. For example, the hypocrisy of encouraging more people to come to the East Shore Trail—so proudly espoused at the recent Summit—requires building more parking lots to get more people on the trails. Economy over environment resounds. Transportation dollars being

requested need to be held accountable. The TRPA should have to complete capacity studies before the 2025 Session for beaches and trails—public or private, all quarter segments, and at individual jurisdiction levels.

A few examples of capacity studies that need to be done Carson City East Shore, where the Trail is overly promoted now with expansion has known roadway capacity issues that need addressing. Douglas County, Zephyr Beach, and United States Forest Service land you have heard about. The newly opened Event Center needs a parking capacity study from the casinos as a mitigation. They have no on-site parking. Please be skeptical and check but verify exactly how funds are proposed to be spent with requests like the “7-7-7 Plan.” Duplicity and transportation funding before you today is clear, and do not be fooled that a BID buy-in by Nevada will be accepted and create the desired funding source.

Plans, plans, and more strategies than one can count have been derived since the 2012 Regional update approval. The very same time, the Tahoe Prosperity Center and the Tahoe Fund appeared as nonprofits that collect from donors to act as quasi-governmental agencies with no accountability and have joined forces with TRPA who always says they have “not enough federal funding.”

Now, the Tahoe Destination Stewardship phoenix has arisen with 30 partner Council members, including TRPA. They have not produced a memorandum of understanding to the public. If they collect dollars, who is the fiscal agent? How are all these dollars that are commingled to complete or not projects held accountable? This is too complex to figure out and goes unchecked. ([Agenda Item II E](#))

Erin Casey, CEO/President, Tahoe Housing Hub:

Good afternoon. Our nonprofit organization focuses on housing stability in the Tahoe Basin, and I wanted to come and support the Item that is outlined in your agenda packet specific to housing in the Basin around impact fees.

We have recently launched and piloted a program that we call the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Accelerator. Accessory dwelling units are an important strategy to addressing our housing crisis. We are developing this program to provide technical assistance to individuals who are willing to use their land and financing resources to build these units on those properties.

Recently, we have been in contact with dozens of property owners in the Tahoe Basin who are interested in doing this and do have some financial resources. Part of our challenge is when we describe to them the costs of building these units—and that includes permitting fees, impact fees, construction costs, et cetera. It becomes harder and harder for people to move forward and actually develop that ADU.

Programs like this, where impact fees can be reduced to that person who is building a unit that is 1,000 square foot or smaller—which most ADUs are—can actually make a significant difference in their willingness to move forward with a program or project like the one we are proposing. Paired with a program like ours, where we are providing technical assistance to people who do not have experience in constructing or building housing, is a big deal, and it is at no cost to them.

I did want to mention that this program was funded by the Tourism Business Improvement District (TID) that is outlined and described in your board packet in North Lake Tahoe. We see this program as being essential. You would not be the only State doing this. There are

other States in the surrounding region—Oregon, for example, Washington, California—that have done the same. Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak.

Elisabeth Lernhardt, Zephyr Cove Resident:

Honorable Chairman and Committee Members, I live right next to Zephyr Cove Resort, and I want to show you something that I found out just today.

When I go and have to cut down a tree, I have to ask for permission from TRPA. When my neighbor wants to build a garage, they have to go through lengthy permission. When our Sewer District Manager wants to enforce crumbling infrastructure, she had to wait three months and almost got a spill like happened at North Lake. So, it takes a long process. We do not have any handle on it. But when my neighbor, the Forest Service and Aramark, puts a fence up like this or this—I will make this available to you—or this on Fourth of July where we cannot go through to see what is happening there. And then another neighbor floats by in her float and sees that there is big machinery, that there are rocks being moved on the beach, that there are five stairs constructed, that there is a fenced area with environmentally sensitive plants and surrounding because there is a riparian there, that they are being bulldozed over as we see in these pictures. Nobody even knows about this. I did not know about this until today either. Where is the permitting? Does TRPA know about it? Why is the Forest Service and Aramark giving the— They can go and do what they want without permission. This should not be happening.

Thank you for your attention. I have a gift for you. You need to learn more about Tahoe. This is from the [inaudible] University of California (UC) Davis. Please watch it. ([Agenda Item II F](#))

Cadence Matijevich, Government Affairs Liaison, Washoe County:

Good afternoon, Chair Daly and Members of the Committee. I want to come today to express our gratitude to the Committee for the opportunity that you provided us earlier to come before you and share with you Washoe County's priorities for Lake Tahoe. We see reflected in your Work Session Document (WSD) today in Items B, C, and D are priorities for housing, particularly housing affordability issues for workforce, for the public sector employees who serve the Basin, teachers, firefighters, public safety, public works employees, and also for transit and transportation. We recognize that bill draft requests (BDR) are the start of the process. There is still work to be done and as the language of these bills comes out, we look forward to working with you during the session. Thank you.

Rebekah Reynolds, Civitas:

Hello, I represent Civitas, a legal consulting firm that specializes in formation of tourism and BIDs. I am here to comment on Item II B, specifically the request to draft a bill that would allow cities and counties to establish BIDs.

The legislation is crucial for providing much-needed funding for transportation, housing, and the mitigation of visitor impacts in the area. A BID is an industry-driven funding mechanism that enables businesses to pay an assessment which is managed by a nonprofit to improve the economic sustainability of the district. The funds are allocated based off a plan approved by more than 50 percent of business owners weighed by the amount they contribute. Currently, there are over 200 TID across the United States, with 23 states having enacted BID legislation—most recently, Illinois and Minnesota.

One of the most successful examples of a TID is North Lake Tahoe, established in 2021. The District assesses over 4,000 businesses and generates \$6 million annually and these funds are used for programs including marketing, sustainability efforts, economic development, transportation, business support, and visitor services, all which will directly benefit the businesses.

I respectfully urge you to consider drafting a bill that would enable cities and counties in Nevada to form BIDs. This would allow Nevada businesses to remain competitive with other destinations across the country; and BIDs have been proven to be a powerful tool for economic and community enhancement. Nevada cities and counties deserve the opportunity to benefit from them as well. Thank you.

Tobi Tyler, Vice Chair, Tahoe Area Group, Sierra Club:

Good afternoon. I live on the Nevada side of the Lake. The Tahoe Area Sierra Club represents community members across the Tahoe Basin. We encourage community members to explore, enjoy, and protect Lake Tahoe.

The Nevada Legislature Committee Members have listened attentively these past months to both the public and the Agency you are tasked with overseeing. We appreciate the attention you have given TRPA and the issues facing the Lake. We hope to work with you in the future to work more closely with community members who live in the Basin, in addition to your collaboration with TRPA.

Our members are very concerned about over-tourism in the Basin, and how that might impact wildfire evacuations. We are concerned about comments TRPA has made about not being responsible for evacuating residents and tourists in the event of a natural disaster. By building more parking lots and more development, TRPA unfortunately has not been able to reduce VMT and key environmental thresholds. We are also concerned about the proposed hospital relocation away from its main population center, which will increase VMT in the Basin. We are worried that this relocation will lead to a lower nurse-to-patient ratio, and how that would affect patient care.

Lastly, we worry about how the necessary helicopter and ambulance travel through the Basin will impact wildlife and wild lands, especially Rabe Meadow and Burke Creek, which is adjacent to the hospital and home to beavers.

Finally, we want to raise again the issue of herbicides being used in the Tahoe Keys. The Sierra Club won the lawsuit preventing herbicides from being used before non-chemical methods are used to eradicate the weeds. The Lahontan Water Board's Basin plan says explicitly that non-chemical methods must be used and—only if they are not effective at addressing the issue—a chemical method may be used.

Protecting Lake Tahoe has to be done with care and consideration for all Basin residents—from the beavers to the Cutthroat Trout to the people who make up the Lake Tahoe community. We look forward to continuing to work with this Committee and TRPA to address the serious issues impacting the Lake, thoughtfully and properly. Thank you. ([Agenda Item II G](#))

Niobe Burden Austere, North Shore Resident and Conservation Photographer:

While reviewing the Committee's web page for information about this upcoming meeting, I noticed a memorandum dated June 11th from Chair Daly regarding a Solicitation of

Recommendations with a submission deadline of July 22nd. I do not recall this Solicitation being announced during previous meetings. Could you clarify when the public was informed about the Solicitation? In reviewing last month's minutes, I did not find any reference to the memorandum. Additionally, I reached out to legislative staff and received a response stating that recommendations do not need to be formally submitted to be considered by the Committee.

Today's WSD includes 13 recommendations primarily from TRPAs Executive Director, TDD, and Chairman Daly himself. However, there are no recommendations from public input, despite numerous two-minute comments from residents over the past eight months. Many of these document comments highlighted critical issues, including the need for TRPA to initiate a basin-wide carrying capacity study, a wildlife evacuation study for public safety, and comprehensive environmental analysis considering cumulative impacts since the 2012 TRPA Regional Plan. These are not merely complaints about TRPA from residents regarding something miniscule in their backyard. Can Chair Daly or the Legislative Committee explain why these critical public recommendations are not included in the working document to be discussed today? I understand the Committee is limited to acting on a final ten legislative measures, but it is crucial to ensure public input is adequately represented. It is more than evident looking at this document that it currently is not.

Thank you for your attention to these items while reviewing the upcoming WSD. I am happy to restate them for the record. ([Agenda Item II H-1](#)) ([Agenda Item II H-2](#)) ([Agenda Item II H-3](#)) ([Agenda Item II H-4](#)) ([Agenda Item II H-5](#))

Chair Daly:

If there is anybody else who needs to come up, fill the chairs.

You are up. Turn your mic on.

Scott Teach, North Lake Tahoe Resident:

I have been a North Lake Tahoe resident for 45 years in just a couple of months. I scrape my notes because most of what I was concerned with has already been said. I will talk about two things really quick though—well, three.

I see that the document was dated today. If you have not read it already, I request that you read it slowly. Please, if you do not understand BIDs, get some knowledge. I disagree with the previous speaker.

In closing, I am just going to say I respectfully suggest you not provide additional funding to the TRPA and its self-anointed partners until they prove they are not just after the next grant.

As a final anecdote, please consider the people who are pro—they are all on somebody's clock—and all these other people who have spent hours, days, weeks, and years observing what is really going on. Thank you.

Dana Tibbitts, TESA:

Six meetings and eight months into this wheel-spinning endeavor to support this Committee's active oversight of TRPAs badly listing ship. We are more convinced than ever that Tahoe's tipping point into environmental and economic collapse is here. The Basin is

fully engulfed in an inferno of greedy schemes, backroom deals, and deep corruption, and the flames of this fire will not be quenched—certainly not by this body. When the oversight apparatus is no better than that which it purports to oversee, there can be no righting of the ship. We, the residents, stand as witness to this travesty. It is a nail in the coffin and perhaps the final chapter in Tahoe's demise.

