



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)

SUMMARY MINUTES AND ACTION REPORT

The second meeting of the Legislative Committee for the Review and Oversight of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and Marlette Lake Water System was held on Monday, January 30, 2012, at 9 a.m. at the Edgewood Tahoe, 100 Lake Parkway, Stateline, Nevada. A copy of this set of "Summary Minutes and Action Report," including the "Meeting Notice and Agenda" ([Exhibit A](#)) and other substantive exhibits, is available on the Nevada Legislature's website at <http://leg.state.nv.us/interim/76th2011/committee/>. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications (LCB's) Office (e-mail: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775/684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator John J. Lee, Chair
Assemblyman Kelly Kite, Vice Chair
Senator David R. Parks
Senator James A. Settelmeyer
Assemblywoman Marilyn Kirkpatrick

COMMITTEE MEMBER ABSENT:

Assemblywoman Peggy Pierce

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU STAFF PRESENT:

Jennifer Ruedy, Senior Research Analyst, Research Division
Heidi Chlarson, Principal Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division
Wayne Thorley, Program Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division
Lucinda Benjamin, Senior Research Secretary, Research Division
Chuck Anderson, Technical Communications Systems Specialist, Broadcast and Production Services
Ryan Dombrowski, Technical Communications Systems Specialist, Broadcast and Production Services

OPENING REMARKS

- Senator John J. Lee, Chair, welcomed the members, presenters, and the public to the second meeting of the Legislative Committee for the Review and Oversight of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) and the Marlette Lake Water System.
- Chuck Anderson and Ryan Dombrowski, Technical Communications Systems Specialists, Broadcast and Production Services, explained the operation of the microphones and recording equipment for presenters.
- Chair Lee informed the public the meeting scheduled for March 19, 2012, will focus primarily on Senate Bill 271 (Chapter 530, *Statutes of Nevada* 2011). He announced the public should feel free to contact Jennifer Ruedy, Senior Research Analyst, Research Division, LCB, with information pertinent to the agenda topic. He briefly described the background of each member of the Committee and their work on Lake Tahoe issues and the passage of S.B. 271 in the 2011 Legislative Session. He called upon Heidi Chlarson, Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division, LCB, to explain the new public comment process for legislative hearings.
- Heidi Chlarson, previously identified, presented information on the changes to the Open Meeting Law for general public comment as set forth in Assembly Bill 257 (Chapter 459, *Statutes of Nevada* 2011).

Chair Lee noted the procedures for conducting Committee business and presenting testimony. Senator Lee referenced his letter dated December 14, 2011, to California's legislative leaders: Darrell Steinberg, President pro Tempore of the Senate and John A. Pérez, Speaker of the Assembly. A copy of the letter was also sent to California's legislators whose districts include the Lake Tahoe Basin: Senator Ted Gaines, Senate District 1, and Assemblywoman Beth Gaines, Assembly District 4. Chair Lee recognized Steve Davey, Chief of Staff, Office of Senator Gaines, and reported that upon receipt of the letter, Mr. Davey immediately contacted LCB staff to address the Committee on behalf of Senator Gaines. Chair Lee invited Mr. Davey to present the message from Senator Gaines. (Please see [Exhibit B](#).)

PUBLIC COMMENT

- Steve Davey, previously identified, relayed Senator Gaines' response commending the Committee for its efforts to bring about notable long-term change to the Lake Tahoe Basin and the operations of the TRPA. On behalf of Senator Gaines, he informed the Committee that the Senator was working on a bipartisan basis with Darrell Steinberg, Senate President Pro Tempore; John A. Pérez, Speaker of the Assembly; and other California legislators who have an interest in Lake Tahoe to appoint a California delegation. Mr. Davey explained urgency legislation would be introduced early in February 2012, when the bill text is received from the legal counsel bureau in Sacramento. Mr. Davey stated he would provide copies to Committee staff as soon

as the bill text was introduced in the California Senate. In addition, he presented a message from Senator Gaines and Assemblywoman Beth Gaines urging the members to move forward on addressing the issues identified in the Committee hearings and not to wait upon California legislation, which was in progress. He extended an invitation to the Committee members to start dialogue between California and Nevada representatives as soon as possible. He thanked the members for the opportunity to address the Committee.

- Chair Lee thanked Mr. Davey for his attendance and explained that the California Legislature is in session, so Senator Gaines could not attend in person. Chair Lee presented Mr. Davey with a letter to Senator Gaines along with a gift on behalf of the Committee thanking him for his leadership, friendship, and efforts in California on behalf of the Lake Tahoe Basin.

APPROVAL OF THE “SUMMARY MINUTES AND ACTION REPORT” OF THE MEETING HELD ON NOVEMBER 14, 2011, IN INCLINE VILLAGE, NEVADA

- The Committee **APPROVED THE FOLLOWING ACTION:**

SENATOR SETTELMAYER MOVED TO APPROVE THE “SUMMARY MINUTES AND ACTION REPORT” OF THE NOVEMBER 14, 2011, MEETING HELD IN INCLINE VILLAGE, NEVADA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN KITE AND PASSED. ASSEMBLYWOMAN PIERCE WAS NOT PRESENT AT THE MEETING.

OVERVIEW OF EDGEWOOD COMPANIES’ PRESENCE IN THE LAKE TAHOE BASIN: PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE

- Chuck Scharer, President and Chief Executive Officer, Edgewood Companies, welcomed the members of the Committee to the Edgewood Tahoe and offered the services of the facility. He provided a history of the company, current operations, and plans for the facility. He informed the Committee that the Edgewood Companies is locally owned by the Park family and holdings include the Montbleu Resort Casino and Spa, Horizon Casino Resort, parking acreage at Harveys Lake Tahoe, Friday’s Station-Overland Pony Express Route east of U.S. Highway 50 (US 50), Edgewood Water Company, and Edgewood Tahoe Golf Course. In 1968, the golf course opened and the first clubhouse was built in 1973 and remodelled in 1993 and has been the home of the American Century Celebrity Golf Championship for 20 years.

Mr. Scharer stated the Edgewood Companies has a valued relationship with the Lake Tahoe Visitors Authority and presented information about the real estate holdings associated with the Edgewood Companies. He spoke of the proposed Edgewood Tahoe Lodge, which is designed to include 194 tourist accommodation units and should create about 400 new direct and indirect jobs locally. He noted many environmental and water quality improvements expected as a result of the proposed project.

The environmental impact study (EIS) is being reviewed by Edgewood staff and the TRPA staff, and he anticipates the public comment phase of the EIS will begin in the next few months and be presented to the TRPA Governing Board in the summer of 2012.

Continuing, Mr. Scharer provided information on his background and experience with Harveys Resort Hotel and Casino. He stated the need to transition the current economic model in the south shore Lake Tahoe region and expressed the need for a strong public-private partnership to move away from the reliance on gaming. He stated the need to reinvent the economy in the region to introduce new products and services, to expand entertainment opportunities, and to provide easier access to recreation. In his view, economic development and environmental gains are directly linked. He noted there is widespread recognition that redevelopment is the key to achieving environmental gains, and the status quo is hurting the environment.

Mr. Scharer presented information on the South Shore Vision Plan, a collaborative effort among various stakeholders, which envisions economic and environmental redevelopment for a significant portion of the south Lake Tahoe tourism corridor to make the market more competitive. Concluding, Mr. Scharer proposed that the South Shore Vision Plan be a future meeting agenda item and expressed the commitment of Edgewood Companies to work with all the stakeholders and the Committee to achieve the economic and environmental goals for the area. He thanked the Nevada Legislature and the Committee for their recent actions and attention to Lake Tahoe, as it has spurred positive change.

- Chair Lee commented on his recent trip to Washington, D.C., and the amount of interest expressed by Nevada and California representatives in the Lake Tahoe Region. Chair Lee called for public comment on Agenda Item No. IV; however, no testimony was presented.

STATUS REPORT ON THE UPDATE OF THE REGIONAL PLAN OF THE TRPA

- Joanne S. Marchetta, Executive Director, TRPA, welcomed the Committee and public to Lake Tahoe and recognized the TRPA Governing Board members present at the meeting. She reported the TRPA is on track to deliver the Regional Plan Update by December 2012. Ms. Marchetta presented a brief review of the foundations of the Regional Plan for growth control. She stated currently the urban boundary is near “built out,” and less than 15 percent of the land area in the Lake Tahoe Basin is in private ownership; only one percent is in existing town or community center areas. She stated there are very few vacant parcels in town centers within the urban boundary that are buildable. However, the Lake Tahoe region is continually affected by existing, outdated infrastructure, and buildings constructed nearly half a century or more ago before environmental controls were required. She explained the Regional Plan Update would focus on fixing the existing building environment, which means replacing and

upgrading facilities to install state of the art water quality treatments and other forms of updated conservation measures.

In contrast to the focus on residential growth control on vacant land in the original Regional Plan, Ms. Marchetta stated one of the proposed implementation strategies is for environmental redevelopment. She stated the three key enhancements of the Regional Plan Update are: (1) removing the barriers for restoration of Lake Tahoe's water quality; (2) restoring a regional role to TRPA; and (3) improving the Lake Tahoe Basin's permit review system. She noted the updated Regional Plan would also provide additional incentives to property owners to redevelop older properties.

