



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

January 23, 2026

The first meeting of the Legislative Committee for the Review and Oversight of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and the Marlette Lake Water System for the 2025–2026 Interim was held on Friday, January 23, 2026, at 1 p.m. in Room 4100, Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 165, 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:

Assemblymember Heather Goulding, Chair
Senator Skip Daly, Vice Chair
Senator Robin L. Titus
Assemblymember Rich DeLong
Assemblymember Blayne Osborn

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT IN LAS VEGAS:

Assemblymember Cinthia Zermeño Moore
Assemblymember Howard Watts

COMMITTEE MEMBER ABSENT:

Senator Melanie Scheible (Excused)

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU STAFF PRESENT:

Julianne King, Senior Policy Analyst, Research Division
Christina Harper, Manager of Research Policy Assistants, Research Division
Terese Martinez, Research Policy Assistant, Research Division
Sarah Delap, Principal Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division
Payton Alvarado, Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division
Daniel Marlow, Program Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division

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

AGENDA ITEM I—OPENING REMARKS

Chair Goulding:

Good afternoon, and welcome to the first meeting of the Legislative Committee for the Review and Oversight of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and the Marlette Lake Water System for the 2025–2026 Interim. Madam Secretary, please call the roll.

[Roll call is reflected in Committee Members Present.]

Welcome to the members of the audience here in Carson—I do not see anybody in Las Vegas—and anybody who is joining us on the phone. At this time, I would like to take just a couple of minutes for Committee members to introduce themselves, so you will know who is with us today. Let us begin with our Vice Chair, Senator Daly.

Senator Daly:

Thank you, Madam Chair. Welcome everybody. Senator for District 13 in Washoe County. I was the immediate previous Chair of this Committee. I have full confidence in our current Chair; she is going to do a great job. And looking forward to following up from what we did last session—or last interim—and move forward and hopefully do some good work. Other than that, thank you, Madam Chair.

Chair Goulding:

Thank you. Senator Titus.

Senator Titus:

Thank you, Chair. I am a medical doctor from Smith Valley. I represent Senate District 17, which includes six Nevada rural counties from Stateline, Nevada, all the way down the western slope, I like to say, of Nevada—from Douglas County to Lyon County, to Churchill County, to Mineral County, to Esmeralda County, and a part of Nye County, mostly Tonopah. This is my third time on this Committee. I think it is critically important that we listen to all sides, and I am excited to be on this Committee. Thank you very much.

Chair Goulding:

Thank you. Assemblymember Watts—we will go down to Las Vegas.

Assemblymember Watts:

All right. Thank you very much, Chair. A little feedback down here. I represent Assembly District 15, right in the middle of the Las Vegas Valley. This is my first time serving on this Committee, but I have served on the Natural Resources Committee since I was first elected to the Legislature in 2018—and have really enjoyed the opportunity to spend time in the Lake Tahoe Basin—and excited to finally have the opportunity to serve on this Committee. Thank you.

Chair Goulding:

I was hoping that you would share that you are one of the few folks that have walked the entire Rim Trail. So, I think that is notable—when you are thinking about folks that have a commitment to the Lake. Assemblymember DeLong.

Assemblymember Watts:

I did not want to brag, Madam Chair.

Assemblymember DeLong:

Thank you, Chair. I represent southern Washoe County, including Incline Village and all of Washoe County that is in the Basin. I can attest to the fact that I have been spending time in the Tahoe area since the mid-sixties when my family used to come up on a regular basis.

Chair Goulding:

Thank you. Assemblymember Moore.

Assemblymember Moore:

Thank you. I represent Assembly District 11 in east Las Vegas, which also reps—it is also a little bit of downtown and a little bit of north Las Vegas. This is my first term serving, and this is my first time serving in this Committee. Lake Tahoe is my favorite place in Nevada, and my favorite place to take my son. I am really excited to be here.

Chair Goulding:

Thank you, and Assemblymember Osborn.

Assemblymember Osborn:

Thank you, Chair. Assembly District 39, which is all of Douglas County and a portion of Lyon County. A native Nevadan, born and raised in Douglas, lived there all my life, and I am particularly excited to be on this Committee. Thank you.

Chair Goulding:

Thank you. I represent Assembly District 27. That is the north end of Reno and up into some of our north valleys. Super excited to be here and delighted to see so many faces and so much interest in being here for the TRPA [Tahoe Regional Planning Agency] Oversight Committee.

I want to take a moment to introduce our Legislative Council Bureau staff, who will be assisting. And for those of you who have not been on this side of the room before, the staff is just instrumental in making all this happen and making sure that your input is effective; so, we just cannot say thank you enough for the folks here. Julianne King here and Jann Stinnesbeck, from the Research Division will be serving as our Committee Policy Analysts. They will be helping us with background information and research on the issues that come before the Committee. Sarah Delap, Erin—I am going to screw up this pronunciation here—Sturdivant, and Peyton Alvarado from Legal Division will be serving as our legal counsel. Daniel Marlow from Fiscal Analysis Division will be serving as our Fiscal Analyst. Terese Martinez from the Research Division will serve as our

Committee Secretary. And lastly, but no small task, is to thank those that are working from the Audio Visual Hearings (AVH) Unit, making things work, so that so many folks can join us remotely. So, thank you all.

I want to thank not only the Committee members for being here and the staff for being here, but for all of you who are participating. I think the thing that we all share is a love for Lake Tahoe and recognizing it as one of the jewels, not just of Nevada, not just of the Sierras, but really a jewel, one of the most spectacular places in the world—and that is the reason why we have so many visitors that come from so far away. As we begin this journey, this interim session together, I would ask that we all put that shared value of making sure that we are here to protect this incredible resource. I would ask that we all then strive to approach the work that we are doing over these several months with a commitment to curiosity and working in collaboration to find really effective policy. So, when—should there be a moment when things are challenging—let us find that base place again where we have a shared interest in—imagine yourself when you are coming around the bend and you have that glance at the Lake and that almost breathtaking moment. I have always said for the 30 years that I have lived here, I hope I never ever take that view for granted. So, that is the spirit from which I hope we will all engage in the process. With that, a couple of housekeeping items.

Before we move to our first period for public comment, I would like to make several housekeeping announcements. First, I would like to remind everyone to silence your phones—so if you will grab it out of your pocket or your bag—you are not going to look silly right now. This is the time to remember to turn the sound off. Members of the public may provide testimony in various ways. All are—everyone can give public comment. There is an opportunity to give public comment now, at the beginning of our meeting and at the end. You can submit public comment in writing, or you can address us in person, either in Las Vegas or here in Carson City at the table. And there is also an opportunity to testify over the phone. When you are testifying in person, please turn the microphone on—there is a button right in front of the microphone, you will find it—and turn it off when you are done speaking. Begin by stating your name and spelling your name. This is so that we have an opportunity to follow up with you and that our records will accurately reflect that you have spoken and given public comment.

The Committee's meeting materials can be found on Nevada Legislature's website. You can also sign up for electronic notifications related to the Committee through that webpage. Our meeting is being videoconferenced to Las Vegas—as you can see—we have some folks down there, a couple of our Committee members and a staff member. We have—I do not believe we have anybody that is attending via Zoom. And finally, meeting materials provided to Committee members for this meeting can be accessed through the Committee's website. You will also note that our Committee members will be referencing our laptops—perhaps our phones—and so please do not take this as a case of “we are not paying attention;” there is a lot going on—just how we are communicating. So, I hope that you will respect that we are engaged by referencing many materials.

AGENDA ITEM II—PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Goulding:

With that, we will open—this is the first public comment period for today. As I stated earlier, there will be an opportunity for public comment at the end of our meeting. You will have two minutes to make public comment. We will have staff keeping a timer, and you will hear a bell when your two minutes is up. And a moment of coaching if you will give me the

consideration. If you are here with a number of other folks, all sharing the same opinion, it is good to take—it is effective in your communication with the Committee to let us know that you share an opinion and maybe not state the entire—take up your entire two minutes—if there is nothing new—with no new information to add. We certainly encourage everyone to be here and share their opinions. I think all of us also appreciate efficiency. So, with that when you are ready.

Doug Flaherty, TahoeCleanAir.org:

Chair Goulding, and Committee members, wildfire evacuation impacts in the Lake Tahoe Basin are regional and cross-jurisdictional. Evacuation outcomes do not respect area plan boundaries. Failure in one area plan jurisdiction directly endangers residents and visitors in another. Yet regional evacuation timing analysis remains entirely absent. TRPA continues to approve land-use changes that increase population, density, and traffic along critical, wildfire evacuation choke point, town-center corridors. I refer the Committee to the 2024 AI [Artificial Intelligence] *Independent Lake Tahoe Basin Wildfire Evacuation Analysis*, authored by highly-qualified wildfire incident command professionals, including John Messina, former Cal Fire Chief of Paradise, California, and the initial Incident Commander during the deadly 2018 Camp Fire; and Shane Lauderdale, former Fire Chief of Chico, California, and the Camp Fire's Operations Section Chief. Their experience with wind- and slope-driven, no-notice wildfire evacuations under extreme roadway constraints is invaluable. The Compact establishes a regional framework of equilibrium and harmony. In the 2024 oversight hearings, TRPA's Executive Director stated that TRPA lacks evacuation authority and serves only as a convener. TRPA may not run evacuations, but it does control regional land-use intensity. It cannot authorize higher density in town-center choke points, while washing its hands of cross-jurisdictional capacity-limited life-safety analysis that local governments have no authority to undertake. I urge this Committee to recommend that TRPA complete a Basin-wide roadway wildfire evacuation timing and capacity analysis for no-notice fire scenarios before approving further Tahoe Area Plan amendments and major projects and to establish a Basin-wide roadway safety capacity threshold consistent with the Compact. Thank you. ([Agenda Item II A-1](#)) ([Agenda Item II A-2](#))

Chair Goulding:

Thank you. Thank you so much. Go ahead.

Ellie Waller, Douglas County Resident, Nevada:

Retired Aerospace Engineering Research Analyst. My passion now is for future generations to enjoy, protect, and restore Lake Tahoe to its previous glory. Before you today are a well-rounded group of concerned citizens that bring institutional and educational knowledge that must be recognized. We have challenged TRPA to be more accountable and transparent and often hear the Executive Director say, "We can do better." That is not good enough. We are curious about how each of you approach your role as Committee members, hearing your concerns and questions about how federal, state, and local dollars are spent. Your packet today should have contained the last session's conclusions and Chair Daly's October request to TRPA and responses submitted in December. In my opinion, the somewhat simplistic priority matrix provided a 10,000-foot view. The devil is in the details pointing to the Lake Tahoe tracker, other like databases, reports, et cetera, takes hours upon hours to figure out what might have been accomplished or not.

Number two, the Tahoe Blue Event Center request for local meeting exemptions did not provide the entire picture during the last Committee session, with noncompliance issues not reported, resulting in TRPA legal hearing in December about not being able to track vehicle miles traveled accurately for a baseline, and other permit issues. I am not against local events not originally requested.

Number three, five pages related to updates. This is the first time I have read the 2012 Regional Plan is a 25-year planning horizon. Waiting until 2037 to address capacity, evacuation issues, et cetera—not acceptable. Time-certain deliverables should be assigned by this Committee.

Summary—Existing conditions have substantially changed, and tiering from outdated 2012 analyses for current-day projects sums up to irrelevancy and urgency to update the plan. See attachments for further references as supplied for the record.
([Agenda Item II B-1](#)) ([Agenda Item II B-2](#))

Dana Tibbitts, Co-founder, Tahoe East Shore Alliance (TESA):

Good afternoon. I am a published author and investigative journalist, a 15-year Lake Tahoe resident, and co-founder of the Tahoe East Shore Alliance. My work focuses on evacuation capacity and wildfire in the Basin. I also serve as an advisor to the National Wildfire Alliance. Lake Tahoe does not need more glossy brochures, vision statements, or dog and pony shows from the TRPA. What we need is a new status quo, data-driven decisions, enforceable accountability, and proof that public money and public policy are in fact delivering measurable environmental and public safety results. Residents funded the first and only high-fidelity Basin-wide evacuation model because TRPA would not. That model shows severe, life-threatening evacuation constraints across the Basin. Nevertheless, luxury housing, speculative redevelopment, and large-scale glamping proposals continue to move forward without serious analysis. What is missing? The legal requirement for TRPA to conduct project-by-project evacuation modeling and the authority to stop or deny projects where safe egress cannot be verified. Oversight without compliance is not oversight—it is window dressing. If you think we overstate the matter, the 2024 TRPA Committee—to deliver—sorry. The TRPA was to commit—deliver a shamefully overdue, updated, environmental review to this very Committee. To date, no such review has been delivered. Where is it? What does this fundamental failure tell you about their leadership? And where is all the money going? Billions of dollars flow through the Tahoe Basin and straight back out again under the banner of restoration and Destination Stewardship. This Committee has the authority to stop the bleeding—

Chair Goulding:

Thank you.

Ms. Tibbitts:

—we urge you to use it. Thank you.

Chair Goulding:

Thank you.

Noa Banayan, Government Affairs Manager, Keep Tahoe Blue:

Good afternoon, Chair Goulding, and Committee members. I serve as the Government Affairs Manager for Keep Tahoe Blue, which you know through our work with you all and our bumper sticker, of course. Thank you for the opportunity to comment at this first hearing of the 2026 Interim oversight session. As many of you know, Keep Tahoe Blue was founded in 1957 to protect our Lake's famed clarity from rapid decline. We are the oldest and largest environmental organization at the Lake. One of our early accomplishments was the creation of a unique bi-state regulator charged with protecting the Lake and ensuring consistent environmental protections throughout the Basin, which obviously became the TRPA. One of the things that we continue to do is work with, support, and encourage our partners at the TRPA in fulfilling their mandates and using their unique authority to protect the Lake's environment. Development and transportation pressures and user impacts are just some of the external pressures facing the Lake. We are focused on finding solutions. This includes identifying and advocating for new and continued sources of funding, overcoming hurdles to implementation, and providing constructive input on plans and policies that TRPA develops. No one benefits if TRPA is not an effective, functioning, and adequately funded agency; we need them for the Basin. The Lake cannot be protected without TRPA meeting their mandate to achieve and maintain Tahoe's environmental standards or thresholds and implement their regional land use and transportation plans. Support and oversight from this Committee in the State of Nevada are critical to carrying out the mission that spurred the creation of TRPA—a sustainable future for a clear and healthy Lake Tahoe Basin. Thank you for your support for Lake Tahoe and the opportunity to comment. Please consider us, Keep Tahoe Blue, a partner in oversight and research efforts in the Tahoe Basin; and we look forward to working with you this session. Thank you.

Alex Tsigdinos, North Lake Tahoe Resident:

I am a long-time resident of North Lake Tahoe. My chief concerns is that TRPA has fallen prey to regulatory capture, lobbyist influence, mission creep, and bureaucratic expansion. It does not meet its primary objectives, effectively use its immense budget, and the only body that has any oversight authority over TRPA is this one. So, as you go through your oversight process over the next few months, I respectfully ask you to do so with some healthy skepticism.

If you feel your agendas, tours, and the people and organizations you will meet with are too highly curated...

If you are hearing Tahoe residents characterized as crazy NIMBYs [Not in My Back Yard], just a vocal minority, elites, and so on to devalue the very constituents you represent...

If you are being steered to believe the only legitimate voices are those of lawyers, lobbyists, organizations—including nonprofits with benevolent sounding names whose primary interests are commercial development, growing tourism, and related tax revenues...

If you are not considering the irony that TRPA, an agency created to be an environmental watchdog, is being taken to court by grassroots environmental organizations...

If you are not hearing or asking hard questions about urban-planning models wedged into a rural environment, regulatory capture, the problems of growing over-tourism and congestion and microplastics and trash in the Lake and Basin...

If you are only hearing of initiatives designed to bring more people into the Basin and listen—and little of how to get them back out in a wildfire evacuation...

If you are being told of workforce housing plans that lack income requirements or enforcement mechanisms, then I hope you see the same red flags so many of us who actually live in the Basin do. Please use your oversight authority and power of the purse to make TRPA better. Thank you very much. ([Agenda Item II C](#))

Cameron Gresh, Government Affairs Liaison, Carson City:

Good afternoon, Chair, and members of the Committee. I am here today to describe how Carson City greatly appreciates the state's efforts to revitalize the Marlette-Hobart [Marlette Lake-Hobart Reservoir] Water System. This system is vital to Carson City, providing the raw water resource needed to serve residents, businesses, and local Nevada state offices alike. In addition to our gratitude, Carson City is currently upgrading its surface water treatment plant to make the best use of this resource. We hope this investment demonstrates our dedication to being reliable partners in our use of the Marlette-Hobart Water System for many years to come. Thank you.

Ronda Tycer, Incline Village Resident:

Good afternoon, Legislators. I am a 34-year resident of Lake Tahoe and of Incline Village. I am part of the citizen contingent here today to help you in your upcoming decision-making as to how to best guide TRPA, so it can save the Lake. I would like to introduce myself to those of you I did not meet last year and also let you know my particular areas of interest. With my long residency at the Lake, I have had ample opportunity to become familiar with TRPA and to participate as a member of the public at dozens of meetings with the TRPA Board. I have offered opinions on TRPA decisions regarding major issues, particularly building and development, emergency evacuation, short-term rentals, and business improvement districts. If and when these issues are addressed over the next eight months, I will be offering information from the perspective of a long time, well-informed citizen. I say well-informed because for the past nine years, I have served voluntarily as the Incline Village/Crystal Bay Community Forum recap editor. And in this capacity, I have prepared a post-meeting summary of the issues discussed in the bi-monthly community forum, which focuses on TRPA, TTD [Tahoe Transportation District], Washoe County, and IVGID [Incline Village General Improvement District]. Of course, I will also be relaying information from these meetings back to our residents via my reports to the community forum. So, thank you for your participation. I look forward to participating with you. ([Agenda Item II D](#))

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

Good afternoon. I am the Vice Chair of Sierra Club's Tahoe Area Group. I am also a 23-year resident of Lake—of the Lake Tahoe Basin and a retired environmental engineer from the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board. I hold degrees in biological conservation and environmental engineering, and I continue my professional commitment to environmental protection through volunteering with the Sierra Club, the oldest environmental organization in the country and in the Basin. I am here today on behalf of Sierra Club members and Tahoe residents who are deeply concerned about the long-term protection of Lake Tahoe and the effectiveness of the regulatory frameworks intended to safeguard its water quality, public health, and environmental thresholds. There remains a persistent disconnect between TRPA's statutory mandate and on-the-ground environmental outcomes. Despite increased budgets, repeated regulatory amendments, and continued development approvals, Lake Tahoe's environmental conditions have not improved and in some respects have worsened. This outcome is inconsistent with the intent of the Bi-State Compact. Environmental thresholds were intended to be enforceable safeguards, not aspirational goals. When thresholds remain unmet, yet fail to constrain growth, and

development caps rely on administrative accounting rather than fixed, enforceable limits, the Compact's protections are undermined. Robust, legislative oversight is therefore essential. Meaningful oversight requires transparency, enforceable limits, and policies aligned with environmental capacity and public safety. Where outcomes do not match commitments, corrective action is warranted to ensure the long-term preservation of Lake Tahoe for current and future generations. Thank you.

Chair Goulding:

Before the next folks here in Carson City, let us go to Las Vegas. Is there anyone in Las Vegas that wants to give public comment? No. Let us go to the phones, and then we will come back to Carson.

AVH:

If you would like to provide public comment, please press *9 now to take your place in the queue. Caller with the last three digits of 650, please press *6 to unmute yourself. Please continue.

Brett Tibbitts, President, TESA:

Good afternoon. I am a 15-year resident at the Lake and of Douglas County. I am President of the Tahoe East Shore Alliance. We were instrumental in the battle to keep Highway 50 four lanes for evacuation and access purposes, as Highway 50 is the only four-lane road on the Lake. I attended every Oversight Committee meeting in 2024. It seems to me that the 2026 agenda is almost identical to the 2024 agenda, with most of the speakers being picked by the TRPA. This is not oversight in any definition I know or understand. I think you are going to be given a very rosy picture by the TRPA—"Everything is fine, but by the way, we need lots more money. We are doing a wonderful job, but we need more money." But that is not true. Billions have been given to the TRPA, but lake clarity is so-so at best. Every year, Tahoe now receives more visitors than Yosemite, Yellowstone, and the Grand Canyon combined—over 15 million. The big-name development projects approved by the TRPA have fallen apart—whether it is the bankrupt and boarded up Waldorf Astoria project in Crystal Bay, the never-got-off-the-ground Latitude 39 project in Stateline, or the 947 Project in Incline Village. But you are not going to hear about these or see them. Lake Tahoe is very [inaudible] Altadena or Pacific Palisades, but you will not hear about this either. You will be told all is fine. Those who worry about wildfire evacuation and standstill traffic are marked by the TRPA. I urge you to amend the agenda to allow a few new professional voices that can explain to you the need—the need for real oversight of the TRPA—

Chair Goulding:

Thank you, Mr. Tibbitts.

Mr. Tibbitts:

—especially regarding—Thank you.

Chair Goulding:

Thank you for your comments.

Victoria Supple, Argentum Partners:

Hi, here today calling in on behalf of the South Tahoe Alliance Resorts and the Tahoe Douglas Visitors Authority. We are here to express our gratitude for the TRPA and other stakeholders that have worked so hard to create a collaborative process for projects in the Tahoe Basin. Collaboration is in Tahoe's DNA and locals prove it is valuable and important. Partnerships and collaboration among all parties in the Basin make projects like the Tahoe Blue Event Center possible—and possible in a way that not only benefits the economy but the greater community and the environment. As a worldwide destination, projects in Tahoe benefit all of Nevada, create critical jobs, and support a healthy Lake Tahoe for generations to come. I just want to hop on and thank you—and send a thank you to Julie, Devin, and the team at TRPA for fostering the spirit of collaboration, preservation, and progress. Thank you.

Jerry Bindel, General Manager, Forest Suites Resort:

Hello. I am currently the General Manager and part ownership of the Forest Suites Resort on the South Shore of Lake Tahoe and a 27-year resident. I am speaking positively on behalf of the TRPA, as well as the Nevada Division of State Lands, and their work being done at the Van Sickle Bi-State Park. It is an amazing facility. It was developed a number of years ago. It keeps people in the downtown core of South Lake Tahoe and Stateline out of their vehicles and accessing the wonderfulness of the remote areas of the Park, as well as all the way up towards the Rim Trail. I encourage this—this Committee to visit—and you can certainly stay at my lovely property, if you would like—when you come up to the South Shore and visit the Van Sickle Bi-State Park. And I encourage the Nevada Division of Lands to continue their great work on enhancing this Park and the experience for our visitors. Thank you very much.

AVH:

You have no more callers wishing to provide public comment at this time.

Chair Goulding:

Thank you. Let us come back to Carson City.

Pamela Tsigdinos, Full-Time Resident, North Lake Tahoe:

Good morning. I have reported for several years on issues in the Tahoe Basin with one goal—to make Tahoe better, not worse, for future generations. Everyone should have the opportunity to experience what Chair Goulding described as the awe and beauty of Tahoe in its natural form—not asphalted over or obscured by tall buildings. Tahoe is not Disneyland and, respectfully, not Las Vegas. We should be able to swim in and drink Lake Tahoe's water—this is also Reno's water—without fear of ingesting herbicides, toxins, microplastics, and more. We must be confident that if a fast-moving wildfire were to start in Tahoe's Basin, or a major earthquake shakes one of our active faults, that a robust evacuation plan can get everyone out of harm's way. Let us learn from Lahaina and Paradise. The public is here out of concern—and yes, deep frustration—about TRPA's loss of focus on protecting the Lake. Together, with you, our job is to identify the problems that need solving for the multi-ethnic public who live and work in the Tahoe Basin and those who visit. To solve problems, we need current, science-based data—facts—not PR-[public relations] based aspirational slides. What has been missing is hard data on Tahoe's current carrying capacity—real analysis that reflects the urgency of Tahoe's basins, today's degraded environment, public safety risks, visitation impacts, and infrastructure constraints.