Our hope today is no longer in the stagecraft of government in an age of globalism. We put no stock in blind guides and gilded chambers. We expect no answer from whitewashed tombs. We watched the machinations of politicians play out like so much bad theater, and we are not deceived by this charade. You have neglected the most important matters of the law and justice and pandered to superficial schemes and deceptive stratagems to turn Tahoe into a cash cow. You have turned a blind eye to the real problems and been entertained by a self-congratulatory parade of dog and pony shows, only to dispense costly benefits and rewards for more bad theater.

Others will occupy the gates that have been destroyed, and the gavel that is coming will not be the hand of a man, but God himself will be the judge of this endeavor and all that comes from it. In the final reckoning, Tahoe belongs to God. Tahoe belongs to the people whose hearts and passion have not been sucked dry by mammon. God is not done, and neither are we.

Chair Daly:

Do we have any other people wishing to give public comment here in Carson City? Seeing none, do we have anybody in Southern Nevada? I do not see anybody.

We will move to the phone lines. Do we have anybody wishing to give public comment on the phone?

Broadcast and Production Services (BPS):

Thank you, Chair. Please press *9 to take your place in the queue. Please press *6 to unmute.

You are unmuted. Please go ahead.

Helen Neff, Incline Village Resident:

I sent written comments regarding Item Number 12 of the WSD. Rather than repeating what has been said by previous concerned local residents and constituents, and for the sake of time and respect for your time, I will just read part of my submitted comment regarding Item 12.

The preservation, protection, and restoration of Lake Tahoe is undeniably critical and deserves our unwavering attention. However, prioritizing the visitor experience above the impact on local residents is shortsighted and horribly misplaced. Over the past five months and today, you have received written documents from Lake Tahoe residents and heard hours of public comment, requesting action on numerous items that are having safety, financial, and quality of life impacts on local residents. While the visitor experience is important to the local economy, it should not come at the expense of residents' well-being. Enhancing the visitor experience is a by-product of a well-cared-for local population and environment, not the other way around.

I urge this Committee to realign its priorities to better reflect the needs and concerns of local residents. By balancing the needs of residents with economic considerations, Lake Tahoe can have a thriving, resilient community that benefits everyone, including visitors.

Thank you for the opportunity to share these thoughts to keep your constituents front and center. By doing so, we all benefit: the Lake, environment, residents, visitors, and the regional economy. Thank you. (Agenda Item I)

Kyle Davis, League to Save Lake Tahoe:

Thank you, Mister Chairman and Members of the Committee. I apologize; I am not able to be there in person with you today. We have submitted a letter for your record, which you should have. We just wanted to make sure to reiterate our support for Items I, II, V B, and VI. Thank you for your time, and I look forward to continuing to work with this Committee and the full Legislature on these proposals. (Agenda Item J)

BPS:

We have no additional callers at this time.

Chair Daly:

Thank you. With that, we will close Item II. We will have additional public comment at the end of the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM III—APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE MEETING ON JULY 19, 2024

Chair Daly:

This brings us to Item III, approval of the minutes from the July 19, 2024, meeting. The meeting minutes should have been emailed to everybody. I hope you had a chance to review them. I did not see anything wrong that I read.

With that, I will entertain a motion to approve the minutes.

VICE CHAIR BILBRAY-AXELROD MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FOR THE MEETING ON JULY 19, 2024.

SENATOR TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

AGENDA ITEM IV—WORK SESSION—DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON RECOMMENDATIONS

Chair Daly:

We will move to the main event, our Work Session ([Agenda Item IV](#)). Our Committee Policy Analyst, Ms. Keller, will provide the introduction and walk us through each one. We will have

discussion and hopefully clarify a few things as we go along. With that, if you could bring us issue number one, we will take them in order.

Ms. Keller:

Thank you, Chair Daly. As requested, I will be walking the Committee through the recommendations included in the WSD, which is available on the Legislature's website.

The Chair and Committee staff have prepared this WSD to assist the Committee in determining which legislative measures it will request for the 2025 Session of the Nevada Legislature.

The WSD contains summaries of several recommendations presented during public hearings, through communication with individual Committee Members, or through correspondence submitted to the Chair, Committee Members, or staff. The proposals have been compiled and organized so that Committee Members can review them and decide whether they want to accept, reject, modify, or take no action on the recommendations. The WSD groups the recommendations by topic, and they are not preferentially ordered.

I would like to remind the Committee that, as nonpartisan LCB staff, I neither support nor oppose the recommendations that come before the Committee.

The Committee is limited to a total of ten legislative measures, which include BDRs and requests for resolutions. Additionally, any recommended legislation proposed by the Committee must be approved by a majority of the members of the Senate and a majority of the members of the Assembly appointed to the Committee.

In addition to legislative measures, the Committee may vote to send as many statements or letters of recommendation as it chooses. It should also be noted that any potential recommendations listed may or may not have a fiscal impact. Any potential fiscal impacts have not been determined at this time.

Finally, please be advised that LCB staff, at the direction of the Chair, may coordinate with interested parties to obtain additional information for bill drafting purposes or for information to be included in the Committee's final report.

With that, I will go ahead and move on to the Recommendations. I will provide a brief summary of each Recommendation, but please be aware that additional background information may be included in the WSD, and many of the parties who provided the recommendations are available to be called upon by the Chair to answer questions as necessary.

A. WATER SAFETY

Ms. Keller:

The first Recommendation for the Committee's consideration is under the heading "Water Safety." Recommendation A-1 is to request the drafting of a bill to prohibit the operation of any watercraft vessel at a speed in excess of 5 nautical miles per hour within 600 feet of the water line of Lake Tahoe.

Chair Daly:

Thank you for Recommendation A-1. Before we take a motion—Committee, any questions on that? I believe this is one of the more straightforward ones. We are trying to keep in order with the theme I have been trying to push, if you have been listening the whole time. We have two states, five counties, one incorporated city, several towns and communities around the Lake, but we only have one Basin. We want to try to be consistent on both sides of the Basin.

One quick clarification—when I was reading the bill, California already has a “No Wake Zone.” Is that correct?

Devin Middlebrook, Government Affairs Manager, TRPA:

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency has the 600-foot “No Wake Zone” that applies to both sides of the Lake that is not in California State law, but we will be pursuing that for consistency across the region on the California side as well.

Chair Daly:

Understood. I wanted to clarify, and we have been trying to coordinate with California as much as we can on several of these issues. If it happens on this side, it needs to happen on the other side, so we have been working on that.

That was my only question—so it is not in their State law. Hopefully they can match what we have, or what we are going to propose at the very least and go forward.

With that, Committee, I would take a motion to adopt Recommendation A-1.

VICE CHAIR BILBRAY-AXELROD MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION A-1.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TAYLOR SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

B. FUNDING

Ms. Keller:

The second Recommendation B-2, under the “Funding” heading, is to request the drafting of a bill allowing cities and counties to form BIDs to provide funding for transportation, housing, and mitigation of visitor activities in the Lake Tahoe Basin.

This recommendation was submitted by Julie Regan, Executive Director of TRPA.

Chair Daly:

Any questions, Committee?

Senator Titus:

I am going to be a “no” on this when it comes to a vote. I truly cannot accept—I think is a taxation. Even though businesses will get an opportunity to vote on whether they are going to do this or not, it does only require a 70 percent threshold, and businesses are going to pass whatever increased fees they have to the citizens. Although I share the concerns and the need for transportation, this is an absolute no for me.

Assemblywoman Taylor:

I wanted the clarification that this would not take effect unless the majority of the businesses vote on it and decide that is something they want to enhance—the transportation around. Am I correct?

Chair Daly:

We can ask TRPA, or Legal Counsel can chime in.

Ms. Sturdivant:

My understanding is based on California law. Under California law, TIDs are formed by the businesses petitioning the county for the formation of the District, and then it would be a certain percentage—50 or higher—if the Committee so chooses.

Assemblywoman Taylor:

Who says that percentage?

Ms. Sturdivant:

It is up to the Committee. If you want us to base it on California law, we would keep it consistent with California law, and I believe it is a majority. If you wanted a higher percentage, it would be something we could draft.

Vice Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

I want to make this clear that this is enabling legislation. We are giving the counties the ability to do this. This will not be a two-thirds vote. Do we know?

Ms. Sturdivant:

This does not require a two-thirds. It is an authorization.

Assemblyman Gray:

I want to echo Senator Titus's comments as well.

For all votes going forward, I do reserve the right to change my vote at any time on any of these subjects as more information becomes available.

Chair Daly:

Absolutely. It is a given. I may change my mind on some of them as well.

The way I understand this, for the rest of the Committee, and the thinking—this was also suggested by Washoe County, theirs was narrower. There are questions I have with the way this is drafted, and how it would be; especially over what it can be used for. I know there were concerns by people who came and talked regarding, “It is just going to be another mechanism to get more people to come to the Lake.” If that is how it ends up as we draft the legislation to go through, then I probably would not end up supporting it. If it is more focused and limited to transportation, housing, and mitigation of impact, then I think we are on the right path. So, that all depends. We are going to get a bill drafted. We have Committee hearings; we go forward.

California has these already. This is something that was requested by Nevada, so they can hopefully keep pace. Part of what we heard, if the Committee recalls, is when we asked—I think the first time in a long time, or ever maybe—South Lake Tahoe to come and present to us, they gave us a laundry list of things they are able to do, and how they are able to fund some of their projects and address the needs and concerns of their citizens, and this was one of them, which is why we are coming forward with these. How it ends up through the legislative process, we need to make sure we get it right. I promise you we will be working to do that.

I understand the “no” votes; if that is where you are now. But hopefully you reserved your right to change your mind, and maybe you will.

I will entertain a motion to approve the drafting of a bill as outlined in the WSD, Recommendation B-2.

VICE CHAIR BILBRAY-AXELROD MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION B-2.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TAYLOR SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED (SENATOR TITUS AND ASSEMBLYMAN GRAY VOTED NO).

Ms. Keller:

Recommendation B-3 is to request a letter to the Governor, the Senate Finance Committee, and the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means expressing the Committee's support for a State General Fund appropriation to maintain the State of Nevada's one-third share of operating funding for the TRPA for the 2025–2027 Biennium. The historic funding ratio for the TRPA is one-third/two-thirds for Nevada and California, respectively.

This recommendation was submitted by the TRPA.

Chair Daly:

Do any members have questions on the Recommendation? [There were none.]

I will entertain a motion to approve the drafting a letter from this Committee to the Governor, and leadership Chairs of the two money committees.

VICE CHAIR BILBRAY-AXELROD MOVED TO DRAFT A LETTER AS STATED IN RECOMMENDATION B-3.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TAYLOR SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

C. HOUSING

Ms. Keller:

Recommendation C-4 is under Heading C, "Housing." It is to request the drafting of a bill allowing local jurisdictions within the Lake Tahoe Basin to charge an impact fee to developers of housing units greater than 1,000 square feet. The fees collected are to be used to pay for utility hookup, impact, and/or mitigation fees for housing units that are less than 1,000 square feet and are deed restricted for sale or rent to occupants with certain income levels to qualify as affordable, moderate, or achievable units.

