

Letter: Land management in Tahoe questionable

To the community,

On any subject to have a discussion, bona fide discussion, it is necessary to define the terms. When we speak on the subject of the city of South Lake Tahoe and its relationship with the Forest Service and the California Tahoe Conservancy, especially on the subject of land use and land management and maintenance, it's necessary to ask what is a city?

Webster's defines a city as 1) a center of population, commerce and culture, 2) an incorporated U.S. municipality with definite boundaries and legal powers set forth in a charter granted by the state.



Bill Crawford

Webster says a forest is a dense growth of trees, together with other plants covering a large area. And conservancy is conservation, especially of natural resources.

And wilderness is 1) uninhabited region left in its natural condition, especially a large wild tract of land covered with vegetation or forests.

So what is the point? When I look at the lots owned by the Forest Service and Conservancy in my neighborhood, it appears they are managed as if a wilderness. That's a contradiction

because they are within the city, small lots in an urban area that are subject to fire. And that's the sticking point.

We live in a city that has no authority within its boundaries over land owned by the federal government and the state of California. So things are in a muddle. They are free to thumb their noses at the city. They do not have to conform to the legal powers of the city.

That's not right. But that's how it is.

Bill Crawford, South Lake Tahoe