Please do not be distracted by recreational triumphs or new development code. TRPA will market those to you as the basis for housing. In reality, those changes offer loopholes for luxury developers. Please require full analysis, not desktop checklists. Amend TRPA's STR [short-term rental] policy. This will convert housing for workers. Thank you very much for your time. ([Agenda Item II E-1](#)) ([Agenda Item II E-2](#)) ([Agenda Item II E-3](#))

Elizabeth Lernhardt, Zephyr Cove Resident:

After more than 60 years, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and the Bi-State Compact are overdue for a meaningful update. TRPA must become more responsive to the everyday needs of local residents and to do its mission of protecting the Lake Tahoe ecosystem, rather than remaining captive to commercial, tourism, and special interest. The current structure too often prioritizes development and visitor-focused projects over people who live and work here year-around. Let me give you a clear example from my area—the Lake Link microtransit service, also known as On-Demand Shuttle. This service was mandated by the Agency as key condition for the approval of the Tahoe Blue Event Center to help mitigate traffic. When first presented to our residents in Tahoe Douglas in May '22, it was promoted as cost-free transportation right in our neighborhoods. It is funded for 1 percent of the Tahoe District Transient Occupancy Tax about 600 million—\$600,000 annually. Yet when the resolution was voted on—at the same day—it only went to 250 feet on the Nevada side. This sleight of hand made it obvious the primary beneficiaries were the Star Alliance and the casinos—not local residents. A year later, when Raley's grocery store pulled out of the Stateline shopping center, the service was quickly extended to Round Hill Safeway—convenient for tourists—but it still excluded the Catholic Food Bank across Highway 50, which serves 80 families for South Lake Tahoe and our area. Does the Star Alliance really need \$600,000 per year so desperately it must deny rights to our most vulnerable residents picking up essential food boxes? When this inequity was raised by me with the Douglas County Board, the Chairwoman tabled the issue for the next three years. I raised this directive—Thank you. ([Agenda Item II F](#))

Richard Beaty, President, Brockway Point Homeowners Association:

Good afternoon, Madam Chair, members of the Oversight Committee. I have been coming to Lake Tahoe for over 55 years. I was a homebuilder in Las Vegas and a developer in Old Sacramento, and I work with the Brockway Point Homeowners Association. I appreciate the work of the Committee, but I want to point out that the Agency, TRPA, was created to ensure lake clarity and environmental health and is now being diverted into many, many other important but secondary issues, including evacuation and other business interests. And I want the Committee to understand that one of the reasons for this is the change in the composition of TRPA from 1969 to the current day. The—without addressing this as an ad hominem sort of thing, the E.D. of TRPA has a B.A. in communications and journalism. The leader of TRPA, Hayley Williamson, is a lawyer with a degree in philosophy. Of the 15 members of the TRPA, only one, a woman named Ashley Conrad, actually has a degree in environmental science or any true understanding of the scientific importance of the different issues facing people trying to establish lake clarity. The remainder of the Committee of TRPA is made up of lawyers, business people, poli sci [political science] majors, an electrical engineer, public relations, and journalism. And I think that speaks to why you may, as the Oversight Committee, not be really getting the kind of hard data that is needed to ensure the Lake's clarity, which is the mission of the TRPA—not evacuation, not business interests, not tourism—it is lake clarity. And I would like to say that in my 55 years, lake clarity has declined almost 45 percent and in the last 10 years, over 15 percent. This is all in the UC [University of California] Davis [inaudible]. Thank you for this opportunity to address you. I wish you the best of luck. ([Agenda Item II G](#))

Richard Miner, Incline Village Resident:

Good afternoon, Chair Heather Goulding and members of the Oversight Committee. I am a nearly 30-year resident of Incline Village and past president of the Incline Village and Crystal Bay Historical Society. I am familiar with the tasks and function of this Committee and have addressed meetings of the Committee in years past. I look forward to hearing from the various spokespersons you will ask to report in coming sessions and to hear questions you raise both about their presentations and the various issues which have arisen over the years, but which continue to remain on the table, so to speak. I do not propose to anticipate those issues, but only to let you know that I am keenly aware of the difficulties Legislators face in hearing all sides of every story—and especially in identifying problems and recommending solutions to the appropriate committees of the Nevada Legislature for action. To that end, I will endeavor to use my time before you to identify critical problems and to suggest specific legislation which can ameliorate them. As I just wrote in a Reno Gazette Journal op-ed piece published yesterday, this is an Oversight Committee—not just a “what-have-you-done-for-me-lately” sounding board. You have work to do. In short, I am not here to bitch; I am here to help find solutions. I look forward to talking with you both as a group and individually, if that is possible, in the months ahead, in a spirit of problem-solving and mutual respect. Thank you for your service to our fellow citizens and to the residents of the Lake Tahoe Basin. ([Agenda Item II H](#))

Ann Nichols, North Tahoe Preservation Alliance:

Hi—Chair and members of the Oversight Committee, I want to speak to the relationship between public safety population and TRPA’s claim that Tahoe has a growth cap. Tahoe’s data—which TRPA gives us—we have 55,000 full-time residents; yet during peak summer months, especially July, the average daily population is roughly 280,000 people. With peak days—you know—it is a fivefold population surge. It is huge. It is ten pounds in a five-pound bag—we cannot handle it. We only have two-lane roads on the north shore. It is just absolutely crazy that TRPA is increasing height, density—unlimited density—for certain areas—town centers—with some deed restrictions that only guarantee that we could still have a lot of luxury housing—because there is no income cap. They are not even using the cap Governor Lombardo has suggested of 150 percent, which seems much more reasonable to me. So, the growth cap that they claim they have only counts units—not people—and it does not relate to population or the environment. So, we really need to know what is—I want you to ask the TRPA, how many people are in the Basin on peak days? Who is responsible for their safety? And how can you demonstrate that it will be done safely? TRPA has these things they cannot count—conversions. Motel units could become 6,000-square-foot penthouses, as in the Boulder Bay project. So, you know, it just—it does not make any sense, and they keep continuing to approve these policies—and anything—a growth cap that counts units but ignores people, population, and environmental carrying capacity is not a real growth cap. Thank you. ([Agenda Item II I-1](#)) ([Agenda Item II I-2](#)) ([Agenda Item II I-3](#))

Kristina Hill, Full-time Lake Tahoe Resident:

Good afternoon. I am a former TRPA employee and environmental land use planning consultant with over 40 years of experience and a full-time Lake Tahoe resident since 1980. Over these decades, I have witnessed profound changes at Lake Tahoe and within the TRPA itself. TRPA was the first professional planning agency I worked for after college. I was employed at TRPA in 1981, when the Bi-State Compact was signed into law. The act of Congress required the establishment of environmental thresholds—clear limits intended to protect water, air quality, et cetera. At that time, every project—including code amendments—were required to undergo thorough environmental analysis to ensure that

those thresholds would not be exceeded. In recent years, TRPA has approved over approximately 350 code amendments that reimagine its regulatory structure to allow additional growth. These pro-development code amendments rely heavily on outdated environmental studies, some dating back to 2012. Environmental review is frequently reduced to checklist-style analysis that are wholly inadequate to evaluate the cumulative and long-term impacts of these changes. Public comments from local residents opposing these actions and even legal challenges have been routinely dismissed or ignored. At this point, meaningful internal reform at TRPA appears unlikely. The most effective tool available to the Legislature is financial oversight. I respectfully urge you to consider eliminating or significantly reducing Nevada's contribution to TRPA, until it demonstrates, through independent scientific analysis and transparent accountability, that it can once again be trusted to fulfill its original mandate to protect and preserve Lake Tahoe's unique and irreplaceable environment. Thank you. ([Agenda Item II J](#))

Steven Dolan:

Chair Goulding and Committee members, thank you for hearing our statements. While hiding within the confusion of the U.S. [United States] Congress, TRPA uniquely represents two states. TRPA has opted to favor one of its three mission statements and through media barrages and lobbying has become a bully of behemoth proportions. That original mandate was and is to: (1) manage water quality; (2) protection of the environment; and under the ever-broadening umbrella, (3) improve public interactions. TRPA is increasing density and changing rules to separate business oversight from Nevada residents. These autonomous inventions skirt existing rules originally intended to control business's unfettered expansion, as well as the TRPA's. Washoe County Commissioners, Hill and Garcia, sit on the Governing Board of TRPA. I informed several of the Oversight Committee about last summer's Commissioner's meeting that I attended. I was shocked when legal counsel for the Commissioners informed the four of the five attending Commissioners that because TRPA is the Basin's governing authority, TRPA will override any decision Commissioners make that is counter to TRPA's proposed changes. That is pretty outrageous. Counsel also said, to keep in the good graces of TRPA, the Commissioners might as well vote for additional dwelling units, increased coverage, higher buildings, less parking—even though for years numerous petitions have been submitted with overwhelming disapproval. Counsel's and Commissioners' voiced opinion was if the threat of—over the threat of fire, at least the Commissioners would have a minimal voice in TRPA. Let us keep the Commissioners from falling into the Helsinki syndrome. Thank you.

Chair Goulding:

Thank you.

Scott Tieche:

Good afternoon. Nevada plays an outsized role in overseeing TRPA and that responsibility matters now more than ever. While California contributes more funding, Nevada is the one state with statutory Oversight Committee, and the public is counting on you. Across the Tahoe Basin residents agree on two fundamentals—Lake Tahoe must be protected for future generations, and public safety must come first. TRPA sidesteps wildfire evacuation, insisting it is a local issue, even though fire behavior, traffic flow, and visitor movement ignore jurisdictional lines. An independent study and repeated public testimony called for a Basin-wide evacuation plan with real capacity analysis. We received instead, a press release and so-called living document that is outdated, while density increases and evacuation checkpoints worsen. Shelter in place should be a last resort, not a go-to plan. At the same

time, TRPA promotes development. Nevada's own Secretary of State recently urged a no vote on the Washoe Tahoe Area Plan after hearing residents' concerns. I trust this gives the Committee impetus to further scrutinize said Plan. Oversight means more than just accepting presentations and vision statements, it means demanding real data, real science, and real accountability. TRPA's budget has grown dramatically, yet lake clarity has declined. Public relations is not and cannot substitute for environmental results or public safety. I urge the Committee to insist on substantive environmental reporting, a credible Basin-wide evacuation plan, and transparency about whose interests are driving policy. Nevada's leadership is essential to restoring public trust and to ensuring Tahoe is protected, not exploited and squandered to the benefit of the partners. I appreciate this opportunity. I apologize if anything was said more than once, but hopefully that underscores the public's concerns. Thank you.

Laura Koscki:

We had, on Christmas Day, a ten-car pileup. It was a 55-hour wait, and I really feel that we need to get on the police department. I know it is a holiday, but I am always out there on the holidays to chip in—help out. And I really think we need to put pressure on our police department, and sheriffs, and Caltrans to treat everybody as tourists—not the military, not jail people—that have been in jail and whatnot. This overreach is what I am seeing, and we are not being productive enough and proactive enough to address these issues. O'Reilly sold 35,000 snow chains in one night. And so, to prevent all the spinouts and accidents, we could have just worked with Caltrans in Placerville and had everybody, you know, talk to about having chains before they even came up into the Tahoe area. The roads are a lot better than they were, but we are still inundated with all the tourists and all the traffic. So, you are still having the potholes and the wrecks from the blown-out tires. I do not know if we are going to be able to get a hold of this, or whatnot, but it takes two days to get a tow truck to save you. And these young kids are coming up and they have two-wheel drive—as well as tourists—and they are sliding off. It takes me at least five hours to even get them out and then use Diamond Back chains to help them get out. If we had a display area with the building that actually sold the Diamond Back—where you did not have to get underneath your vehicle—that would help these tourists, as well as the rest of us trying to help out to get them out faster and really work more as a safety unit together. That is what I see is, we are backed up, you know, we are just basically reacting instead of being proactive. Fire insurance—

Chair Goulding:

Thank you.

John Eppolito, Real Estate Broker, North Lake Tahoe:

I am a real estate broker in North Lake Tahoe for 28 years, both states, Nevada and California. For the first 15 years or so that I sold real estate, I told my clients—especially my buyers—this Basin will never be overdeveloped because of TRPA. Unfortunately, I was not telling the truth. I did not realize the TRPA was going to lose their way and focus more on city planning than keeping Lake Tahoe clean. When TRPA's Phase Two Regional Plan was voted on, the highest-ranking elected member of the Governing Board, Secretary of State Cisco Aguilar, voted no. And he told—and he stated, quote, "This Board needs to start listening to the residents of Tahoe." End quote. We are still waiting for that. Hopefully, this Committee will help with that. One of the biggest issues is the cumulative effects of all this development. They cannot get us out in the event of a wildfire. And we have seen these big fires in places that have a lot less fuel than Tahoe and people have died—and it is way

worse in Tahoe because there is less roads. I agree with a lot of what was already said—Alex and Pam Tsigdinos—I think—that is the one—Ann Nichols, Kristina Hill, Steve Dolan, Doug Flaherty. And it is—again, the biggest thing is getting out in the event of wildfire. And one of the things with the cumulative effect that is not being considered and has not come up today is all the development down here in the valley—how that impacts us at the Lake—because on the weekends, where does everybody go when it is hot down here? And, TRPA is working off of—I think it is 2012. Is that what it is? 2012 plans? They have totally ignored all the new development down here and they want to bring in all the new development up there. Please make sure we can get out when there is a wildfire. Thank you.

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

Good afternoon, Chair Goulding, Vice Chair Daly, and the Committee. I am President/CEO of Travel North Tahoe Nevada, but most importantly—and equally importantly—I am a full-time resident of Incline Village and a 35-year resident of the Tahoe Basin—having raised with my wife, our three kids in this great place. First, I would like to thank you for your interest in working on this Committee and your interest and passion for Lake Tahoe. You will hear a lot of passion through these meetings about Tahoe and that is all really good stuff. I first want to talk and thank this Committee for its efforts last session. A number of very important bills came out of—recommended from this Committee; and thank you, Chair Daly, at that time, for that as well. SB 426 was a critical bill for being able to control and manage the recreation corridors within the Nevada side of the Tahoe Basin. Given the Tahoe Transportation District working with local jurisdictions, the ability to manage those corridors, as we begin to finish the parking lots at the Spooner end and the north end, providing transit connections, and then pulling those cars off the road. As you know, if you have driven up there in the summertime, that it is quite—it is not a fun drive down there. I also want to thank this Committee for SB 420, which was enabling language for Business Improvement District. We did not quite get that to the finish line. We look forward to working with both this Committee and members of this Committee directly on what that might look like for this coming session. This enabling language would allow businesses to self-assess and generate revenue specifically to be targeted towards the needs of the jurisdiction, transportation, visitor impact mitigation, downtown beautification, and economic development. So, I want to—we look forward to working with this Committee and the TRPA, and the Committee at-large, and thank you for your support and interest. Thank you.

Chair Goulding:

Thank you. Thank you to all who have commented. Does anybody else want to approach the table? Do we have any other callers on the line?

AVH:

Your public line is open and working, but you have no more callers wishing to provide comment at this time.

Chair Goulding:

Okay, thank you. Thank you all for your comments. We appreciate them, and it is critical to the process that you show up and share your thoughts and feelings. Thank you for that. And with that, now we have the opportunity to move on to the next item on our agenda.

AGENDA ITEM III—OVERVIEW OF COMMITTEE’S STATUTORY DUTIES AND SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE 2023–2024 INTERIM

Chair Goulding:

Our first order of business is an overview of the Committee presented to us by our Committee Policy Analyst, Ms. King. Ms. King, will you proceed when ready?

Ms. King:

Thank you, Chair Goulding. I have the pleasure of serving as the Committee's Policy Analyst this interim. So, I have prepared a brief Committee overview ([Agenda Item III](#)), and that overview is available on the Committee's webpage and in members' meeting packets. The overview provides historical information, meeting dates, an overview of the duties and voting requirements of the Committee, as well as summaries of the Committee's recommendations for legislation from last interim. The overview also includes a list of Committee staff and contact information. I will go over a few of these items right now, but please know that I am always available to Committee members if you have any questions later.

On page 1, we have an introduction that provides some historical information. To summarize, since 1985, the Nevada Legislature has exercised review and oversight of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, or TRPA, through interim studies and, since 2003, through this statutorily created Committee. When the Committee was established, it replaced the former Marlette Lake Water System Advisory Committee and was codified in NRS 218E.555 as a dual-purpose oversight body. And more recently, Senate Bill 226 of the 2025 Session revised the membership and leadership structure of the Committee. The Committee now consists of eight members and five alternate members, and the Committee's Chair and Vice Chair are appointed by the Legislative Commission, rather than by election at the first meeting, as was done in the past. Also on page 1, you can see a list of Committee members and alternates.

And then moving to page 2, we have the powers and duties of the Committee. The general duties of the Committee, as set forth in statute, are to provide appropriate review and oversight of the TRPA and the Marlette Lake Water System, or MLWS; review the budget programs, activities, responsiveness, and accountability of the TRPA and the MLWS in such a manner as deemed necessary and appropriate by the Committee; study the role, authority, and activities of the TRPA regarding the Tahoe Basin and the MLWS regarding Marlette Lake; and to continue to communicate with members of the California Legislature to achieve the goals set forth in the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact.

The Committee can submit up to ten bill draft requests, or BDRs. Those BDRs must relate to matters within the scope of the Committee, and they must be submitted by September 1st, meaning the Committee must complete its work by August 31st. The Committee has been budgeted to hold up to six meetings during the interim. The dates for those meetings are February 27th, April 10th, May 29th, July 10th, and August 14th, which will be the Committee's final meeting and work session. And these meeting dates can be found on the Committee's website. So, last interim, the Committee's focus included topics such as MLWS capital improvement projects, as well as affordable housing, forest health, transportation, and water quality in the Tahoe Basin.

On page 3 is a table listing the eight legislative measures recommended by the Committee during the 2023–2024 Interim. Of the eight measures, six were passed and signed into law; one was passed but vetoed by the Governor; and one did not pass the deadline. The Committee's first BDR became Senate Bill 106, which prohibits operating a watercraft faster than five nautical miles per hour within 600 feet of Lake Tahoe's shoreline. This measure passed. The second BDR became Senate Bill 420. This bill would have authorized certain cities and counties to form Business Improvement Districts to provide funding for transportation, housing, and the mitigation of visitor activities in the Tahoe Basin. The bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Finance, where it did not receive a hearing and did not pass the deadline. The Committee's third BDR became Senate Bill 99, which passed but was ultimately vetoed by the Governor. This bill would have authorized a city or county located in the Lake Tahoe region and governed by the TRPA to impose a linkage fee on the development, construction, or remodeling of certain residential properties in order to pay for certain expenses related to the development of affordable housing. The Governor's veto message can be found on the Governor's website and also by clicking the link in the table if you are looking at the electronic version of the overview. The fourth BDR became Senate Bill 426, which passed. This bill creates the Lake Tahoe Basin Scenic Byway Corridor Recreation Safety Zone. The fifth BDR became Senate Bill 10, which revises reporting requirements for the State Land Registrar and the State Forester Firewarden. And this measure passed. The sixth BDR became Senate Bill 83, which also passed. This measure authorized the release of \$10.5 million in general obligation bonds to continue the implementation of Nevada's portion of the Lake Tahoe Environmental Improvement Program—also known as the EIP—for the 2025–2027 Biennium. And representatives from the Division of State Lands will be providing a presentation today to provide more information regarding the Lake Tahoe EIP. The seventh BDR became Assembly Bill 86, which passed. This bill removed the requirement to obtain a logging permit for a cutting operation. And finally, the Committee's eighth BDR became Assembly Bill 8. This bill exempts the Division of State Parks from the requirement to deposit public money of \$10,000 or more accumulated during any day by the next working day and instead requires the Division to deposit the money within ten working days.

Last interim, the Committee also requested sending multiple letters to various entities. These letters can be found on the Committee's overview page for the 2023–2024 Interim. All of these recommendations, including the legislative measures, can be found in the Committee Summary Report, which is located on the Committee's interim webpage from last interim. And below the table, you will find the statutorily required reports that are submitted to the Legislature that may be of particular interest to our Committee members. And below that you can find staff information. So, please do not hesitate to contact me if you would like assistance in acquiring these reports, or if you need assistance with any of the issues related to the matters that come before this Committee. Thank you, Chair Goulding and Committee members, that concludes my summary of the overview, and I would be happy to answer any questions.

Chair Goulding:

Committee, do we have any questions? Committee members? Senator.

Senator Titus:

Thank you, Chair; and thank you for that report. I think it is really important to point out that although we had ten possible BDRs, we only used eight. I like small government; so, I was happy about that. The second point about—of the eight, we actually passed six; and that just points to the work that this Committee did with our Chair to make it

bipartisan—what was best for Tahoe region. I just want to acknowledge the good work that our Chair did last session. Thank you. And hopefully we continue to show that and maybe we can get ten out of ten, although I do not like that big government—maybe eight out of ten—or even seven out of seven—would all be fine. The point of the story is though that we have to work together—listen to everybody—and we have an opportunity to do good stuff for Lake Tahoe. Thank you.

Chair Goulding:

Any other questions? Thank you, Senator. You have set the bar high—you have set a goal for us now. With that, seeing no other questions, we will move on to our first—our presentation by TRPA.

AGENDA ITEM IV—OVERVIEW PRESENTATION BY THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

Chair Goulding:

We have Julie Regan and Mr. Middlebrook. Please begin when ready.

Julie Regan, Executive Director, TRPA:

Good afternoon, Chair Goulding, Vice Chair Daly, Committee members, staff, members of the public. Joining me here at the dais today, as noted, is Devin Middlebrook, who is TRPA's Government Affairs Manager. And in the audience, we have many staff members, including our General Counsel, Graham St. Michel; and our Board member, Shelly Aldean, who has served on the TRPA Governing Board as Carson City's representative for more than 23 years with great distinction. I am very delighted to see Shelly in the audience.

While we are not meeting at the Lake today, I want to be the first to say welcome to Team Tahoe. To the returning Committee members, thank you for joining us again. And for new members of the Committee, we very much look forward to sharing Tahoe with all of you. As noted in Ms. King's very insightful report, since '85 the Nevada Legislature has worked directly with the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, either through interim studies or this statutory Committee created in '03. I have had the privilege, in my 22 years at TRPA, for working with the Oversight Committee over the last two decades. This Committee does indeed play a key role in the continued protection of Lake Tahoe. Collectively, the six Committee bills that you just heard about became law following the 83rd Nevada Legislative Session.

Our presentation today will introduce—or reintroduce—the returning members, a bit about our work since the last interim and session, and preview some topics the Committee will hear about throughout the year. ([Agenda Item IV](#)) Just to ground us right out of the beginning here—at 2.3 million years old, Lake Tahoe is the oldest lake in North America and the third oldest in the world. Volcanoes and plate tectonics, glaciers, earthquakes, and seiche waves, even—you know, lake tsunamis—shaped the landscape of our precious Lake across the millennia, creating one of the clearest lakes in the world.

The Washoe people have called Tahoe home since the beginning of time. Lake Tahoe is actually a mispronunciation of the Washoe word for lake—dá?aw. Today, the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California, as they are known, continue to protect and preserve their homelands. You will hear more from the Tribe at the next meeting and throughout the interim. I want to emphasize the importance of TRPA's partnership with the Tribe. We have

so much to learn from them about how to steward the Lake and our region. I am very proud of our collaborative relationship with the Tribe.

Moving on to Tahoe's more modern history. It is a story, as many of you know, of discovery, of resource extraction, unplanned development, and finally environmental and community resilience. Tahoe received relatively little attention prior to the discovery of the Comstock Lode in nearby Virginia City in 1859. To supply lumber to the mines, roughly 70 percent of the Tahoe Basin's forests were clear-cut over several decades. The Marlette Lake Dam was first constructed in 1874 to supply water and flume logs to Virginia City.

So, following this period of widespread logging, Tahoe receded from the national psyche, and the forests grew back. The Tahoe regrowth—the forest regrowth occurred during an era of fire suppression policies. Today's forests, as a result, are overly dense, putting them at high risk of droughts, beetle outbreaks, and catastrophic wildfire. The risk of wildfire and evacuation is a top concern that we hear from the public—as you did today. I am very much looking forward to diving into that issue in the February meeting. I just want those who took the time to testify today, in person and on the phone, that we at TRPA absolutely hear this concern and we share this concern, as people who have been in the community and affected by previous wildfires—our staff, our Board members, et cetera.

The 1960 Winter Olympics—moving on to a big milestone in the history of the Basin—happened at Palisades Ski Resort on the north shore in Olympic Valley. It did put Tahoe on the international map. A development boom ensued, with no thought given to environmental protection and the long-term sustainability of this national treasure. Plans then called for the region to grow to the size of San Francisco, complete with a multi-lane freeway circling the Basin and a bridge across the mouth of Emerald Bay—as you can see in this historic rendering at the time. In response to the plans, in 1969, Nevada and California came together and established our agency, TRPA, with the consent of Congress through a very unique Bi-State Compact. And today we remain one of the nation's most unique and unprecedented deliverer of environmental protection and growth management. Novel at the time, our authority was intentionally set to a watershed level, spanning across state lines to take a holistic approach to planning for the region. Now, more than 55 years later, our region has changed, but there is no bridge over Emerald Bay and instead of freeways, which were originally envisioned, the Rim Trail sits atop the mountains ringing the Lake. We are so fortunate to have that asset.