This recommendation was also submitted by the TRPA.

Chair Daly:

Committee, any questions on this Recommendation?

Vice Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

I wanted to confirm this is true and that once again, this will be enabling legislation. Are we allowed to have that be tiered? So, if someone is building a 30,000-square-foot home, it would be a tiered system. Or would the percentage be the same no matter what? Are we able to do that?

Ms. Sturdivant:

The *Constitution* requires that you do that. The fee charged for each housing must be specifically linked to the impact it will have.

Chair Daly:

To follow up on that, when we are discussing the WSD and various things—and maybe we would have the TRPA explain a little bit on what their thinking is, and how it would really work in Nevada. What Legal Counsel said was that you may want to say, "You are over 1,000 feet, so we are going to charge you a fee for all of these impacts." But if that particular oversize, or over the 1,000 square foot development, did not impact the sewer fees and did not impact other things, you would not be able to—at least under Nevada law—charge that impact. Is that the way I understood, Legal Counsel?

Ms. Sturdivant:

Under the *Constitution*, to charge an impact fee or a linkage fee for affordable housing, the impact has to be directly connected to the impact that the specific development will have on the area. When we say specific development we mean each house, and it must be roughly proportional to the impact of that specific development.

Generally, my understanding of the way this works is that the local government adopts an ordinance authorizing these impact fees and then must conduct a Nexus Study to determine what that impact will be before they can impose that fee on the development. To the extent you are doing it with an individual house, that may or may not be feasible.

Chair Daly:

In this case, the local government would have to be the counties. We do not have incorporated cities on the Nevada side, and this would not apply to the California side anyway.

Ms. Sturdivant:

Correct. If there is anything I have misunderstood about the way this is supposed to work, we can certainly hear more from TRPA.

Julie Regan, Executive Director, TRPA:

Your understanding is consistent with ours. This would be enabling legislation that would give local jurisdictions more tools in the toolbox to support affordable housing, and these fees would be determined—and the usage—in collaboration with TRPA, but they would be with the counties and potentially could form funds to support housing and other lower underserved members of the community.

I am going to ask Devin Middlebrook, who worked with local jurisdictions on this one, to add to that.

Mr. Middlebrook:

Legal Counsel's answers are in alignment with our understanding. I think at Tahoe, when you look at our development pattern, if a housing unit is being remodeled, that housing unit already exists versus it being new and taking out of our overall development rights pool. That does have a different impact on our local housing stock and our ability to have housing for our local workforce. As mentioned, the Nexus Study would have to be completed before this could be put in place. It would look at those different aspects and look at potential exemptions, so if you build something over 1,000 square feet but it is deed-restricted for housing, that is something that may be exempted out as well. At the best of this, Committee and the Legislature on how those exemptions and scaling work.

Chair Daly:

Senator Titus, you are leaning in.

Senator Titus:

I am not going to ask them a question. I wanted to comment about this when they are finished.

Chair Daly:

Absolutely. I think we got all the answers.

Senator Titus:

This is another one that I cannot support. To charge a fee on one group to offset a fee for another group is, for me, inherently wrong, along with deed restrictions. I will be no on this one.

Chair Daly:

Understood.

My understanding is this may be relatively narrow, the counties have to implement it. So, it is enabling—the Nexus has to be made, all the conditions. If they charge a fee and the person does not agree, they have the opportunity through the courts to say, “Nope, you did it wrong.”

We will draft a bill; there is a legislative process. We will see how far we get answering all the questions we need to have and put in place if it will work. But if it is another opportunity or tool to try to get housing for the people who need it and mitigate some of these other issues that do exist—that is the reason it is on the agenda.

Unless anybody has any more comments or questions, I will accept a motion to approve the drafting of a bill as outlined in the WSD.

VICE CHAIR BILBRAY-AXELROD MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION C-4.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TAYLOR SECONDED THE MOTION.

Assemblyman Gray:

I fully concur with Senator Titus. Workforce housing is not a problem for the residents, it is a problem for the employers. Maybe people should be looking at the employers to do something.

With the deed restrictions, I am not in favor of that. You are shifting the cost from one group to another group that has nothing to do with it and just cannot abide by that.

Chair Daly:

Well, if you are a worker who lives in the Basin, you are a citizen the same as the rest. Yes, you are impacted—same with all developments—they have to mitigate their impacts and try to get things done.

THE MOTION PASSED (SENATOR TITUS AND ASSEMBLYMAN GRAY VOTED NO).

D. TRANSPORTATION

Ms. Keller:

Recommendation 5 is under heading D, "Transportation." The Recommendation is to request the drafting of a bill to amend Article IX of the Bi-State Compact. This bill will not become effective until the State of California enacts substantially similar legislation. The bill includes four possible amendments.

Recommendation 5-A for the Committee's consideration is to establish the Lake Tahoe Basin Scenic Byway Corridor Recreation Safety Zone, and allow the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD), and their contractors, to issue parking tickets to illegally parked vehicles within the safety zone. The bill will provide that if the use of contractors is allowed, the writing of tickets will not be incentivized by basing contractor pay on the number of tickets written, and this amendment will not become effective until additional elements of the Lake Tahoe transportation planning are in place. This recommendation was submitted by Carl Hasty, District Manager of the TTD, with modifications by the Committee Chair.

Recommendation 5-B would clarify that the TTD or other local governments are allowed to charge a fee for public parking at certain paved rights-of-way and off-highway parking areas along the State Route (SR) 28 Scenic Corridor that are connected by improved paved paths. The fees collected will remain in the Lake Tahoe Basin to be used by the partnering federal, state, and local agencies to administer the parking management programs, operate, and maintain the public parking lots, the connecting trails, and associated facilities as well as public transit that provides the public access to their public lands. This portion of the recommendation was submitted by the TTD with modifications by Chair Daly.

Recommendation 5-C would add a tribal representative member to the TTD Board of Directors. This recommendation was submitted by Chair Daly.

Finally, Recommendation 5-D would impose a public transit surcharge on the per night charge for rental of any transient lodging in the Lake Tahoe Basin. The proceeds of the surcharge are to be paid by the lodging operator to the applicable county for distribution to the TTD. In Nevada, the surcharge shall be \$4.25 per night. Of the \$4.25 surcharge, \$0.25 will be distributed by the TTD to the Tahoe Science Advisory Council to support its activities. The remainder of the surcharge will be used to support transportation needs in the Lake Tahoe Basin. The Board of the TTD will have the authority to provide a waiver of the \$4 surcharge to entities that already have a comparable surcharge to support transportation in the Lake Tahoe Basin. This recommendation was submitted by the Committee Chair.

Chair Daly:

A lot of moving parts there, Committee. We can take each component one by one, if you would like, and then you can make a decision on the whole thing. But we will have one motion on the Recommendations. Let us start with making sure we all understand it the same, so we can make an informed decision.

On 5-A, regarding the Scenic Byway Corridor and the parking issues, we have a representative here that can answer questions and comments from the Committee.

Vice Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

I have truly enjoyed my time on this Committee, and it has been really eye-opening. I am a third-generation Nevadan, so to be up here and share in what you call home, I have felt very lucky.

The parking situation was eye-opening for me. Just driving up here, I had little ones rushing out in front of the car, and it scared me to death. I also heard that there were some jurisdictions where parking tickets were \$50 and people were like, "That is just the price of going to the Lake for the day." I am a mom. Safety is paramount for me, so I am very happy that we are bringing this so it will see continuity around the Lake. I appreciate the Chair for bringing this. This has been, I think, one of the most important things that we are going to do in this Oversight Committee, so thank you.

Assemblyman Gray:

I think I know the answer to this, but where would the fines collected go?

Chair Daly:

My understanding is they would go to the TTD, because they would be the ones writing the tickets.

Assemblyman Gray:

So, we would not be incentivizing the people writing the tickets, but it would be incentivized to write tickets?

Chair Daly:

Well, if they are allowed to have a contractor, one of the things I told them was, "Either you are going to have your own employees and do that stuff." People have to be parking illegally first.

As you read at the bottom of the comments, this would not be effective until there are alternatives in place. We have to develop, get people to have confidence that they can go there, pay one parking fee legally, and then get to where they need to go with microtransit or other types of public transportation that gets them to where they want to be. Those elements have to be put in place first. There has to be an alternative before you can do that. If, as they explained, they do not have the staff, resources, or it is going to be easier to get a vendor to actually do the groundwork—I told them I prefer they were their own employees—but there is no way we are going to allow you to write a contract that gives them an incentive to write more tickets. That is how they get paid—not going to happen.

Assemblyman Gray:

Affirmative, and I agree with you on that. The other part is, I do not like the contractor idea at all. They are performing a law enforcement function. We have seen with the red-light cameras where a contractor runs those, they sign the ticket, send them to law enforcement, and the law enforcement officer then signs them off, and they get thrown out because you have a right to face your accuser. So, I do not know that this would even withstand a court challenge. I think if we start writing massive amounts of tickets, we may be seeing a lot of people challenging these tickets. I agree that there is a safety problem, but I have yet to see the statistics of how many car doors have been flung open in front of other cars, and

how many kids have run out in traffic and gotten hit. A lot of it is fear, but I do not know how much of it is reality.

Chair Daly:

Well, I cannot tell you the last—and I have been up to the Lake more recently than in the past. Every time I have gone up there, there were not off-hours. I have seen numerous cars parked on the wrong side of the fog line. Not entirely, but they got the rear fender hanging out. They have the front fender hanging out it; it is an issue. But until there is an alternative, there is not a lot to be done about it. Remember, there are a lot of steps that must happen before any of this stuff gets done. When we draft our bill, we are going to share it with California. There is going to be dialogue between the two States. We must have substantially similar bills; otherwise, the Compact cannot be amended.

I was talking with Director Settlemeyer the other day, and he had concerns over legality and who would have jurisdiction. When I was talking with Legal, we were talking about this. You are not taking away the right of highway patrol to write a ticket. You are not taking away the right of Washoe County to write a ticket, or Carson, whichever jurisdiction it may be. Theoretically, the same person gets three parking tickets if this is in place. I am sure that would be a pretty good deterrent. The consistency on what it is going to be on both sides of the State—we can write that into this on what it would be, at least for the TTD. This would be the last part of a comprehensive fix on the traffic we are trying to put in place. But we have to have all of the parts, and we have to be talking about all of the parts and trying to move in the same direction with our counterparts in California.

Assemblyman Gray:

Maybe a rhetorical question for you, Mister Chair. Are we may be putting the cart before the horse?