First, Ms. Marchetta discussed some examples of strategies to improve water quality and achieve environmental gains, which included:

- Encouraging land coverage be concentrated in town centers;
- Shrinking the redevelopment footprint on sensitive lands by providing additional transfer incentives for water quality or other environmental gains to concentrate development in existing town centers; and
- Creating exemptions for land coverage accounting and mitigation fees for bike trails to meet the requirement to reduce auto trips included in the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact (Compact), Public Law 96-551, 96th United States Congress 1980.

Second, Ms. Marchetta explained the change in TRPA's role to restore a focus on regional planning. She explained under the new planning and permitting system, local site-specific decisions would transition to local governments in accordance with TRPA-approved plans and regulations. This approach is referred to as conformity review and approval. Local governments would need to create localized land use plans to meet the Compact's environmental standards and be reviewed and approved by the TRPA. She expressed the need for local governments to tailor their plans to serve the unique communities they represent. In her opinion, the transition would allow TRPA to expend its resources on regional planning. She mentioned two established effective regional planning models studied during this transition are the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency and the California Coastal Commission.

Third, Ms. Marchetta stated the TRPA would focus on improving the efficiency of the permit review system. She explained a conformance review planning approach could remove redundant processes for property owners, provide environmental protections, and provide efficient growth management standards that address unique local conditions.

She discussed the process for completing the Regional Plan Update and stated a report will be presented to a joint meeting of the Governing Board and the Advisory Planning

Commission of the TRPA by the end of March 2012. A 60-day public comment period will begin on the draft plan, as well as an accompanying draft environmental impact statement (EIS). During the public comment period, the TRPA would meet with stakeholders in Nevada and California to craft compromises on key issues of disagreement and will present the Regional Plan in the fall of 2012. She stated the Governing Board and TRPA staff are on schedule to take action on the final Regional Plan by December 2012, and noted that active public input would be included in the Regional Plan Update.

In response to a question from Chair Lee, Julie Regan, Chief of External Affairs, TRPA, provided information on a proposal under review to incentivize the use of “pervious pavement,” a product that allows infiltration of runoff water similar to paver stones used for driveways and decking. Ms. Regan explained the proposal is being discussed by the TRPA Governing Board and the Regional Plan Update Committee, and in the draft EIS due out at the end of March 2012.

Responding to Chair Lee’s request for clarification of the proposed transfer incentives for water quality or other environmental gains, Ms. Marchetta clarified the Lake Tahoe Basin is close to “build out.” Consequently, a strategy is being examined to generate incentives where a property owner could choose to sell the development rights of a property located in a sensitive area to someone who planned to complete a redevelopment project in a town center. The proposed strategy would create a saleable property right, which could be transferred from a more sensitive parcel and create incentive credits to property owners to transfer rights to urban centers for development. The proposal would not eliminate any development rights or property rights. She explained that different transfer ratios are being examined for the proposal.

- Chair Lee called for public comment on Agenda Item No. V and requested the TRPA Board Members address the Committee.
- Assemblyman Kite interjected information on a recent meeting of the TRPA Governing Board’s Local Government Committee and requested an update on discussions between the TRPA and local governments.
- Nancy McDermid, Member, Governing Board, TRPA and Vice Chair, Douglas County Board of Commissioners, explained the representation on the TRPA Governing Board’s Local Government Committee, which she chairs. She explained that the Local Government Committee makes determinations and recommendations on topics such as signage, secondary residences, code and planning transitions of the TRPA to local governments along with the triggers to move a project from the local jurisdiction review process to the TRPA review process. She explained the goal of most of the new projects is to reduce coverage, especially in sensitive areas. She expressed support for a process where local governments develop individual plans, which are then reviewed by the TRPA for compliance with the Regional Plan. Ms. McDermid said a Memorandum of Understanding could be drafted between a local government and the

TRPA, so the local plan could be incorporated into a master plan (Nevada) or a general plan (California) depending on the location of the local government. She noted that the City of South Lake Tahoe recently adopted a General Plan Update, and the League to Save Lake Tahoe promptly sued the City of South Lake Tahoe over the plan. She added that U.S. Eastern District Judge Burrell dismissed the case, but an appeal is underway.

- Assemblyman Kite lauded the beneficial progress the local governments have made to create a partnership with the TRPA.
- Ms. McDermid praised the TRPA staff for the work done with the Local Government Committee and the Regional Plan Update Committee and the positive cooperation that has occurred to date to determine the purview of issues suitable for local government jurisdictions and the TRPA.
- Chair Lee explained Assemblyman Kite is taking the lead role in working with local governments and requested concerns and questions be directed to him. Chair Lee asked whether conservation groups active in the Lake Tahoe Basin are invited to participate in the Local Government Committee meetings.
- Ms. McDermid replied that the conservation groups are always present, and they appear to have concerns about monitoring an increased number of meetings when the TRPA ultimately delegates some decisions to five local governments in California and Nevada. She anticipates that concerns will be vocalized when the draft Regional Plan Update becomes available for public comment at the end of March 2012. She stated the conservation communities in Nevada work well with the different local jurisdictions and the TRPA. She opined the status quo does not help the Lake Tahoe region and in order to attain environmental thresholds, positive change needs to occur. Ms. McDermid commented on the extensive review process of the Homewood Mountain Ski Resort (Homewood) project, which was evaluated by four different boards with public hearings and then approved by four unanimous votes, but was halted by a lawsuit.
- Senator Settelmeyer expressed appreciation for the work of the TRPA and asked what might be potential roadblocks to completing the Regional Plan Update on time. He expressed concern about the process possibly ending in litigation.

In response to a question from Senator Settelmeyer, Ms. Marchetta stated when the draft Regional Plan Update becomes available, all stakeholders would be involved in negotiations on key areas. She did not anticipate significant roadblocks from representatives of the conservation community, and she anticipates most interested parties can reach a reasonable compromise on the Regional Plan Update. She noted that if the past repeats itself this Regional Plan Update will end in litigation, again causing a three-year moratorium on permits.

- Senator Settelmeyer requested a list of projects the TRPA has approved over the last five years and information on whether any lawsuits were filed on the projects and if so by whom.

In response to questions from Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick, Ms. Marchetta explained the EIS for the Regional Plan Update is a technical review of anticipated impacts from the Regional Plan, which is different from the five-year threshold evaluation. She explained the threshold evaluation is scheduled to be published in March 2012, as well.

- Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick requested a copy of the EIS and the five-year threshold evaluation when they become available. In addition, she explained local governments in Nevada have the authority to change a master plan, and questioned whether waivers would then occur on an ongoing basis.

In response to Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick, Ms. Marchetta stated local jurisdictions would submit local plans to the TRPA for assessment of conformity with the rules, regulations, and threshold standards and only if the local plans incorporated sufficient provisions to meet the Compact's standards would the local plan be approved; it is not a waiver process. She further explained plans would be reviewed by the TRPA at a regional scale to examine how the plans propose to deliver regional benefit through a local jurisdiction permitting process. The TRPA would "audit" a certain number of the local permitting decisions as a mechanism to ensure implementation of Lake Tahoe Basin standards.

In response to comments from Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick, John Hester, Planning Director, Planning Department, TRPA, stated local governments cannot make a zoning change to a master plan more often than every quarter. When amendments to a master plan are proposed by a local government, the amendment would be submitted to the TRPA and would be evaluated against the Regional Plan to maintain compliance.

- Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick expressed concern based on her experience where 20 to 30 amendments to a master plan are proposed in one quarter. She emphasized the *Nevada Revised Statutes* currently provide the authority for amendments to be made by local governments. In addition, she requested information on a schedule of fees or penalties if environmental requirements are not met.

In response to a question from Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick, Ms. Marchetta explained a provision in the Compact allows the TRPA to assess a fine up to \$5,000 per day for violations and offered to provide a copy to the Committee members.

- John Hester, previously identified, said the jurisdiction whose code is being violated would handle the code enforcement process. For example, the violation could be for a TRPA permit or a local government permit.

Responding to comments from Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick, Ms. Marchetta reiterated that in the Regional Plan all development in the Lake Tahoe Basin remains capped, so persistent change to local plans would always fall within the ceiling constraints of the Regional Plan.

In response to comments by Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick, Nancy McDermid, previously identified, clarified in the Lake Tahoe region there are existing limits for new development, so a local governmental amendment to a master plan could not be approved. In her view, possible changes could only be effected by the TRPA and would affect all the local jurisdictions.

In response to comments from Senator Settelmeyer, Ms. Marchetta stated she does not anticipate a duplication of fees being assessed by local governments and the TRPA for jurisdictional compliance violations.