We have heard a lot about development. So, we wanted to talk about the history and timeline of development. At the time of the 1960 Olympics—think about this, it is a little hard to imagine—there were 5,000 homes in the region. By the time our Compact was signed, just a decade later, that number of homes had doubled and the bar charts tell a story by these increments of time. TRPA was formed to address this problem by slowing and managing development in the region. As you can see on the slide—although it may be a little hard to read—the vision of our watershed-based collaborative governance that led to the formation of TRPA did not immediately solve this growth problem. The pace of development continued to accelerate in the 1970s and '80s—and that is the largest bar horizontally. During this period, the region was building nearly 5,000 new homes every 4 years. In less than 30 years, the number of homes in the region increased sixfold; and then, in 1987, it all changed.

The result of intense collaboration between local, state, and federal partners, our '87 Regional Plan was a watershed moment for the Tahoe Region and the notion of regional environmental protection. The 1987 Regional Plan contained the first agreed-upon growth

management system that still limits the amount, pace, and location of development in the region. It placed limits on the number of new homes, hotel rooms, campsites, and new commercial floor area that could be built. Regional plan policies, code, stormwater management requirements, and design standards ensure new development is consistent with the region's environmental standards. Finally, the regional plan also provides local governments, with which there are several, with community-focused area plans, allowing them to meet their specific needs all while rolling up to regional goals.

In the two decades following the adoption of that '87 plan, the pace of new development was more than about 300 homes per year. But over the most recent decades—and the smaller bars at the lower portion of the graph—that pace has slowed significantly with roughly 80 homes added per year. And as noted in testimony, our year-round population today is around 55,000 people—full-time residents—on the north and south shores—California, Nevada combined. Yet in the year 2000, that number was over 60,000; so, we have actually lost full-time population over the last 25 years. The Regional Plan succeeded in bringing more orderly growth and development to the region, but it did not address how to address the legacy patterns of development of the past. And many of you have driven around Tahoe seeing aging, vacant hotels; blighted properties; buildings that are poorly located in meadows or other sensitive areas. A major update to the Regional Plan in 2012 responded to this challenge by creating a suite of incentives to remove development from environmentally-sensitive lands. Our goal is to redirect growth from the early sprawl of Tahoe's development into town centers, supporting more vibrant and connected communities close to transit. So, thank you for walking back in time because it truly does inform the policies of today.

As TRPA embarked on implementing the new regional plan, our states and federal government played a pivotal role in changing the development trajectory for the Basin. In a coordinated and parallel effort—importantly—the two states and federal government began acquiring land in the region to spare it from development, protect open space, and ensure public access for the future. In 1960, 50 percent of the Basin was publicly owned, by the '70s that had grown to 70 percent, and today, it is at 90 percent. The federal government is the largest landowner, with nearly 80 percent of the land managed by the U.S. Forest Service. The State of Nevada owns and manages some of Tahoe's most beautiful recreation and natural areas, including Sand Harbor, Spooner Lake, Van Sickle Bi-State Park. The remaining 10 percent of Tahoe's land is privately owned and falls under the management and oversight of our Regional Plan.

We measure success of the Regional Plan by our continued ability to plan and manage development, enforce our Regional Plan components, but also to restore past development and damage that happened on the landscape long before we had these measures in place. TRPA has approved more than 300 of the environmentally-beneficial transfers of development that restore damage from the past. The Agency ensures private development directly funds environmental projects through collection of mitigation fees—and this is part of the public-private partnerships that exist in the Basin. From 2021 to 2025, TRPA collected these fees and then distributed them back to local governments to the tune of \$15 million in mitigation funds to directly go for environmental projects across the region in the local jurisdictions where those fees were collected. The Regional Plan is also supporting local housing with 173 deed-restricted units built and 65 accessory dwelling units permitted since the 2012 update of the Plan.

Turning to transportation, of which the community is rightly concerned. In addition to our land use planning authority at TRPA, we also serve as what is called the Metropolitan Planning Organization—we love our acronyms—or MPO for the region. Our Compact also

created the Tahoe Transportation District, who is tasked with implementing the regionally significant transportation programs and capital investments. TRPA's Regional Transportation Plan is updated on a four-year cycle, which our Board just adopted an update to last year. It is called Connections 2050. It contains 90 projects focused on improving transit, trails, town centers, and technology—our four "T's." The update ensures that transportation policies also protect Lake Tahoe, improve safety, provide recreation access to our public lands, serve our local residents, and support businesses. The Plan also incorporates input from more than 10,000 participants, who we reached out to with surveys, presentations, workshops, and events. Feedback that we received included the dire need to improve safety for all users of our transportation system. Serious concerns about safe evacuations during emergencies like wildfire, the need for more transit options in the region, better parking management, new technologies to manage traffic congestion, and more funding for road and trail maintenance—all of which are addressed in our Transportation Plan.

We have made progress toward achieving these goals in the last five years. In 2024 alone, TRPA allocated \$70 million in funding for transportation projects to those implementing those projects. Just last year, 13 transportation projects—implemented by a variety of partner agencies—began construction. Several projects were completed last year, and the rest are scheduled to be finished in the upcoming construction season—because we only have two seasons at Tahoe—winter and construction. Nevada transportation projects include the construction of a new parking lot at Chimney Beach. This parking lot is a key component of the State Route 28 corridor plan, with a goal of not creating more parking but instead removing the dangerous roadside parking on Highway 28 and relocating it off the highway. Next, we have the full rehabilitation of U.S. 50—implemented by NDOT [Nevada's Department of Transportation]—to repair old pavement, improve safety, install broadband, expand stormwater infrastructure to clean that runoff as it comes off the highways—all without reducing the number of travel lanes, a key community concern related to fire evacuation. Also, Douglas County is involved with the construction of Kahle Complete Streets and that will underground power lines, upgrade the roads, provide new bike and pedestrian access to connect residents to transit and nearby Nevada Beach, and to restore wetlands on the Forest Service land adjacent.

That is a perfect segue to our Environmental Improvement Program, which you will hear more from our partners with the State of Nevada. A little background to ground you before that presentation—as many of you remember, in the 1990s, scientists began sounding the alarm that our Lake clarity was declining, despite all the actions that we had taken on the regulatory side in our new Regional Plan. Researchers pointed to find sediments washing into the Lake from roads and urbanized areas that lack stormwater infrastructure. It became clear that regulation alone would not suffice. Proactive capital investment and collaboration across the region would be required to address the threat of losing the Lake. In 1997, the Environmental Improvement Program, or the EIP—as we call it, was created to do just that. From restoring meadows to improving bike and pedestrian paths, the EIP drives investments in projects that protect water quality, reduce fire risk, restore ecosystems, and support sustainable recreation. More than 80 public and private partners, collectively known as Team Tahoe are working together across state lines to restore and protect the Lake. You will receive a more in-depth presentation about it at your next meeting as well, but hopefully this background will give you some important context. Since the EIP was launched in 1997, at our first presidential summit, more than 850 projects have been implemented in the four EIP focus areas. We are going to dig into all four focus areas throughout this interim, but just quickly to run through the four.

Watersheds and water quality—this covers urban stormwater projects all the way to restoration of meadows that were developed and re-meandering rivers. These projects are designed to reduce the pollutants before they flow into Lake Tahoe.

In the area of forest health, land managers are thinning forest, restoring wildlife habitat, and making neighborhoods safer across the Tahoe Basin—because healthy forests mean safer communities.

In the area of sustainable recreation and transportation—we are improving recreation infrastructure with partners and the transportation systems to benefit not those of us who have the good fortune to be in the region and enjoy these recreational activities, but also those visiting our precious environment. And all of these programs and policies are based on the best available science.

And the science, stewardship, and accountability focus area is very much based on performance measures that inform the work of our partners and ground this in the knowledge of the public, and how to foster their communication, understanding, and awareness of what the projects are going on around.

A few words just about progress—very proud of the progress of our Team Tahoe partners in those areas—they are extensive. A quick snapshot which is available online on our Tahoe Tracker—the EIP tracker. We have constructed more than 200 miles of bike and pedestrian trails to reduce traffic and improve air quality. And these accomplishments are reflected across the partnership, certainly not TRPA alone. We have collectively prevented more than 500,000 pounds of sediments running into the Lake, helping stabilize lake clarity—which happened starting in the year 2000—through stormwater and other investments in water quality. Our partners—collectively, in this partnership with the Tahoe Resource Conservation District is very integral to our Aquatic Invasive Species Program, which is renowned throughout the country. Overall—inspected more than 100,000 boats before they launched to make sure we are not introducing new aquatic invasive species.

All of this is leveraging 60 years of research and monitoring to support our decisions. And importantly, since the first Summit, our partners have treated more than 100,000 acres to reduce hazardous fuels in the Basin. All of this is done in a shared funding framework that is known around the country from federal, state, local, and private sector investments to get the work done. I will note that the money that has been amassed in this restoration program flows to implementing agencies—so the vast majority to the Forest Service—but across that partnership of 80 organizations, everyone is rowing in the direction to achieve our overall standards and environmental thresholds.

A quick piece of our internal operations—we have an incredibly talented staff that are the backbone of that Team Tahoe Partnership for the EIP. And we have an annual work plan that is adopted by our 15-member Governing Board. Our core activities in each department to uphold the Bi-State Compact and implement our Regional Plan are laid out in this detailed work plan. Additionally, we set strategic priorities to direct staff time to areas that need attention, based on our environmental threshold evaluation and community feedback. Our four strategic priorities are forest health and wildfire, lake and watershed restoration, housing, and transportation. We are funded by a variety of sources, including appropriations from both states, permitting fees, competitive grants. I really truly want to thank this Committee and the Nevada Legislature for their support for the TRPA budget in the previous

two Nevada biennium budgets—returning to that historic one-third, two-third share with California. I will note there are considerable grants that are passing through TRPA to project implementers. And we would be happy to dig into that if the Committee so desires—a deeper dive on the budget.

Just a couple more slides here about community engagement because that is the crux of how we hear from our residents—very proud of the work that we have done over the last year since the last interim and the session. In the next couple of slides, I will just give a couple of examples. Our community engagement is central to all that we do at TRPA. Our planners are fielding phone calls, constantly meeting with applicants, meeting with the public with inquiries, conducting field visits, site tours, compliance assignments—across the Basin. Our website, LakeTahoeInfo.org, is also available and in the spirit of transparency available for many parcel-level data questions, as well as the condition of the environmental threshold standards. To reach residents more broadly, we produce *Tahoe In Depth*, a newspaper mailed to every homeowner in the entire Tahoe Basin and distributed around the Basin and surrounding areas. We also convene community meetings and working groups on specific initiatives. For example, our Tahoe Living Working Group has engaged hundreds and thousands of people over the last couple of years talking about housing affordability in the Basin.

I have covered a lot of ground. So, the next slide really is meant to pause—to oblige a request from the Chair—to have a little fun with Lake Tahoe and have a fun fact. If we could have that slide. Lake Tahoe is deep, I just wanted to share—as many of you know—in fact, the bottom of the Lake is lower in elevation than where we are sitting right here in Carson City. A little comparison for our Legislators in Las Vegas, you can see just how deep the Lake is—the Empire State Building would go down all the way to the bottom, and the Lake would still be above it. So, just a quick reset for the last couple of slides, and then I would be happy to take questions.

Back to business, as you heard from Ms. King at the start of this Committee, the interim oversight session was very productive. I too want to echo our thanks at TRPA to former Chair Daly for his leadership, and welcome Chair Goulding in the interim going forward. We are very proud of the work to make our highways safer and more accessible to recreation access. We are very thankful that we were able to reconfirm our 600-foot no-wake zone, which is very important to the protection of Lake Tahoe shoreline—from an erosion standpoint, from a wildlife habitat perspective, and importantly, for safety—reducing conflicts between boaters and paddle craft. We also supported our Nevada counterparts in the State of Nevada to endorse the Environmental Improvement Program bonds, which are integral to the Nevada share of the EIP. Our team is already busy working on bill implementation, and we are also working with our California legislative representatives to bring forward companion legislation to address safety issues around the Emerald Bay corridor and the 600-foot no-wake zone.

The Committee also sent three letters to TRPA requesting additional information and offering input for our consideration. A few updates regarding the letters—the first letter requested an update on the environmental analysis conducted for the 2012 Regional Plan, TRPA’s threshold standards, and other environmental updates. While we often refer to the Regional Plan update as 2012, it is actually a programmatic document that spans more than 20 years—a 20-year horizon. When reviewing proposed projects, TRPA considers whether a project is consistent with the plan, potential environmental impacts, and if additional analysis is needed. TRPA has and continues to update the plan as needed to ensure that we do not get out of date with issues and that we are relying on best available science. For example, in 2018, TRPA updated the shoreland ordinances and shoreline policies of the

Region Plan, which governs how many buoys and piers are allowed on the Lake and regulations to harmonize uses. A full public engagement process, over many years, was part of that and a full Environmental Impact Statement was conducted then as part of the work. The next significant update to the Regional Plan is now underway through our Tahoe Living Strategic Initiative to address the housing crisis, where the majority of our region's workforce can no longer afford to live in the Basin. TRPA will produce recommended amendments to the Regional Plan and *Code of Ordinances*, with technical analysis and robust community engagement. TRPA is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement, EIS, using our current baseline conditions to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of policy changes. And in fact, next week at our Governing Board meeting, Wednesday the 28th, we will be scoping that environmental document, and we welcome public input in that process.

There were questions in letters around—in the same letter—regarding our threshold standards. The term *environmental threshold carrying capacity* has been mentioned and it comes directly from the Bi-State Compact. While the term may sound complex, it is very simple in terms of the conceptual arrangement of carrying capacities. These are the big collective goals, like restoring 100 feet of clarity to the Lake, that TRPA and partner agencies are working to achieve. At the core of the threshold standards is accountability. The ten categories that we have in terms of thresholds are pictured on the slide. I want to point out that the threshold standards are not ours alone and that the Compact requires all local agencies and jurisdictions to achieve these thresholds. Consistent with the Compact, we regularly report on the status of the threshold attainment, which began in 1991. We completed the most recent threshold evaluation last year for data collected through 2023. At a high level, the evaluation found that 79 percent of measurable thresholds were in attainment. It highlighted some specific goals, but one that is worth noting is that the Basin partnership collectively achieved the threshold for our wetland and stream zone restoration target that was set 40 years ago. And also, emerging challenges were documented, such as the impact of wildfire smoke on air and water quality.

The most recent threshold evaluation was peer reviewed by independent scientists, which we presented to our Governing Board last year. Peer review is essential to the scientific process because it helps ensure the methodology and findings are accurate, credible, and sound. We are fortunate to have the Tahoe Science Advisory Council in place, a group of 12 scientists from leading academic and research institutions in the region. The Science Council led the independent peer review of the report, and everything is available online. TRPA has always used the findings of the threshold evaluation to identify what is working, what is not working, and to prioritize its work. We asked the public what they thought were the most important findings as well and very much increased the public accountability as part of that process by engaging the community in the discussion over the last year and a half. One recurring theme we heard was not only to maintain progress made so far on forest health and community wildfire protection, but to double down on it. We elevated that to a strategic priority in our work plan, and I am pleased to report that next month our Board will be considering updates to the forest health threshold standards.

Another letter discussed the Committee's interest in us establishing a priority matrix for decision making process. The result was a timely one. As I mentioned, we completed our threshold evaluation report last year and that reporting process is critical for us, because it provides the grounding for the Agency's Basin priorities for the next four years. During that extensive outreach—as I mentioned—a top priority that we heard was consistent with the

priority matrix—the preservation, protection, and restoration of the Lake. I want to assure you that our Governing Board took that direction to heart and we elevated, in our strategic priorities, the role of lake and watershed restoration, forest health, as well as sustainable recreation and transportation and housing. We can go into a deeper dive in future meetings as well if the Committee so desires.

Lastly, a lot has come up in the Tahoe Blue Event Center in this meeting. The final letter requested that TRPA consider exempting local events from a permit-driven event cap at the Event Center. The Event Center is located just on the south shore at Stateline in the casino corridor and opened in September of '23. The 5,200-seat event and conference center hosts a minor league hockey team. It hosts concerts and conferences and local events like fundraisers. TRPA required a permit and environmental analysis for the project, which included requirements to mitigate vehicle trips, fund transit in the area, and monitor project success. Additionally, TRPA placed an overall event cap of 130 events over 220 days to ensure the Stateline area was not overrun with traffic.

After the first year of Event Center operations, community members and Douglas County expressed concern about the events cap unfairly preventing small local events from taking place at the new Event Center. These concerns were expressed to this interim Committee and resulting in the letter. At the same time, TRPA was already working on these issues and—as well as incomplete implementation of permit monitoring requirements. After robust discussion with the Event Center and stakeholders, the County, our Board adopted a settlement agreement that maintains the core permit condition with no additional new traffic, unmitigated, while providing the Event Center with greater flexibility to host local events for the community. The thoughtful engagement on the Event Center permit is a good example of how collaboration works at Tahoe. I am pleased that we could be responsive to this Committee. The Event Center is generating more than a million dollars in contributions to local micro/mass transit in the form of the Lake Link service.

As we look forward to the upcoming interim session, the topics and speakers at each meeting will explore many aspects of Lake Tahoe, the greater partnership, and our Environmental Improvement Program. Through each topic, you will learn the history, current actions, challenges, community needs, and where we will need your help. We are looking forward to next month's discussion on forest health, wildfire prevention, and evacuation planning. This is one of, if not the top, concerns that we hear from residents and the community, broadly speaking. Other important topics abound, including transportation, sustainable recreation, lake clarity, aquatic invasive species. We look forward to working with you on these very, very important issues. Nevada has always been a key partner, leader, implementer, and funder of the work at Tahoe. Our Agency looks forward to working with you all to collectively solve these problems, and to continue this generation of protecting Lake Tahoe for the future. I will now turn it back to Chair Goulding, and we would be happy to answer any questions.

Chair Goulding:

Thank you for that very robust report—appreciate it. Committee members? Yes, go ahead.

Assemblymember DeLong:

Thank you, Chair. I actually have two questions, if I may. The first one is more of a technical one. Under the transportation section you discussed, how is the “smart data” collected?

Executive Director Regan:

Thank you for the question, Assemblymember DeLong. The smart data is actually a really fascinating program. Our staff, in the science and data team at TRPA, provide a lot of the backbone data that we collect in our normal course of business. The Tahoe Transportation District was the implementer of that grant program—applied for the funds to do that. I will tell you one example that I showed to our Board just a couple of months ago—was in action of smart cameras that were around a roundabout in the Meyers area of South Lake Tahoe as you come in on Highway 50. That data was able to show that people were going the wrong way around the roundabout, and immediately in the transportation districts, you know, urgency to Caltrans, they were able to fix that situation. They have actually applied for additional funds to deploy those cameras to help us better manage congestion and traffic flow, and Devin Middlebrook may have more information for you.

Devin Middlebrook, Government Affairs Manager, TRPA:

The data collection is through camera systems. So, the state DOTs on both sides of the Lake have existing cameras that they are able to get data from there. The Tahoe Transportation District, as Julie mentioned, also has this mobile camera trailer they can put in areas where there are gaps in that state DOT system, and no personal data or license plate data is kept to identify any individuals through that process.

Assemblymember DeLong:

Thank you. My second question has to do with the Regional Plan. How does TRPA view that, the Regional Plan, relative to—at least in Nevada, I am not going to speak for the California side—the relationship with the various county land use plans, particularly in light of NRS 278.822.

Executive Director Regan:

Thank you for the question, Assemblymember. The Regional Plan sets regional parameters; and the Compact is very clear that the Regional Plan is also to be harmonized with state law. We have California and Nevada and then we have local jurisdictions. It is a brilliant part of the original legislative statutory authority for Tahoe. In that, whatever is stricter of the two applies in certain situations. The Regional Plan has evolved over the years, and a very big focus of the 2012 update was to develop what are called area plans. If you think of it like a regional planning entity, like the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Authority, you have regional standards, but you also have local area plans where very specific conditions on the ground by a community can be adopted. We had actual hundreds of what we call plan area statements and community plans before the 2012 plan. It was very confusing to understand the zoning in each area. So, the concept of the area plans is that local jurisdictions like Washoe County, Douglas County, which are going through their area planning processes, could customize them to meet their needs, but all while meeting the overall regional goals and standards. It is designed to work together, but to give local jurisdictions more flexibility, because we recognize that the Stateline area in the casino core is very different than Incline Village, which is very different than Tahoe City and Meyers in El Dorado County. Local jurisdictions all have a seat on our Governing Board, and that is very much a part of how we harmonize the statewide interests in the Compact, as well as the local jurisdictional interests. And then we have through the area plans, with certain

jurisdictions, we have memorandum of understanding and delegation of permitting authority, so that it, in many cases, depending on the jurisdiction, people have one-stop shopping to do—to have efficiency in how projects get managed. That varies by jurisdiction. But in many cases, a lot of residential permitting is handled at the local level, in some jurisdictions.

Assemblymember DeLong:

Thank you for that. Thank you, Chair.

Chair Goulding:

Any other questions from Committee members? Senator.

Senator Titus:

Thank you, Chair; and thank you, Director, for that thorough update. I have two questions that I might—Madam Chair. First, you mentioned that there has been a decrease in people who consider the Tahoe Basin permanent residence, from 60,000—its highest—to about 55,000 now. Is that difference in 5,000—did the actual housing capacity change, or is there about 5,000 homes that are now rentals or vacation homes, et cetera? How do you count—factor that in?

Executive Director Regan:

Thank you for the question, Senator Titus. Really interesting. The census of 2000, I think it was about 64,000, roughly 63-64,000. We lost one in four jobs between 2000-2010, actually, because of the decline of gaming. If you recall what was happening in California, Governor Schwarzenegger negotiated treaties, and Native American gaming came online. The same thing happened in Reno. We started hemorrhaging jobs because casinos were losing business and that business has never come back. We had a lot of people—we had schools closing, we lost a lot of population in that first decade, and we have not rebounded to that. I would also say during that same period was the rise of technology. Before—there have always been, you know, at least 50 percent of homes that were second homes, or part-time residents, managed by a vacation home accommodation services, property managers. What changed also, in more recent years, is that you can book Airbnb on your phone, you can go to Vrbo, and it has completely changed how people travel—how families travel, with multiple families staying in homes. We also had a rise of vacation home rentals. So, the permanent population has changed. We have gone further in second homes, and it varies around the Lake. I would say in Placer County on the North Shore, there are some areas that are maybe 70 or 80 percent part-time residents—so a very small year-round population. It really ebbs and flows. On the Nevada side, I would say it probably hues closer to maybe 55 percent second homes, or part-time residents, versus full-time. And people are using their properties differently. We saw during the Zoom town, boomtown period of COVID, more people that occupied their homes part-time at previously, were able to telecommute. And while that dropped off a bit with more back-to-the-office work requirements, we still are seeing more telecommuting from residents that maybe were here only on the weekends. People are extending their stay—so that the visitor and part-time homeowner has—patterns have shifted—and our Agency is really tracking that, with other local jurisdictions who are also working on those issues.

Senator Titus:

A follow-up, Madam Chair. Along that same idea, the demographics have also changed. I mean, I am acutely aware of the concerns in Douglas County, which I represent. I am sure just about every county in Nevada, we have seen a decline in population of students. But it is really striking in Douglas County and the impact there. So, when you say the 55,000 people—will we ultimately see a difference in the demographics of who absolutely live there? Will that be in another presentation, or can you get that to us?

Executive Director Regan:

Senator, thank you for the question—happy to dive deeper. Our staff has actually done a really thorough analysis for our science and data team because what has also shifted during the same period, which is fascinating, is that visitor patterns have shifted and that compounds congestion. People in the heyday of the casinos used to drive to Stateline, park in very large parking lots, stay in hotels. During—even before COVID, the rise of outdoor recreation was going through the roof. People who had never gone outdoors, particularly, maybe they would be more inclined to go to amusement parks, or other forms of entertainment, discovered the great outdoors. They started coming to Tahoe. We are seeing more congestion on our corridors and our recreation sites, our public lands, and all of that affects how we manage transportation. But, happy to do a deeper dive on those population statistics for you.

Senator Titus:

Final question, I promise, Madam Chair, at least for now. One of the things that—I have been on this Committee many times—and one of the things that we do not get enough of, I think, is how we are limited based the fact that we are a bi-state agent, we represent only the Nevada side, although it is controlled through your group, all through with multiple municipalities and forms of government, at least three counties on the Nevada side, and let alone on the California side. I think it is important—maybe you should do some clarity of what we can actually do on this Committee, because I think last time we talked a lot about what we could do to change some of the things we wanted to do, and how we would have to reach out to California. I think it is a little frustrating that we cannot move all the rocks and trees and all because what—we are absolutely impacted by what California agrees. I know you cannot answer that right now, but I would like you to answer, what reporting do you do to the State of California? And do you—do they have a committee like Nevada does? How accountable are you to the California side? Thank you.