Chair Daly:

I suppose we would have to come back and try to amend the Compact again in four years, or however long it takes. We are trying to get all of the elements, or at least part of it, which is why this would not be put in place until other elements of the mitigation are being done, which is under the part with the surcharge in that, and it is not completely spelled out on there. When we get to that, there will be things put into the legislation by design of, “No, we are not just giving you this money and hope you do good work.” We are not going to do that. I have said that before, if you get this money, step A, step B, step C, and now that you have alternatives, we can start enforcing the parking. The whole concept has to go together. I am hoping to do the heavy lifting just once and not three times. I hope that answers your question.

Committee Members, any additional comments on this element of the overall proposal? Seeing none—everyone got their understanding of that portion of it. There are a lot of questions unanswered, but that is why you have a bill, like I said before.

I have a question on this: to clarify that the TTD or other local governments are allowed to charge a fee for public parking on certain paved rights-of-way. Maybe Mr. Hasty can come up. Who owns the parking, rights-of-way, and other various things? Who has jurisdiction over them? Each local government, when you are talking about counties or—and we are only in Nevada now—you have Incline Village; they have a General Improvement District, but I do not think that is the local jurisdiction you are talking about. Are we talking about

the Forest Service? Are we talking about State public lands? Who has these rights-of-way? When you charge a fee to somebody for parking on someone else's land, how is that all going to work? Are there going to be agreements between them about the cost sharing and revenue sharing? There were a lot of questions on this portion.

Carl Hasty, District Manager, TTD:

I appreciate the question. What we are seeking in all of this with parking is consistency—the ability to do this across jurisdictions, and that includes Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) rights-of-way.

As you saw in SR 28, part of the solution is to build off-highway parking to relocate that parking. We have also begun to implement paid parking. Two reasons for paid parking are: (1) for some behavior change, to try to encourage people to come at different times—not everybody at the same time; and (2) as a revenue source to maintain the parking and even the Trail. This has been accomplished with the pilot we have conducted with the North Trailhead where that revenue is going to help maintain at least the zero through five years of the maintenance because capital dollars are easy to find; operating dollars are not, so that is the intent of this.

Similar to the enforcement is to have that consistency across since we have a shortage of peace officers, and they have better things to do. So, the ability to try to address that through other mechanisms and be able to provide that consistency.

The last aspect of that, with both the enforcement and paid parking, is to avoid the relocation of a situation. If you are charging in one area, you will end up finding it is just human nature. Where can I go? And I am not going to have to pay. So, we start to address a Corridor solution here, then everybody understands it and gets the drill, and then we do not see that behavior start to shift in other areas, causing other impacts.

Chair Daly:

I understand we are limited to within the Corridor and the areas that have been identified. How many local jurisdictions are there? You have the three counties in Nevada.

Mr. Hasty:

In the 28 Corridor, you have three counties and Douglas County extends all the way along Highway 50 as well. Douglas County has already begun to address this on their own. Portions of that, like along Zephyr Cove, have their own pilot this summer.

Chair Daly:

If we go with legislation along this, are you counting NDOT as owning the rights-of-way on some of it? Are you counting them as a local jurisdiction?

Mr. Hasty:

It is part of that, and that is part of the issue. That North Trailhead parking lot, for example, is an NDOT right-of-way, but that right-of-way does not have the road. If you are getting into a shoulder situation, and you have a shoulder situation where you can make that safer, or that parking safer, and you are going to charge, then this becomes applicable within an NDOT rights-of-way, whereas right now it is not possible.

Chair Daly:

I am trying to understand it so we can help Legal draft the bill. You said Douglas County is already starting to address some of this stuff and collecting a fee and saying, "We are going to have paid parking." How is this going to overlap with that? Is TTD going to say, "We get a piece. We are the lead dog, and we are going to take your money."

Mr. Hasty:

If you note TTD or other local jurisdictions, the whole idea here is to provide capability. As we have found, what we do at Tahoe is we end up leveraging each other in terms of organizations; it does not have to be just TTD. If a local jurisdiction wants to take that on, then that is where we will work that out. Typically, like on the 28 Corridor, what we end up doing is having cooperative agreements with each other about who is doing what so that we can coordinate and make sure we are building a seamless system that people can understand.

Chair Daly:

In a perfect world. Right?

Mr. Hasty:

Perfect world—that is what we are seeking, right?

Chair Daly:

What you are looking for from us is consistency on what the charge is going to be. And then maybe direction on what it should be used for now that you charge this fee. This element of it would not have to wait for the other alternatives. If it is legal parking, we want to encourage that right away.

Mr. Hasty:

That is right. You are not going to charge for parking if you are not ensuring that the public who is paying has a reasonable expectation of safety, and that is a component of this—to make this a safer and better understood parking situation and not encourage the less safe parking that happens so rapidly everywhere now.

Chair Daly:

You are going to make them pay for illegal parking, but through a different mechanism—I get it. I hope that clarifies things for the Committee and for Legal when we draft a bill, consistency on what the fee would be and use of the dollars might be something we would look at.

Any other questions from the Committee? Seeing none, we will move to C. This was suggested to me when we had discussions with our counterparts from California. I added it to our work session here today. California suggested it. If we are going to amend the Compact, it has to be consistent on both sides.

Chairman, come on up; we are happy to take your advice on this. If you do not want to do it at this time, we would ask you to call our counterparts in California.

Serrell Smokey, Chairman, Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California:

First, I would like to say I truly appreciate the recommendation. I was not even fully aware of this until recently, that the Washoe Tribe is currently not at capacity to fill the role of having an official member on this Board, even though we are continuing to move forward to want to form that process.

A few things I want to throw at the Committee for your awareness are that the Wá·šiw will be bringing forward recommendations in the future, but those will be done by resolutions approved by the Washoe Tribal Council. Those will come forward to the Oversight Committee here and through California as well. Again, we are on both sides—Nevada and California. So, that is where the recommendations from the Tribe will be coming from.

When recommendations like this come up, I want the Board to be aware that when it comes to specifically this Board, this Oversight Committee, the Lake Tahoe area, we need to be careful because when we use the word “tribal” or “tribal representative,” the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California is the only tribe in the area around the Lake Tahoe area. There is no other tribe that can lend claim to Lake Tahoe, and we have that finalized and approved through Federal Court and through the Indian Claims Commission—that was formally recognized as Washoe Tribal Lands. The Washoe Tribe will be bringing those recommendations forward.

Again, I appreciate the recommendation. We do not have capacity at this time, but we will be bringing forward and looking forward to still working with the TTD, not in an official capacity at this moment, but we will be giving our opinions and recommendations to the Committee, but we are not ready to fill that specific Board right now.

Chair Daly:

Thank you for pointing out the oversight there on the Washoe Tribe. That was not our intent, and we fully intended that it would be somebody from the Washoe Tribe.

If you would do me a favor and reach out to California Senator Alvarado-Gill, this was her suggestion, and let her know that you are okay. We will probably leave it out of today's work session. But keep in touch with this; I am sure you will get a chance to talk to future interim committees. If it is in order sometime in the future to amend the Compact for that on the TTD, we are happy to take a look at it.

Vice Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

I wanted to take an opportunity to thank you, Chairman Smokey. I was very moved by your words at the Lake Tahoe Summit. You can tell how much your people treasure this land and Lake. For you to come forward and be so thoughtful and say, “We are not ready, and it needs to be written this way.” I appreciate your compassion and your love of the land.

Senator Titus:

I, too, want to acknowledge Chairman Smokey being here at this table. The only part of this BDR recommendation I was going to support was adding a tribal member. I appreciate that you recognize capacity, recognize that it is a Washoe Tribe, and recognize that many times good intentions are really not the best way to go. Thank you for being here today. Continue to represent your people, and the Lake, and land that you love so much and being good representatives of that.

Chair Daly:

Thank you, Chairman.

Chairman Smokey:

Thank you all. We will probably be bringing this back next session.

Chair Daly:

No worries.

Moving on to the fourth element of this recommendation—to impose a surcharge for all room night stays—trying to develop or have a revenue source for the TTD to do their work. As I said earlier, having the parking hubs and various things they have, plans that are implemented—have the hubs actually get those. They can get grants and one-shot money to build some of it, but then the ongoing cost for maintenance and staff to actually make it work. There are several elements to this that have to happen.

First, you must have someplace people go to pay a one-day parking fee, and then be able to have confidence they are going to get transported to their location. The goals in mind are to reduce VMT, address parking issues and do what we can so the visitors have a good experience with less impact on the residents. Everything costs money. I know what my colleague is going to say from Yerington regarding spending a nickel to do some good. It is anticipated.

The other part of this element that I wanted to address was the \$0.25. After that, I do not know how much money this will generate. I am sure the \$0.25 is probably going to be \$0.03 in the end. But the Tahoe Science Advisory Council is Tahoe specific; it is funded by California. Nevada pays nothing. I have been told by a lot of people on both sides that the Council still gives advice and input to everybody that asks in the Tahoe Basin—TTD included. So, I think the zero from Nevada is a little light. I think part of that would be in line on our side—\$0.25 is probably too much. But the surcharge, I fully intend when we do the bill that we are not going to say, “Here is the money. I hope you do good.” We are going to lay out what we expect, what the order and steps need to be, and not try to reinvent the wheel.

[We will] work with every other agency, Tahoe Truckee Area Regional Transit and partner with them, Regional Transportation Commission out of Washoe County, and South Lake Tahoe—it does not have to be one-size-fits-all. We do want, and I think we have to have, the TTD, which is why we are going that route because it already covers both sides of the State and eliminates jurisdiction issue to be the lead. They are not going to tell NDOT or California Department of Transportation what to do, but they can coordinate with the other local jurisdictions. I am hoping there will not be a turf war, which is also what we are trying to avoid where South Lake Tahoe says, “I have my money, and I am only going to spend it to address these issues.” We should identify for the Basin, like I said earlier, two states, five counties, and one incorporated city, but there is only one basin. So, what makes the most sense to improve the transportation in the Basin? It does not matter if it is on the Nevada side, Washoe County, Placer County, or South Lake Tahoe; what is the next project that needs to be done? Pull the money from everybody and spend it, and it will all come out in the wash. This is the way I hope this will work.

Then, trying to take into consideration, if the rest of the Committee remembers, we do have Douglas County—which is where I got the idea—already charging \$5 a night to pay for their bonds, and if conservative Douglas County can do it, I am sure the rest of us can as well. We also heard from South Lake Tahoe. One of their presentations is that they have a similar surcharge they are already doing on lodging within South Lake Tahoe, part of which is used for other government activities, but part of it is also used for transit. So, we did not want to double up on them, but we do not want to have a blanket exemption forever either, which is why we need to have the TTD be able to issue that waiver. We may put in the drafting that it is an automatic waiver for three or five years, however long we say, and then they can look at it case-by-case as we go along.

Those are all the elements that I envision for what this element of this proposal is intended to do. We will get the language right. If we do it right, I think we will be successful. We also have to get this over to California and get them to agree in a substantial manner. Also, one of the things that is not listed there that we need to understand and make sure is perfectly clear is that the TRPA is responsible for the transportation plan and the TTD is going to have this, but they have to work within the transportation plan from their parent organization, if you will.