- Chair Lee requested representatives of the City of South Lake Tahoe address the Committee.
- Ms. Claire Fortier, Member, Governing Board, TRPA, and Mayor, City of South Lake Tahoe, stated the City Council examines improvement requests specific to a parcel of land, and she explained any improvement on a specific parcel of land goes through a myriad of regulatory examination. She explained that the restrictions in the 1987 Regional Plan capped growth, which has led to very restrictive and difficult regulations. In her view, there is a need to rebuild the crumbling infrastructure and dated building facades in the South Lake Tahoe area to benefit the environment and the economy in the region. She said, “We need to rebuild Tahoe green to keep Tahoe blue.”
- Bruce Grego, Member, South Lake Tahoe City Council, California, expressed concern about the processing of environmental lawsuits and the impacts of Senate Bill 271 (Chapter 530, *Statutes of Nevada* 2011). He questioned if environmental lawsuits could be given priority in the judicial process, and stated other types of cases receive priority based on certain criteria. Mr. Grego emphasized the need to adjudicate environmental issues in a more timely manner.
- Chair Lee recognized Kyle Davis, Political Director, Nevada Conservation League, along with other members of the conservation and environmental community who were in the audience. Chair Lee encouraged those individuals to come forward to discuss some of the challenges they may be having in working with this Committee. He called for further public comment for Agenda Item V; however, no further testimony was presented.

UPDATE OF ACTIVITIES BY THE TRPA GOVERNING BOARD

- Casey Beyer, Member, Governing Board, TRPA, appointed by the Governor of California, explained he was born and raised in Reno, worked summer jobs in the

Lake Tahoe Basin, and is a native Nevadan. He has been involved in public policy development at the local, state, and federal levels for more than 30 years and asserted the preservation of the Lake Tahoe Basin environment is a priority. He professed the need to support economic development in the region and to remove barriers to development. As a TRPA Board Member, Mr. Beyer stated his strong commitment to work with the Committee and stakeholders to reach a balance among environmental enhancement and economic vitality. In closing, Mr. Beyer reiterated the need for open and civil dialogue between all stakeholders to develop a Regional Plan to benefit the Lake Tahoe Basin. (Please see [Exhibit C.](#))

- Claire Fortier, previously identified, and a member of the TRPA Governing Board who sits on both that body's Regional Plan Update Committee and Local Government Committee, asserted the local governments, conservation, and business communities are working together to preserve the environment and economic vitality of the Lake Tahoe Basin. In her view, finding a collaborative solution would require local, state, and federal stakeholders to suspend differences and work toward a common goal to have a clear lake, clean shore zones, supported by a vibrant economy and viable communities surrounded by beautiful mountains and healthy forests. Ms. Fortier stated the answer is to rebuild Lake Tahoe green to keep it blue. She stated the City of South Lake Tahoe has seen years of decline and has an unemployment rate of 15 percent, which is above state and national averages. Hotel occupancy rates have decreased by 50 percent during the time she has lived in the Lake Tahoe Basin. The middle class has been displaced by second-home owners, who represent 65 percent of the current housing inventory. The City of South Lake Tahoe is the only jurisdiction entirely located in the Lake Tahoe Basin. In Ms. Fortier's opinion, having an effective Regional Plan embraced by Nevada and California would be the key to survival for the City of South Lake Tahoe.

Continuing her testimony, Ms. Fortier commented on the past restrictive regulation of projects for homes and businesses and discussed the abatement of uncontrolled growth by the 1987 Regional Plan. She credited the advocacy of the conservation community to put growth limits in place and to set environmental thresholds. However, she stated the solution then is not the solution for present-day issues and stressed the need to redefine the future of the Lake Tahoe region. Ms. Fortier explained the 2012 Regional Plan will define how redevelopment would occur to restore Lake Tahoe and revitalize the economy. Concluding, she thanked the TRPA Governing Board and staff for making the difficult transition in concept and approach to balance the preservation of the environment and the regulation of growth, the State of Nevada for setting a needed timetable, and all those working toward tough compromises to rebuild trust for the protection of Lake Tahoe.

- Steve Robinson, Member, Governing Board, TRPA, designated by the Director of Nevada's State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (SDCNR) provided information on his background working in the public sector and with former U.S. Senator and Nevada Governor Paul Laxalt. Mr. Robinson commented on the transition of the TRPA from its inception to the current organization, and expressed

support for S.B. 271 and the transfer of code and ordinance enforcement to local governments. He noted that with the impetus of S.B. 271 both the Governors of California and Nevada are currently very engaged in understanding the scope and functions of the TRPA. He explained the reduction in federal funding will require increased participation by the private sector to upgrade and renovate aging properties, which would require redevelopment incentives. In conclusion, Mr. Robinson expressed concern about the threat of litigation and the impact on the completion of the Regional Plan Update. He noted that some projects are unanimously approved by the TRPA Governing Board, yet they are still stymied by litigation despite anticipated environmental benefits. The possibility of litigation casts uncertainty on all TRPA Governing Board actions.

- Chair Lee cited the Sierra Colina Village and Homewood projects as having anticipated environmental benefits, whose approvals by the TRPA Governing Board were immediately challenged by litigation. He questioned whether the lawsuits on approved projects such as these were the result of a lack of communication.
- Ms. Fortier, previously identified, commented on the complex regulatory structure within the Lake Tahoe Basin. She commented on the influence of advocacy groups on community-based decisions for development. She opined that the City of South Lake Tahoe's General Plan Update is one of the greenest and most sustainable plans in the State of California, yet the League to Save Lake Tahoe sued over the City's General Plan Update. She noted that the City's General Plan Update acknowledged that when the TRPA's Regional Plan Update was completed, it would take precedent in any area at odds with the City's General Plan Update. She said the League to Save Lake Tahoe sued the City over that provision. Ms. Fortier advocated for a process with very clear regulations and requirements at the outset of a project, so lawsuits are not filed after years of planning are completed.
- Casey Beyer, previously identified, briefly discussed the California Environmental Quality Act, *California Code of Regulations*, Title 14, Chapter 3, Sections 15000 *et seq.*, which created a high threshold for environmental legal action, and he asked if similar legislation could be examined. In Mr. Beyer's view, the TRPA Regional Plan Update can be "defensible," if it is developed with input from all stakeholders.
- Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick expressed appreciation for the optimism of the TRPA Governing Board Members. She encouraged a continued focus on consistency so officials at all levels do not violate the people's trust. She questioned why the language in the Compact addressing when legal action may be brought has not been amended to narrow it down some.
- Casey Beyer, previously identified, explained there are various levels of litigation using federal and state laws, and he discussed the "reasonableness" of lawsuits. He said the TRPA Governing Board is attempting to reduce the amount of litigation on projects by engaging all stakeholders in the process.

- Ms. Kirkpatrick expressed the need for regulations to be consistent. She requested Mr. Beyer, Ms. Fortier, and Mr. Robinson, each from their own perspective, to submit proposed policies to remedy the conflicts that have been encountered.
- Senator Settelmeyer requested information on the origin of the objections and asked if the source was local residents, individuals living outside the Lake Tahoe Basin, or organizations and entities not located in the region.
- Ms. Fortier, previously identified, indicated there are enormous misunderstandings of the issues for the Lake Tahoe Basin on a national level. She indicated individuals nationwide feel an ownership of Lake Tahoe. In her view, a majority of residents have a very real understanding of the difficulties, though nimbyism coupled with supporting objections received nationwide make it difficult to discern the particular group presenting opposition to the process.

In response to Chair Lee, Casey Beyer, previously identified, provided the history of planning and development of the Homewood project and explained the local environmentalists raised objections to the project utilizing support from outside the Lake Tahoe Basin for the litigation. He indicated the TRPA Board is currently working to resolve the disputed issues, and clarified the Homewood project and the Sierra Colina Village project are separate projects with unique environmental issues. Mr. Beyer noted that specialists examine the EIS for points of disagreement, and whether those points of disagreement are defensible may become a court challenge. He mentioned the Boulder Bay Resort and Wellness Center project in Crystal Bay, Nevada was examined for five and a half years without a court challenge.

- Chair Lee called for public comment on Agenda Item No. VI; however, no testimony was presented.

DISCUSSION OF THE LAKE TAHOE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

- Joanne S. Marchetta, Executive Director, TRPA, presented a broad overview of the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) strategy. She stated the EIP was launched in 1997 after the Lake Tahoe Presidential Forum, and it was designed to achieve the Lake Tahoe Basin environmental thresholds set by the Compact. She explained that the first phase of the EIP identified hundreds of projects over a 10-year period among federal, state, local entities, and the private sector and was accomplished with investments in ecosystem restoration totaling \$1.5 billion. She added the essential key to leveraging investments has been through regional partnerships, and she presented a breakdown of EIP capital investments from 1997 to 2010. Ms. Marchetta informed the Committee that in 2009 the EIP was updated to focus investments in the following six target areas:

1. Air quality and transportation;
2. Applied science;
3. Forest Management (including fuels reduction);
4. Program support;
5. Recreation and scenic resources; and
6. Watersheds, habitat, and water quality.