Executive Director Regan:

Thank you, Senator, happy to answer the question. I think you have hit the inherent fascinating legislation of what is the Compact. We have two states consented by Congress. So, we have State Legislature in California, in Nevada. Our federal congressional delegation. We have six local jurisdictions—and they all have a seat on our Board, and the Governing Board reflects the makeup of that. We are charged with harmonizing the rules and regulations from both of those states and the local governments, and there are conflicts sometimes. Sometimes a law will pass in one state or the other, and we have to sort it out locally.

A good example of that is accessory dwelling units. The State of California has passed a lot of housing bills that were different in terms of how they would be implemented than we do things in Tahoe. We have worked with our stakeholders to harmonize that, and that is part of the work that our Board has been doing with housing and our Tahoe Living Working

Group over the last several years. We do report to the California—both the—through the administration, just as we do here, through the California Natural Resources Agency, in regular meetings with Secretary Wade Crowfoot. We make presentations in the California Legislature. Actually, the California Legislature did establish a Tahoe Committee—a committee to protect Lake Tahoe. It never was funded for meetings and staff, and it never got off the ground; so, it sunsetted. We actually did not have the opportunity to do that, but we constantly work in Sacramento. Devin has made many presentations in the Legislature and perhaps he would like to elaborate on that.

Mr. Middlebrook:

I would just also note, in addition to everything Ms. Regan said, the California Legislature also has direct appointees to TRPA's Governing Board versus Nevada's makeup is a little bit different. So, there are direct appointees from Legislature on our Board. That is another direct avenue of legislative oversight for TRPA.

Chair Goulding:

Assemblymember Moore.

Assemblymember Moore:

Thank you, Chair, and thank you for the presentation. I do have a question regarding the grants. You have listed \$15.3 million in grants. I am curious to know if the majority of these grants are federal grants, state grants, multi-year—if you can give us some details on what these grants are. Thank you.

Executive Director Regan:

Thank you, Assemblymember Moore, for the question. Yes—great question—the majority of those grants are federal grants. I will give you a couple of examples. We get—we serve as the fiscal agent for the Environmental Improvement Program's Aquatic Invasive Species programs. So, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, through funding of the federal government, through the Restoration Act, flows through TRPA, and we pass that to the boat inspection program of the conservation district. That is federal money that makes its way to the conservation district to actually do those 100,000 boat inspections. Another big source of funding, in addition to Lake Tahoe Restoration Act, Invasive Species funds, is transportation. In our capacity as the MPO, the Metropolitan Planning Organization, we receive federal funds that support our planning staff at TRPA. We have requirements with that money to do the four-year Regional Transportation Plan and to also then pass those dollars that come in for transit to those who implement the transit system. So, on the North Shore, that is the Placer County TART [Tahoe Truckee Area Regional Transit] System, regional transit. On the South Shore, it is the Tahoe Transportation District. So, that money is reflected in our budget. But, the majority of those funds actually pass to partner agencies to implement very important programs that further our mission and our environmental standards. I would be happy to give a more detailed list to the Committee, should that be desired.

Chair Goulding:

To follow up and expand on that, have there been any cuts to that federal funding that we have seen so far?

Executive Director Regan:

Thank you, Chair Goulding, for the question. We were very worried—not only with cuts to programs, also with the shutdown that occurred. I would say, Tahoe—we are very fortunate to have a congressional delegation that is bipartisan and that fights for Tahoe—unparalleled. We were successful in maintaining most of those grants. Some repayments were delayed, but we have been able to work with our delegation and the administration to unstick a lot of those dollars. We were concerned—but just, for example, in the last “minibus” the Congress is appropriating; we are trying to get the budget that we are in right now—federal Fiscal '26—trying to get those dollars finally appropriated and—approved and appropriated. The Lake Tahoe Restoration Act funds that flow to forest health for fuels reduction to the forest service or other partners—we are whole in those numbers through the interior bill. So far so good. But it is something that we actually—our staff in the finance team—Chad Cox is our Chief Financial Officer. He is a Nevada resident and is here. He and his staff worked tirelessly to work with our administrative officials in Washington to elevate Tahoe—to underscore what it would mean if we were having severe cuts or delays in repayments.

Chair Goulding:

Thank you for that excellent news. Assemblymember Osborn.

Assemblymember Osborn:

Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Ms. Regan. I wanted to ask about the \$15 million in mitigation funding that has been distributed over the last couple of years. I was just wondering if you could give us kind of an estimate of what that percentage is of the collections. Does that make sense? Thank you.

Mr. Middlebrook:

We are planning on providing a more detailed presentation on our full mitigation fund program at a future meeting. But for that time period, 2021 to 2025, I believe, the receipts of mitigation funds was about \$15.7 million, and the disbursement was about 15. We are getting that money out the door. I think it is also important to note that that is not TRPA revenue. That is money we collect and hold on behalf of the local jurisdiction; so that disbursement is done at the request of local jurisdictions when they have projects come forward. We really do hold that in trust for the local jurisdictions.

Executive Director Regan:

And if I may, Assemblymember—to add to Mr. Middlebrook’s statement, our Governing Board allocates those funds. It is a public process that is agendized at our operations and governance Committee meetings and then the Board disperses that through routine business—it is a public process. Just a couple of examples, like things like street sweepers to pick up sediment on the roads, bus shelters, trails, watershed restoration—it is a wide panoply of projects that have been funded.

Assemblymember Osborn:

Thank you.

Chair Goulding:

In just a moment I am going to hand things off to our former Chair because I want him to be able to have a dialogue with you about the three letters. But I am going to jump the gun on one of them, because I am very curious about the vehicle miles traveled with relation to the Event Center. There was the requirement that there will be no additional vehicle miles traveled associated with that, which is quite frankly hard for me to imagine how that is possible. I would like to hear—my understanding is that there may not be—is it correct that there has not been any data collected to verify that? Let me restate that—has there been any data collected to verify that there has not been a net gain in vehicle miles traveled? And what is the strategy—and you may have well covered this in the past—still, I find it difficult to imagine building a structure which is meant to attract people and at the same time saying we will not attract people. Can you flesh this out for me?

Executive Director Regan:

Thank you, Chair Goulding, for the question. Thank you for clarifying that, it is a really important point. There are new trips generated from the Event Center, but they have to be mitigated. The permit condition was very clear, that we will do—that the Event Center and the Tahoe Douglas Visitors Authority, that is the permittee, would deploy a suite of strategies to mitigate new trips. Some trips will be things—people might be already doing other activities, instead they are going to the Event Center. But a new hockey team is bringing new people that would not have come to Tahoe. So, you are 100 percent right. The idea was to mitigate those trips through things like Lake Link. We would not have a Lake Link free microtransit service on the South Shore were it not for this permit. It is a really good example of where we could have the private sector—can contribute; have stakeholders come together. Transit in Lake Tahoe is severely challenged because of a lack of funding, because we have that very small year-round population. You know, money flows from Washington to large cities for transit. We have always struggled with that. So, the \$4 of every ticket that is generated from the Event Center—participation of people going to concerts or hockey—\$4 supports the program, \$3 goes directly to micro/mass transit, and \$1 goes to continue the monitoring. The monitoring was slow in the beginning; we were coming out of COVID. In 2023, the Event Center had struggled to get open for many, many reasons. We had to straighten that out. And that was what we embarked on over the course of a year—year and a half—with very deep conversations to the—technology had changed, we streamlined that, there is monitoring data. There is a very detailed report that was part of the agreement that came before our Governing Board a year ago, February. And so we had to work through how to monitor going forward, how to use better technology, making sure that we are accounting for trips and counting them correctly—it is a hideously complex way of doing this. Nothing around vehicle miles traveled is straightforward; and so, we have had to employ traffic engineers and experts with multiple jurisdictions. So, that is ongoing. There is monitoring, and there was an update. One of the conditions of that settlement agreement was also to get a sidewalk built. You know, if any of you have spent time in Tahoe, you may be walking down a sidewalk and then it is gone or it is degraded from the weather. We developed Tahoe as a summer resort that became more of a full-time resort, and we are getting sidewalks and streets implemented through projects. There is a plan to connect the Event Center with a sidewalk all the way up to TRPA's office, hopefully, but at least to the intersection of State Route 207 at Kingsbury Grade—because a lot of people live up Kingsbury and walk to work—and right now it is an unsafe condition. One of the conditions in our permit was our Board wanted the Event Center team to help support getting that completed. And there is a plan through the Tahoe Transportation District in Douglas County and partners to get that done.

Chair Goulding:

Can you share some of that—those that report with us?

Executive Director Regan:

Happy to.

Chair Goulding:

Is there any independent analysis that is outside of the TRPA?

Executive Director Regan:

Yes, most of it was completed by traffic consultants, and I could—I would be happy to send the whole report to you.

Chair Goulding:

Great. Assemblymember DeLong, you had—you said you had a follow-up.

Assemblymember DeLong:

Thank you for the indulgence, Chair, and thank you for the presentation. Just a quick follow-up to one of your responses to Senator Titus, with regards to the number of—I guess full-time versus part-time uses of units. Based on your table, one of your presentation tables, it looks like there is roughly 42,000 units. Are you saying essentially 20,000 are part-time rental units or equivalent to that?

Executive Director Regan:

Assemblymember, thank you for the question. Of the round numbers, say 50,000 parcels are developed because some are apartment buildings, some are single family homes. Of that number, Basin-wide, it is roughly a 55-60/40 split of part-time versus full-time. There are still fewer full-time residents than part-time. And now that has gone up in the last 10, 15, 20 years. I have watched it in real time, in my 30-some years in Tahoe, where the market is shifting and that is part of the housing crisis. Markets nationwide are going to more larger homes, the size of homes are expanding, doubling, tripling around the country, and those that can afford that product to purchase are not people who live and work in the Basin, largely. So, it has been a compounding issue that has raised the affordability crisis to a head in Tahoe. But yes, we have been tracking the part-time resident homeowners and depending on where you are, it can shift. Most of those I would say are just part-time and not rented. But we have stats, I think there is something like 5,000 vacation home rentals in the Basin and we have a full data—inventory of that.

Chair Goulding:

Senator Titus.

Senator Titus:

Thank you, Madam Chair, for your indulgence. Last time I was on this Committee, I heard a statement from you, I believe, Director, that it was actually cheaper to live in South Lake Tahoe than it was in Stateline and the rest of the Nevada portion. Is that still true?

Executive Director Regan:

Senator, thank you for the question. I will double check. My hunch would be, yes, I think the City of South Lake Tahoe's price points real estate-wise would be lower. Just as they would be, let us say, in King's Beach versus in Incline Village. The Nevada side of the line has skewed higher. I mean, that is why most of my employees live on the California side because of affordability issues. We do have some that commute from the Valley because they cannot afford to live—but three-quarters of our staff live in the Tahoe Basin. Yes, typically the Nevada side price points are higher than the City of South Lake Tahoe.

Senator Daly:

Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you. I want to start back with the—on the three letters, I am going to mainly stick with that. A lot of this stuff I kind of heard, getting refreshed. I do not want to spend a lot of time asking questions I already know the answers to—might help the rest of the Committee, but we will get a chance to do them later. So, on the Event Center parking—and part of the question was already asked—and if I read the letters again yesterday—I do not remember every little detail. But, you said that somebody had to do the evaluations. Your conclusion was there was not an increase in vehicle miles traveled or it was a balance. Are you able—or is there going to be a recommendation to allow those local events above the cap of the 130 events? That is the goal we are getting to. Everybody seems to agree it is a good idea. What can we do to adjust? Are we there? And if we are not there, how do we do it anyway?

Executive Director Regan:

If I may, Senator. Thank you very much for the question, Senator Daly. I am going to actually invite Dan Segan, our Chief Science and Policy Officer, to join me because he was the staff person that worked very intimately on all the statistical analysis of this permit. I will start—big picture. Number one, the Event Center formally had a cap on how many events there could be. At the heart of the problem was that a meeting of 20 people counted the same as a concert that had 4,000 people. That was the heart of the issue—and to stay under the cap the Event Center and those managing the Event Center had to turn away civic events—you know, high school band practices, things like that. Fundamentally, I think everyone agreed that was just wrong. This is a public facility that should benefit the community, and so that was part of the issue that we had to solve. And actually, it was Dan and our team, in consultation with the stakeholder discussions, that said we should go to an attendance cap, not a number of events cap. I can have Dan fill in the details. And then I wanted to augment the question of Chair Goulding, which was a great question. Again, it is not that the Event Center is not bringing in new trips, but there are other programs in place—Lake Link and microtransit is just one. There are also van pools that are happening, paid parking, other strategies, that all together, when the analysis was done, show that that permit was being met to not be bringing in a bunch of new trips. There are also restrictions of when events can happen. So that—let us say the Harvey's Outdoor Concert Series is having a banner concert in July. There are prohibitions of when events can be held currently, so that Stateline is not overloaded all at once with competing concerts that would bring many thousands of people. I would invite Dan Segan just to speak more specifically to your question.

Dan Segan, Chief Science and Policy Officer, TRPA:

To answer your question directly, Senator Daly, we removed that cap on local events last year and converted it to a cap on total attendees. We have—there is a robust monitoring report that is reviewed by a stakeholder group. We had a meeting of that group last week to

review the first year's monitoring data from the Event Center. And that is the information we use to say that there has not been an increase in total vehicle trips. Assemblymember or Chairman—Chairwoman Goulding asked, how is it possible that there is no increase in overall trips from—when you have a new Center bringing new people in. The way that the permit is structured, the primary mitigation for it is paid parking within the casino core of our region. So, we get about 5,000 vehicle trips a day at present that end in the casino core. And it turns out when you charge people to drive places, they tend to carpool more and drive less, and they take other forms of transit. What we have seen is that the base level of parking—or the base level of charging for parking reduces trips. And then trips are reduced even further because there is higher parking fees during different types of events—and so, we will see greater carpooling during those.

Chair Goulding:

I want to jump in with the—about the conversion from a cap on number of events to a cap on attendance. How did you make that conversion?

Mr. Segan:

In the EIS for the Event Center, there is a suite of estimates that relate to trip generation relative to each attendee at an event, as well as embedded assumptions related to the effectiveness of paid parking and then the effectiveness of microtransit in reducing trips. So, we used that mass balance to identify a level at which—and we think it is a fairly conservative level—at which we would definitely have a net reduction of trips at the end of the year through implementation of those two programs. And the number that we aligned at was 250,000. You can see that in our—in the staff report, there is the detailed calculations that relate to the identification of that number and then the assumptions that are then further validated by the monitoring to go into that number.

Chair Goulding:

Is that part of the report that you are already planning on sending? If not, will you please add that—so that we can look at that? It feels a little bit—I appreciate that. What I do not—what I am concerned about is that there is a black box and it is sort of a magical—this is how we translated cap on events to cap on attendance. I would like to see—make sure that we have some transparency on that because it is easy to imagine how you could really expand that inside the black box. So, if we could have that analysis, I would appreciate it.

Executive Director Regan:

Thank you, Chair. We would be happy to provide that. I appreciate the question. I will say, just from a policy standpoint—in how TRPA's structure for the regulatory framework works—we want to have environmental benefits, not just mitigate impacts, but actually get to benefits. And one of the things I just learned, that you might find interesting, is that the airport shuttles, the Amador Stage that goes from Reno Airport to Tahoe, has not been running full in recent years—really, since COVID, it has not kind of come back. They had cut hours of service, which was resulting in some issues. I just learned that there is a new partnership for the hockey games to fill the seats on that airport shuttle—which was running anyway—and so, there is a new program to discount tickets and discount the shuttle to pick up people in Reno to go to the hockey games. Apparently, a lot of people in Reno are loving the Knight Monsters right now—but without the public-private impetus to keep working on transit and keep that commitment, some of these things might not have happened otherwise. So, just like a real-life example of how policy is driving action, getting people more interested in taking the bus, which is a barrier—a lot of people would much prefer to

be in their private automobile than to go on transit. That is something that is part of it, not just the availability, but to make the experience desirable. And so happy to give you that full report—and whatever detail you would like, we will provide.

Senator Daly:

Thank you, Madam Chair, again. So, the revelation here that you changed—and made some changes—was not in your response letter because you had not done it yet. That is what I got out of that part of it. And even with the change on the attendance so they can have more events, and I guess ones only above a certain limit count towards the 130. I am assuming that is what it will—we will wait and look. Is there still—how much is the potential that local events would be limited? I have follow-up questions on this before we go to the other two letters. But—so, you did make some changes. We are moving in the right direction. It is a positive change. We got to continue to monitor and mitigate. So, explain a little bit on the events—or how does the attendance versus the number of events actually work?

Executive Director Regan:

Dan will jump in on the technical side—but my understanding, Senator, is that there has been no inhibition for local events that—the Soroptimist’s wine tasting and other activities have not been barred from occurring under the new framework. We adopted that coming up on a year ago, it was February of 2025, when that permit went back before our Board. So, there are actually great programs where parents are volunteering at the concessions, and they get to keep proceeds to benefit local schools and organizations. And it has really helped the community be much more supportive of the Event Center in general. But Dan may want to fill in more to answer your question.

Mr. Segan:

You are correct. When we wrote that response, the changes had not been adopted by our Board. They were adopted in February of 2025, and they removed that event cap entirely. So, there is no inhibition—the inhibition would occur if it went above 250,000 attendees a year, which we have not seen attendance close to that yet. So, there has been no inhibition on local small events.

Senator Daly:

Appreciate that. So, it made me think of a different question. How many of the local events are—because you—proximity very close to South Lake Tahoe. And we heard from people in South Lake Tahoe on the issues. I think a balance of events, most of them from South Lake Tahoe, Nevada, Douglas County. Any information—and that is really not important—I was just curious.

Executive Director Regan:

Be happy to—I do not know the answer to that question. You know, the Tahoe Douglas Visitors Authority manages that, and I would be happy to send you that. I am sure they have an easy report that we could provide to the Committee.

Senator Daly:

And then are there ticket sales to that event? You still collect the \$4 per ticket?

Executive Director Regan:

My understanding is that the local events also—the \$4 goes into the mitigation for transit and monitoring. Is that your understanding? Yes, the answer is yes.

Senator Daly:

And then I know the charge for the parking—it is required that the casinos now charge. They cannot have it free, even if they wanted to, because you guys say, “No, you have to charge.” Which, you know, how much of that, if any, is going towards the transit mitigation—like the ticket sales and various things? I know my friend who represents Caesars Entertainment, Mike Alonso, probably did not want to hear me ask this question. But if they are not kicking in, what the hell, I mean, it is money in their pocket. People are still going there to park, and it is all going to the casino—they should share. Do they?

Executive Director Regan:

Thank you, Senator, for the question. I—well I will tell you as a—you know, 30 years in Tahoe, I think the only thing that Tahoe locals hate worse than the lack of snow that we have right now is paid parking. So, it has not been a popular move at the casinos for the local community. But, in fairness, people used to park at those casinos to go skiing. And so, understanding, you know, dynamics shift—and the resorts around the Stateline casino core are very active in supporting micro/mass transit. I can get you the specifics on contributions. But at the end of the day, the properties around the casinos are theirs and they made the decision, and they make the decisions on the charging mechanisms. The Event Center itself, I believe, Bally's manages that parking because it is on the property. The Edgewood companies donated the land for the Event Center—they own the underlying property there, but Bally's manages the parking.

Senator Daly:

Understood. As you said, the interest of—the gaming people supported the Event Center to get people who have come to the Lake to also then hopefully go to the casinos, along with the skiing and the rest of the things that they support. I was just curious on how they were trying to help them with the mitigation—so we continue to have events and not go over the VMT [vehicle miles traveled]—to me, it is in their interest to do that. So, you do not have to answer—just a comment. And if Mr. Alonso is listening, he will come talk to me—I am sure.

Executive Director Regan:

Senator, if I may, also, I did learn of a program last summer that was supported entirely by the casinos. One of your public commenters mentioned getting the micro/mass transit Lake Link to Round Hill Pines. There was a funding gap to do that. The Caesars—former Harvey's—Caesars Entertainment underwrote that shuttle service to get from the casino corridor, Roundhill Pines, to the beach and it was very successful—is what I understand, but happy to follow up.

Senator Daly:

Understood, and several of the measures that we—some were successful, some were not—but several of the measures that we did last interim were directed to trying to get money for the transportation. I think it is the baseline, and the first thing we got to try to do to address several of the other issues. So, moving to the next one—and I want to go to the plan, right, the Regional Plan. Part of the reason I asked that question, sent the letter—or

the Committee agreed to send that letter—was because we were getting information from you guys and cloudy on the story—not intentional, I do not think. We were getting information from the public and the comments—some of their information was even conflicting amongst themselves. Not intentional, but like I say—so, we were not getting—there was this version and this version, and we wanted to know—I wanted to know what the real version was. So, part of asking the question—I learned a few things—like I think one of the public commenters said it is part of a plan that was intended to last for 25 years. A couple of the things that you have done—you have said that you have been able to update the Plan through codes and various things. You have the mitigation fees element of that—various things. So, you are planning on having a new plan update by 2037. I understand that costs millions of dollars to do. On the changes and all of the issues that we are trying to do—and I know you did housing and various things. How are we going on that? Because we still seem to have a conflict—listening to public comment today—that you guys are not doing this—and the Regional Plan is X and it should be Y, and everybody has an opinion. I have been to a lot of Planning Commission meetings in Washoe County, in Reno, Sparks, various things. I think there is a large disconnect, on the public side, on how it really works—what some of the limitations are. But then there is also sometimes not clear communication. So, I think your letter was helpful, and we are going to be digging into a little bit more through this. I will be asking some new questions because new ones came up. I do not know if you want to respond to any of that, but—so, it is still clear as mud.

Executive Director Regan:

Senator, thank you very much for the question. I really appreciate this conversation because we are trying to be clear and transparent about the facts around the regional plan update. And one of the keys is that the environmental impact statement was a 20-year look, and the action that was really being studied was how much new development should occur in that 20-year horizon. What action our Board takes triggers the level of environmental review. And so, in 2018, when we took an action that looked at piers and buoys and land use in the shore zone, we did a full environmental impact statement. That is all online, people can look at that—that was specific to the shore zone. Right now though, we are—next week at the board meeting—scoping a new environmental impact statement that will look at today's conditions. So, all the comments that we have heard—which are legitimate and valid—we are going to look at that, and we are going to be hiring an independent firm to do all that analysis; and that will take a year. That will inform decisions that our Board will make 18 months from now about how to change housing policies to help make housing be more affordable in the Basin. We are doing a full environmental impact statement, but—the conversation in your letter actually prompted all of us to go back and look at that environmental document from 2012. And particularly if you look at the cumulative impacts' chapter of that, it lists not only what is going on at that time, but also what was in the pipeline and what projects might come online—and a lot of them have not happened. You know, by that point, the Homewood Master Plan had been approved and adopted by the Governing Board. We have not seen that development really occur over on the West Shore. As was noted in public comment, the old Biltmore property in Crystal Bay, the Cal Neva Lodge—those projects have not materialized. And a lot of that had to do with financing, and recession, and COVID and things outside of Tahoe's control, but those were analyzed for future growth. And so, when you look at the details of that environmental impact statement, the amount of development that was authorized over 20 years, if we

were tracking exactly, we are still under what was envisioned. So, when people see change on the ground—yes, things have happened, but it is all within that envelope that was originally analyzed in that document. But, we are taking a fresh look at that, and we are kicking that off next week at our Board meeting, and that will be a full environmental impact statement review.

Senator Daly:

Understood. I—we are trying to get information based on the conflicting points of view—not saying anybody was right or wrong. I am not saying anyone was trying to be intentionally misleading, right? I do not think the TRPA has it in their agenda to try to mislead—and I do not think our public commenters are trying to do the same, but they could have and look at the same thing and come up with two different opinions on what it means, and how it affects, and what the next steps are. Understand that—we just have to work through it.