Any questions or comments from the Committee?

Assemblyman Gray:

Looking at all this comprehensively, I represent Douglas County and Lyon County. I jokingly say that I represent the most expensive part of the State and the least expensive part of the State; along with that go incomes. I think with a lot of these, and I cannot believe I am going to say this, but there is an equity to this. We are going to be making the Lake inaccessible to a lot of people at this point, especially when we eliminate highway parking and start charging for governmental parking and parking lots. I can only imagine what that is going to cost in the end.

Going back to the safety issue—if this is truly a safety issue—somebody pointed out to me rightly so, this is really a safety issue. Why are we waiting on California? Why do not we take the lead and get stuff done and do it now?

Chair Daly:

We have to amend Article IX. Both States have to do it; otherwise, you cannot amend Article IX. There are other ways to try to get this stuff done, but then it would only be a Nevada side issue. We need it to be one Basin. I do not want to say it again, but one Basin.

Assemblyman Gray:

But if it is truly about safety, we can attack it from our side at the county level and then go forward and incorporate it into amending Title IX later and have one for the entire Basin.

Chair Daly:

I think that hodgepodge, and in each jurisdiction doing their own deal— Once somebody gets entrenched and gets a revenue stream, they want to protect it. I am just saying, it is human nature. I have seen it happen a million times. I think this approach is better and more comprehensive. Again, two states, five counties, one incorporated city, and one basin. We need to try to get that consistency, which this will do—well, at least in theory, in a perfect world.

Senator Titus:

I certainly appreciate what the issue is with parking, transportation, and road congestion. Mostly affecting it in my mind are the citizens who are there and are visitors too, who are at risk—it is definitely a safety issue. I appreciate they are trying to have solutions.

For me, there are parts of this suggested BDR that I can accept and others that I cannot get past. So, I will be interested to see how this goes. Ultimately, it is written, but as it is currently recommended, it is not something I can support in its totality. I will be no on this one.

It makes me very nervous when we expand law enforcement duties to non-law enforcement agencies. The writing of tickets, enforcement, and legality are something I am very concerned about with that expansion. Hopefully, as this progresses, it is something I can support.

I do want to mention that the Tahoe Science Advisory Council is very important. Finding a way to pay for that and adding that is not a bad idea. I do think Nevada needs to step up and help with that, but I am not convinced this is the way to do it. As it is presented today, and hopefully, as these things drop, as you have mentioned multiple times—we are going to work on this. We are going to remove the only thing I really thought was a great idea, which was C. As this progresses and as we progress with these things—writing, terminology, and legality of some of the stuff—I look forward to coming up with ideas that will help with the transportation issues. But these particular recommendations today I will not be supporting.

Assemblyman Gray:

I wonder if the Washoe Tribe would be amenable to having somebody they appoint at the tribal level who may not be a member of the tribe that is still going to represent their interests. That way they would still have a seat, and if they do get to a point where they are going to have a tribal member, great. If not, they would still have somebody who represents their interests.

Chair Daly:

I heard the Chairman—I think he left. At this point, I think we lean with his recommendation; when they are ready. I think there is appetite. No one is going to say, “No, they should not be there.”

Back to Senator Titus on extending the writing of the tickets. I know they have contractors that have done meters in Reno, which failed miserably that I recall. I know there are private meter-made companies across the country. I am this far from saying, “We do not need it. You have to do it yourself with no contractor.” They said that is an issue, and it is easier to do with a vendor—the only reason I considered it.

At this time, I would accept a motion to request a bill draft under Recommendation D-5, including A, B, and D, and eliminate C.

VICE CHAIR BILBRAY-AXELROD MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION D-5 A, B, D, and eliminate C.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TAYLOR SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED (SENATOR TITUS AND ASSEMBLYMAN GRAY VOTED NO).

Chair Daly:

We will move on to Recommendation D-6.

Ms. Keller:

Recommendation D-6 was also submitted by the Committee Chair, and it is to request either a resolution or a letter to the Governor, the Senate Finance Committee, and the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means expressing support for a State General Fund appropriation of \$2.5 million for each fiscal year of the 2025–2027 Biennium for Nevada's portion of the funding strategy set forth in the Lake Tahoe Transportation Action Plan.

Chair Daly:

This is the "7-7-7" funding, which primarily goes to transportation. I know the Committee did a resolution last time. I do not know if we already have enough bill drafts, and it takes up a bill draft. I do not know if we would run into our limit. I propose sending a letter to the Governor, leadership in both houses, and the Chairs of the Finance and Ways and Means Committees; that was my thinking there. I do not know if we have enough bill drafts to do a resolution.

We can do a resolution. We are still within our ten. What does the Committee prefer?

Senator Titus:

Just wondering whether you or staff have reached out to the Governor's Chief Financial Officer or the Governor's Chief of Staff regarding this to see if they already have it in their budget; what their plans are. They may have different avenues, and I wonder how much cooperation there has been between the Executive Branch and this Committee.

Chair Daly:

I have not gotten that far. There are a lot of moving parts.

Before we say, "Will you accept this?" does the Committee want to continue and make a recommendation for this type of funding? I believe we do, and I think it then helps the Governor with his decision-making process, the Ways and Means and Finance Committees, and leadership in both houses. I think the recommendation from us is the starting point. I am perfectly fine writing a letter. If you want to go through all the gyrations of drafting a bill and doing a resolution, we can do that if that is the will of the Committee. But I think a letter is just as good.

Senator Titus:

I might follow up on that then. I could get behind a letter of support as opposed to a resolution.

Chair Daly:

I think it basically amounts to the same thing as showing support from this Committee for that. I do not know that we need to spend all the time and effort on a resolution.

Any other questions or comments from the Committee? Seeing none, I will entertain a motion to send a letter of support from the Committee to have Nevada fund its share of the "7-7-7" Plan.

VICE CHAIR BILBRAY-AXELROD MOVED TO SEND A LETTER OF SUPPORT AS STATED IN RECOMMENDATION D-6.

SENATOR TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

E. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Ms. Keller:

Recommendation E-7 is under the heading "Reporting Requirements," and it is to request the drafting of a bill with two elements amending or eliminating certain reporting requirements by the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR).

Recommendation A is to eliminate the requirement for annual reporting to the LCB regarding *Fire Prevention and Forest Health in the Nevada portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin*. The report is required by NRS 528.150 and was established in 2009. The Recommendation was submitted by Kacey KC, the State Forester Fire Warden. According to DCNR, the report has become obsolete and redundant.

Recommendation B is to amend the reporting requirement to the Nevada Board of Examiners regarding the *Nevada Land Bank Report* on lands or interest in lands transferred, sold, exchanged, or leased in the Lake Tahoe Basin from quarterly to annually. I have a correction to the WSD. The report is actually required by NRS 321.5954. According to DCNR, all Nevada Land Bank coverage sales, purchases, and transfers will continue to be reported to TRPA, as required by a Memorandum of Understanding and are available upon request. This portion of the recommendation was submitted by Charles Donohue with the Nevada Division of State Lands (NDSL).

Chair Daly:

Any questions from the Committee on E-7 A and B? Seeing none, I would accept a recommendation to request a bill draft as proposed in E-7 A and B.

VICE CHAIR BILBRAY-AXELROD MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION E-7, A and B.

SENATOR TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

F. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS

Ms. Keller:

Recommendation F-8 is under the heading "Environmental Improvements," and it is to request the drafting of a bill authorizing the release of the next phase of general obligation bonds in an amount of \$19 million to continue to implement Nevada's portion of the Lake Tahoe Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) for the 2025–2027 Biennium and including authority for the expenditure on EIP projects of any interest accumulated on proceeds from bond issuances for the EIP.

This recommendation was submitted by Charles Donohue, Administrator of the NDSL.

Chair Daly:

Hopefully another easy one, Committee. Any questions on the proposal? Seeing none, I will accept a motion to recommend a bill be drafted as outlined in the WSD.

VICE CHAIR BILBRAY-AXELROD MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION F-8.

ASSEMBLYMAN GRAY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Ms. Keller:

Recommendation F-9 is to request the drafting of a bill to provide that a logging permit is not required for cutting operations conducted by a landowner unless the operations conducted qualify as a legally defined logging operation. This recommendation was submitted by Kacey KC, the State Forester Fire Warden.

Chair Daly:

Committee, any questions on the proposal?

I have one comment. I did have a question when we had this, I said, "So if they do not have to have this permit, are there other permits, oversight, and various things to make sure they are not eliminating a sensitive species or one of the more desirable trees?" I got a long email back that says, "Yeah, there are like four different people." They have to go through and get a logging permit, and when you are not actually a logging operation it seemed redundant, so I was happy to put this on the agenda.

Assemblyman Gray is itching to make a motion.

Assemblyman Gray:

I am. I like this one.

ASSEMBLYMAN GRAY MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION F-9.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TAYLOR SECONDED THE MOTION.

Vice Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

I think this is a great bill. Obviously, wildfires are a huge concern, and knowing that owners can use their best practices to mitigate their building being subject to a wildfire is fantastic.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Ms. Keller:

Recommendation F-10 is to request the drafting of a bill granting the Nevada Division of State Parks (NDSP) an exemption from the requirement that funds collected be deposited "no later than the next day" and instead, allowing up to ten working days for such deposits. This recommendation was submitted by the NDSP.

According to the NDSP, this requirement to deposit funds exceeding a certain threshold "no later than the next day" is particularly challenging for parks like Sand Harbor during peak seasons when daily collection frequently exceed the threshold.

Chair Daly:

I did get one comment from the former Chair of this Committee who said, "Well, I am not sure I like that." And I said, "Well, it says they are collecting amounts over that. They are open later than the banks are, and they are open on weekends when the banks are not. It makes sense." As it goes through the Committee process, if ten days is too long, we will address that in whichever committee gets this bill.

With that, seeing no other questions or comments, I will accept a motion to draft a bill as outlined in F-10.

VICE CHAIR BILBRAY-AXELROD MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION F-10.

ASSEMBLYMAN GRAY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Ms. Keller:

Recommendation F-11 for the Committee's consideration is to send a letter to TRPA encouraging the Agency to provide the Committee, prior to the start of the 2025 Legislative Session, the status of its update of the environmental analysis conducted in the 2012 Regional Plan and TRPA's Threshold Standards. This recommendation was submitted by the Committee Chair.

Chair Daly:

Committee, any questions or clarifications?

Senator Titus:

In public comment, we did hear concerns regarding this, and I need clarification on the process of where they are with this update. I think it would be important that we get it prior to Session. It should not be a, "Will you please give it to us?" We need to have that prior to. I am wondering if that is a possibility if they are going to have it ready or not; and will this letter make a difference?

Chair Daly:

We have people here that can answer our questions.

Ms. Regan:

Thank you for the question, Senator. A little bit of background—we have heard this consistently in our Governing Board comments. I have talked to many members of the community about this issue.