Continuing her testimony, Ms. Marchetta presented data from the draft threshold evaluation report on lake clarity, the signature indicator of the ecosystem's health. She concluded the decade-long trend shows the rate of decline in water clarity has been slowing down since the inception of the 1987 Regional Plan and the implementation of the EIP, which she opined indicates the EIP is one of the most effective set of actions to restore and save Lake Tahoe. Ms. Marchetta discussed: (1) forest management to reduce fuels in the Lake Tahoe Basin for the safety of communities and the health of the forests; and (2) Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS), one of the highest priorities in the EIP. She informed the Committee the funding for continued restoration comes from federal, state, local governments, private sector, and philanthropic sources. In conclusion, Ms. Marchetta identified the TRPA priorities to: (1) continue performance measures, reporting, and tracking tools to improve accountability; (2) continue to implement hundreds of projects that are currently underway; (3) examine the multi-agency implementation framework for efficiency and effectiveness; and (4) update the EIP five-year project priority list. (Please see [Exhibit D.](#))

- Nancy J. Gibson, Forest Supervisor, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, Region 5, U.S. Forest Service (USFS), presented information on the Forest Service role in the EIP. She provided information on her background and explained the USFS Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit (LTBMU), created in 1973, focused on environmental improvement. The LTBMU manages 78 percent of the land in the Lake Tahoe Basin, approximately 154,000 acres, and convenes the Lake Tahoe Federal Advisory Committee, a formal group of citizens who advise the Federal Interagency Partnership (FIP) as the EIP is implemented. The FIP directs federal agencies to coordinate activities with the states, local governments, and the TRPA to attain environmental thresholds that support the EIP, and the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act authorizes federal funding for the projects. She informed the Committee the land sales under the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act (SNPLMA), Public Law 105-263, provided the first consistent source of funding for EIP projects, which has resulted in the completion of 260 projects since 2005 in water quality, forest health and fuels reduction, ecological restoration, and recreational access. She said a major role for the LTBMU focused on improving water quality through upgrades to trails and road systems in the Lake Tahoe Basin.

Continuing her testimony, Ms. Gibson described the watershed and habitat improvement projects for the: (1) east shore beach trails; (2) Nevada Beach day-use Best Management Practices retrofit; and (3) Blackwood Creek Stream and floodplain restoration. She stated that since 1984, the USFS has provided nearly \$93 million for local erosion, stream restoration, and sediment control projects. In recent years, she stated the USFS received an additional \$10 million each year from SNPLMA funds to complete the projects. She added Nevada jurisdictions have received more than \$22 million for the treatment of storm water runoff, and joint funding was received from Sierra Colina, LLC; Erosion Control Grants from the USFS; and Nevada's Division of State Lands (NDSL), SDCNR. She explained the USFS also supports the EIP by working to restore native species and to reintroduce the Lahontan cutthroat trout, federally listed as threatened, to Fallen Leaf Lake and the Upper Truckee River. In addition, the USFS works to protect and develop conservation strategies for native plants and to prevent the spread of invasive species to the Lake Tahoe Basin. Concluding, Ms. Gibson reiterated the USFS mission is to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the nation's forests and grasslands to meet the needs of present and future generations by continuing the implementation of the EIP in the Lake Tahoe Basin.

- Patrick Wright, Executive Director, California Tahoe Conservancy (Conservancy), expressed the strong commitment of the State of California for the EIP from the outset. California has invested more than \$621 million for numerous projects since 1997. He further explained the California Tahoe Team was created in 2011 and has 11 member agencies based in the Lake Tahoe region and the city of Sacramento. He provided information on California priorities, which parallel many of the projects already presented to the Committee to help protect the environment and the economy in the Lake Tahoe Basin. Mr. Wright stated the highest priority for protecting Lake Tahoe clarity are the Upper Truckee River watersheds. In his view, the biggest challenge is coordinating restoration efforts of the numerous agencies that own parcels to support a common strategy of protecting the Truckee River and to deal with the legitimate, albeit varied, concerns of all involved. He added the second highest priority is the Bike Trail Network and to create Class 1 and 2 trails to make it easier to navigate around Lake Tahoe.

Further, Mr. Wright highlighted the Van Sickle Bi-State Park, a model of bistate cooperation between the Conservancy and Division of State Parks, SDCNR, to acquire bond funding combined with the Tahoe Fund and the Tahoe Rim Trail Association to assist with operating funds. Mr. Wright emphasized the importance of the EIP to secure funding. The EIP supports the commitment made by California to Nevada and the federal government because without California's share the partnership could dissolve. The EIP also ensures the funds designated for projects in the Lake Tahoe Basin are well spent, and the projects are jointly prioritized by both states and all agencies involved. In conclusion, Mr. Wright stated the absolute need for a workable

Regional Plan and EIP to support investments needed for the vital restoration projects to protect the environment and support the economy in the Lake Tahoe Basin.

- James R. Lawrence, Administrator and State Land Registrar, NDSL, SDCNR, stressed the importance of the EIP, one of the programs for achieving environmental gain. He provided information on the EIP structure, focus of program areas, and future plans. Mr. Lawrence said the NDSL coordinates the environmental improvements for Nevada in the Lake Tahoe Basin pursuant to NRS 321, which states “the Division may establish and carry out programs to preserve, restore, and enhance the natural environment of the Lake Tahoe Basin.” Prior to the EIP, he explained the 1986 Tahoe Basin Act and 1996 Tahoe Bond Act approved grant funding, but there was not a coordinated program until the EIP was established. In 1999, the Lake Tahoe Basin Act was passed, and Nevada was the first stakeholder to pledge full support to the EIP. He added in 2009 with the passage of Assembly Bill 18 (Chapter 431, *Statutes of Nevada*) Nevada supported the second phase of the EIP.

Continuing, Mr. Lawrence explained Nevada’s approach utilizes an interagency resource team coordinated by and housed in the NDSL called the Nevada Tahoe Resource Team (NTRT) comprised of employees from Nevada’s Department of Wildlife (NDOW), Division of State Parks, and Division of Forestry, SDCNR, to ensure that all project thresholds are met, and funding is maximized. He said the NTRT implemented 119 projects in the Lake Tahoe Basin utilizing partnerships with Nevada’s Department of Transportation (NDOT), Nevada Department of Environmental Protection (NDEP), State Historic Preservation Office, federal, and local agencies. Further, he presented information on the NTRT’s three main focus areas: (1) fuels reduction; (2) water quality; and (3) parks. He stated 40 percent of critical landscapes within the Lake Tahoe State Park system have received fuels treatment to prevent catastrophic wildfire.

Regarding water quality in Nevada, Mr. Lawrence explained the focus is on the road system and urban core areas, however, Nevada does not have as many urban core areas as California. The road system delivers the largest amount of sediment into Lake Tahoe, so highway projects are prioritized and grants are issued to local governments to treat critical neighborhoods for storm water runoff. He described an innovative solution to a parking problem in Crystal Bay caused by narrow roads. The project used a unique paving system along the roadway that allowed for parking and for water to infiltrate the ground instead of flowing into Lake Tahoe.

Mr. Lawrence stated another NTRT focus area is parks. Nevada taxpayers cover the costs for many of the EIP projects, and he said the recreation improvements are made so Nevadans and visitors can enjoy Lake Tahoe. He added projects have been done at Sand Harbor, North Canyon/Spooner and Van Sickle parks, hiking trails, water quality improvements in parking areas, camp grounds, and picnic areas. He identified the 2012 projects of highest priority and explained the EIP will continue to collaborate and leverage funds to achieve critical environmental goals. Concluding, Mr. Lawrence

discussed the funded projects in progress and unfunded projects, which have been identified but are on hold due to a lack of Nevada bonding capacity.

- Chair Lee called for public comment on Agenda Item No. VII; however, no testimony was presented. Chair Lee informed the Committee that Agenda Item No. XIII. would not be heard due to time constraints; however, a tour of Nevada state parks will be scheduled during a future Committee meeting.

DISCUSSION OF THE LAKE TAHOE TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD

- Colleen Cripps, Ph.D., Administrator, Division of Environmental Protection, SDCNR, explained the Lake Tahoe Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) is a science-based water quality restoration plan, which was developed and initiated by the Nevada DEP (NDEP) and the California State Water Resources Control Board to address the decline of water transparency at Lake Tahoe by selecting a common numeric target for the TMDL. She added the responsibility for implementing the TMDL rests with the states and stated since the clarity standard and water transparency objective have not been met, Lake Tahoe was deemed to be impaired, under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1948, as amended in 1972, also known as the Clean Water Act (CWA). Once a lake is determined to be impaired, the CWA requires a TMDL be established for the lake. The NDEP and California Water Board selected a common numeric target for the TMDL at Lake Tahoe to restore water transparency to 1967 to 1971 levels, which is a Secchi disk depth of 29.7 meters. Dr. Cripps further clarified the TMDL clarity standard indicates the goal can be achieved within 65 years, though the estimate assumes climate change, catastrophic events, and funding constraints do not adversely affect progress toward achieving the goal. (Please see [Exhibit E.](#))
- Harold Singer, Executive Officer, Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (Lahontan Water Board), California Environmental Protection Agency (CEPA), explained the establishment of the TMDL for Lake Tahoe was a collaborative effort between the NDEP and the Lahontan Water Board over a ten-year period of time of major scientific study. Mr. Singer pointed out a key determination was made based on the studies and revealed one of the main pollutants causing Lake Tahoe's clarity to decline was fine sediment particles, and accounts for approximately two-thirds of the clarity problem. Mr. Singer further explained the urban upland contributes 72 percent of the fine sediment, so technical working groups were formed to investigate the sources, what activities could be initiated for mitigation, and what benefits would be derived as a result. He discussed the challenge to reverse the clarity decline and measurably improve clarity within the next 15 years by capital improvements or activities that reduce pollutants and achieve approximately 79 feet of clarity.