Which now gets me to the last one, which was the matrix. Now, that was kind of something, listening to the public last time, I wanted to try to use and have—and I said this before, I think you have this tool already, based on what the Compact says. I think someone here said today it was a simplistic look, and I said, “You know, it depends.” Like I said, people can have different opinions based on the same analysis of a document. When I read your response letter and I look at it in conjunction with your Regional Plan, the 2012 Plan letter, I am seeing—in my view—perhaps a disconnect on what you guys understood my intentions were. I do not think your letter hit the mark—or your analysis hit the mark—on what I was trying to say. What I was trying to get you to look at is—in addition to all of the impacts that it might have—would be to ask the opposite, the positive question. I say, all right, so you are not going to have a negative impact here, but what are you doing to improve any of these other things? I think you can add that to some of the criteria. And your attorney is here—he may differ on his analysis and all that stuff—but I think you can do it. I know you can update that 2012 document, because it said so right in your letter—and you did it for housing and several other things—and you can make amendments and code changes and the various things. I do think it is within your authority where you can say, “Hey, we are going to look at residential housing under so many square feet differently, then we are going to look at residential housing in these mega-mansions and stuff and the housing that nobody can afford except for the Uber-rich or very well-moneyed people.” You can look at it different between residential, with using those thresholds, and commercial on the developments, on—what are you going to do? And then you have these mitigation fees—hey, if you have an impact and you are going to have to pay a fee because of that potential degradation that you are going to do. It is kind of like Senator Titus—so, remember we just recently had a regulation on the Sagebrush ecosystem deal, and you can get credits on—if you impact, then you have to mitigate and put, you know, get credits from somebody else who has done positive things. I think you missed the mark. I do not think you made any of the changes. You said, “No, everything we are already doing addresses all of your things.” So, we are going to be pushing on that a little bit more. I think you could ask each one of these developments and say, “Okay, you are not going to have this much impact.” Or “You are going to have this impact, and you have to mitigate this, but you do not have anything that you are doing to restore or any answer—improve the lake quality, and you need to have at least a little bit of that.” And you can have different thresholds for different types of projects. Somebody’s residential—I know you do not have to do all this stuff for a remodel, but if they are going to put an accessory dwelling unit, I do not know that you can really make it pencil out that they are going to have to restore wetlands

somewhere. But if somebody wants to put in a new secondary boat dock at their 40-acre, \$280 million estate that they are at two months out of the year—if that—they can certainly afford to mitigate some other things and make sure that they are not impacting the residents and make sure that they are not doing that stuff. You get where I am coming from? I think you have the tools there; you just have to have the willpower to do it.

Executive Director Regan:

Thank you, Senator, very much for the question. We are going to keep working on this. We want to be responsive to your inquiry. I think one of the things we could do that we could illustrate through subsequent meetings and documents is to show the benefits of other environmental measures. And we—I had a few of those performance measures on screen in the presentation, but there is so much work going on that I think speaks to your concern, that perhaps we did not do a good enough job of answering. We are going to work on that—we will, absolutely. The point you are raising about basic fairness of development—the development rights system—and keep in mind, that I am not aware of any other place in the country that manages growth and development like Tahoe. Like we only let out these 100-130 allocations to build a year—everything is counted and tracked—and land coverage—and how much you can cover of your property. It is a complete system. But, right now, if you build a 10,000-square-foot house or a 2,000-square-foot house, it is one development right—that counts as one. Our new housing initiative is looking at tiering that, so that larger development—if there are associated impacts that are born out in the environmental analysis, that we would have a basis for changing that system. That will take 18 months for us to get to a decision of our Board. So, we are working on it, but the basic notion of fairness has come up a great deal. Not just with your leadership in this Committee, but also in the community—because we are seeing changes, not just in Tahoe—across the country. Where I grew up on the East Coast, little beachfront cottages in the mid-Atlantic; they are disappearing. They are 10-bedroom homes and 12-bathroom houses replacing small—which once were beautiful—quaint cottages. So, this is a trend. I think we are holding our own in terms of the regulatory framework that we have to try to maintain the character of our community in Tahoe—but there is more work to do, and I will keep working on it.

Senator Daly:

Thank you. I understand. I did not get that out of your letter—and I told you that after I got the letter last session. I said, “I think you missed the mark, and we are going to revisit it next time.” Assuming I was on the Committee, which I am. So, your bad luck, I do not know—good luck for whoever. I do think you can do that on square footage, on—I do not know if dollar value is the one—but it is a fairness thing. So, the guy that is trying to build a single-family house or an accessory dwelling unit or—and the guy that is taking up space and has to bring in a tower crane to build his house right on the shore next to a cliff. You know, he is not doing anything to enhance the quality of the Lake. That house is not going to enhance the quality of the Lake. Not doing anything to mitigate impacts to anybody else that already lives there. Not doing anything to enhance the experience of people visiting the Lake. Do not even know if it is really helping the economy that much—of the four things that we had. I think you could say, “Your project, if you want it to be approved, does not answer these additional questions,” that you can put in, and change your code—same as you did with the housing and various things—and keep your plan, Regional Plan, updated for new issues, if I read it correctly, and things as they change on the ground and various things. Now, I know your lawyers are going to say, “We are going to get sued over this,” et cetera, et cetera. So, let us find out. I mean, and at some point, approval agencies get people to say, “Yeah, you are right. I will go along.” Some people

may want to sue—that is fine. But, if you do not take the opportunity, then same as you have these mitigation fees is that, hey, you are going to degrade a water quality and you have to pay this much, so we have money to restore wetland somewhere else. You can do the same thing if you do not meet some of those four matrix priorities. And that is why it is a matrix. You can have different levels for different things and different issues and say, “Hey, we know you are not going to be able to increase—you are not doing anything on the environment, but we want to see if you are doing anything on these other types of things.” And you cannot just become a thing where well-moneyed people can do whatever they want at the Lake, which is a complaint I have heard. I know the people last time were upset saying, “You are doing this, and you have this economic part in there and everything and you are ignoring what we said.” I said, “No, I am not. You just need to understand what I am trying to get to.” I think it will improve the Lake if we can ask, and get answers to, and qualify projects based on those issues.

Executive Director Regan:

Thank you.

Chair Goulding:

Thank you for that. Long presentation and a long series of questions—I think that it was critical given that we are launching into a year-long process here, and I appreciate the dialogue. I appreciate the fact that we are—we will anticipate continuing the conversation on these issues. With that, I believe we can move on to the next presentation.

Executive Director Regan:

Thank you very much.

AGENDA ITEM V—OVERVIEW PRESENTATION BY NEVADA’S DIVISION OF STATE LANDS, STATE DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES REGARDING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND RELATED NEVADA PROGRAMS

Chair Goulding:

Our next presentation is by the Division of State Lands regarding the Environmental Improvement Program related to Nevada programs. We have Mr. Donahue, Mr. Stahler—or Ms. Stahler, and Mr. Fromherz—apologize if I did not pronounce that correctly. Thank you for your patience—appreciate that. You may not get grilled quite as badly at the end of your presentation, but you never know. Please proceed when you are ready.

Charlie Donahue, Administrator, Nevada’s Division of State Lands (NDSL), State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR):

Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the Committee. Good afternoon. I have had the pleasure of working in the Environmental Improvement Program since 2002 in various capacities. With me here today is the Deputy Administrator, Ellery Stahler, as well as our Tahoe Program Manager, Kevin Fromherz. Thought it was important for this interim Committee to start hearing other voices than just the administrators. I wanted to thank you for your sponsorship of our BDR last session and that it was successful, and that the Environmental Improvement Program is working with the Treasurer's Office to sell that 10.5 million that was in that bill. Thank you very much. ([Agenda Item V](#))

Nevada's Division of State Lands has had a long commitment to Lake Tahoe, including managing the Lake as a sovereign water body, and that means including authorizing the piers and buoys that you were just discussing. Nevada holds title to lands in the Basin that make up the Nevada—excuse me, that make up Lake Tahoe, Nevada State Park, which is managed by State Parks. The Division of State Lands was fortunate enough to be tapped in the mid-'80s to acquire sensitive parcels within the Basin that could not be developed. These parcels were purchased from willing sellers. The Legislature, after a vote by the residents of Nevada supporting such an initiative, authorized the sale of \$31 million in general obligation bonds to acquire those sensitive parcels, as well as work on erosion-control projects in the Basin.

As that project and program was ending in the late '90s, the Environmental Improvement Program was actually starting—with the visits from our President Clinton, Vice President Gore—and the initiative to move forward with restoration activities in the Basin more aggressively. At that time, the Division of State Lands was tapped as the lead agency for the State of Nevada. And one reason why is because we already had a presence. We are responsible for the bed and banks of Lake Tahoe. We had just wrapped up securing close to 500 urban parcels in the Basin. So, one of the first activities that the agency did was to establish the Nevada Tahoe Resource Team (NTRT). You are going to hear more of that from Kevin—that is Kevin's team. He is the Program Manager of that team. It is an interagency, interdisciplinary team. As that team was assembled, we started moving forward with the first phase of the EIP, which Nevada made a commitment to its contribution of \$82 million.

In 2009, as that phase was beginning to wind down, the partnership in the Basin realized our work was not done. So, in 2009, the Agency came back to the Legislature requesting \$100 million in AB 18—and it was authorized. And over a number of years, we worked with the Treasurer's Office to pull—make a draw against that \$100 million to continue to implement the EIP and work on individual projects with the Basin partners. To date, Nevada has implemented approximately 175-177 projects and completed those.

With that, Madam Chair, I am going to turn this over to Ellery, to give you a little bit more background and build on Julie's comments related to the EIP. And then I believe she is going to turn it over to Kevin—get into some of the specifics of your request, Madam Chair, related to the accomplishments. Thank you.

Ellery Stahler, Deputy Administrator, NDSL, DCNR:

Thank you, Charlie, and thank you, Madam Chair, and members of the Committee. As you have just heard from Charlie, Nevada has a longstanding history of effort to help protect and restore and preserve the natural environment at Lake Tahoe. And as you have heard earlier from Julie Regan, Executive Director of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, that effort is complemented and amplified by a coordinated, collaborative effort of over 80 organizations; and they are spanning sectors ranging from federal agencies, the Washoe Tribe, two states, local jurisdictions, the scientific community, nonprofit organizations, and the private sector—and that collaboration is known as the Lake Tahoe Environmental Improvement Program; and the State of Nevada is just a part of that. That collaborative is nationally recognized. It is a conservation model that is looked to and we are proud to be a part of it. With that said, I will turn it now over to Kevin Fromherz, who is going to explain a little bit more of who we are and what we do.

Kevin Fromherz, Program Manager, NTRT, NDSL, DCNR:

Thank you, Madam Chair, and members of the Committee. I have the privilege of managing the Nevada Tahoe Resource Team program. And as Charlie mentioned, it is an interagency, multidisciplinary team, which is really—it is amazing to run. So, members of our team are from the Nevada Division of State Lands, along with the Nevada Division of State Parks, and Nevada Division of Forestry, and a member from the Nevada Department of Wildlife.

Current team members include:

- Brent Moore, a Forester who manages our Urban Lots program;
- Chris LaCasse, our Water Quality Coordinator, who manages stormwater projects and AIS;
- Heather Watkins, our Land Agent who assists us with land issues, easements, permitting, and development rights to the Nevada Land Bank;
- Danielle Whybrew, who is our Administrative Assistant;
- Anna Higgins, who is a Forester with Nevada Division of Forestry, who completes forest health projects on Nevada Division of State Park Lands;
- Mark Enders, our Wildlife Biologist, who manages wildlife and assists with project planning to ensure we do not have an impact on sensitive species and wildlife in the Basin; and we also have
- A vacant position with State Parks, who does our recreation program and that position is currently being filled.

Our focus areas come from the legislation that Charlie mentioned, AB 18 from 2009. We focus on the implementation of forest health, restoration, and fuels management projects throughout the Nevada side of the Basin; control and prevention of invasive terrestrial and aquatic species; enhancement of recreation opportunities—mainly sustainable recreation in our state parks; protection of sensitive species and improvement of wildlife habitat; and then water quality, erosion control, stream restoration, and enhancement. And as was requested, I am just going to go through some accomplishments for the last two years and then what we have going forward.

In the forest health, restoration, and fuels management project, we have two Foresters, along with our wildlife biologist, who support and plan projects throughout the Lake Tahoe Basin. That work is performed by both Tahoe Douglas and North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District crews, along with our Nevada Division of Forestry crews, private contractors, and other partners. We have current projects in Tunnel Creek, which is on the north end of Spooner Lake and Backcountry State Park and buffers up against Incline Village. Work is being done in there to improve creeks, stream environment, and reduce critical fire danger in that area. Up in North Canyon, which is in the Spooner Lake and Backcountry part of the state park, we have ongoing aspen restoration and large-scale fuels reduction projects to protect the Marlette Lake Water System.

In Van Sickle Bi-State Park, we continue to implement forest health projects down there as well, to protect the Stateline community and South Lake Tahoe, as most of that Park is within the wildland urban interface. Upcoming projects include understory burning in

Tunnel Creek, to build on previously completed understory burns completed in the past; work along our evacuation corridors; and forest health restoration in the Marlette Lake watershed. Additionally, over the past five years, we have treated 98 percent of our urban lots, which are in the wildland urban interface for fuels reduction. We try to maintain that cycle of it every five years.

Prevention and control of invasive species. Primarily supporting TRPA and other Basin partners with projects to prevent invasive species from entering the Lake, along with trying to control species such as cheatgrass and perennial pepperweed—that try to take off in the Tahoe Basin—with mitigation projects. We also are supporting NDOT and Tahoe Transportation District with the construction of a new AIS station and mobility hub at Spooner Summit. This permanent station will improve AIS inspections for motorized watercraft, along with mobility and transportation along the Highway 28 corridor.

In our recreation category, our Recreation Specialist supports the Division of State Parks with implementing sustainable recreation projects across the four Lake Tahoe, Nevada, State Parks. Recent accomplishments include the completion of the Sand Harbor master plan. This was a multi-year planning initiative to redesign Sand Harbor, which was largely constructed in the 1970s—and really, it is just not built for the modern visitation that we are seeing in the area, along with aging infrastructure. That plan is going to go to development in the next year. We are hoping to see the first construction, in partnership with Public Works, on some new bathrooms near the Shakespeare facility in the summer of '27.

We are also—as you might remember from the members of the Committee last time we visited Van Sickle Bi-State Park—we have completed most of the planning on phases two and three. We will be breaking ground this summer on employee support facilities, multi-use paths, Stateline Monument, and other facilities; and the visitor center should follow shortly thereafter—in probably '28 or '29. We continue planning the design on a sustainable trail system for Spooner Lake and Backcountry State Park—accessing that beautiful acreage that, you know, is all over the Carson Range there and access to Marlette Lake, Hobart, and other facilities that you might hear about later from Public Works with their water system. Then improvements to Cave Rock boat ramp, which continues to be one of the few drought-resistant, year-round boat ramps on Lake Tahoe. Many of the boat ramps go—can dry up during low water years, and this one maintains access to the Lake for boaters.

Wildlife habitat and support for our Wildlife Biologist. He continues to study/research wildlife species, including sensitive species, such as Allen's Chipmunks, which are in the Wildlife Action Plan produced by NDOW [Nevada's Department of Wildlife]; and monitoring a sensitive species and helps with program—our project planning to ensure that we minimize our impacts. Things like that could include minimizing fuels reduction of projects to certain seasons, to ensure that owls and other species have access to nesting grounds. We are also working with NDOW on a fish passage barrier on Third Creek to aid in the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout recovery. That permanent facility should be constructed this summer.

Water quality projects—we continue to award grants to both Washoe and Douglas County to improve their stormwater infrastructure through our water quality program, along with Nevada Tahoe Conservation District (NTCD) and NDOT. We continue efforts in Spooner Meadow to restore the previous historic cattle grazing and Comstock-era water diversions that have impacted the meadow system—and that project is advancing through the planning phase and should go to construction in '27. Additionally, we are working on improvements to our urban lots, to address aging stormwater infrastructure in those areas, and restoration projects in quaking aspen for forest health.

I would also like to point out, in the last couple years, we received Best in the Basin award for Spooner Lake and Backcountry Visitor Center. This new facility opened to the public just a couple of years ago. We completed a 62-acre forest health project in the Bonpland drainage, which is just north of Sand Harbor, along with the 237-acre Marlette South hazardous fuels reduction project. We are supporting NTCD with the completion of the Marlette Creek water project and also providing funding to Kahle Complete Streets. And if you would like more information on these projects, we do submit a NTRT semiannual report to the IFC [Interim Finance Committee]. If anybody would like a copy of that, we would be happy to provide that.

Ms. Stahler:

As Charlie mentioned, the Fund to Protect Lake Tahoe is a primary funding mechanism for Nevada's share of the Environmental Improvement Program. It makes it possible to implement projects such as the ones described by Kevin, and that authority comes from AB 18 passed in 2009. You will remember in 2009, that was around the era of the Great Recession. And so, for the first ten years or so of this part of our program, we received bond sales kind of on the lower end of the spectrum. We are looking at a remaining authority from that initial \$100 million of about \$48 million. And as Charlie mentioned, we come back to this body seeking your review, your consideration, and your support of biannual installments—or draws—off of that \$100 million. And we are currently putting pen to paper to estimate projected project costs that we would anticipate in the '28-'29 Biennium. In addition to that, we are aware that our program expires June 30, 2030, which is coming up quick. And so, we are likely also going to ask for your consideration of extending this program for an additional ten years to 2040. With that, we thank you for the opportunity to present to you this afternoon, and we are happy to take any questions you may have.

Chair Goulding:

Yes, go ahead. Thank you for the—you answered some of our questions in that last slide that we were—I think that there were some people who were gearing up to ask about that \$100 million and where you were on that. So, I think you have got that covered. Senator Titus.

Senator Titus:

Thank you, Madam Chair. Just a quick clarification on slide nine. You talk about wildlife support and habitat protection. Will we be hearing—and maybe Director Regan will tell us, or anybody that is going to present in the future, or Chair—very interested about wildlife crossings. There have been some conversations, and I know Assemblymember Watts is interested also regarding wildlife crossings; and so, will there be any presentation—because I know you work with NDOW on wildlife crossings.

Mr. Fromherz:

Thank you, Senator. We have been partnering with NDOT and NDOW to have conversations on that. I can work with TRPA and others to make sure that there is a presentation on those projects for you.

Senator Titus:

Great. Thank you. I was not sure there would be one right now. And one more question, if I might, Madam Chair.

Chair Goulding:

Yes, and I can partially answer that for you. Yes, we are intending to put that on a future agenda.

Senator Titus:

Excellent, thank you. And then, also, I am a County Health Officer. Disease process is really important to me, and you talk about things like the chipmunks. At some point, will we be hearing anything about the plague and any presentation that—there has been cases. I know we are looking at protecting the Allen's Chipmunk—and I know that is not a particular source of the plague; but you do have some chipmunks that are indeed. Any update from a public health access and exposure from Lake Tahoe.

Mr. Donahue:

Thank you for the question, Senator. I do not believe a specific presentation is scheduled unless the Chair has an intention to add that to the schedule. But, I would be more than happy to get our Wildlife Biologist on the team to give you either some background information—give you a personal call—whatever works for you to get your questions answered.

Senator Titus:

Great. Thank you, Madam Chair. I would just be fine if they just send us maybe an update on how many cases—where they are at now. I do not know that—it is obviously your decision whether we need an actual presentation, but I think it is something to be aware of. Thank you.

Chair Goulding:

Senator, thank you for that. I will put it on my to-do list, and if it rises to the level of concern that—I will make a judgment call on whether that is just a report that is distributed to everybody or whether it is worth making—putting it on the agenda.

Senator Titus:

Thank you.

Mr. Donahue:

Madam Chair, if it is helpful, we can get you some of that information upfront, so that you can make an informed decision.

Chair Goulding:

Thank you. Assemblymember DeLong, did you have a question?

Assemblymember DeLong:

Two very short questions, if I may. In regards to extending the program, you had mentioned wanting to come in front of the Legislature to do that. Are you planning on that being an Agency bill or are you looking for this Committee—on that?

Mr. Donahue:

Thank you for the question, Assemblyman. We would be looking to this body for that BDR, if it is appropriate.

Assemblymember DeLong:

Just thinking how many bills we have, and how they get allocated. And then the second question had to do with the fish passage on Third Creek. Where is that going to be located? Besides Third Creek—specifically, where on Third Creek?

Mr. Fromherz:

Thank you, Assemblymember. The Third Creek fish passage is basically right at the Lake—where the Lake starts in. And what is happening is Rainbow Trout and Cutthroat—Lahontan Cutthroat Trout spawn at the same time; this is a sorting facility. The—NDOW currently uses a temporary facility there. And so, the intent is—from what I understand from NDOW, and I can clarify this—is to allow the—to basically hand start the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout to send them upstream and then take the Rainbow Trout out to the fish hatchery for production out there.

Mr. Donahue:

Madam Chair, if I may follow up with my response to the Assemblymember DeLong—is that it would be our intention to link in the program through a BDR. But I also recognize those two concepts could probably be handled in one BDR, if there is not that capacity in the Committee.

Senator Daly:

Just quickly along those lines as well—so it says that you requested \$52 million—\$46 million has been sold. So, is that a difference of—what is it? \$6 million just was not given to you or just has not been sold yet?

Ms. Stahler:

Thank you for the question. Just has not been sold yet.

Senator Daly:

Okay. So, \$52 million is allocated. So, there is \$48 million left—theoretically—that would have to be authorized at a future legislative session. And then if I am reading this correctly, you are looking to extend the time from 2030 to 2040. But you are not going to be—it does not look like you would be asking for additional funding before the '29 session. It says '28 to '30 there—so, that is '29.

Mr. Donahue:

Thank you. Thank you for the question, Senator. I think the point here is I am a pretty conservative individual. I do not really want to wait until 2029 to make sure that there is no break in this program. So, that is why I am suggesting we bring it forward in 2027. I think we have a pretty good handle on our capacity and ability to spend. However, I would also like to acknowledge that the team working with the Division of State Parks has identified some substantial—really true—capital improvement projects. The Sand Harbor Master Plan

revealed an awful lot of need there as well. So, while the program may be extended during that extended time period, the team may need to come back and also ask for some additional investment in general obligation bonds.

Senator Daly:

I understand. I am 100 percent understanding you need to do it in the next session, not wait all the way to the deadline—to the extension to—for 2030. Were you going to ask for additional allocation in 2027? I was reading—you are. Okay. And yeah, that can probably be all handled in one BDR to do both things. But—and then, at some point in the future, I am assuming you guys are going to come and say you need to replenish the pot.

Mr. Donahue:

Yes, I do believe, with some of the projects that have been identified, I think we will be beyond that \$48 million and have an additional need.

Chair Goulding:

Any other questions? Excellent. We are wildly behind our schedule. So, thank you for doing an excellent job; and we can move on—I believe—to our next agenda item.

AGENDA ITEM VI—OVERVIEW PRESENTATION ON THE MARLETTE LAKE WATER SYSTEM

Chair Goulding:

Dr. Kent Choma from Carson City. We will have our next presentation from the State Public Works Division on the Marlette Lake Water System. Dr. Choma, please proceed when you are ready. First, give me a correct pronunciation, because I am pretty sure I just completely botched that.

Kent Choma, Ph.D., PE, Deputy Administrator, Buildings and Grounds Section, State Public Works Division, Department of Administration:

The correct pronunciation is Choma.

Chair Goulding:

Okay, Dr. Choma, please proceed when you are ready. Thank you for that correction. Assistance is coming. Thank you. I know there was not—How are we doing there? Do you have a report from the tech team?

Dr. Choma:

A little technical issue with getting the presentation to appear on the screens.

Chair Goulding:

Would you like to start with an overview? Give us some—build some context. So, we will be ready and eager for the slides when they arrive—but the audience is eager to hear your words of wisdom.

Dr. Choma:

Good afternoon. Thank you for having me here today. I am here to speak a little bit and give you an introduction to the Marlette Lake Water System. I believe all the Committee members have the handout; so, I can just go with that, and people can just follow along. So, a few points we will cover—the historic and key features of the water system, what its major components are, some of the recent improvements we have completed, several that are underway right now, as well as a few that we have planned for the future.

So, the historic overview perspective—it was constructed in 1873 with the purpose of water collection, treatment, and conveyance for domestic industrial uses within the Comstock District of Storey County—so, Virginia City during the silver rush—and the Carson Valley. The State of Nevada purchased the water system in June of 1963, and currently we are the sole water source for Virginia City, Gold Hill, and Silver City in Storey County. We also sell a lot of water to Carson City, and their purchases make up the majority of the water that we actually sell. In this past fiscal year, the system delivered just over 641 million gallons of water to Carson City and Storey County. Historically speaking, it was engineered by a gentleman named Herman Schussler in 1873. A little side note is the—much of it was actually built in less than a year, which seems amazing by any construction standards given that they did not have the equipment we have today. It functioned as a company called the Virginia and Gold Hill Water Company that was renamed in 1933 to the Virginia City Water Company. And that was sold to Curtis Wright Corporation in 1957 and renamed the Marlette Lake Company. State of Nevada purchased it in June of 1963 for \$1.65 million. ([Agenda Item VI](#))

As far as potential water storage, the Marlette Basin has a potential storage of 3,400–3,500-acre feet, which is 1.14 billion gallons of water. The Hobart Basin has a storage capacity of approximately 2,700-acre feet. The East Slope—and there is a map coming to show you what all this is—for those who are not familiar with it—so hang on for the big closer with the map. East Slope—about 1,800-acre feet for a total of 8,000-acre feet of water. And again, those numbers, Carson City average over the last few years, took about 556 million gallons per year and Storey County just under 100 million per year.