I wanted to explain the 2012 Regional Plan process and the environmental review that went along with that. It was a very big process and went on for many, many years. Both States were heavily engaged. Thousands of people in the community engaged in that, and that was looking out at another 20-plus years and analyzing development caps. We are working within the bounds of that right now. There has not been another big action since then that would trigger such a big environmental review, with the exception of the Shore Zone Plan.

In 2018, that was a programmatic issue related to the development potential of peers, buoys, safety, and recreational access in the Shore Zone. The Agency did a large environmental impact report that was part of that action, which was one of the big actions taken and had an accompanying environmental review specific to the shoreline policies. There has not been a big action that has triggered a full environmental impact statement (EIS) since then, other than projects that would come forward that have their own environmental process, and those would be triggered by project applicants.

What we are in the process of doing—there are two things I think this Committee would be interested to know. Every four to five years, we do an environmental threshold evaluation report, and that reports on the hundreds of standards that live underneath the Tahoe Regional Plan and the progress related to those standards. We will be publishing that report by the end of the year, and we will be happy to brief this Committee, and send a full update in whatever fashion this Committee would like to know more about that. We are happy to do that. That will be a public process, and we will be presenting that to our Governing Board. We will be rolling into a process in 2025 where we engage the community now that we get that data. That is a very comprehensive look at all ten categories: (1) air; (2) water; (3) scenic recreation; on and on in the ten categories. There are well over 150 standards that live within that. That is coming this year.

In 2025, we will be engaging the community. Well, now that we have the data, what policies need to change? That will go into 2025. We will roll right into our annual work plan and budget, which our Governing Board adopts in June of next year. That is one area that is happening, and we can put all this in writing as a response to this item before you now.

The other opportunity is housing work. We have Phase Three of the Affordable Housing Initiative that the TRPA Governing Board has been directing our staff to work on. Housing affordability—this Committee has heard a lot of public comment about that this interim. We are doing a full EIS commencing in 2025 that is going to look at growth projections for the Basin and update all relevant material—that is in the works, and is being funded through a grant through the State of California. A full-blown EIS generally costs around \$1 million to \$1.5 million, and we are funded through the State of California to do that as part of our housing initiative to try to make housing more affordable in the Tahoe Basin.

I will invite my colleague Devin Middlebrook to add any other comments.

Mr. Middlebrook:

To your last question, Senator Titus, we can absolutely have a response back to this Committee this year, so you have time to read it, digest it, and ask questions before the start of next year's legislative session.

Senator Titus:

Having said that, I think that maybe changing the wording of this particular letter and sending them a letter requesting clarification and a listing of where they are in the process, what is going to be done when, and the things that Ms. Regan mentioned now would serve adequately for what we want to do.

Chair Daly:

Agreed. Thank you.

We are going to send a letter to the TRPA. We are going to make sure we get it right, and we may add other stuff. I also would make the comment that we are going to send this letter, and we are going to copy it to our counterparts in California—the two that represent the portion of the Lake—and ask them to send a similar letter. We can do things here from Nevada; we can give recommendations. I do not know that we have authority as just one State to say, "Do this or else." We can make life hard on them, but I do not know that it serves anybody's purpose either, which is why we are trying to get California to send the same letter. We will ask them. It gives you a little bit more direction of, "You might want to think about doing this."

If there are other questions or things you want to be added, or we are not asking the right questions, send us an email on what we left out. I am not an expert on this stuff, but we do want to emphasize that we want to get an update on where you are on the status. We have heard a lot of it from the people up at the Lake, and it seems to me like it is an area of criticism that you can remedy.

Assemblywoman Taylor:

I agree. Thank you for explaining the things that are in motion. It would be great to have that in one place, so I am glad this is one of our recommendations. Thank you to my colleague, the Senator, for bringing it out in that way, so it is clear and directive.

I would suggest that, as you put that information in one place for us, you do the same for the public. It is a public document anyway but being intentional about that because in the meetings—I have been on this Committee ten minutes—there is a lot of concern about

the things that are happening and a lack of understanding of what is happening, what is not, and so on, and that information can clear up a lot of that.

I would recommend that, in sharing that with us, you find the appropriate manner to make sure it is shared with the public as well. It sounds like there are a lot of good things happening that are not being shared, and that helps close that gap, and helps us as we formulate the other language around all of these BDRs that are going forward so we can make sure those concerns are all part of that.

Ms. Regan:

Thank you, Assemblywoman.

Absolutely. We want to be forming conversations and working groups with the public. We will commit to engage the public in that way.

Assemblywoman Taylor:

I think they would appreciate that. Thank you so much, Ms. Regan.

Chair Daly:

We do want to share this with California. We want to try to give direction and get all the updates that we can. If there is something we left out for our members of the public, we can add it to the letter, if it is appropriate.

With that, I will accept a motion to have the Committee draft a letter to the TRPA to give us status updates on a variety of issues.

VICE CHAIR BILBRAY-AXELROD MOVED TO SEND A LETTER AS STATED IN RECOMMENDATION F-11.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TAYLOR SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Daly:

The next one, Recommendation F-12, is misunderstood by many people, including maybe the TRPA, but I will explain it.

Ms. Keller:

Recommendation F-12 is to send a letter to the TRPA encouraging the Agency to utilize the following priorities in its decision-making processes, work, and resources: (1) preservation, protection, and restoration of the Lake; (2) enhancing the visitor experience; (3) mitigating impacts on residents; and (4) economic considerations. This recommendation was submitted by the Committee Chair.

Chair Daly:

Committee, any comments, questions, concerns, or explanations?

Assemblyman Gray:

On this one, I am not sure how you came to the hierarchy here. For one, I think when they are evaluating projects in the Basin, each project is individual and should be looked at based on its individual merits. If you really want to have a hierarchy for the decision-making process and prioritize them, I would have a whole different recommendation, especially moving the impact on residents to the top—they are there 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year—and then rearranging the other ones—maybe moving one to two.

I do not like the idea of prioritizing every single project using the same priority scale. Every project is individually unique, and it is going to have a different impact on the community, the Lake, and the visitor experience.

Chair Daly:

Understood. Thank you.

I think I said in one of our other Committees when we were talking about these issues, and I am not sure if TRPA fully understands where I am at, but we will make sure it is clear in the letter. I know the people who made comments earlier misunderstand what my intention is with [Recommendation] 12, and I will try to defend it.

What I think a lot of people miss is that whenever you have an oversight or authorizing agency regarding development—City of Sparks, Washoe County, Placer County, California—they all have their rules and guidelines. You have to meet the criteria in order to develop your project—if they meet the zoning, submitted all the proper permits, have gone through the evaluation, and identified traffic impacts, et cetera. They have put the proper mitigations on that. I have seen projects in the City of Reno for a convenience store have 26 conditions levied on them—you can only deliver at this certain time, you cannot have noise over this, you must have your streetlights pointing down in the parking lot, no skylight; those types of things. I am sure TRPA has similar issues. But on the other side, that developer has the right to develop their land to its highest and best use.

I said this earlier—the Compact is a little unique as an oversight regulatory body on development in that they have more tools on what they can and cannot do when you are coming forward with the project. Recommendation F-12 is not meant to enable TRPA to green-light projects based on these things, but to say, “Mr. Developer, you bought this parcel with 25 acres, and you want to build a 80,000-square-foot house and various things.” On their priorities, he has the right to develop and do some stuff, but they can add things under the Compact that other jurisdictions cannot. What are you doing? How is this project going to preserve, enhance, and restore the Lake? If they cannot do that, the City of Reno or whoever says, “We really need a school in this subdivision.” They cannot condition that, but they can hint that they really want to have it and drag their feet on approval until they mitigate or restore 100 acres somewhere else at the Lake.

That is where the priority is—how does your project preserve, enhance, and restore the Lake? It is not a requirement on every 1,000 square foot house, but there should be a matrix and a priority on: Have you met this element? And what are the thresholds we are going to apply to that? The second one, is it going to enhance the visitor experience? Is it going to hurt it? The third priority is, how much is it going to impact the existing residents? These are extra conditions that TRPA can review.

I want to say, you need to develop a matrix or standard that can be applicable, not go foul of the unlawful taking because that is a lawsuit they have. [I have] a lot of experience on the development side coming from my previous job with the Union; we would support projects and impose others. If they have met the zoning, all the criteria, the standard, and they spent the money on the high-powered lawyer to dot all the i's and cross all the t's, they get their projects, right? If the City Council or County Commission denies this because, "Well, the residents do not like it," or this or that, and it was not a condition they were able to put on them when they get sued; they lose, regularly. It costs everybody a lot of time and money and everybody is still unhappy, and the developer gets what he wants.

The Compact is a little more unique. I think you can develop and use some of these tools not to give a license to people to develop more, but to give you more tools to say, "How can we make all of these other things that are happening in the Lake better if your project goes forward?" I am looking at the TRPA saying, "That is what I mean by develop this matrix," and this is the order—preserve and restore the Lake, make sure that visitors still have access to the Lake, make sure the residents are not overly— Any visitor is going to adversely impact you. I think I told you that at one point. September 25, 1959, was a great day in Northern Nevada, that is when I was born. Everybody who has moved here since then has impacted my life negatively, and I want you to leave. That is not going to happen. So, let us be real about this.

The last consideration is the economic impact. That is not number one; that is down the list. That is my thought process on that. You can agree or disagree, but that is the letter I think we are going to get a motion to pass.

Yes, Senator Titus.

Senator Titus:

Thank you, Mister Chair. I appreciate your comments and your reasons for putting this on.

I am wondering, do they not have a list now that they use when they look at these things? I think I need clarification on what the current process is when they do that checkoff when there is their decision-making process.

Chair Daly:

Before we hear from them, you are going to hear that absolutely, yes, they do. They may not be in this order or with this understanding or criteria; I want them to start thinking a little bit more about what is your project going to do to enhance the Lake?

We all hear the story. Zuckerberg bought two parcels at the Lake, and he has the right to develop them. He has the money, the wherewithal, and the experts to get everything he wants; it does not matter how long it takes, he will pay the money. But he is doing nothing to mitigate any impacts. He is one guy, but he flies in from a helicopter. He probably does not impact anybody, right? But he is doing nothing to restore the Lake.

All those types of things, I think they can at least have as a matrix and a priority; what is your project doing to address this? Maybe they cannot condition it, but they can make things maybe slow down. I probably should not say that. But they absolutely have a process, and I am not sure that it is working as well as it could with the tools they have in the Compact.

Ms. Regan:

Mister Chair, if I may jump in. Thank you for the question, Senator.

Yes, we do have a process. We have had a lot of back-and-forth on this question with Senator Daly, because the Compact is our constitution. We tier from the Compact, then the Regional Plan, and we have the environmental standards. Any project that goes forward has to be demonstrated not to adversely impact those standards.