Continuing, Mr. Singer added the NDEP and Lahontan Water Board are aware of economic concerns and are taking them into consideration during the implementation process of the TMDL. He disclosed that prior to the adoption of the TMDL, the NDEP and Lahontan Water Board focused on treatment of all storm water runoff into

Lake Tahoe using a “shotgun” approach. Since adoption of the TMDL, efforts are focused on the sources with the highest loads to meet the reduction requirements set by the TMDL. He clarified the TMDL is a federal program implemented by the states and addresses the following:

1. Benefits of the memorandum of agreement approach;
2. Common program benefits;
3. Development of Nevada’s Storm Water Load Reduction Plans and California’s Pollutant Load Reduction Plans by local urban jurisdictions;
4. Joint TMDL Management System, which is under development, to track all load reductions in urban and other source areas;
5. Lake Clarity Crediting Program to track load reduction for projects that are implemented;
6. Nevada Implementation Approach; and
7. The California Urban Storm Water Implementation Approach.

Mr. Singer outlined examples of various multi-agency local jurisdictional programs with customized solutions for differences in rainfall events, connective watersheds, and unconnected watersheds throughout the Lake Tahoe Basin. He stated the Sierra Colina Village project is an example of a private entity and public agency partnership to perform water quality improvements. He reiterated the TMDL does not preclude bistate-type projects, which can receive credit for load reductions and benefit the agencies that implement such projects. In California, a schedule of credits has been developed to provide regulatory certainty for municipalities that identify proposed activities. The schedule determines upfront the amount of credit the entity would receive upon completion of the projects.

Further, Mr. Singer explained the main difference between California and Nevada is the vehicle used to present the TMDL standards. In California the Urban Storm Water Implementation Approach uses the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit system for municipalities as authorized by the Clean Water Act. He briefly described the NPDES permit program used for many years for urban jurisdictions on the California side of the Lake Tahoe Basin. He added a new permit was developed in 2011 for the California Department of Transportation which includes TMDL requirements.

Concluding, Harold Singer stated the joint TMDL management systems are working with TRPA to ensure the smooth integration into the Regional Plan Update and added

the implementation of the Tahoe TMDL would be a long-term process and would continue to evolve and improve with continued teamwork and coordination.

- Colleen Cripps discussed the Nevada Implementation Approach (NIA), and said it is different than the NPDES permit process used by California. She stated the NIA will be implemented through a series of memorandums of agreement with local jurisdictions. Dr. Cripps reiterated the Clean Water Act requires waste load allocations to be incorporated into the existing NPDES permits. She clarified Nevada jurisdictions have not previously been regulated by permits, and the MOA is a more flexible method of implementation. She stated MOAs are currently being developed with Douglas County, Washoe County, and NDOT to specify how pollutant load reductions would be achieved. The MOAs will be based on the storm water load reduction plans and detailed strategies to identify the best areas for pollutant reduction.

Continuing her testimony, Colleen Cripps noted the local governments have two years from the date the TMDL was adopted to develop their plans. Though the implementing mechanism is different, the science, goals, project-planning process, and crediting program are very similar to California. She provided information on the benefits of the MOA approach, that includes collaboration, adaptability, flexibility, and efficiency by focusing resources on achieving on-the-ground results instead of meeting administrative permit requirements. Dr. Cripps also explained under the MOA process, Nevada jurisdictions would be able to apply for funding, which is not available to jurisdictions using the permit process. She presented information on the TRPA's role in the TMDL by providing incentives and planning tools rather than playing a regulatory role in the process. In summary, Dr. Cripps stated the Lake Tahoe TMDL represents decades of work and was a long-term process that would continue to evolve.

- Harold Singer stated the key part of the TMDL from the California and Nevada perspectives was adaptive management and monitoring the different scientific approaches to provide important feedback on pollutants.

In response to a question from Senator Settelmeyer on coordination with general improvement districts (GIDs), Colleen Cripps stated the Nevada DEP has met on numerous occasions with local governments and GIDs regarding the development of storm water load reduction plans and to identify the most appropriate projects for implementation.

Responding to a request from Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick to clarify the intended storm water load reduction implementation process and integration of new development projects, Colleen Cripps reiterated that the Nevada DEP is working closely with local governments to develop strong collaborative implementation plans for the TMDL; the Nevada DEP has approving authority for the plans. In her view, redefining the TRPA's oversight role for local government plans for consistency with the Regional Plan would strengthen the implementation efforts. Dr. Cripps clarified that the local governments would handle redevelopment projects and determine the types of credits to be issued for achieving storm water load reductions set by the TMDL.

Acknowledging comments from Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick on the two-year planning horizon for local governments, David Gaskin, P.E., Deputy Administrator, Nevada DEP, stated the TMDL is based upon a basinwide perspective with general goals and objectives. In his opinion, additional time is required for the jurisdictions to focus on specific projects and to prioritize the efforts with the greatest local impact for storm water load reduction.

- Colleen Cripps pointed out some projects are underway, and the crediting program would evaluate ongoing projects to ensure the local jurisdictions receive credit for the storm water load reductions, which are attained during the two-year planning process.

In response to comments from Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick regarding verification of progress, monitoring, and sanctions for not completing a plan, Colleen Cripps disclosed the Nevada DEP has the ability to establish a regulatory program if local governments do not implement plans. However, based on past meetings, she did not anticipate a change would be necessary because resources are so limited, which amplifies the need to develop creative ways to accomplish projects and ensure the best storm water runoff reductions in the short term.

Responding to a question from Chair Lee on clarity measurements, Colleen Cripps explained the Secchi disk clarity standard measurement is an average measurement based on 25 to 30 measurements taken over the period of a year. She noted Nevada adopted the clarity standard based on visible light extension and not the Secchi disk measurement standard.

In response to a question from Chair Lee on atmospheric deposits, Harold Singer said atmospheric emissions were examined during the scientific review as a primary resident concern that development from the west was affecting the Lake Tahoe Basin. However, he clarified the research determined only a very small percentage of emissions found in Lake Tahoe come from outside sources and stated nearly all of the material entering Lake Tahoe is generated within the Lake Tahoe Basin.

Addressing comments from Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick on environmental-friendly storm drain systems, soil erosion, and groundwater, Harold Singer stated there are a number of different tools available to deal with storm water runoff and each are site specific to public and private entities. He said source control improvements are less costly, so infiltration basins have been predominately used for storm water runoff. Mr. Singer stated infiltration does not work where there is high ground water, so other techniques such as chemical filtration or mechanical filtration are being developed. Also, he stressed the need for adaptive management to measure effectiveness and determine the most productive infiltration method.

- Harold Singer said local planners will examine the value of different activities within their jurisdictions, such as: (1) applying abrasives differently; (2) examining methods used on private property; or (3) minimizing the amount of pollutants in the storm water

runoff by increased street sweeping. Mr. Singer added the *Lake Clarity Crediting Program Handbook*, September 2011, (Handbook) was developed as part of the TMDL and was the prime document used by local jurisdictions in Nevada and California to quantify the value and benefits of past operations and maintenance (O&M) improvement projects. The jurisdictions must demonstrate the combined credit total of the planned O&M projects would meet the load reduction obligations set by the TMDL within a five-year period. Mr. Singer explained California local entities would receive credit for projects completed since 2003 toward meeting the first five-year increment of the clarity challenge.

In response to the Chair, Colleen Cripps agreed that asphalt would probably continue to be used, though there are efforts being conducted to minimize dust and storm water load runoff and include: (1) better street sweeping; (2) improving storm water drainage systems where runoff flows into infiltration basins near roadways; and (3) using different types of materials for snow control on roadways to reduce airborne particles; efforts can be evaluated to meet the TMDL reduction levels. Dr. Cripps will provide a copy of the Handbook to Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick.

- Chair Lee called for public comment on Agenda Item No. VIII; however, no testimony was presented.

DISCUSSION OF TRANSPORTATION ISSUES IN THE LAKE TAHOE BASIN

- Jeff Pulverman, Deputy District Director, Planning and Local Assistance, District 3, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), presented information on transportation planning in the Lake Tahoe Basin and said Caltrans manages 64.1 center line miles and 155 lane miles in the Lake Tahoe Basin, and he noted approximately 55,000 vehicles and 884,000 miles per day are driven on the California State Highway System (SHS). He explained the following challenges that Caltrans and all the transportation providers in the Lake Tahoe Basin face are severe weather, topography, and environmental constraints and pointed out some state highways in the region serve as main streets for many local communities. He identified three main priorities for Caltrans in the Lake Tahoe Basin are completion of EIP commitments, highway system maintenance and operations, and participation in the regional transportation planning process.

Continuing, Mr. Pulverman explained the regional transportation process is extremely complex and stated Caltrans must annually certify that the TRPA has maintained the following information:

1. Long-range regional transportation plan;
2. Short-term regional transportation improvement program; and

3. Regional transportation planning program that meets California and federal requirements.

Mr. Pulverman added Caltrans is a major participant in the EIP and the storm water runoff reduction program, and approximately half a billion dollars have been earmarked for EIP construction projects for the next two years. He provided a synopsis of the Caltrans System Planning Program, a statewide program where individual segment plans are developed for every state highway and assigned a level of service (LOS) standard on an A to F scale with “A” being free flowing traffic and “F” being congested conditions. He explained only a highway designated with the worst LOS standard would be proposed for additional highway lanes; however, adding lanes in the Lake Tahoe Basin is not possible. He emphasized that LOS “F” conditions are anticipated in the region, so other alternatives such as operational bike, pedestrian, and transit improvements are being examined. (Please see [Exhibit F](#).)