Some of the major components—there is the Marlette Lake, the namesake of the system. There is a pump and generator system to move some of that water over to the Hobart Reservoir. We also have something called our East Slope catchment, which catches some of the spring water, also to divert it in for use. Diversion Dam, where we divert water from one of the creeks into our water system. Lakeview tank—where it is stored and then divided there to either go to Carson City or through a siphon to Storey County.

There is that map that I had mentioned I would put up. You can see we have Marlette Lake—the large lake—and that was original construction. There is a flume that runs north up to an Incline tunnel. That flume is no longer used, but that was the original way they got water out of Marlette Lake. It went through that Incline tunnel because Marlette is on the other side of the summit from Carson City and Washoe Valley. So, they had to get the water over that hill somehow; so, they went through the mountain, through this tunnel, onto East Slope and then took that water to Diversion Dam. Now we use the pumping station and the generator to use it to pump water from Marlette up over to Hobart Reservoir, where that water then goes down Hobart Creek. At Diversion Dam, some of it is split off and goes into pipelines that take it to Lakeview Tank. At Lakeview Tank, it is split to either go to Carson City or the underground siphon that actually goes under 580,

just as you leave North Carson City into Washoe Valley. It is actually under the highway. For those—anybody is welcome for a tour that all of us would love to show you. It is historic and it is a civil engineering marvel, all in one. So, and it took me a while, several trips and a map to figure out how this all ties together. I do not know how they figured it out in 1873, because they did not have Google Maps.

Marlette Dam—it is an approximately 46-foot earthen structure, originally constructed in the 1870s. And it was raised—after construction it was raised two more times to then hold more water. The last raise happened in 1959, and it impounds about 11,000-acre feet of water.

The Hobart Reservoir—again, Marlette is on the other side of the summit—Hobart is on our side of the summit, if you will. Also, an earthen dam, about 22-feet high, also constructed in the 1870s. It was last raised—or worked on—in 1956 following a dam breach, and it impounds about 107-acre feet of water. Also mentioned were the East Slope catchments, and those are these catchment basins that are along the east side of the summit. They collect spring water that is just running down the hill, put it into a pipeline, and it gets routed into Hobart Creek—so, we can also capture some of that water as opposed to just running down the area. You can see there are some—the old beat-up looking catchment basins and the new prettier ones are obviously the replacement ones we have been putting in, to more efficiently capture that spring water.

Diversion Dam is on Hobart Creek, and that is where the diversion happens from all the water that was either pumped over from Marlette into Hobart Reservoir—or coming down Hobart Creek we divert it into some pipelines that take the water to our storage tank. That was reconstructed last in 2017; so, it is a very new piece.

Lakeview Tank—if you are driving on 580 you can see it from the right angle if you are lucky. But that is the high end of the siphon. That is where the water is either diverted to Carson City through Ash Canyon or that is where the pipeline starts, that goes underground from there under 580 and pops up into Five Mile Reservoir outside of Virginia City. Since Five Mile Reservoir is lower in elevation, it just happens with gravity. Now there are three pipelines that actually—they were put in over a series of about five, ten years with drainage construction back in the 1970s and '80s to move that water from this point to Five Mile Canyon.

This shows the pipeline that heads down to feed Carson City. So, up in the top right are the—is the Lakeview Tank. Then that pipeline is underground and takes it to a reservoir in Ash Canyon, where it then goes into the creek, and that feeds into Carson City's water treatment plant. So, that is how Carson City gets their water.

Some recent improvements that we have done—this past year it started in 2024 Calendar Year and was finished this year. We placed about 2¾ miles of the 12-inch steel pipe with 20-inch HDPE [high-density polyethylene] pipe on the East Slope collection and transmission line. So, that is the collection basin, as well as how some of the water then gets into—off the creeks—sorry—off of the springs into our system for use. In addition to the pipeline, they replaced three of the catchment assemblies and the associated drains and air releases and those sorts of pieces. To put it in perspective, the width of this area is the exact width of a large truck. So, they had to dig and work around this open excavation area, remove—placing a new pipe, get it operational, and then remove the old pipe with very few places to make U-turns and all those things. The logistics of this operation were quite impressive.

Some jobs that are underway—the Marlette Dam rehabilitation project started this spring, and that was to complete replacement of the entire earthen dam, install a new primary outlet and seepage collection, construct a new spillway, and install a new control building with remote monitoring. The diagram at the bottom is a cross-section of the final version. So, on the left portion of it, that sort of triangular-shaped, pyramid-shaped piece is the dam and then to the right, there is sort of three little bubbles or boxes. Those are temporary dams that were used to hold back the water, so they could excavate out and remove the earthen dam to then rebuild a new one that is seismically engineered to today's standards—because when the first one was built, there was no seismic engineering. It was 1873.

Here is a little profile of what those three aquadams look like. They are big rubber bladders filled with water and they—just by mass and weight—hold back the water of the Lake. So, over the winter of 2024 into 2025, we had to lower the lake level about 22 feet, so that it could be held back by the temporary dams. They moved 24,000 cubic yards of dirt, removed the existing 500-foot pipeline, installed a new—short of—1,000-foot linear pipeline, poured 300 cubic yards of concrete, installed 2,400 cubic yards of riprap. There are more pictures here. That is a picture showing those temporary water-filled dams holding back the Lake. So, to the upside of it is the Lake and then to the bottom right is where they were able to excavate and remove all the former dam pieces and then rebuild the new dam.

That is some of the equipment that is removing the old dam. They had to dig all the way back down to good rock—bedrock—to then start rebuilding it. So, that shows what they were doing during the demolition phase. Then here they are with very large trucks—off-highway equipment—putting in new material that then gets compacted and creates the new dam structure. That is an overhead view of how it was left over the winter. The construction season there is relatively short—it is maybe six months-ish, based on snow conditions. So, they had to get that first piece done—remove the old dam, build the new dam—before the snow was flying and they succeeded. So, that shows the new dam as it looks today, and you can see the water level is very, very low because we lowered it 22 feet for construction. The second phase of the project will be to build the control building for the valves that are—you cannot see, but there are valves that can control the flow out into Hobart Creek, which is not how the water gets to Carson City or Virginia City, that is to control the lake level. And then also rebuild the spillway, which is, if you will, the emergency piece that if the water level gets too high, instead of reaching the dam, it will go around the dam in a concrete spillway.

There are some civil engineers behind me. I hope I am not doing too bad—because I am an electrical engineer—so, I am winging it, right? Here is another view of the dam as it is today, following that first phase of construction. You can see that there is—the water will eventually get closer to the top, probably within six or eight feet of it. So, there is a lot of recharging that has to happen over the next few years—as we get, hopefully, some robust seasons of snow to give us that extra water.

Also underway is the Hobart Reservoir Dam Rehabilitation. That will start this spring, and its completion will also take two years. First season will be to rebuild the dam. Second season will be to do the spillway and the control building. Similar scope—they are going to replace the entire dam, install a new primary outlet and seepage collection, construct a new spillway, and new control building. For this one, they will also dredge the basin when it is dewatered. We have a lot of organic material in there that can hamper water quality, so they will use this time to clean that up a little bit.

Some of the design expectations—they will use two of those aquadams instead of three, because it is a much smaller reservoir. Expecting to move about 20,000 cubic yards of dirt, remove the existing 180-foot-long pipeline, install a new 360-foot pipeline, install about 1,000 cubic yards of riprap. These are pictures of the existing Hobart Reservoir. And if—the one in the right picture, you can sort of see that the water is brownish-looking and that is just from all the organic material that is in that current reservoir.

Another current project underway that happened this year is to rebuild the generator—that I mentioned that there is—that we now pump the water from Marlette into Hobart and that requires electricity. We have a generator building and a generator that is there, and it runs pretty much continuously from July through October during that pumping season to get the extra water. That generator will be overhauled, since we cannot use the pump right now, because the lake level of Marlette is so low—because we had to release all the water for construction. That opportunity is being used to rebuild the generator now. So, when we have enough water in Marlette, we are able to run the generator with no problems, and it will be good for another 15 or 20 years before the next rebuild.

A few future items that we are going to have probably in the next CIP [Capital Improvement Program] list. If you are watching for that when you are—we are in session, look for those. replace pipeline from Diversion Dam to Lakeview that was installed in 1957; and replace one of the siphon lines that goes from Lakeview down the hill and back up. That one, it says number two, because there are three lines, that was installed in 1877. I think it is fully depreciated, and then also look at replacing the transmission line feed that runs from the Lakeview tanks to the Carson City Truman Plant down through Ash Canyon.

Then just a little note on some operational items. I mentioned that obviously with the drawdown in Marlette, we will have reduced revenue in our budget because—and we have budgeted for that—knowing we will not be able to move as much water because Marlette, we had to lower 22 feet. We have to get that built back up again. I am not sure if this year is going to be a really stellar snow year, but it is not looking like it. So, hopefully we can have a really solid spring and get some more water, but we are expecting a two-to-three-year requirement minimum to get that backfilled.

Now some other projects we are working on that are smaller are raising the elevation of the inlet pump in Marlette; some pump rebuilds; and some SCADA [Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition System] upgrades. So, we have better remote—or more consistent remote—monitoring control of the system, because in winter we end up having to use a snow cat, or snowmobiles, or snowshoes to service some of the areas.

That concludes the presentation. Are there any questions? And before I forget, again, if anybody wants a tour, please contact me.

Chair Goulding:

Excellent presentation. Thank you. I am absolutely going to take you up on that tour.

Dr. Choma:

Looking forward to it.

Chair Goulding:

Super quick question—and I will not cover you with all the questions that I would ask if we had a lot more time, but is that generator hydrogeneration? What is the—is it diesel or what?

Dr. Choma:

It is natural gas. There is a natural gas line that was brought in up to the generator—to that generator location.

Chair Goulding:

Got it, thank you. Assemblyman DeLong.

Assemblyman DeLong:

Thank you, Chair. For the building and grounds portion of the system—where does your jurisdiction stop? Is it at 580, or do you take it all the way up to the siphon outlet?

Dr. Choma:

For that siphon, we have responsibility basically to the highway—to 580. Then, on the Carson City side, it goes on Ash Canyon and there is a 1-million-gallon, above-ground reservoir, and it is our responsibility to that point.

Assemblyman DeLong:

And on the dam rebuilds—is building and grounds getting a NDWR [Nevada Division of Water Resources] permit, for a dam permit?

Dr. Choma:

I will have to phone a friend, who is two rows behind me. That would be a yes from our engineer of record.

Assemblyman DeLong:

And who is the engineer of record?

Dr. Choma:

That is Lumos Engineering [Lumos & Associates, Inc.].

Assemblyman DeLong:

I am familiar with them. Thank you very much.

Dr. Choma:

Of course.

Chair Goulding:

Any other questions? Yes, Senator.

Senator Titus:

Thanks, Madam Chair. Quick—prior to the forming of Marlette Lake, where did that runoff go? Was it Washoe Lake?

Dr. Choma:

It would have come down the slope and probably gone into Washoe Lake. And that was—that capturing started back in 1873 with the Marlette Water System. They actually installed that as part of their plan.

Senator Titus:

Just real quick also—I think the base elevation of Lake Tahoe is 6,300. Is that correct? I was—what is it? Okay, I was close. And so, what is the base elevation of Marlette Lake when it is at capacity?

Dr. Choma:

Seven thousand eight hundred.

Senator Titus:

You have a lot of phone-a-friends behind you, so I am pleased with that. Thank you. Thanks, Madam Chair.

Chair Goulding:

Do you need any other trivia on—?

Senator Titus:

These are important, because if there is a failed system, where does that water go? Does it go to Carson City? And is it coming here? These failed dams—they are important to know which way it all flows, and where is that water going to go when these dams fail.

Dr. Choma:

Marlette would go to Tahoe, because it is on the west side of the summit, and Hobart would come into Washoe Lake.

Senator Titus:

All right, thank you.

Dr. Choma:

Because Hobart Creek—we split it, but then continues down into Washoe Lake.

Senator Titus:

Great. Thank you. See, these are—this is not trivia; this is important.

Chair Goulding:

I was not trying to trivialize the question. Sorry. Anything else? Thank you so much for the presentation. Fascinating. We will definitely work together on setting up a tour.

Dr. Choma:

Thank you.

Chair Goulding:

—and all of the Committee members.

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

Chair Goulding:

Moving on. We have also invited each of the counties to come and present and express their priorities for this legislative session. Our first county presentation is Washoe County, Ms. Matijevich. Thank you very much for being here. Thank you for your patience, and we look forward to your presentation whenever you are ready.

A. WASHOE COUNTY

Cadence Matijevich, Government Affairs Liaison, Washoe County:

Good afternoon, Chair Goulding, Vice Chair Daly, members of the Committee. Hard to follow that excellent presentation, which is such a great endorsement for STEM [Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics] education. So, maybe I will be a good endorsement for liberal arts education—one can only hope at 4:20 on a Friday afternoon. So, I want to start by expressing Commissioner Alexis Hill's regrets. She had planned to be here, but some scheduling challenges prevented that—so, you got me today. I am grateful for the opportunity to share with you some of Washoe County's priorities for the Lake Tahoe Basin. If you will forgive me, she and I had planned this as a tag team. I am going to try to do both, from the notes and run the slides. ([Agenda Item VII A](#))

Just some brief information about Washoe County's facilities and services in Lake Tahoe. You can see there, we have a number of facilities that we operate—Sheriff's Office Substation—you can see the information there. I will not read all of these given the late hour, and the fact that I know that all of you can read. We do quite a bit of public works up at the Basin, including road and stormwater maintenance. I would take this opportunity to give a plug for Mr. Donahue and his team's ask for continued funding for the EIP—that helps us with our projects as well. And so, that is very important, and we would endorse support for those requests as well. In some of the questions and answers that you had around land use and building permits, we are one of the designated agencies. And so, land use and building permits for Tahoe does happen with our Planning Department. And we also issue business licenses for the businesses that are in our portion of the Basin.

Other local government entities that help provide services in the Washoe County portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin—so not just Washoe County, but the Incline Village General Improvement District, commonly referred to as IVGID. You can see that they also provide a

number of services to the residents of Incline Village. The North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District provides fire prevention and protection services. The Northern Nevada Public Health District provides health services. And then of course, Washoe County School District educates the children that live in the Washoe County portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin.

Chair Goulding, at your request, we want to hit on a couple of priorities. I want to be clear that these are not Washoe County's only—our only interests in the Tahoe Basin. And certainly you have heard about some other things today. I think as we proceed through this interim period, we will dive into some of those issues—wildfire evacuation, the issue of the availability and affordability of homeowners insurance are definitely things that we care about. But in the interest of the time that was given for this presentation and knowing that this is your first meeting and that some of those topics you will dive into deeper—I am going to focus today on three primary topics. The first being establishing dedicated, sustainable funding for transit in the Washoe County portion of the Basin. Implementation of the 2025 Washoe Tahoe Area Plan update, an equitable authority and proportional distribution of tourism-driven revenues that are generated in the Washoe County portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin.

I will start with transit and transportation, and you have heard today already some previews about the importance of transit and transportation, and how particularly transit can help with reducing vehicle miles traveled; and the impacts to the economic—excuse me, environmental impacts on Lake Tahoe that come from vehicle traffic. Availability and use of transit in the Basin is critical. And particularly, we care about it for the whole Basin, but our priority is for the Washoe County portion of the Basin. So, for us that looks like the TART [Tahoe Truckee Area Regional Transit] fixed-route transit. That is a free, year-round, fixed-route service that operates throughout North Lake Tahoe and Truckee, including Incline Village and Crystal Bay. It is operated by the Tahoe Truckee Area Regional Transit, otherwise known as TART—more acronyms for you—a public-private collaboration that is administered by Placer County, California. And so, for the portion of that route that is in Washoe County, in Fiscal Year '25, there were 37,693 one-way passenger trips, and the operating costs for our portion of that route is just about \$780,000, and the funding for that route is currently provided by the Washoe Regional Transportation Commission, our RTC, and the Federal Transit Administration.

We also have been the benefit, up until very recently, of the TART Connect, which is—you have heard earlier today some discussion around microtransit. And unfortunately, I am here to share with you that the TART Connect microtransit service that had been a free, year-round, door-to-door operation in Incline Village and Crystal Bay that had begun in 2021 was terminated—discontinued in December of this last year due to lack of dedicated, sustainable funding. It is really unfortunate for our community that that happened. You can see there—even more than the fixed-route line—76,500 one-way passenger trips. And 63 percent of those were shared by two or more passengers. And so, as that microtransit was making its way throughout Incline Village, trips that would have been in two, three, four—perhaps—cars were able to be completed by one vehicle. You heard a little bit earlier about how microtransit can help offset other vehicle miles traveled. And so, it is really unfortunate that this has had to cease. The operating expense—it is not inexpensive, admittedly, but, so, it had been, over the years, funded through a patchwork of providers. And all of them I think were as generous as they were able to, but with economic pressures, and a reduction in some of the revenues that come to all of those various partners, that was not able to be sustained any longer. And then the other key transit and transportation component that we have today is the East Shore Express, and that is a free, daily, seasonal shuttle that runs between Incline Village and Sand Harbor, from late June to early September. That is operated by the Tahoe Transportation District. You can see there the

number of one-way trips and the cost. I would note that is funded through federal dollars and from Nevada State Parks. The Nevada State Parks funding is not guaranteed from year to year, but is critical. And if it were to go away, in all likelihood that important piece of our transit and transportation system would also have to be either significantly reduced or terminated. So, to the degree that you all are asked to support Nevada State Parks' budget—to continue that funding, we would ask for your support on that, please.

Another thing that has been in progress—continues to be in discussion with the community in Incline Village—is a mobility hub, a central place for the heartbeat, if you will, of transit in Incline Village and heated shelter during the winter months, EV charging stations, vehicle and bicycle parking, public gathering spaces. So, that continues to be a discussion in our community. And again, just the funding that is needed around all of these transit is a primary issue for us.

Our Washoe Tahoe Area Plan implementation—so, you heard a little bit earlier from Director Regan about how there is the overall Regional Plan and then we, as individual jurisdictions within the Basin, have our own particular area plans that are specific to our communities and that meet the needs that are particular to our communities. And so, we initiated an update to our area plan in December of 2024, that was recently approved by the TRPA Governing Board in December of 2025. The focus of that was workforce housing supply and affordability—with primary goals of:

- Incorporating TRPA's mandated density, height, parking, coverage incentives for attainable workforce housing;
- Easing restrictions on accessory dwelling units by allowing them on parcels that are smaller than an acre—that had previously been a prohibition—the parcel had to be an acre or more to have an ADU—and so, that got changed; and
- Reducing unnecessary barriers to housing.

I think it is important to note that even with these changes to our area plan, TRPA's growth limits are still in place, and that these incentives are only applicable in the town centers—in areas zoned for multifamily, and that they are only available to projects where 100 percent of the units are deed-restricted with income or employment requirements.

I want to talk a little bit about short-term rentals, because I know that there is interest in that as it relates to housing affordability and use of housing in the Basin. And so, we currently have 680 short-term rental permits issued in Incline Village and Crystal Bay. That represents about 90 percent of all of the short-term rental permits across the entire unincorporated portion of Washoe County—so, they are really concentrated in Incline Village and Crystal Bay—but they really represent a little more than 10 percent of the housing in Incline Village and Crystal Bay. I think there is some perception that 50, 60 percent of the houses are being used for short-term rentals—and that is not what our permitting data brings to bear. And our short-term rental permitting team does proactively look for short-term rental properties that are operating without a permit. So, we are looking at listings on Airbnb and Vrbo and other platforms to identify properties that may be operating a short-term rental without a permit. We are proactively doing that. I also want to note that in 2024, we prohibited STRs from being established in ADUs. So, sort of seeing that ADUs are part of how we solve the issue—countywide frankly—of the affordability crisis and that is a component of it. We have issued incentives in our County for the creation of ADUs—but in the Tahoe Basin, we do not allow those to be used as short-term rentals.

Then one other component of that is that we have established a Lease to Locals Plan, where we incentivize property owners to offer longer-term leases to local residents. And so, the data that is there on your slides shows—I am actually pleased to report that since we put the slide presentation together, we have had additional property enrolled; so, 15 properties total so far, and 3 additional adults are housed in that additional property. So, that project is fairly new—but something that we are doing as Washoe County to try to incentivize some of that housing stock being converted to long-term rentals.

Before I start these next two slides, I want to be very clear that as I talk through these—I want to present to you information for you to understand sort of the status of the tourism-related revenues that this Legislature—that the Legislature that you are members of—have authorized in Washoe County. I—not necessarily by raising this suggesting that they are—not necessarily suggesting that there should be any changes to any of this. But I think it is important context for all of you to understand why there have been requests made in the past for changes to these, and why we feel that there is something that needs to be done to address equity of the authority and distribution in the Washoe County portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin. You can see on their chart there—that everywhere else in Washoe County lodging properties have been authorized by this Legislature to implement a surcharge, except for in unincorporated Washoe County. So, I am not necessarily saying that the answer is a surcharge, but as we work with you through this interim process and in the next legislative session, I would ask for you to keep this in mind when we come forward with solutions to help fund these priorities—particularly transit—that we are asking for you to give us tools like you have given the other portion of our County.

Similarly, here, I want to show the breakdown. This is Washoe B. Washoe B is the taxing district for the lodging properties that are located in Incline Village and Crystal Bay. You can see the breakdown there of the 13 percent room tax rate—where the individual components go. So, you can see that a full 4 percent, or 30 percent of the overall number, goes to support facilities that are in the Valley. So, of those monies, none of that is being retained in the Basin that—none of that 4 percent is available for needs in the Basin. It all goes to facilities that are in Reno. I am not saying that those facilities are not great facilities and that they should not be supported. Please do not misunderstand my pointing that out. But proportionately speaking, that is 30 percent of those revenues are not available for the needs in the Washoe portion of Lake Tahoe—when the revenues are being generated there. The things that we would advocate that they would be spent for would support both tourists and our residents.

There are some additional resources for you on some of the things that I have mentioned today. There are contacts for myself and for Commissioner Hill. I do want to clarify something that was mentioned earlier. Commissioner Hill does serve as Washoe County's designee to the TRPA's Governing Board. She is the Commissioner for District 1, which is the portion of the Basin—of the area of Washoe County where the Basin is located. She has an alternate to that Committee, but we only have one member that sits on that Governing Board. So, the Board of County Commissioners names the commissioner that serves to that and their alternate, and there is not necessarily a requirement that it be a commissioner, so her alternate could be a member of the community. It has been recently Commissioner Garcia, but I just wanted to clarify because I think someone said earlier that they both sit on that, and that would only be the case if Commissioner Garcia were there in her alternate capacity.

With that, Madam Chair, thank you for the opportunity to share. I hope that that has been helpful. Skipped over some of my notes in the interest of time, so if there are things that were not quite clear, I am happy to try and answer those questions.

Chair Goulding:

Thank you, and thank you for that clarification. We had made a note here on the issue of the two Commissioners and knowing that there was only one seat—so I appreciate that clarification. Members of the Committee, questions? Anyone?

My understanding is from your slides—so the question is about the room tax and where is that allocated? But, can you flip back to that slide? Because my interpretation of that slide was—it was not clear to me about that. Can you cover that? The—where is the room tax? One—it looked from the slide that there was not a room tax.

Ms. Matjevich:

Thank you, Madam Chair. I want to—is this—am I on the right slide for you? So, there are two columns there. There absolutely is a room tax. In Washoe County, we have six different taxing districts for the purposes of collecting transient lodging taxes. And so, you can see—there is the Reno B district, Reno D, Reno E, Sparks, Washoe A, and Washoe B. Washoe B is the Incline portion—Incline/Crystal Bay portion—of Washoe County, and the legislatively-approved room tax. The room tax rates are legislatively approved, and that rate in Washoe B is 13 percent. What has not been authorized is a surcharge per room night, which is different than a tax. It is a fixed per room night rate that can be charged. You can see that in Reno B, they have been authorized to charge \$2. In Reno D—depending upon what type of a property it is \$3 or \$4. In Reno E it is \$2. In Sparks, it is \$2. The Legislature has not authorized the imposition of a surcharge for either Washoe A—which is all of—any property in unincorporated Washoe County that is not in the Basin—and then Washoe B. My apologies if I was not explicit enough and that was confusing, but—

Chair Goulding:

That surcharge is on top of the 13 percent.

Ms. Matjevich:

That is correct, Madam Chair.

Chair Goulding:

Got it, thank you for that clarification. So, of that 13 percent, how is that allocated? This is the allocation of that 13 percent.