We are not quite sure how to move forward in terms of a matrix. What we commit to do is we would be happy to receive a letter to explore options around this. It is a matter that we have to take to our Governing Board. Whatever change to our rules of procedure, our project application review, adopting such a document—that would be up to the Board. The Board has its own independent authority from the Compact going forward. So, it does involve both sides of the State line—California and Nevada—in terms of agreement, and that is a process to go through. But I think we are very happy that we hear the sentiment. The sentiment that is being expressed as part of this conversation is something our Board has expressed as well.

I mentioned the next phase of our housing policy work. There is huge equity focus on that, so the Environmental Impact Report we are doing will explore new opportunities. Think of a sliding scale. Right now, if you build a single-family home that is 2,000 square feet, it is one development, right? Certain mitigation fees go with that. If you build a much larger home, it is still one development. We are exploring options to have more of a sliding scale where there are impact fees that relate to the larger size of that home or other impacts that might be there. But we have to explore that in the environmental review, which is going to take another year or two. There is a process to go through to achieve what the underlying concerns are, from what I am hearing, and we are willing to explore that.

When the Compact was amended—in 2013, both States amended the TRPA Compact, which had not been amended since 1980 previously—that was part of California and Nevada recommitting to the Compact. One of the additions to the Compact now that we operate under was to consider economic measures and have economic considerations as part of decision-making. That was already a part of our thought process, but it was not specifically called out in the Compact. Now, that is in the Compact, and that was the last update from 2013 in the States, and then Congress has to consent to that, which happened in 2016. But we do not have an economic or threshold standard, so I wanted to point that out for the record.

Chair Daly:

I do recall in our previous stuff; I can regurgitate some of the information. We knew about that amendment; Senator Lee and wanting to pull out. It says you must have an economic consideration. You do not have any standards around it. What I am saying is that is not the top priority. It is a consideration, and it does not say how much consideration it has to be. They wanted it to be a priority. You must have economic activity at the Lake. Businesses must have customers, and customers must have people to do things at the Lake.

I think you have unique tools within the Compact, and if you are creative and tell your Board, "Yeah, they are independent; they can do all this stuff." But you do not want us to do to you what I am suggesting you do to these people who want to develop.

Senator Titus:

What I am hearing is that they already have a process and sending them a letter to list yours in order is all well and good. I am concerned because there is a list of one, two, three, and four; it seems like a hierarchy. I do oppose not putting the impact on residents higher. I do not think this letter necessarily has to happen. In my mind, if we are going to send a letter, we should be sending a letter to our cohorts on the California side requesting a meeting to discuss some of these things that we would require them to have before sending a letter to the TRPA.

I think we are going to battle in the wrong way. I am discouraged that we do not have more of an emphasis here that says this Tahoe Oversight Committee wants to meet with the delegates from California to get some of these things hashed out as opposed to putting it on the plate of the TRPA.

Chair Daly:

Understood.

Like I said, people may agree or disagree with where we are at. Obviously, this letter would be sent to the California delegation with a request for them to send a similar or their own version of the letter. We will try to explain in the letter what our reasoning is behind it.

Like I said before, you have a people problem. You have the people who are at the Lake, and you have the people who want to visit the Lake; they each have their own set of concerns—they are not mutually exclusive, and either one has the right to totally impact or negate the other. We have to navigate that. I learned a long time ago that you cannot make everybody happy all of the time. Some people you can never make happy, right? We are going to move forward and do the best we can.

I think giving direction to try to get your Board to think of it differently to utilize the tools you have to address some of these things. If a developer has the money to spend on it anyway—Zuckerberg could fix a lot of problems with what he lost in the stock market two weeks ago in one day. I do not mean to pick on Zuckerberg—Musk and the rest of them are all the same.

Ms. Regan:

I want to express that we want to be responsive to this Committee. We have also been hearing those concerns expressed from the community at our Governing Board, and our Governing Board is committed and shares a lot of the same concerns you do, so [we are] happy to address the letter. We do have legal parameters that we have to work within under the Compact and the bi-state nature of our work. So, happy to look at that.

I want to invite my colleague Devin to echo the comments.

Mr. Middlebrook:

Chair if I may ask a clarifying question on the visitors item. When you are talking about visitors, are you defining that purely as visitors to the region who do not live in the Basin or visitors to the public lands? For example, as a born and raised resident of the Tahoe Basin, when I go out and recreate on our trails or beaches, I am visiting our public lands; just want clarification on that term.

Chair Daly:

Visitors are visitors, right? Residents are residents. Sometimes they can be visitors and residents, but generally not in the other direction. So, the visitor experience is that nobody owns the Lake; it is a public lake. People have the right to come and visit the Lake, and we do not want to— I know people have said you have a limited capacity and all this stuff. I do not think there should be an interest fee. We need to try to make the experience for as many people as we can accommodate. Some overcrowding is going to fix the problem itself.

If you come back when you look at this and you get the letter and you say, "We are trying to think of this and we cannot really do this," because you have legal parameters and various things and it takes a change of the Compact, then make that recommendation. We did try to reach out to our California counterparts. We did have a discussion with a couple of them, but it took a lot to even get that far. What we heard from the ones we did talk to is that in California—same as Nevada—there is a lot of love for the Lake. There are a lot of people that will do things to try to get the Lake going.

Those four priorities in that order are the ones that I envision and see. Preserving and protecting the Lake is always going to be number one. People who are trying to utilize the Lake—those visitors, I think they have as much right as the people who live there to enjoy the Lake. But we do not want to trample over the residents as well. The economic concerns, "I need to have this new hotel or new condo or whatever." No, no, you do not. How many acres of wetlands are you going to restore? Not exactly like that, but you can figure it out.

Vice Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

I would make the motion to send a letter to TRPA encouraging the Agency to utilize the following priorities in its decision making process work and resources: (1) preservation, protection, and restoration of the Lake; (2) enhancing the visitor experience, which can also be residents; (3) mitigating impacts of the residents; and (4) economic considerations.

VICE CHAIR BILBRAY-AXELROD MOVED TO SEND A LETTER AS STATED IN RECOMMENDATION F-12.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TAYLOR SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Daly:

Any questions or comments on the motion?

Senator Titus:

I will be a no on this motion. I think it is well-intended, but it is not the direction I would prefer that we go.

THE MOTION PASSED (SENATOR TITUS AND ASSEMBLYMAN GRAY VOTED NO).

G. EVENTS

Ms. Keller:

The final recommendation G-13 for the Committee's consideration is to send a letter to the TRPA encouraging TRPA to consider exempting local events [Douglas County, South Lake Tahoe, and El Dorado County] from the current restriction on the total number of events and activities which can take place at the Tahoe Blue Event Center per year. The letter would also request that TRPA provide an update on the status of permit restrictions at the Center for local events prior to the start of the 2025 Legislative Session.

Chair Daly:

Committee, any questions or comments?

Vice Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Thank you very much for bringing this forward. One of our first trips up there was to look at this Event Center, which is beautiful. From talking to residents, it seemed like local residents were not able to access and have meetings there and do things like Girl Scout meetings in the nice conference rooms or have a small event for a school group. Once again, as a mom, I am happy with where this came out. I think we still have some work to figure out what that is going to look like, but to have that ability to help the local folks access that beautiful Center. I am very much in favor.

Assemblyman Gray:

I really appreciate this coming forward too. That is one thing I have heard consistently is about the community being able to use that facility. That is one reason I will say it honestly jockeyed on this Committee. I really hope my compatriots up here will see fit to do that also. I would like to encourage the TRPA to look at removing all the restrictions on events. That is not today; I do not know that the science is there to back it up at this point. It is impeding Douglas County and the Lake. They could be doing great things up there.

Chair Daly:

I will just make a quick comment. The former Chair of this Committee said, "I hate this one." I told her, "Look, it is a letter." This is my intent for the TRPA to review the policy and make adjustments if they are warranted. Look at it—but I do believe allowing local events to not count towards 130 days is doable; it is not going to have major impacts and will go a long way to help Douglas County help South Lake Tahoe because they use it as much as anybody else. Those events are going to go someplace in the Basin, especially if they are local events, and then you do not get the \$4 per ticket. I am just saying.

I am ready for a motion, Committee.

ASSEMBLYMAN GRAY MOVED TO SEND A LETTER AS STATED IN RECOMMENDATION G-13.

SENATOR TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

AGENDA ITEM V—PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Daly:

We will close [Agenda Item IV](#), which brings us to our second period of public comment. Make sure you turn on the mic, and we will proceed.

Mr. Flaherty, Previously Identified:

The TRPA fears a supplemental EIS to the 2012 Regional Plan more than they fear God. Their own code of ordinances and rules of procedure—I have read it several times—allow this to happen. They will not do it. Supplemental EISs are usually undertaken for new information or changes that are significant and substantial since the 2012 Regional Plan. Let us name a few. How about an increase in millions of visitors since 2012? How about ten of the largest wildfires in the last ten years? How about the emergence of best practices on the California side of the California Attorney General stating they need to do wildfire evacuation plans? Let us see, what else? How about Highway 50 being branded as a wildfire evacuation route? And on and on and on. Pay no attention to the housing policy red herring she threw out there that was taking you down a rabbit hole. Please stick to your letter. I am sorry, Senator Titus; you seem to be swayed by this dog and pony show. A supplemental EIS, have your Council look at it. It is in the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Please have them report to you and do this. Thank you so much, Chair. There are some things we can agree on—that is for sure.

Ms. Tsigdinos, Previously Identified:

I would like to just add to what Doug just mentioned. Without an environmentally healthy Lake—we need those measurements; we need them now—there will be no visitors or residents. Have you considered where the millions of visitors to the East Shore Trail relieve themselves? The Lake is our drinking water source. So, yeah, gross.

I would like to express my deep disappointment that this Committee, which is the only legislative body with TRPA oversight, chose never to dedicate one of six full Committee meetings to in-depth presentations and related legislative recommendations from Tahoe residents. Really, we are your constituents. Shutting us out is frankly undemocratic. Two minutes does not give us adequate time to fully illuminate the challenges that our communities face on a daily basis. The people, your constituents, cannot vote out TRPA leadership or the TTD. Worse—they are accountable to no one. With free reign, these agencies and their tourism-driven partners have been the architects of many of Tahoe's problems. The TRPA's decisions and partners have consistently advocated for reckless tourism over environmental impacts and public safety. They obfuscate at hiding environmental data and kicking the can down the road by not championing an environmental impact review that includes a carrying capacity with understanding that we need clear evacuation data. This Committee has done a great disservice to the Lake, the people who live here, and those who visit as well.