Commenting further, Mr. Pulverman discussed the three major non-maintenance improvements planned for the SHS, which include:

1. SR 89 Realignment Project;
2. Adaptive Signalization Program for US 50; and
3. US 50 and South Shore Community Revitalization Project (SSCRP).

Mr. Pulverman described the Complete Street Directive, a roadway designed and operated to carry vehicles, transit vehicles, pedestrians, and bikes, and said Caltrans has one of the most aggressive directive policies in the nation, which is incorporated into new projects whenever possible. Concluding, he presented information on the Caltrans transportation statewide competitive planning grants, which offer between \$1 million to \$3 million annually, and he said grant writing assistance is available to stakeholders in the Lake Tahoe Basin.

- Tracy Larkin-Thomason, Assistant Director, Planning, NDOT, provided a brief overview of the Nevada roadways that are managed by NDOT and explained the LOS policies and amount of traffic on Nevada highways in the Lake Tahoe Basin are also monitored the same as Caltrans. For the EIP, she stated NDOT focused on drainage improvements, maintenance operations, and slope stabilization and completed 13 EIP projects at a cost of approximately \$57 million, with five pending projects for a total of about \$97 million. She provided specific information on several NDOT projects:

1. US 50 to Dagget Summit (SR 207) 2012 water quality project and a reconstruction of the roadway project estimated to be completed by 2013;
2. US 50 slope protection near Cave Rock and Glenbrook Canyon;

3. SR 28 from Incline south to Carson City and the Washoe County sewer line project; and
4. SR 431 for slope protection curb and gutter projects.

Further, Ms. Larkin-Thomason emphasized the importance of maintenance operations for NDOT in the winter, as well as year round to develop and use water walls, reduce the amount of aggregate that is applied to roadways and better collection from water quality vaults. She stated NDOT's top priority is safety of the traveling public on Nevada highways by utilizing road safety audits, center line rumble strips, and restricted and unrestricted parking areas. In conclusion, Ms. Larkin-Thomason provided information on coordinating with TRPA for complete street initiatives, bike and pedestrian paths, and landscaping. (Please see [Exhibit G.](#))

- Nick Haven, Transportation Planning Manager, Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO), and TRPA, presented information on the regional transportation planning (RTP) process at Lake Tahoe, and included the common goals for multiple transportation authorities to provide: (1) a collaborative RTP process; (2) Compact policy achievement; and (3) threshold attainment. Mr. Haven explained the TRPA's designation as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) in 1999 by the United States Congress, which generated additional planning resources for the Lake Tahoe Basin. He said the California RTP Authority also produces planning resource allocations and fund tracking.

Further, Mr. Haven provided a breakdown of regional transportation funding and stated the TMPO programmed more than \$400 million for transportation projects scheduled for the next four years. He emphasized the need to leverage resources through public and private partnerships and regional coordination are very important for transportation systems. Mr. Haven identified the 11 individual entities responsible for planning and completing projects in the Lake Tahoe Basin and stated the Lake Tahoe region is approaching "build out," so growth capacity has and will continue to be limited. He presented four key transportation goals for the Lake Tahoe Basin: (Please see [Exhibit H.](#))

1. Coordinate with state DOTs and local governments to maximize investments in transportation to achieve water quality for environmental and economic benefits;
2. Design and construct roadways and system improvements to better manage the six peak transportation weekends when traffic congestion is generated;
3. Establish strategies for transportation access to, from, and within urban areas; and
4. Examine the effectiveness of existing systems, develop alternatives, and leverage investments.

- Carl Hasty, District Manager, Tahoe Transportation District (TTD), presented information on the 1980 Compact Amendment Article IX, which created the TTD and provided for the implementation authority for owning and operating transportation services and facilities connecting to and within the Lake Tahoe Basin. He stated the difference between the TTD and the TRPA is the TTD is not regulatory and has the authority to establish funding mechanisms for transportation and transit. Mr. Hasty presented information on the TTD board members and pointed out the private sector representatives from the Transit Management Associations on the north and south shores of Lake Tahoe. He noted the TTD has some local funding but predominately uses federal funding for project planning, construction readiness, priority capital projects, project delivery team members, and the US 50 SSCRP. The priority capital projects include the SR 89 Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization, Lake Tahoe Ferry, and Nevada Stateline-to-Stateline Class One Bikeway. Mr. Hasty stated the Bikeway was approved and funds have been allocated to build the first section in the south shore community beginning in the summer of 2012, and planning is underway for the second section. (Please see [Exhibit I.](#))

Further, Mr. Hasty emphasized the importance of the project delivery team (PDT) to accomplish projects and said the PDT consists of members from the public and private sectors. He expressed the importance and success of the PDT to address transportation issues over the last 15 years and into the future and provided additional information on the SSCRP, a project that would route traffic in a loop, create a local main street, and expand the pedestrian area, which are common goals of the region and are included in the Regional Plan. In his opinion, the common goals for physical improvements and practices are extremely important to economic development and are based on hydrologic information to mitigate drainage issues. He discussed the projects currently in progress and anticipated the necessary documents would be certified and construction permits sought in 2013.

Concluding, Mr. Hasty discussed the consequences of S.B. 271, which, in his view, would include the loss of the: (1) regional partnership and authority; (2) MPO dedicated to the Tahoe Region; and (3) transit advocacy for the south shore in California and Nevada. Mr. Hasty discussed steps to preserve the successful regional transportation functions for developing the Trans Sierra Transportation Coalition, an area that encompasses multiple counties and constituencies from the cities of Sacramento and Reno, Fernley, Fallon and Douglas Counties in Nevada tied together by a transportation system that supports a regional recreational-based economy. He informed the Committee members of a resolution passed by the TTD Board that stated the investment in transportation infrastructure was extremely important to the environment and economy. Douglas County, the South Shore Transportation Management Association (TMA), and North Tahoe TMA have also passed similar resolutions. He added the RTPs would play a key role in an inter-regional transportation plan if the Olympic Games were to be held in the Lake Tahoe Basin in the future.

- Assemblyman Kite asked about the Olympic Games, a water taxi on Lake Tahoe, and the runoff from vehicles laden with snow and mud.
- Mr. Hasty responded he recently attended a workshop for transportation organizations in Nevada and the City of Truckee held in conjunction with the organizing and venue committees. Mr. Hasty clarified ten alternatives have been analyzed for a possible connection between south and north shore using either 150-passenger or 200-passenger ferry vessels. He briefly discussed maintenance practices on parking lots and roadways in the Lake Tahoe Basin.
- Tracy Larkin-Thomason provided information on sand and oil interceptors installed on wastewater drainage systems as required by some master plans. She explained the state would fund the mitigation of substances used for maintenance that carry onto other entities, but the primary funding responsibility rests with the local entities.

Discussion ensued on what substances are put down and then collected from roadways, funding of ongoing maintenance efforts by Nevada and California, and what dialogue was conducted on using an interregional approach to consolidate funding intended for road maintenance.

- Responding to comments by Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick, Carl Hasty stated economies of scale should be explored for ongoing maintenance of roadways and implementation of other programs. He said there is a need for more discussions on funding by entities in the Lake Tahoe Basin; but dialogue has occurred at the GID level.

PUBLIC COMMENT

- Chair Lee called for public comment on Agenda Item No. IX.
- Steve Teshara, Chair, South Shore TMA, Truckee–North Tahoe TMA, and South Shore TMA representative on the Tahoe Transportation District Board, explained CalTrans, NDOT, regional transportation agencies, and the TMAs collaborate on the annual preparation of the Tahoe Basin Construction Map, a map of all the construction projects on local roads, so the traveling public and residents have prior information on what roads are impacted.

DISCUSSION OF AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES IN THE LAKE TAHOE BASIN

- Ted C. Thayer, Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Program Coordinator, TRPA, explained that the AIS Program is a program to control, monitor, and prevent the introduction of AIS in the Lake Tahoe Basin through coordination between federal agencies, Nevada, California, the TRPA, Tahoe Resource Conservation District, and the Tahoe Science Consortium. He explained the Lake Tahoe Regional AIS Management Plan provides the structure to implement the multi-agency AIS Program to: (1) prevent the new introductions of AIS into the region; (2) limit the spread of

existing AIS; and (3) abate the harmful economic, ecological, public safety, and social impacts resulting from AIS. Mr. Thayer pointed out the AIS Program is divided into three areas for control, early detection monitoring, and prevention of new invasive species.

Continuing his presentation, Mr. Thayer expressed the need for coordination and explained the partnerships with federal agencies, NDOT, NDEP, Division of State Parks, Caltrans, private entities, research institutions, and public utility districts at Incline Village, North Tahoe, Round Hill, and Tahoe City. Further, he explained the AIS Program is a co-chair of the AIS Coordinating Committee (AISCC) along with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the lead federal partner. Members of the AISCC prioritize programs annually, so a work plan can be set to achieve the greatest benefit.