Ms. Matjevich:

Yes, Chair Goulding. That is the allocation in Washoe B. That allocation looks a little different across—in the other taxing districts. I know that at one of your future meetings you are going to be receiving presentations from the Convention and Visitors Bureau, and I expect that you will get even more robust information from the Reno-Sparks Convention & Visitors Authority (RSCVA) about how those are distributed in other portions of the County. I know they have tables and charts that show that, but for purposes of Washoe interests in the Incline/Crystal Bay area, this is the breakdown. And these are all, again, these uses are set forth by the Legislature. The Washoe County Taxes on Transient Lodging Act of 1999 was the last change that was made to this distribution. The surcharges were not addressed in that and came in subsequent sessions. But when those were implemented, there were pleas made at that time by the interests in the Washoe County portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin to address the issue. Interestingly, even then, we need money for transit and

transportation. If you go back and look at the minutes of those hearings, when that was put into place there was a request made by the interests in the Washoe County portion of the Basin to look at that—and we were told, like, “Let us put it into place, see how it works, and we can come back in a couple of years and revisit it.” So, here we are 27 years later. I would suggest that maybe it is time to look at it once more—respectfully.

Chair Goulding:

Thank you for that presentation. Thank you for the information.

Senator Daly:

Two quick questions. So, of the money that is generated in Lake Tahoe, generally, in the Basin—that would include Douglas as well, and by my understanding not many room nights in Carson—but of the percentage of the room night dollars that are generated in the Basin, it all goes to the RSCVA, right? And then gets redistributed?

Ms. Matijevich:

Madam Chair, through you to Senator Daly. In Washoe County—room taxes collected in Douglas County, Senator, I am not going to speak on it because I might make a mistake. But room taxes collected in Washoe County are paid to the RSCVA, and the RSCVA then distributes those out to the various entities—the receiving entities that you see distributed on the slide; and so, they get them. They do not get to keep them all. They have to give them to other entities based on the statutory breakdown of what is allocated to the receiving entities—and you can see that there. I would note that the percentage that goes to Travel North Tahoe Nevada—you may see that on some reports as a grant. That is a little bit misleading because there is legislation that requires that. So, it is not a discretionary grant that the RSCVA gives, they are required by statute to give half of the percent—half of the percentage of the 13 percent that goes to the Convention & Visitors Authority, they have to then further distribute to Travel North Tahoe Nevada.

Senator Daly:

Okay, and we will have to follow up on the rest of that. So, on the short-term rentals—is the room tax collected on that for the County?

Ms. Matijevich:

Senator, yes.

Chair Goulding:

If there are no more questions, then we will ask Douglas County to come up, and they can clarify how that works in Douglas.

B. DOUGLAS COUNTY

Chair Goulding:

So, we have Ms. Davidson from Douglas County. After Douglas County, we will have Storey County—and those will be the last two presentations. Okay. Go ahead when you are ready. Thank you.

Jenifer Davidson, County Manager, Douglas County:

Honorable Chair, and distinguished members of the legislative Committee. I appreciate the opportunity to return before this Committee, and thank you for your continued attention to governance and long-term stewardship of the Lake Tahoe Basin. Joining me today is Wendy Lang, our Assistant County Manager. On behalf of the Douglas County Board of County Commissioners and our residents, businesses, and the visitors we serve, we are pleased to provide updated remarks regarding the County's priorities for the Lake Tahoe Basin. Through our remarks here today, we hope to provide the Committee with an overview of the progress being made in the Tahoe Basin, the opportunities that remain, and the priorities that will benefit from your continued engagement in oversight.

Meaningful progress has been achieved through strong partnerships between Douglas County stakeholders in the Basin. Those relationships remain essential to advancing sustainable development, protecting our natural resources, addressing public health and safety needs, and enhancing the overall quality of life in the Basin. We appreciate the Committee's time, leadership, and continued commitment to the long-term success of this remarkable region. Two years ago, we spoke with you about the importance of partnership, balance, and accountability in managing one of the world's most treasured and natural environments. Those themes remain highly relevant today. The need to strike a careful balance between people and place will continue to be a reoccurring message in many presentations by our partner agencies, for many obvious and important reasons.

Douglas County's priorities for the Lake Tahoe Basin reflect what the Board of County Commissioners consistently hear from our residents, businesses, and partners. Protect the Lake, keep people safe, and ensure Tahoe remains a place where communities can thrive in harmony with their world-class environment. ([Agenda Item VII B](#)) This slide summarizes the framework guiding our work in the Basin. None of these priorities stand alone; partnership, environmental stewardship, public safety, transportation, infrastructure, and quality of life are all deeply interconnected. Our focus is on coordination across overlapping agencies, so that policies reinforce one another and produce tangible results for residents and visitors alike.

The Kahle Complete Streets, which was mentioned earlier today, is a project that is a strong example of effective regional collaboration. This project led by Megan Kelly with the Nevada Tahoe Conservation District improves safety for pedestrians and cyclists, enhances accessibility, and delivers meaningful stormwater and environmental impacts—or excuse me—benefits for the Lake. We are pleased that the construction is now underway. We see this as a model for how public and private funding can be leveraged effectively to achieve transportation infrastructure and environmental goals for our community.

The Tahoe Blue Event Center, located in Douglas County portion of the Lake, exemplifies effective collaboration across multiple public and private partners—bringing together Tahoe Douglas Visitors Authority, or TDVA, local government, community stakeholders, and TRPA to achieve regional objectives. The Center is owned by TDVA, who is ultimately responsible for repaying the financing. However, through an agreement with TDVA, Douglas County contributes \$1.3 million annually in redevelopment tax increment revenue generated, for a total of no more than \$34.25 million to the project. This represents a significant investment in economic vitality by the County in the Basin. The Center also

demonstrates how economic vitality and environmental stewardship can coexist. This facility was designed to bolster the regional economy, while operating in an environmentally responsible and safe manner. In its first years of operation, TDVA has demonstrated a strong commitment to conserving resources and managing impacts from its operation. We encourage TRPA to continue its support of the Center.

In 2024, Douglas County requested modifications to certain event limitations on the Center's permit that were intended to manage visitation but had the unintended effect of restricting community use by local organizations and public agencies. We appreciate the permit modifications that addressed county and community concerns while improving coordination around transportation and access. We thank this Committee, TRPA, TDVA, and the public for their leadership and engagement around this subject. We continue to support the ongoing review of the Event Center's permit and operations to ensure the facility remains well integrated into the surrounding community and the environment.

In December 2012, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Governing Board adopted updated regional plans, establishing new goals and policies to guide future land use decisions in the Lake Tahoe region. The Board also adopted an updated TRPA *Code of Ordinances*, introducing provisions that allow local jurisdictions in coordination with TRPA to prepare area plans that implement the updated Regional Plan. Douglas County is currently in the process of drafting the Tahoe Douglas Area Plan, or TDAP, to further the goals and policies in the Regional Plan and meet the provisions of Chapter 13. The TDAP is a long-term blueprint that will guide development and environmental stewardship over the next 5, 10, and 15 years in the area outlined on the map in orange on this slide. It will align local priorities with TRPA's Regional Plan, while reflecting the unique character of our communities. Public engagement is central to this effort, and we are committed to a transparent process that balances environmental protection, community vitality, and regulatory clarity.

As an important component of regional planning moving forward, will be the region's response to housing needs in the Basin. Douglas County supports TRPA's efforts to provide sustainable and affordable workforce housing in walkable communities. This approach can help reduce vehicle travel and improve public safety by allowing employees to live closer to where they work, in a region where housing costs present real barriers. We support and encourage workforce housing solutions while recognizing that any increases in land use or density must be carefully planned, appropriately scaled, and accompanied by infrastructure, environmental protections, and community input to address resident concerns related to public safety, quality of life, and the long-term health of the Lake.

Speaking of public engagement, community feedback provided to date during the TDAP update process has been clear. Residents value safety, environmental protection, and quality of life, particularly along Highway 50 and in areas experiencing tourism pressure. Additionally, participants in the engagement process have expressed diverse perspectives on housing affordability, redevelopment, and growth. As I have stated in several presentations that I have given previously, residents in Douglas County want progress, but they do not want change. It is the job of elected officials and public administrators to navigate the paradoxes of local governance by effectively translating this feedback into balanced policies that are practical, protective, and responsive to the needs of the area. I am going to pause on this slide for just a moment so you can capture all of the summary of public comment that we have received to date. At this point in the presentation, I will now turn it over to Assistant County Manager, Wendy Lang.

Wendy Lang, Assistant County Manager, Douglas County:

Thank you very much. Honorable Chair, and distinguished members of the Committee, we appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today, and thank you for your dedicated oversight and long-term protection of the Lake Tahoe Basin. It is our privilege to represent Douglas County here today.

There is strong agreement in Douglas County that addressing growing travel demand in the Tahoe region calls for a comprehensive transportation system and coordinated strategies that operate across jurisdictions. Lasting reductions in vehicle miles traveled can only be achieved through coordinated region-wide planning efforts. We appreciate the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's leading of a regional effort to create a more coordinated, efficient, and sustainable transit system throughout the Basin. The Transit Comprehensive Operational Analysis is an important step toward a more integrated and efficient regional transit system. Douglas County sees this as an opportunity to strengthen coordination, clarify governance roles, and identify sustainable transportation funding. Early engagement is critical, and we are committed to aligning this effort with our mobility, safety, and tourism management goals.

Douglas County supports continued investment in a comprehensive network of public transit, parking management, trails, sidewalks, and bike lanes that provide Tahoe residents and visitors with safe, reliable, and convenient alternatives for traveling throughout the region—to homes, workplaces, schools, commercial and recreation areas, and to live their daily lives. As day visitation continues to increase, it is especially important to ensure access to the Lake without requiring a personal vehicle. We support strategies that make it easier for visitors to arrive, park once, and move around the Basin using multiple transportation options. Investments in separated, multimodal paths, coordinated parking solutions, and transit service within the U.S. Highway 50 corridor will better connect neighborhoods, recreation areas, and commercial centers, while enhancing safety, access, and overall experience.

The U.S. 50 corridor acts as an important local connection for a wide range of recreation, employment, and residential centers, while also being an important regional connector for commerce and through connectivity. Highway 50 is the main access to many popular public recreation areas, such as Van Sickle Bi-State Park, Nevada Beach, Roundhill Pines, and Zephyr Cove, among many other locations. It provides access to numerous trails, including the famed Tahoe Rim Trail, the Tahoe Trail, and other federal, state, and local public lands. Most importantly, Highway 50 is the only access to many residential properties and smaller businesses located along the corridor, as well as the primary access from the east to the business and casino core of South Lake Tahoe. The corridor experiences high volumes of traffic, not only in peak summer season, but throughout the year from a mix of users, including commercial trucks and passenger vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists. Safety is a major issue on this corridor, as it experiences a high rate of fatal vehicle crashes, large numbers of shoulder-parked cars, pedestrians and cyclists crossing or traveling along the highway, and little transit service to the corridor.

Our Warrior Way paid parking program reflects a practical approach to managing access, safety, and visitor experience, and environmental impacts. The pilot program has generated local benefits by supporting schools, parks, and community services. Importantly, it also improves emergency access and balances the needs of residents and visitors—an outcome we believe is essential throughout the Basin. Pricing is structured to discourage overutilization, particularly in high volume periods and to encourage access to private entities, such as Aramark's operations at the Zephyr Cove beaches. In 2025, over

4,000 cars were parked off the highway and over \$125,000 of profit were returned directly to support students and park and trail maintenance in the Basin. The program aims to meet the community needs thoughtfully without creating new problems. By making use of space that would otherwise sit empty, we are putting existing resources to better use. Revenue generated is primarily through beach activity, while park and library users remain unaffected, as their access to these facilities includes waived parking fees. This effort has improved the experience and safety while also managing overall capacity to minimize impacts, including trash, sanitation, and emergency access in the area.

Our Kahle Congregate lunch program is a relatively new, expanded offering at our Kahle Community Center because quality of life is about more than infrastructure—it is also about people. This program supports older adults by providing nutritious meals and meaningful social connection. It succeeds because of strong partnerships with nonprofits and volunteers, and it highlights how community-focused services contribute to the overall health and resilience. Each Thursday, we consistently serve lunch to about 25 to 30 seniors. In addition to lunch, we are expanding other programming, like walking groups and card games. This growth creates an activity hub for the community and connects multiple generations as we integrate senior-focused services in the same space that we are hosting youth sports, recreation, fitness, and early childhood education.

Ms. Davidson:

The Lake Parkway project is a long-term investment in mobility and safety between Stateline and Kingsbury Grade. By improving multimodal connections, we can reduce congestion, enhance safety, and support economic activity. We continue to work with regional partners to advance design and secure funding in future fiscal years for this project, and we look forward to it coming forward. We are almost to the finish line.

In December 2025, the Board of County Commissioners voted to create the Douglas County Stormwater Utility, and we are so proud of their leadership on this front. This utility is designed to provide a dedicated, transparent funding source for protecting water quality in meeting regulatory requirements across Douglas County, but especially relevant to this conversation—water quality at the Lake. By using an enterprise fund model, we will ensure that revenues are reinvested directly into system maintenance, infrastructure upgrades, and environmental protection. This approach will strengthen coordination with TRPA and state partners while supporting infrastructure upgrades and stormwater drainage mitigation in the Douglas County portion of the Basin in compliance with federal standards—federal and state standards. We anticipate the Board will take action to set rates for the utility this spring.

And last, we just want to leave you—in closing, Douglas County remains committed to collaboration, accountability, and stewardship in the Lake Tahoe Basin. We support policies and improvement projects that can serve and restore Lake Tahoe's environment, revitalize communities, enhance the quality of life for our residents, and the visitor experience, and improve public safety overall. On behalf of the Douglas County Board of Commissioners, we appreciate the Committee's oversight and partnership, and we thank you for the opportunity to share our priorities. We look forward to continuing our productive relationship with the State of Nevada and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency. We welcome your questions and your discussion. Thank you.

Chair Goulding:

Thanks for the excellent presentation. We have a number of questions. Why do not we start with Assemblymember DeLong?

Assemblymember DeLong:

Thank you, Chair, and thank you for the presentation. I have a question on your figure five—or page 5 of your presentation. You outline a boundary for the Tahoe Douglas Area Plan, and there is a carve out in the casino corridor. Is there a local plan for that area, or is that just covered by the Regional Plan?

Ms. Davidson:

Thank you, Assemblymember DeLong, for your question. That area is a separate area plan.

Assemblymember DeLong:

Thank you.

Ms. Davidson:

Yes, the South Shore Area Plan.

Chair Goulding:

You bet. Senator Daly.

Senator Daly:

Thank you, Madam Chair. Real quick—so my understanding there is a—to help service the debt on the Event Center—there is a \$5 per night surcharge on that?

Ms. Davidson:

Thank you, Senator Daly, for the question. Yes, there is a \$5 a night surcharge that is collected and goes directly to TDVA for the Event Center.

Senator Daly:

How was that enabled? Was it legislatively enabled by the state or was it county implemented? How did it end up being collected?

Ms. Davidson:

Thank you again for the question. It was enabled through legislative action.

Senator Daly:

When they approved the Event Center at the beginning?

Ms. Davidson:

I think it was—thank you again for the question. I believe it was implemented shortly thereafter.

Senator Daly:

Okay, thank you.

Chair Goulding:

Senator Titus.

Senator Titus:

Thank you, Chair, and thank you both for being here. Great to see you gals. On page 8, you have a board—or a signage board—and what really caught me was at the very bottom it says, “Cell signal strongest at Highway 50 and Warrior Way.” You have mentioned multiple times—improving infrastructure—and just wondering about—and I am sure—and maybe we will have some presentation on cell service access, some of that, cell towers. What are we doing when we do expand? Are you putting in more lines? Just worried that the—that is a reality, you gals both live in Douglas County and drive through there and frequently we have—as I drive through it—and it is even worse in Smith Valley, just really vacuums, where we have no cell service whatsoever. So, wondering if it is—if we are going to have a presentation on some of those infrastructure needs in the Tahoe Basin? Or what is Douglas County looking at that way?

Ms. Davidson:

Thank you, Senator Titus, for the question. Broadband availability, cell service at the Lake, are absolutely something that Douglas County is paying attention to. It is particularly challenging at the Lake. A lot of the infrastructure—we are talking about digging into bedrock in order to install it, and so it can be quite expensive. Douglas County has benefited from a number of partnerships with, not only other public agencies, but also other nonprofit agencies. We recently received a presentation to the County Commission this week. I am totally drawing a blank on the nonprofit agency. Thank you, Tahoe Prosperity Center. I have a phone-a-friend in the audience too. Thank you, sir. They presented to us and through a number of their efforts have applied for grant projects for various broadband investments across the Lake. But it is also something that the County is looking at—how we can include broadband and other infrastructure components into the work that we are doing in road maintenance projects and other environmental projects as well—how we can expand that net.

Senator Titus:

Thank you for that. I just—we are pushing out that we are asking people who come to visit the Lake to make sure they have parking before they get there. Some of them may not know that, they might pull in and need to sign up and then cannot. And so, I just want to make sure we are paying acute, you know, we are making sure that we are paying attention to that need—that we cannot ask tourists to come and do this, or locals to come and go up there and pay for parking, and suddenly they do not have any phone access. I am sure you are aware of that. Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Chair Goulding:

All right; we got any more? Go ahead.

Assemblymember Osborn:

Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Ms. Lang and Ms. Davidson. Ms. Davidson, I am looking at your last slide, the chart on the stormwater utility for the Tahoe Drainage Infrastructure. And there is a difference there in 43 different feature types that you have

listed. I am just curious, is the difference there that those units are they outside of Douglas County? The ones not maintained by the County.

Ms. Davidson:

Yes. Thank you for the question. My phone-a-friend, Ms. Lang, did say yes, they are the pieces of stormwater infrastructure maintained by others, which would be the general improvement districts within the Douglas County portion of the Basin.

Assemblymember Osborn:

Thank you very much.

Chair Goulding:

Okay. Any other questions? All right. Storey County, you are up.

C. STOREY COUNTY

Chair Goulding:

We have got County Manager Osborne and Vice Chair Mitchell here from Storey County. Thank you, gentlemen, for hanging in there. We appreciate your patience, and we look forward to your presentation—the presentation—the final of the evening. We are—yeah, I think we can count this as evening hours now.

Clay Mitchell, Vice Chair, Storey County Commission:

Thank you, Chair. Our brief presentation, to be sure.

Chair Goulding:

We thank you for that as well.

Mr. Mitchell:

All right. Chair Goulding and Committee, nice to see you. Thanks for having us, and boy, do we have some big plans for Lake Tahoe to share with you! You brought those slides, right? I am just kidding. ([Agenda Item VII C](#)) We just like to spend—briefly discuss our portion of the Marlette Water System. I know it has been a long meeting, so we will keep it short. For reference, under current agreements Marlette water can only be used on the Comstock—in the Comstock area of Storey County, which is shown in pink on this map. We also serve water to Silver City, which is in Lyon County, and that is that little blurb at the very bottom there—it is part of the system service area. Now, as was mentioned, this is the only source of water for the Comstock. I would also note for the record that no Marlette System water is used for industrial or any other purposes at the TRI [Tahoe-Reno Industrial] Center. There are two sides to the Marlette system, and on the left is a much-simplified version of the upper portion of the system, which was discussed earlier by Dr. Choma, and it is owned and managed by the state. We are responsible—Storey County is responsible for maintenance and operations of the pipeline and the system from 580 to the east. I just wanted to note briefly that the pressure at the bottom of this 1870s-vintage, Civil War-era, lead-jointed, iron-pipe inverted siphon can be upwards of 800 psi [pounds per square inch]. Anecdotally, if it pops a rivet, that is enough to break rocks. That is about 1,870 feet of head on

the—that is creating that pressure. As Dr. Choma mentioned, that pressure is enough to push the water up and over the Virginia range on the other side without any pumping.

On the Storey County side, the raw water is stored in Five Mile Reservoir, then piped by gravity feed to our treatment plant just above Virginia City and then distributed to customers throughout the Comstock. It is a pretty dense amount of water infrastructure for a fairly small community, and in many ways it is amazing that this reconstruction-era system still functions today. I am going to pass it on over to County Manager Osborn to round out our presentation. Thank you.

Austin Osborn, County Manager, Storey County:

Good morning, Committee members, Chair Goulding, Vice Chair Daly. Really appreciate the opportunity to speak with you tonight. I am just going to talk a little bit, taken from this point, of how the big picture of how this all works on the Storey County side of the system. So, as we know, Nevada, on that side, basically collects the water, transmits it over to Storey County, and then, once it crosses 580, then we take it from that point forward, and we transmit it up to the treatment center, and then we distribute it through our communities, which include Virginia City, Gold Hill, Silver City, and then there is an area of American Flat that is currently largely undeveloped that you would provide as well.

There is an agreement between Storey County, the State of Nevada, and Carson City where we purchase the water, and there is a limit on how much we can purchase—as you see on the slide here. And then we charge—or pay about 85 cents per 1,000 gallons of water for our system. Now—it recently went up about a dime. So, it is important at this point—Commissioner Mitchell did mention—I want to emphasize that that agreement—we are in the process of renegotiating that with the parties. I want to make it very clear that that renegotiation has no intent whatsoever to provide this water outside into Tahoe Reno Industrial Center, or any uses like that, outside of the Marlette System. It is important to emphasize because we are asked that frequently—if those sorts of things would happen.

The next question—or next here—is really just—this slide is really for your review. I am happy to answer any questions about it when the presentation is over, but I am going to run to the next slide that really just gives you the scale of what the system looks like in our area. There is about 800 connections that includes residential and commercial, and there is room for about another 1,000 or so. Basically, we have a 2023 Water Master Plan that dovetails into our County Master Plan that shows there is about 1,000 vacant parcels in the Comstock area that potentially could be developed either with residential, commercial, or other uses. It is important to note, too, that this system is very important for flows because it is the only source of water that we have—and that also includes for fire suppression and wildland fire suppression.

In this slide here, you can see that if we were to build out the Comstock based on existing vacant parcels and what we have currently, we are looking at roughly about 1,500-acre-feet of water that would be needed. That is substantially less than some estimates that were kind of running around publicly, like 5,000 or 6,000. That would not be the case.

I want to talk about this slide a little bit. It is kind of important, and it is meant to be dramatic—because it is dramatic. What we have here—these little pictures—one is in 2025; one is about 2014. This is a situation that we live with on a pretty regular basis. Commissioner Mitchell talked about when a rivet pops, you know, it can break rock. Well, when a pipe busts, it can break through the road. And so, this picture down at the bottom, to give an idea, this happens, we get geysers in town. We get geysers on the water line

going to Silver City. There has been—last year—a geyser that happened right at the bottom of 580. There was a second one that happened—the one that happened before that wiped out a person's garage and his landscaping—apparently built over the pipe and did not know it. So, that has been addressed on our side by our water system.

Fortunately, we have a very strong relationship with the state. A lot of times the state will come help us with these things, especially if it is on the main transmission line down at the bottom of Washoe Valley. Inversely, we also help the state on the state side, sometimes with equipment and personnel that we have. We are very grateful for that relationship. So, really, like Commissioner Mitchell explained, we are dealing with not only transmission that was built in the 1870s, but the distribution in our local pipes—and here, in town—are also the same. So, we have a small public works department that is maintaining and keeping this thing going. These blowouts do typically—always are scheduled usually on Thanksgiving, Christmas, and Nevada Day—and that is not an exaggeration. You could talk to our Public Works Director; he will attest to that.

So, some upgrades—we are upgrading the system. First are the needed upgrades. These are the things—this kind of gives you a cost breakdown. When you look at that transmission line—that is of 800 psi—there is \$21 million that is needed—to not only upgrade that line to meet future demand, but also for it to be sustainable and not blow out. We have American Flat main. We have a main that goes to Silver City—it is \$12 million. Overall, it is about \$70 million total; \$40 million of critical infrastructure and 20 to 25 of it—that is absolutely—we are crossing our fingers every night that something terrible does not happen.

But that does not say that we are not upgrading the system. We put about \$12 million into it so far on the Storey County side, you know, with tanks and treatment and distribution lines and those sorts of things. And so, we are definitely busy with that. That line you see down in the bottom, that is the main line that goes right in front of the courthouse. It is one of the most important lines in Virginia City, serving our community.

How do we make this thing work, really? It is all about rates, and it is about grants, and it is about debt. So, when you look at that slide on the right, there is about \$3 million worth of debt on the water side alone. This does not count sewer. And what is important about that? You are talking about 800 ratepayers that are paying into that; so, that is a big number per capita. And then when you looked at the left side—the slide is just a little bit dated—but what you are seeing here is that we are really close to about as high as we possibly could charge for those residents and businesses without becoming into an undue hardship. So, this is a real issue. What the formula we really look at is—to fill that difference—is grants, we look at loans, and I want to talk about growth just a little bit in a slide or two ahead.