Ms. Waller, Previously Identified:

Committee Members, I write comprehensive in the weeds comments I know do not get read, but they need to be put into the record, which I am glad some of them have. I think I start with my first disappointment. Yes, the citizens of Douglas County—which I am—who live in the Carson Valley also believe we should be using the Event Center but not at the expense of allowing TRPA to change a permitted condition, as we have talked, that they can do to allow this to happen. There is no parking at that Event Center. The people that come

up—the citizens, the Girl Scouts, everybody should be able to use it. But this mitigation is because there is no parking there. When the citizens come up, you have to look at the weeds, and in the details, they are going to pay for parking. Is Douglas County going to make arrangements with the casinos to allow free parking for the residents? This was a controversial issue—during one of many controversial issues—on the Event Center.

Next, please get educated on the BID taxing, not just a fee. I beg you to understand that the “7-7-7” strategy. I am from Douglas County; we are the smallest populated jurisdiction around the Lake; 7,000,000 from a smaller county may be unattainable. I am not saying that we should not pay our fair share, just like Nevada pays their fair share—one-third. That segues into how much money did we look at today in possible approvals where duplicity, in my opinion, is happening. We do not have accountability in the process.

Ms. Lernhardt, Previously Identified:

Committee Members, I want to continue the fire evacuation process on Highway 50. It is unclear to me how it cannot—it has been designated— Highway 50 has been designated by TRPA most likely in order to obtain grant money as an urban street. And then they turn around and try to make a road diet applicable to it, which by the term is reducing four lanes into two lanes. These road diets are only applicable to non-arterial urban routes, but it is not; you have all driven up there many times now. You see it is a high alpine route. It is not an urban route. Do we have to follow along with this bizarre grant application that is twisted to the money trail rather than to the safety of the locals? You need to look at this. This has to be redesignated. It has to be a federal evacuation route. Thank you for your attention.

Ms. Burden, Previously Identified:

I am very disappointed that again, none of the following critical issues presented multiple times by the public have been addressed as additional items to the WSD today. The need for TRPA to initiate a Basin-wide carrying capacity study, a roadway-by-roadway wildfire evacuation study for public safety, or a comprehensive environmental analysis considering cumulative impacts since the 2012 Regional Plan. What environmental impact does it take for this to happen? Will any of these issues be addressed in the Committee's final report one way or another?

Secondly, I do not understand why a minor adjustment to wording was not considered for Agenda Item D-5 (C) to “add a tribal representative member position to the TTD Board of Directors” to be filled at Washoe’s discretion.

Thirdly, with regard to D-5 (D) to “impose a public transit surcharge to per night charge for transient lodging in the Lake Tahoe Basin,” I would recommend discouraging fees and overnight guests where TOT fees are already being charged, and we actually should be encouraging longer stays where visitors learn to love and want to protect the Lake, but then charge a fee of mitigation to day visitors entering the Basin who are the primary cause of many of the traffic and pollution issues that we are trying to mitigate. I assume there is ongoing data collection on day visitors versus overnight guests. This needs to have more thought and to have the intended effect. This revenue for intended transportation enhancements needs to make public transit efficient enough to discourage the use of private vehicles for day visitors. If I had more time, I would be happy to include more constructive conversation, and I wish that the public had that opportunity with the Committee at one of these sessions. Thank you for your time.

Ms. Tyler, Previously Identified:

Following up on what Niobe said, we need an EIS drastically to look at cumulative impact since the 2012 Regional Plan update, and we need a carrying capacity study. We need that right now. We need that before any more area plans are approved by TRPA. Regarding number 12, I appreciate putting preserving the Lake at the top. Thank you very much for that, but I suggest you consider combining two and three stating as follows, "Balance the impacts on residents with enhancing the visitor experience." I think that would be a big improvement, and that is all I have. Thank you.

Chair Daly:

Thank you. Do we have any other public comment here in Carson City?

Ms. Regan, Previously Identified:

I just want to thank this Committee for your time. It has been an incredible experience to work through issues, and I want to thank the public for their time and energy; and reassert TRPA's commitment to work with the community to address a lot of these concerns because our team lives in the Basin. We all love the Lake, and we want to work together to find solutions. Thank you for your energy, your time, and your passion for the Lake.

Chair Daly:

Thank you. Seeing no others in person here in Carson City, is anybody in the building in Southern Nevada? I am not seeing anybody.

Let us go to the phones.

BPS:

Thank you, Chair. To participate in public comment, please press *9 to take your place in the queue.

We have no callers wishing to participate at this time.

Senator Titus:

I may have jumped in here. You were probably going to take comments from Members. If that is where you were going, that is what I was going to do.

Chair Daly:

Actually, I was going to thank staff and everybody for making the work go smoothly. But if you would like to make a comment or anybody else, feel free.

Senator Titus:

That is exactly where I was going, Mr. Chair.

I want to acknowledge that it was a pleasure serving on this Committee. I enjoyed our time up at Lake Tahoe. Although the very first Committee that we took a tour up there, one of our Committee Members may have frozen to death without the assistance of staff who brought her warm clothing and coats. Staff was very good on this, and I appreciate that.

Also, the members of the community showing up each and every meeting; sharing your concerns did not go unnoticed, believe me. I heard you, and I want to thank you because you all are our constituents and so, being responsible to that the best we can. I appreciate that.

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, you have come under fire a lot on this. I appreciate your professionalism in answering my questions when I reached out and not running away from the questions I had for you.

Mister Chair, I want to thank you for your energy and time that you put into this, and you took it seriously. I appreciate that, and I want to acknowledge you.

Vice Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

That was me who forgot their coat in the backseat of my car when my husband dropped me off at the airport. So yes, thank you. I would have frozen to death. I am a Vegas girl.

I too have enjoyed my time immensely. I have heard the citizens of Tahoe. You are so lucky to live up here. I know you know that; we are very jealous down in Southern Nevada.

Thank you again to the TRPA, and mostly I want to thank the Chair. We, for the first time, reached out to our California legislators and are working because it is one Lake, and I cannot believe we do not normally do that. I hope that is now a tradition this Committee will continue to do, because I do think it is so important when they pass the law there and we do not. All of a sudden, you have different laws once you cross state lines. Obviously, that does happen, but we are talking about one Basin, so things that actually affect this Basin should be uniform. Thank you, Chair, for doing that.

I flew up here on my own dime because it was not an official meeting, but I was happy to do it. I think we got really great information. Thank you all for spending time out of your day to come up here and be passionate about these issues, and thank you for bringing me into your community.

Assemblywoman Taylor:

As one of the new people on the Committee, I have learned so much, and I want to encourage all of you who protect, love, and take care of one of the most beautiful parts of our country—of the world—to continue to do so. These are still works in progress when they are BDRs, so there is room. There are suggestions that came up even in your closing comments that there is room for. Help us as we get to a place that is the best place to be.

I appreciate the work of TRPA and the staff, and I really appreciate the work of our Chair, who has done an amazing job, and the colleagues who I serve with. But mostly, I appreciate you. So, stay in that because everybody is trying to get to a great place with this, and it is going to take all of us to get there. We cannot get there without you. You have forgotten more about the Lake than I know. I need you to stay in there with us so we can get to great places. I think we are on the way. But we will take some turns along the way, but we need you to get there. So, stay in it.

Thanks for the honor of being on this Committee.

Senator Scheible:

I will echo all my colleagues' comments thanking everybody for their time and dedication to protecting Lake Tahoe and being here every meeting to help us as we take on our charge as the Oversight Committee. I love serving on this Committee. Thank you all for being here.

Chair Daly:

What I was going to do was thank our staff, policy analysts, Legal, secretaries, people who put these things together and get the notices out—all of which they do behind the scenes. They send me an email and say, "Is this good?"—their ideas that came from me and from suggestions. We will try to do better to communicate so that the public can put in suggestions as well. In the future, we do hope to continue talking with our counterparts in California. I know most of you here on the Nevada side; feel free to talk to the legislators in California—be nice to them. We need them to concur with what we are trying to go with.

I want to thank the Committee and everybody who put up with all the stuff we had. It was good. Like I said, when I first introduced, it was the first time for me on this Committee. I have lived here all my life. I have learned a lot of things, and I know that in a perfect world, things would be different, but that is not what we have. We are going to do the best we can. Whether everybody is happy with everything we do, we are trying to still push forward. I hope you appreciate and understand that.

Thanks to our Vice Chair and to our Republican component of our Committee. You were helpful, and that is what it is about. To Senator Scheible, for nudging me into this and saying, "You do it." I am happy to have chaired the meeting. I do know that we will have different people. Next time, the Chair will be somebody from the Assembly if we follow the tradition, and our two Assembly members here—well, maybe our third Assembly member—will not be on the Committee next time. We will have new people and there will be a learning curve on that as well.

Normally we do not take additional public comment at the end. There is not a counterpart committee. Nevada has the Oversight Committee. California does not have the Oversight Committee; they have a Governor appointee. We also have a Governor appointee on the TRPA Board. But California has two members on the Board appointed by the legislatures, as I understand it. So, they do not have a similar structure.

Anyway, we are off of our agenda. We can take this offline after the Committee is over. Thank you, staff and Committee members.

The following written public comments were received:

- Tahoe Science Advisory Council ([Agenda Item V A](#))
- Staci Baker, Serious Ground Water Issues ([Agenda Item V B](#))
- Diane Becker ([Agenda Item V C](#))
- Aaron Vanderpool ([Agenda Item V D](#))
- Sue Daniels ([Agenda Item V E](#))
- Pamela Tsigdinos ([Agenda Item V F](#))
- Alex Tsigdinos ([Agenda Item V G](#))
- Richard Miner ([Agenda Item V H](#))

AGENDA ITEM VI—ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 3:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Terese Martinez
Research Policy Assistant

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	Ann Nichols, North Tahoe Preservation Alliance	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II B	Doug Flaherty, TahoeCleanAir.org	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II C	Robert Aaron	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II D	Brett Tibbitts, Tahoe East Shore Alliance	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II E	Ellie Waller, Nevada Resident	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II F	Elisabeth Lernhardt, Zephyr Cove Resident	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II G	Tobi Tyler, Vice Chair, Tahoe Area Group, Sierra Club	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II H-1	Niobe Burden Austere, North Shore Resident and Conservation Photographer	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II H-2	Niobe Burden Austere, North Shore Resident and Conservation Photographer	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II H-3	Niobe Burden Austere, North Shore Resident and Conservation Photographer	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II H-4	Niobe Burden Austere, North Shore Resident and Conservation Photographer	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II H-5	Niobe Burden Austere, North Shore Resident and Conservation Photographer	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II I	Helen Neff, Incline Village Resident	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item II J	Darcie Goodman Collins, League to Save Lake Tahoe Kyle Davis, League to Save Lake Tahoe	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item IV	Alysa Keller, Senior Principal Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
Agenda Item V A	Tahoe Science Advisory Council	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item V B	Staci Baker, Serious Ground Water Issues	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item V C	Diane Becker	Written Public Comment

AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER/ENTITY	DESCRIPTION
Agenda Item V D	Aaron Vanderpool	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item V E	Sue Daniels	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item V F	Pamela Tsigdinos	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item V G	Alex Tsigdinos	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item V H	Richard Miner	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>.