In conclusion, Mr. Thayer said the AIS Program needs to: (1) develop a long-term funding plan; (2) develop a regional approach through cost sharing; (3) diversify funding sources to sustain the program; and (4) review the costs and benefits. He stated the financial support is derived from the federal government, State of Nevada, State of California, local, and private sources. (Please see [Exhibit J.](#))

- Karen Vargas, Wildlife Staff Specialist, AIS Program, Fisheries Division, NDOW, discussed Assembly Bill 167 (Chapter 387, *Statutes of Nevada 2011*), which among other provisions, authorized an annual AIS “sticker” fee designed for motorized and non-motorized watercraft. She presented information on the status of Nevada’s AIS Program statewide and in the Lake Tahoe Basin. She stressed the importance of regional collaboration to convey a uniform message to the public: “clean, drain, and dry”. (Please see [Exhibit K.](#))
- Kent A. Smith, Regional Manager, California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), North Central Region, presented a brief overview of each of the program categories in the Lake Tahoe Basin, which include: (1) New Zealand mudsnail monitoring; (2) quagga and zebra mussel monitoring; and (3) Warm Water Fish Control Project. Mr. Smith explained the quagga and zebra mussel monitoring program was due to sunset in January 2012; however, the California Legislature extended Title 14, *California Code of Regulations*, Fish and Game Commission, Section 2301, § 235.3, Inspection of Aquaculture Facilities and Permitted Businesses, for five years, which provides authority over conveyances and surface water and facilities. Concluding, Mr. Smith emphasized the importance of sound working relationships and coordination to develop a regional approach to implement the AIS Program. In reference to Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick’s earlier comment about “trust”, he said “trust” has to be developed through relationships over time. He said the CDFG has developed personal relationships, agency relationships, and jurisdictional relationships working on AIS issues in the Lake Tahoe Basin, and those established relationships and developed trust will be key to continued success in their efforts.

Mr. Smith relayed a story that happened in 2011 to demonstrate the importance of trusted relationships. He said the CDFG had been bringing two electrofishing boats, otherwise known as e-boats, to the Lake Tahoe Basin each year for survey work. California's budget constraints necessitated that the CDFG find another e-boat to use in the area rather than transport the two older e-boats that were otherwise committed. Federal funds were secured through the TRPA for CDFG to purchase an e-boat; however, budget constraints complicated the matter for the CDFG. Staff from the CDFG contacted Ken Mayer, Director, NDOW, to ask if the department might be able to purchase the e-boat for use in the Lake Tahoe Basin, and they were able to do so. Now, it is available to both states operating in the Lake Tahoe Basin. (Please see [Exhibit L.](#))

Discussion ensued on the Tahoe Science Consortium, eco-terrorism, and uniform public messages.

- Dave Roberts, District Manager, Tahoe Resource Conservation District, was unable to address the Committee; however, his presentation is included as [Exhibit M.](#)
- A letter dated February 3, 2012, to Jennifer Ruedy, Senior Research Analyst, Research Division, LCB, from Alexandra Pitts, Acting Regional Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, United States Department of the Interior, Sacramento, California, was received on February 6, 2012, and provided an update on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's participation in the AIS program at Lake Tahoe. Copies of the letter were distributed to the Committee members and, at the request of Chair Lee, has been included as an exhibit. (Please see [Exhibit N.](#))
- Chair Lee called for public comment on Agenda Item No. X; however, no testimony was presented.

DISCUSSION OF FOREST RESTORATION AND FIRE PREVENTION IN THE LAKE TAHOE BASIN

- Michael D. Brown, Fire Chief, North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District, pointed out the controlled burns occurring in the Lake Tahoe Basin at the time of the meeting. Mr. Brown informed the Committee there are seven fire departments in the Lake Tahoe Basin along with federal and state agencies that coordinate daily on fuels reduction efforts. He provided a history of the development of the forest fuels reduction program, which includes public education and provision of materials to maintain defensible space. Mr. Brown explained the three primary methods used for removing fuels: (1) hand thinning and pile burning; (2) prescribed manageable fire; and (3) mechanical fuels treatment. He stated the seasonal federal, state, and local fire crews understand the importance of thinning the fuels and forests around communities before a fire can reach a catastrophic level. He noted the importance of the various hand crews around the Lake Tahoe Basin for both fuels reduction work and fighting wildland fires. Concluding, Mr. Brown stated locating funding is a challenge for

the fuels reduction program and reported funding is received from SNPLMA, the White Pine County Conservation, Recreation, and Development Act of 2006 (109th United States Congress), numerous federal and state grants, private sector funds, and contributions from local GIDs and homeowners associations. He said the California-Nevada Tahoe Basin Fire Commission, which was established by former Governor of Nevada Jim Gibbons and former Governor of California Arnold Schwarzenegger, following the Angora Fire of 2007 clearly established that land managers and public and private property owners need to be responsible for the forest and fuels reduction projects.

- Elwood Miller, Ph.D., Coordinator, The Nevada Fire Safe Council, and Operations Chief, Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team, thanked the Committee staff for helping the presenters prepare for the meeting. Dr. Miller explained all seven fire departments work collaboratively to meet the fire protection districts' highest priority needs based on wildfire threat analysis. He added to meet the requirements of the White Pine Act a comprehensive plan titled "Lake Tahoe Basin Multi-Jurisdictional Fuel Reduction and Wildfire Prevention Strategy" was developed for 2008 to 2018. He indicated the seven fire departments accepted responsibility for completing fuels reduction in three jurisdictions: (1) private and local nonfederal jurisdictions; (2) California State Parks; and (3) California Tahoe Conservancy, and by the end of 2011 approximately 3,225 acres have been treated. Mr. Miller presented information on the Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team (TFFT), which develops the Incident Action Plan, an annual plan of proposed fuels reduction projects. (Please see [Exhibit O](#).)

Concluding, Mr. Miller stated because of the collaborative effort, the TFFT is ahead of schedule on fuels treatment and work was initiated on additional acreage. Mr. Miller presented information on the extreme fuel loading, hand thinning and piling, pile burning, and post-treatment reduction of fuels. He opined there is tremendous local community support from 55 active community chapters of the Nevada Fire Safe Council because of effective public awareness programs on improving forest health to achieve a more natural, historic forest condition.

- Pete Anderson, State Forester Firewarden, DOF, SDCNR, started by thanking fellow fire agencies that assisted in fighting fires that have occurred in western Nevada since November 2011; five of the eight fires were very large resulting in the loss of more than 60 homes. He reported statistical information on the Lake Tahoe State Park accomplishments by the Nevada DOF on forest restoration and hazardous fuels management. He reiterated the importance of collaboration and partnerships in the Lake Tahoe Basin in project planning, thinning, and sharing equipment to accomplish fire prevention projects. Mr. Anderson asserted that sustaining project funding for fuels reduction is paramount because many funding sources are shrinking. He said states have improved grant applications, so the process is more competitive. Concluding his remarks, Mr. Anderson pointed out a critical forest problem is bark beetles. He acknowledged that pile burning has increased and will continue to increase in the future because of the few facilities accepting biomass and the high transportation

costs involved. He noted the closure of the biomass plant at the Northern Nevada Correctional Facility in Carson City means one less option for the use of biomass. (Please see [Exhibit P.](#))

- Kathy Murphy, Staff Officer, Vegetation Urban Lots Fire and Fuels, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, Region 5, USFS, emphasized the need for partnerships and to connect the treatments to be more effective over a wider landscape. She presented information on completed mechanical and hand thinning prescribed fires, the Spooner Fuels Reduction Project, and the Incline Fuels Reduction Project. She described the biomass removal in the South Shore Fuels Reduction and Healthy Forest Restoration Project and presented information on the Nevada fuels and vegetation treatments. Ms. Murphy explained the management efforts are concentrated in the urbanized areas and are not conducted in the wilderness. (Please see [Exhibit Q.](#))

In response to questions from the Committee members, Pete Anderson said by the end of the 2011 fire season, approximately half a million acres were affected by fire. He also explained that the use of inmate labor plays a major role in fire suppression responses and fuel treatment throughout the state, and all nine camps are capable of conducting firefighting services and fuel reduction projects, which generate revenue for the program

In response to a comment by Senator Settelmeyer regarding a fire fuels reduction team for the Tahoe and Douglas County region, Michael Brown, previously identified, clarified the teams consist of 20-person hand crews with two to three full-time supervisors with 17 to 18 seasonal employees hired each year. He explained the crews are available for fighting fires and also conducting controlled forest burns.