This gives you an idea where we are currently with federal assistance. Commissioner Mitchell, our business development officer, and sometimes our grants administrators spend significant time in Washington, D.C. We have a great relationship with our delegates, and they do have a tendency to come home with bags of money. That is where we put it. We bury it in the ground, and we fix pipes, and we fix problems across the County. We are very grateful for those relationships because we rely on them, in addition to our internal revenues that we have.

This is an interesting sign. I want to talk about it, and this will be pretty much toward the end here. The top slide, if we were to walk out of this building and look east toward Dayton, you would see—you probably would not see it from here—but right behind the mountain, there is this bowl, and it is called American Flat—and originally it was American City. It was

going to be the capital of Nevada at one point before it came this way to Ormsby County. This is an area that we have in our Master Plan identified as a potential—it is a footnote—of some residential development idea. This is an area that is relatively flat—it is kind of isolated. It is beautiful, and it might be an area that we might be able to, you know, put in a couple thousand homes—or something like that—over a phased period of time. What is important is, unlike a lot of areas in Nevada, this area is within the Marlette service water area. So, the numbers that I talked about earlier—we talked about 1,000 empty lots that would include this for the large part, but we could potentially go just a little bit north of the numbers that we talked about—serving a residential community in this area. This would probably be like a cluster development, where you are looking at roughly about a third acre-foot per unit—not a lot of water per unit—but overall might be a regional benefit, something we would like to talk about with you and in the future.

The bottom picture is a totally different animal. If you were to drive another 12 miles out into the Dayton Valley and look north, there is an area of Mark Twain—half of it is in Dayton, half of it is in Mark Twain. And our Master Plan has identified that as potentially an area for large-scale, workforce, residential, suburban-type of housing. This area is definitely not in the Marlette service area, and we are not saying here today that we have intent to move water to this area from the Marlette service area. But what we are saying is—we would like to at least engage in regional discussions about crediting and debiting, or some other methods in the region that might work—that help get a development like this off the ground.

Also, potentially, with both of these projects, we could get inter-local agreements with a developer, and we could get development agreements that both could benefit Storey County and the issues that we discussed, as well as perhaps with the state on the state transmission side with some of the issues they are running into with upgrading the system—and overall, of course, for the region—for much needed affordable and attainable housing. Just so you know, the Painted Rock area would be about 50 minutes from Tahoe-Reno Industrial Center—drive time. That area on the bottom is 40 minutes. We timed it. It is exactly the same distance as the nearest residential community in Washoe County, except you are not on Interstate 80.

And then lastly, really our last steps—what are we going to do next? And really is to continue negotiating the successor Marlette Water Agreement—or Carson City, Storey County, Nevada Water Agreement—with us. Establish, really, those new rates, and then continue with our federal delegations. And we would like to have a discussion with regional partners on potential growth. At that point, we are happy to answer any questions that you have. Thank you very much, Chair, Vice Chair, and Committee for your time.

Chair Goulding:

Thank you for your presentation. Assemblymember DeLong.

Assemblymember DeLong:

Thank you, Chair. Thank you for the presentation. As it relates to the service territory boundary—would it take legislation to change that? Or how is that boundary established?

Mr. Osborn:

Thank you, Assemblymember DeLong. To say what I understand and not anymore—but there is a decree, the Franktown Decree, that determines where that water can go in the

area. I believe that that would have to be looked at—at a minimum—that service area boundary would as well. It is a significant challenge. Thank you.

Chair Goulding:

Assemblymember Osborn.

Assemblymember Osborn:

Thank you, Madam Chair. I just wanted to clarify a couple of things. I think you said this. But on slide 7, the 995 vacant residential parcels—that equates to the 296-acre-feet build out—basically in American Flat. That is where the majority of those residential parcels are? Did I understand that correctly?

Mr. Osborn:

Thank you, Assemblymember Osborn. Commissioner Mitchell may want to elaborate on this, but there is—we would look at about the 1,500-acre-feet that would be needed in total. That would be in that area. It is possible depending on the number of parcels that would be created in that area that that number could grow based on that. But, our Storey County Master Plan and Water Master Plan identifies these numbers currently.

Mr. Mitchell:

There is a decent amount of infill in Virginia City and Gold Hill as well. There are some other things that would need to happen for them to be developable. And so, it is a little more of an even split between infill and historic areas that were inhabited within the town sites of the cities, as well as the American Flat area.

Assemblymember Osborn:

Follow-up, Madam Chair? Thank you. And so, how serious is Storey County on building these houses and moving that expansion forward?

Mr. Mitchell:

We are certainly having serious discussions on all fronts. There are currently a few large property owners in the American Flat area with very different uses—so, for example, some mining processing—there are public lands in that area as well that—there are some things to be worked through. And so, we certainly would need to have the support of those current landowners to make a large-scale project like that happen. We are having pretty serious internal discussions about everything that we can do to encourage the infill—beyond what we already do—as far as opening up our ADU restrictions to make those more accessible and help with affordability. We have already passed allowing smaller house sizes—we used to have a minimum. Really trying to get creative in how we can encourage even more growth to meet the needs that are there.

Mr. Osborn:

If I may—thank you, Chair. I would like to elaborate on that as well, as we have recently updated Title 16, which is our development codes and water codes for parcel maps and divisions of land and subdivisions. We have been working with our engineering office too, to make sure that when a planned unit development comes our way—application—we are prepared to respond to it and be able to review that. That area in Mark Twain that is

discussed in this—which is outside of the Marlette area—that area is about 2,500 acres. If the developer was able to utilize that to potentially four homes per acre, you are roughly looking at about 10,000 units. That is not something that would happen in a short period of time. That is a long-term phased project, and it is roughly about two miles away from Highway 50. So, there is a gap there, as far as getting utilities and things to it—we recognize—and there has been some interest in discussion about that. Thank you.

Chair Goulding:

One more question from Senator Daly.

Senator Daly:

Thank you, Madam Chair. I wanted to go back to my colleague from Reno's question about the service area. So, you said that it is not in legislation. It—there is a decree—is that a—where did that form? How does that get amended?

Mr. Osborn:

Thank you, Senator Daly, through the Chair. What I understand is there is a Franktown Decree that dictates where the water is and also dictates that Virginia City, Gold Hill, and Silver City are the principal uses of this water, as they were originally; and it is our only source of water. For me to opine and get into discussion about how you would make those boundary changes—it kind of gets into that decree, and I feel I would like to kind of look into that further with some legal counsel. But I think it is important to note that what we are not proposing here today is to change that or to change the boundaries necessarily—the American Flats is inside the service area, so that would be a moot issue. But that Mark Twain area is more of just a regional discussion about—could water be traded or moved from one place to another in another way that does not affect the decree, does not necessarily affect the Marlette service area, but maybe could creatively be looked at in other ways as a regional leadership to potentially serve. Hopefully to answer your question.

Senator Daly:

Yes. I am just trying to understand the decree. Who issued the decree? Was it a covenant that was issued when the state took it over? Is there, you know, deed restrictions or whatever—however they want to do that—and say, "Hey, it can only be used for this, and this is the service area." So, like I said, who issued the decree? Is it a state issuance? Is it the previous owner's requirement? And that is what I was trying to get to. Then you said one thing, and I think this—remembering from the last interim and various things. You said that there are issues with the state operating it. Obviously, it is a budget item for the state. If it is not making money, there is a risk—the state says, "Throw up our hands and walk away." They could. What are the risks there? And who would it benefit if there were some changes to the use? Because my understanding—there is more water in the system than is being currently used by a substantial amount. And then I think the concern is—on the other side—is, "No, we do not want the water to be going to the industrial uses," and various things. At least that is not the preference—preferred use. What risk is there from the state? And there—you mentioned they have issues and concerns on the system and making sure that it is viable. In my understanding, if I remember correctly last time, Carson City buys and uses more water than they really need to make sure that the whole system is still viable.

Mr. Osborn:

All right. Thank you, Senator. I think to answer your first question—the Decree is a Supreme Court ruling from the State of Nevada. That is set by that. To answer your second question—hopefully, I do answer your second question—is not to opine on where the state is on their system. But they gave a real fine presentation on some of the improvements they are making and some of the rehabilitation they are making on the state side of the system, and it is challenging; it is antiquated equipment that is being replaced, and they are doing a very fine job at that. And then you see on the Storey County side, the exact same thing is happening—piece by piece the system is being replaced. And I, under the agreement on our side, that we are fully equipped and prepared to maintain the system—continue providing services to our ratepayers and our businesses and our residences—but it is a challenging endeavor. This is something that we work on every day, and we are trying to fund it. We are trying to keep that balance correct in the budget. We are trying to work with federal appropriations and folks to try to bridge those gaps. Now, we are fully capable of doing this, as we have been since the 1860s and continue to over the last decade and two. What I am kind of saying in this presentation, especially the American Flat area that is within the service area, potentially, that you could talk about some regional discussions. A developer comes in and has an idea or a dream—and we work with the Bureau of Land Management and the property owners in the area. There is a lot of things to work on and get straightened out in preparation for something like that. And if something were to come and say, well, we need the amount of water and, you know, maybe that siphon right now will not supply what they need—maybe through development agreements or local agreements—other types of mechanisms that we could work with the state, with Carson City, with us in the region, a whole—to maybe come out and help get some funding into the overall system that helps that project, but also ends up helping the existing infrastructure for the benefit of everybody. It is really kind of a holistic approach we are looking at this point. It is very high level—very master plan. But I think it is important that we at least kind of look ahead about what potentials might be available for that type of growth in the future. Thank you.

Senator Daly:

No, and I understand and I—the system cannot fail. I mean, you cannot not supply water to an area of the state—that is their only source. I was just trying to ask for that. I know you said you wanted to talk to your legal people before you try to talk about the Decree. So, maybe I can ask our staff to find it and get us a copy—get the whole Committee a copy. I would like to take a look at it and see what it says—just so we have reference on all of it as we try to solve problems. We always try to solve problems. At least we are trying anyway.

Chair Goulding:

I think our crack staff has already found it. We will get that to everybody. Okay. Any other Committee members, questions? Thank you, gentlemen.

AGENDA ITEM VIII—PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Goulding:

I think that leaves us with our final episode of public comment. Is there anyone in Carson City who would like to make public comment? Looks like we have got a couple of folks walking up.

Ms. Lernhardt, previously identified:

Madam Chair, I have a couple of questions as a resident from Douglas County to our Manager, Jenifer Davidson. Looking at her second-to-last picture, it looks like a revival of the Loop Road project. What are her plans—or the County's plan—in reviving this? And I thought this had been shelved. The user conflict in the area of the—and this is very specific to Douglas County, I understand—the user conflict in the Casino Corridor—we are all living through this every day. It is tremendous. It is cause for concern, and I am wondering how the solution would look like—because it is not a new problem. It is an ongoing problem. And with Senator Cortez-Masto allocating \$2.9 million just recently to this project, I think it is beyond the sidewalks that Director Regan mentioned. It is—will require a lot more. Because there is other issues that need to be addressed here, such as these new recreational vehicles—Lime Bikes—things that I do not even name. It is Mono Bikes that are motorized—they are all electric vehicles. They have no lights. And besides the bikes that have also mostly no lights and jump in front of you in the middle of the night—it is a very difficult problem to solve. I would like to see some more work done on that because it needs to be solved. It is a concern. People go across from one casino to the other. There is a tunnel that nobody seems to use. The side streets—if you want to negotiate those—they have no light. It is difficult, but it should be addressed. Thank you.

Mr. Dolan, previously identified:

Thank you. Mea culpa—I guess I should have said “Washoe County Commissioners, both Hill and Garcia as Commissioner Hill's alternate” sit on the TRPA's Governing Board. Now, coming from the Keep Tahoe Blue website where we had a speaker earlier—it states:

Water in Lake Tahoe is nearly as murky as it has been in 52 years of recordkeeping, according to new reports from UC Davis. Clarity in Lake Tahoe, the alpine jewel of Northern California known for its crystalline waters, was measured to a depth of 62 feet in 2019. That is down by nearly 8 feet from the year before when clarity was clocked at 70.9 feet and stands as the second lowest figure since recordkeeping began in 1968. The worst year was 2017 when it was 59.7 feet.

So what is not being said? You know, a lot of claims are being made, but what is not being said? It is kind of a three-card molly game, when you think about it, Senator Titus, and you ask about bi-state limitations. And it is kind of like asking the fox to guard the henhouse, when you are asking the TRPA about those limitations. And, you know, that is illustrated by the fact that they are saying 55,000 permanent residents and not actually including the seasonal residents, which are huge—okay—and then they are not including the ADU changes, which they have changed the laws to incorporate. Thank you very much.

Ms. Waller, previously identified:

I want to thank you for all choosing to participate as members of this Committee. Your thoughtful input, directives, discussions, and suggestions are appreciated. Just an observation—one observation—with the emergence of the vacation home rentals, it is nationally-systemic, internationally. I do not believe that the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency has required any analysis of the impacts related to the extra number of people that are staying in these homes, that—single family homes—that were once or never occupied. We could use an average of four people with a home. This can be tripled and quadrupled depending on the number of bedrooms and the local jurisdiction codes. Just a brief look at—there is approximately 6,000 of them around the Lake. I am hoping that there is a way to capture the thresholds of these types of—whatever we are going to call these units. They function like a hotel or a motel room. There is a finite number of tourist accommodation units provided by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency. There is only approximately 1,300, maybe, left. I am not sure. So, that is not a viable way to capture how these should be handled. I think we need to look at this more closely. I was not aware that the TRPA had a data inventory. Next is microtransit, and I was glad it was brought up by Washoe County. It is not free for maintenance and operation—it is free to a user. This is a struggle around the Lake. We cannot expect first-time visitors to just come and stay.

Mr. Flaherty, previously identified:

Chair Goulding, members of the Committee, a couple of things to touch on briefly. I know it is late. Ms. Regan mentioned that we have the third-oldest lake in the world. That may be true, but also a very well-known scientific report states we have the third most plastic-polluted lake out of over 30 lakes studied worldwide. How did we get there? That is catastrophic right now. I went down to Hidden Beach last year. I was stunned at the number of microplastics—the colors embedded in the sand. I am not a scientist, but I said right there, “We are in deep trouble here.” I hope this Committee encourages TRPA to do—not an in-depth study of how many plastics are in the Lake—we know that. Let us have a plan to start solving the problem. We need a data-driven plan to start solving this problem. It is catastrophic. We got here because we have too many people over a period of time. That many plastics in a lake this size, that is—that is staggering. Second—also, Chair Goulding—the reason that the VMT is not adding up is because using a major aerospace engineer executive in South Lake, well renowned, we calculated using the Event Center's own data—the actual VMT is 3.24 million VMT—that is conservative, and I will be happy to deliver the reports to you.

Mr. Tsigdinos, previously identified:

If I had a nickel for every time I had to spell the name. I urge you to support Washoe County in obtaining a more equitable distribution of occupancy taxes, as well as adding a room surcharge in Washoe Tahoe. This would help fund transportation and infrastructure needs in Washoe Tahoe that are related to tourism and would negate the need for any new TBID [Tourism Business Improvement District] taxes that would impact residents year around. Thank you.

Ms. Tsigdinos, previously identified:

Residents you have heard from today would love not to be here. It is late. None of us want to be sitting in this room. We would not be here if we did not think oversight is seriously lacking and much needed. I would like to underscore that the TRPA has made hundreds of ordinance changes in recent years. In the past two years alone, it has made code changes to allow for greater density before conducting environmental analysis of the current Lake

conditions, to prove that the Lake and the infrastructure—we have heard from everyone today the cell service is bad, the roads are bad, we have so many infrastructure problems, it is hard to name them all—that the Lake can safely withstand more density. The logic is endemic to the TRPA and really must be remedied. Thank you, Chair Goulding, for highlighting the black box metaphor and the lack of transparency. We in the Tahoe Basin experience this routinely, which is why many people do not even go to TRPA meetings anymore, because they are not hearing the truth. Appreciate, Vice Chair Daly, your comments about noting TRPA missed the mark and clearly has the tools and authority to meet Compact obligations but lacks the willpower to do it. In the spirit of recognizing achievement, I would like to assign an A plus to TRPA for deflection and double speak. I encourage the Committee to review the video from today to see how many of your questions went unanswered. I encourage you and the staff to dig deep—push. Please. The public relies on you, as we have made clear, you are the body that has oversight. We have gone everywhere—we have gone to legislative meetings—we have gone to the County—we do not see change. We rely on you more than anything for public safety, please. Please—we really implore you, and thank you for your service.

Ms. Koscki, previously identified:

I really think we need to make Lake Tahoe into a national monument where the tourists would have to have reservations before they entered the area. We have had over 15 deaths in a short amount of time this last year—with the boating accidents on the Lake. As well as a few people are up for manslaughter for sliding on the marble ice; and that is not a way to penalize someone because we have marble ice and we cannot control the road, so to speak. To throw a teacher in jail for killing a—accidentally killing a young girl who was going to an event, and I told—asked the City Council to put a cop car out there with no one in it. They just ignore us. Wildlife are being slaughtered—41 bears in the month of July. It is a race track out there and as well as all the coyotes and whatnot. And, you know, I have asked over and over for wildlife bridges on I-50 coming in; now we need a divider, because we got four head-on collisions in one night on Echo Summit. And not alone—a gentleman flipped his car over and then wanted to get back in it after the tow truck guy came and I was like, “Sir, let me just get you out of town,” and they do not. The tourists are stubborn—deer in headlights. You know, coming up with no chains and then trying to chain up when you are on marble ice. It is just so dangerous. Tahoe has become so dangerous, and we really need to implement solutions. The 5G towers destroy bald eagle eggs in 30 minutes. Not alone, it activates the poison in the vax, the graphene oxide, and there has been a lot of documentation. Not alone, our children are having nosebleeds and seizures from the 5G towers. And when you Google this, even the firemen are having some serious brain damage—pilots are as well. And so, that would mean everybody driving now with this poison in the vax is a detriment to all of us. Thank you.

Chair Goulding:

Thank you. Is that—anybody else would like to give public comment? Appreciate you all, appreciate. Phone lines—we have—is there anybody on the phone lines? It was empty a few minutes ago, but can we just double check and see if there is anybody on the phone lines that would like to give public comment?

AVH:

Chair, your public line is open and working, but you have no callers at this time.

Chair Goulding:

Thank you very much. Thank you, Committee members. Thank you down in Las Vegas. It is nice to see that you are still there—that you are still awake—deeply appreciate that. I know it is hard when the action is happening hundreds of miles away, so thank you for that. Thank you to all the presenters—deeply appreciate the information that you have shared and your commitment to sharing information and being part of the process. We will continue to engage as the months progress, and I think that ends our meeting for tonight.

The following written comments were submitted for the record:

- Niobe Burden Austere ([Agenda Item VIII A-1](#)) ([Agenda Item VIII A-2](#)) ([Agenda Item VIII A-3](#)) ([Agenda Item VIII A-4](#)) ([Agenda Item VIII A-5](#))
- Kathie M. Julian ([Agenda Item VIII B](#))
- Stephen A. Barney ([Agenda Item VIII C](#))
- Ron Grassi ([Agenda Item VIII D](#))
- Collin Harris ([Agenda Item VIII E](#))
- Terri McBride ([Agenda Item VIII F](#))
- Roxanna Dunn ([Agenda Item VIII G](#))
- Diane Becker ([Agenda Item VIII H](#))
- Helen Neff ([Agenda Item VIII I](#))
- Peggy Bourland ([Agenda Item VIII J](#))
- Aaron Vanderpool ([Agenda Item VIII K](#))
- Rhianna Kogut ([Agenda Item VIII L](#))

AGENDA ITEM IX—ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 5:41 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Terese Martinez
Research Policy Assistant

Julianne King
Senior Policy Analyst

APPROVED BY:

Assemblymember Heather Goulding, Chair

Date: _____

MEETING MATERIALS

| AGENDA ITEM | PRESENTER/ENTITY | DESCRIPTION |
|------------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| Agenda Item II A-1 | Doug Flaherty, President, Tahoe Sierra Clean Air Coalition (DBA TahoeCleanAir.org) | Written Public Comment |
| Agenda Item II A-2 | Doug Flaherty, President, Tahoe Sierra Clean Air Coalition (DBA TahoeCleanAir.org) | Written Public Comment |
| Agenda Item II B-1 | Ellie Waller, Douglas County Resident, Nevada | Written Public Comment |
| Agenda Item II B-2 | Ellie Waller, Douglas County Resident, Nevada | Written Public Comment |
| Agenda Item II C | Alex Tsigdinos, North Lake Tahoe Resident | Written Public Comment |
| Agenda Item II D | Ronda Tycer, Incline Village Resident | Written Public Comment |
| Agenda Item II E-1 | Pamela Tsigdinos, Full-time Resident, North Lake Tahoe | Written Public Comment |
| Agenda Item II E-2 | Pamela Tsigdinos, Full-time Resident, North Lake Tahoe | Written Public Comment |
| Agenda Item II E-3 | Pamela Tsigdinos, Full-time Resident, North Lake Tahoe | Written Public Comment |
| Agenda Item II F | Elizabeth Lernhardt, Zephyr Cove Resident | Written Public Comment |
| Agenda Item II G | Richard Beaty, President, Brockway Point Homeowners Association | Written Public Comment |
| Agenda Item II H | Richard Miner, Incline Village Resident | Written Public Comment |
| Agenda Item II I-1 | Ann Nichols, North Tahoe Preservation Alliance | Written Public Comment |
| Agenda Item II I-2 | Ann Nichols, North Tahoe Preservation Alliance | Written Public Comment |
| Agenda Item II I-3 | Ann Nichols, North Tahoe Preservation Alliance | Written Public Comment |
| Agenda Item II J | Kristina Hill, Full-time Lake Tahoe Resident | Written Public Comment |

| AGENDA ITEM | PRESENTER/ENTITY | DESCRIPTION |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| Agenda Item III | Julianne King, Senior Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) | Committee Brief |
| Agenda Item IV | Julie Regan, Executive Director, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) Devin Middlebrook, Government Affairs Manager, TRPA | PowerPoint Presentation Due to copyright issues, the handout is on file in the Research Library of the LCB, Carson City, Nevada. For copies, contact the Library at (775) 684-6827 or email to: Library@lcb.state.nv.us |
| Agenda Item V | Charlie Donahue, Administrator, Nevada's Division of State Lands (NDSL), State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR) Ellery Stahler, Deputy Administrator, NDSL, DCNR Kevin Fromherz, Program Manager, Nevada Tahoe Resource Team, NDSL, DCNR | Presentation |
| Agenda Item VI | Kent Choma, Ph.D., PE, Deputy Administrator, Buildings and Grounds Section, State Public Works Division, Department of Administration | PowerPoint Presentation Due to copyright issues, the handout is on file in the Research Library of the LCB, Carson City, Nevada. For copies, contact the Library at (775) 684-6827 or email to: Library@lcb.state.nv.us |
| Agenda Item VII A | Cadence Matijevich, Government Affairs Liaison, Washoe County | PowerPoint Presentation |
| Agenda Item VII B | Jenifer Davidson, County Manager, Douglas County Wendy Lang, Assistant County Manager, Douglas County | Presentation Due to copyright issues, the handout is on file in the Research Library of the LCB, Carson City, Nevada. For copies, contact the Library at (775) 684-6827 or email to: Library@lcb.state.nv.us |

| AGENDA ITEM | PRESENTER/ENTITY | DESCRIPTION |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| Agenda Item VII C | Clay Mitchell, Vice Chair, Storey County Commission Austin Osborne, County Manager, Storey County | Presentation Due to copyright issues, the handout is on file in the Research Library of the LCB, Carson City, Nevada. For copies, contact the Library at (775) 684-6827 or email to: Library@lcb.state.nv.us |
| Agenda Item VIII A-1 | Niobe Burden Austere | Written Public Comment |
| Agenda Item VIII A-2 | Niobe Burden Austere | Written Public Comment |
| Agenda Item VIII A-3 | Niobe Burden Austere | Written Public Comment |
| Agenda Item VIII A-4 | Niobe Burden Austere | Written Public Comment |
| Agenda Item VIII A-5 | Niobe Burden Austere | Written Public Comment |
| Agenda Item VIII B | Kathie M. Julian | Written Public Comment |
| Agenda Item VIII C | Stephen A. Barney | Written Public Comment |
| Agenda Item VIII D | Ron Grassi | Written Public Comment |
| Agenda Item VIII E | Collin Harris | Written Public Comment |
| Agenda Item VIII F | Terri McBride | Written Public Comment |
| Agenda Item VIII G | Roxanna Dunn | Written Public Comment |
| Agenda Item VIII H | Diane Becker | Written Public Comment |
| Agenda Item VIII I | Helen Neff | Written Public Comment |
| Agenda Item VIII J | Peggy Bourland | Written Public Comment |
| Agenda Item VIII K | Aaron Vanderpool | Written Public Comment |
| Agenda Item VIII L | Rhianna Kogut | 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>.