- Senator Settelmeyer commended all the teams for their efforts.
- Michael Brown introduced the forest and fuel reduction program staff present at the meeting: Mike Vollmer, Program Coordinator, Forest Management, TRPA; Mary Huggins, Division Chief, Amador Eldorado Unit, California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Cal Fire); John Pang, Fire Chief, Meeks Bay Fire Protection District; Ben Sharit, Fire Chief, Tahoe Douglas Fire Protection District; and Tim Alameda, Battalion Chief, North Tahoe Fire Protection District and stated the districts' efforts are not divided by state boundaries and fuels reduction projects are provided for the benefit of the entire Lake Tahoe Basin.
- Chair Lee acknowledged Mary Huggins, previously identified, and recognized the importance of building strong relationships between Nevada and California to share resources for fighting fires and fuels management.
- Mary Huggins commented on the positive relationship between California and Nevada and between federal, state, and local entities and explained how resources are shared. However, she commented on budget reductions and the loss of the inmate program due to early releases. She emphasized the need for strong partnerships to meet the needs

within the Lake Tahoe Basin and assured the Committee members that the relationships built when fighting fires will continue. She noted that policy questions should be directed to Ken Pimlott, Director, Cal Fire. Ms. Huggins expressed concern that for the first time since 2008, two fire engines will not be coming back to the Lake Tahoe Basin. The additional fire engines were a result of an Executive Order issued by former Governor Schwarzenegger. She stated the California budget reduction has negatively affected the districts and resulted in the loss of the two engines, one on the north shore and one on the south shore, which were used for 24-hour, seven day a week responses to all types of emergency calls and will result in a shortfall of approximately 1,300 defensible space inspections required pursuant to California Public Resources Code 4291. Responding to questions from the Chair, Ms. Huggins explained the California Fire Safe Council System has chapters throughout California and said communication works very well within the Lake Tahoe Basin.

- Chair Lee called for public comment on Agenda Item No. XI; however, no testimony was presented.

UPDATE ON RECENT BISTATE DISCUSSIONS RELEVANT TO THE TRPA

- Leo M. Drozdoff, P.E., Director, SDCNR, stressed the importance of the efforts of all the presenters for the benefit of the Lake Tahoe Basin. Mr. Drozdoff stated there will be differences of opinion about the contents of the Regional Plan Update, but he stated the discussions on the differences would identify the areas where more work is needed. Mr. Drozdoff estimated only a small percentage of the Regional Plan Update issues would need further attention. However, in his opinion, the issues will be fully vetted during the next few months, so decisions can be made based on the information received during that time. Mr. Drozdoff commented on the current litigation of projects and the negative effect that has on the positive work being accomplished. He noted that the list requested earlier in the meeting by Senator Settelmeyer of projects approved by TRPA and subsequently litigated would not include those projects that were withdrawn or never submitted for permits. He said the threat of litigation has a tremendous chilling effect on development that may not be fully evident in a list of approved projects. He said he is participating in ongoing conversations with his counterpart in California, and Joanne Marchetta and her staff from TRPA have been involved in some of those conversations.
- Assemblyman Kite applauded the cooperation of all the agencies in the Lake Tahoe Basin, though he stated more discussion is needed on public-private cooperation for funding and to mitigate water clarity issues.
- Mr. Drozdoff stated public participation was high but projected funding support might not continue and stressed the need for increased private development to positively impact the environment. Mr. Drozdoff stated proposed projects have demonstrated environmental benefit, yet they have been blocked by litigation. He mentioned the need

to incentivize private development that will have positive environmental benefits because projects will not proceed without a return on investment.

- Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick had reservations about the transparency of the project approval process, but commented many steps have been proposed for improvement. She strongly reiterated the importance of public understanding of the revised process, the intent of the Committee, and all the positive information from the numerous presenters who have addressed the Committee. She added that she looks forward to the next meeting on March 19, 2012, when the environmental group representatives are scheduled to address the Committee because it will be their opportunity “to be part of the process, to buy into the process, and to understand the process”. There has to be a level of trust on both sides. Ms. Kirkpatrick stated the need for proponents of different viewpoints to conduct discussions and develop solutions to address concerns so legislation can be developed as soon as possible for the 2013 Legislative Session. She said a lot of money has been wasted on litigation that could have been spent on road and restoration projects.
- Mr. Drozdoff opined that government agencies are doing a much better job of coordinating, but agreed there is a critical need to get positive information out to the public. He stated S.B. 271 has focused discussions on issues for the Lake Tahoe Basin, but in his view, there is a need to hear the issues and concerns of stakeholders not in the public sector.

In response to a question from Chair Lee, Mr. Drozdoff said the location of projects in the Lake Tahoe region determines where a lawsuit is filed and ultimately heard by a court. He added it is also essential to determine the most effective method for communicating with all the government agencies and environmental stakeholders in Nevada and California. He mentioned that he plans to reach out to the new Executive Director of the League to Save Lake Tahoe after she has started in her new role.

- Chair Lee said that he would be happy to attend any meeting that Mr. Drozdoff coordinates with the new Executive Director of the League to Save Lake Tahoe, and he thought the fellow Committee members may also be interested in attending. He called for public comment on Agenda Item No. XII; however, no testimony was presented.

OVERVIEW OF THE VAN SICKLE BI-STATE PARK

(As directed by Chair Lee this agenda item was not presented)

A tour of Nevada state parks may be scheduled during a future Committee meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

- Chair Lee called for public comment; however, no testimony was presented.

ADJOURNMENT

- Chair Lee stated the next Committee meeting is scheduled for March 19, 2012, and the agenda will focus on S.B. 271. There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 4:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lucinda Benjamin
Senior Research Secretary

Jennifer Ruedy
Senior Research Analyst

APPROVED BY:

Senator John J. Lee, Chair

Date: _____

LIST OF EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the “Meeting Notice and Agenda,” provided by Jennifer Ruedy, Senior Research Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB).

[Exhibit B](#) is a letter dated December 14, 2011, to Darrell Steinberg, President pro Tempore of the Senate, and John A. Pérez, Speaker of the Assembly, California State Legislature, from Senator John J. Lee, Chair, Legislative Committee for the Review and Oversight of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and the Marlette Lake Water System.

[Exhibit C](#) is the written testimony of Casey Beyer, Member appointed by the Governor of California, Governing Board, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA).

[Exhibit D](#) is a Microsoft PowerPoint presentation handout titled “Lake Tahoe Environmental Improvement Program,” provided by Joanne S. Marchetta, Executive Director, TRPA.

[Exhibit E](#) is a Microsoft PowerPoint presentation handout titled “The Lake Tahoe Total Maximum Daily Load,” submitted by Colleen Cripps, Ph.D., Administrator, Division of Environmental Protection, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (SDCNR).

[Exhibit F](#) is a Microsoft PowerPoint presentation handout titled “Transportation Planning in the Lake Tahoe Basin,” provided by Jeff Pulverman, Deputy District Director, Planning and Local Assistance, District 3, California Department of Transportation.

[Exhibit G](#) is a Microsoft PowerPoint presentation handout titled “Lake Tahoe–Nevada,” submitted by Tracy Larkin-Thomason, Assistant Director, Planning, Nevada’s Department of Transportation.

[Exhibit H](#) is a Microsoft PowerPoint presentation handout titled “Connecting Our Communities, Transportation for the Lake Tahoe Region,” submitted by Nick Haven, Transportation Planning Manager, Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization.

[Exhibit I](#) is a Microsoft PowerPoint presentation handout titled “The Bi-State Compact,” submitted by Carl Hasty, District Manager, Tahoe Transportation District.

[Exhibit J](#) is a Microsoft PowerPoint presentation handout titled “Lake Tahoe Aquatic Invasive Species Program,” submitted by Ted C. Thayer, Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Program Coordinator, TRPA.

[Exhibit K](#) is a Microsoft PowerPoint presentation handout titled “Status of Nevada’s AIS Program,” submitted by Karen Vargas, Wildlife Staff Specialist, AIS Program, Fisheries Division, Nevada’s Department of Wildlife.

[Exhibit L](#) is a Microsoft PowerPoint presentation handout titled “Department of Fish and Game in the Tahoe Basin,” submitted by Kent A. Smith, Regional Manager, North Central Region, California Department of Fish and Game.

[Exhibit M](#) is a Microsoft PowerPoint presentation handout titled “Lake Tahoe Aquatic Invasive Species Program, Tahoe Resource Conservation District 2011 Program Accomplishments,” submitted by Dave Roberts, District Manager, Tahoe Resource Conservation District.

[Exhibit N](#) is a letter dated February 3, 2012, to Jennifer Ruedy, Senior Research Analyst, Research Division, LCB, from Alexandra Pitts, Acting Regional Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, United States Department of the Interior, Sacramento, California.

[Exhibit O](#) is a Microsoft PowerPoint presentation handout titled “Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team,” submitted by Elwood Miller, Ph.D., Coordinator, The Nevada Fire Safe Council, and Operations Chief, Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team.

[Exhibit P](#) is a Microsoft PowerPoint presentation handout titled “Forest Restoration and Fire Prevention in the Lake Tahoe Basin” submitted by Pete Anderson, State Forester Firewarden, Division of Forestry, SDCNR.

[Exhibit Q](#) is a Microsoft PowerPoint presentation handout titled “Lake Tahoe Management Unit, Forest Health and Hazardous Fuels,” submitted by Kathy Murphy, Staff Officer, Vegetation Urban Lots Fire and Fuels, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, Region 5, USFS.

This set of “Summary Minutes and Action Report” is supplied as an informational service. Exhibits in electronic format may not be complete. Copies of the complete exhibits, other materials distributed at the meeting, and the audio record are on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Carson City, Nevada. You may contact the Library online at www.leg.state.nv.us/lcb/research/library/feedbackmail.cfm or telephone: 775/684-6827.