

Opinion: Understanding EDC measures E and G

By Larry Weitzman

A few days ago in the *Lake Tahoe News* was a story written by Joann Eisenbrandt, attempting to “untangle” measures E and G. In reading the story it appears the lead issue was buried unintentionally for both measures in the story as these measures are almost impossible to decipher without special knowledge and understanding. But after spending hours and days studying E and G, the intent is to shut down almost all county growth and development, but not government growth. So let’s get right to it.



Larry Weitzman

Measure E would attempt to stop most all, if not all development through the use of its paragraph 3 which says: “All necessary road capacity improvements shall be fully completed to prevent cumulative traffic impacts from new development from reaching Level of Service F (LOS F) during peak hours upon any highways, arterial roads and their intersections during, peak-hour periods in unincorporated areas of the county before any form of discretionary approval can be given to a project.”

Without getting into the ambiguities of the language as written, this basically says before one building permit can be pulled relative to a project of five or more units and/or

parcels, a developer would have to build all offsite transportation improvements to prevent a LOS F for even one minute as dictated by the government (including a nebulous Caltrans projection done by crystal ball) that such a development will be forecast to cause. It's unclear if a LOS F on Highway 50 outside the county (it reads that way) could also be attributed to an EDC development that would require remediation as well, but this measure should be renamed "The lawyers full employment act."

As you can see it will stop all development of five parcels or more as it will be argued that the impact of such developments will cause a LOS F and cost the developer tens or hundreds of million dollars before he can start construction. And what if a LOS F occurs because of unforeseen causes, traffic accidents, issuance of traffic tickets or some other cause? That's a lot of authority for a couple of bureaucrats. The cost of housing is going up as litigation (maybe even payola) becomes a major housing cost.

Currently, builders pay the total traffic improvements required via adding on a proportionate cost to each building permit via TIM Fees, otherwise there will be no building industry large or small in EDC. This no growth faction has perhaps become extreme because our BOS and CAO's office in the past have let developers off the hook of some of their obligations after or during the project. This measure would take any discretion out of the politically hyper BOS and leave all discretion with other non-responsible, state bureaucrats. The second choice could be worse. Measure E is fraught with legal issues and interpretations that are totally unknown at this time. It's an open book for bigger government and control.

If you don't think mistakes aren't made by the BOS and staff, recently the BOS approved a Serrano build project that said it was being recommended by staff (the CDA and its head, Roger Trout). Nobody in the county administration or government

understood that the development agreement had expired eight years ago and had no force and effect, but it was too late to protest. Let's see who is going to be held accountable?

Measure G uses another tactic to stop development cold and that is water. It requires that all projects shall be required to be connected to a public water system. No private water need apply. A water connection could run in the tens of millions of dollars (see new water policy 5.2.1.3.). Policy 5.2.1.4 says rezoning, discretionary development and subdivision approvals dependent on public water supply shall be subject to the availability of a permanent and reliable water supply necessary for all uses including fire prevention and the water issues go on. EID has only so much water, so who is going to pay for additional water rights? As with LOS F, it could price development out of sight.

But there is more potential bad stuff having to do with zoning. The measure changes the general plan wherein land use must conform to preexisting zoning before the general plan adopted 12 years ago. To understand how it is supposed to work, a general plan sets land use throughout the county. Land use is a broader definition of how land should be used, an example being residential 1-5 acres. To further refine and define the zoning of the land use a zoning update ordinance will update zoning to a more specific number within the designated land use in that area.

So the zoning gets fixed at 2-acre zoning. The zoning defines the land use. The BOS could limit it to 5-acre parcels or one-acre zoning after many public hearings, but it will be between 1-5-acre zoning as prescribed by the land use.

Measure G wants the exact opposite to happen. If there were zoning prior to the General Plan that said it was 10-acre zoning before the General Plan, then G provides that it must be downzoned to 10 acres. This kind of thinking destroys the General Plan that was approved by the voters in 2004. The

failure of the General Plan under these measures, if it could withstand legal challenges, could destroy the county. Measure G wants to do things backassward. This will also cost the county millions in litigation and raise the price of developed real estate.

While this small faction wants to take away development decisions from the BOS, this measure will make our current budget issues look like pocket change. These measures demonstrate that there is a small coalition in EDC that is just fed up with continuing illegal BOS actions and are looking for ways to stop it, even though Measure E and G are poor solutions that are off the end of the other side. What would work better is a better BOS and administrative staff that know what they are doing.

Just look at the problems now with the financing of the new sheriff's facility. That's what you get with a part time CAO who hasn't got a clue and a CDA that seems to be asleep at the job. The first thing the BOS needs to do is hire a new CAO who knows the job and how to do it. That man is already in house. One thing you should know is that Shiva Frentzen is the only BOS member that understands what is going on. It's a shame the recall didn't work for the rest of the BOS.

Larry Weitzman is a resident of Rescue.

Letter: Appreciative of community's support

To the community,

Bread & Broth's Friday night Second Serving celebrated its

seven-year anniversary on May 13. Second Serving serves weekly free-of-charge meals to the community at Lake Tahoe Community Presbyterian Church. Second Serving is an expansion of Bread & Broth's Monday evening food service at Grace Hall of Saint Theresa's Catholic Church in South Lake Tahoe.

Bread & Broth is a nonprofit, all-volunteer program feeding the hungry in our community for over 25 years; proving a hot meal for those in need, as well as a goodwill gathering place for its volunteers. Second Serving would like to extend a thank you to all of our wonderful volunteers, past and present, for donating their time.

We would also like to extend our sincere appreciation to the following donors for their support that continued our success these past seven years: Erik and Melodie (Freshies), Rosie Cowen and Glenn Simpson (Blue Angel Café), Sheldon and Dan (Tep's Villa Roma), Scott Craig (Riva Grill), Tim Halloran and Mark Vassau (Nepheles), Nick Ashmore (Cafe Fiore), Steffen Moise (Ridge Tahoe) and Tim Tretton (MontBleu). When you are choosing a place to dine in Lake Tahoe, we hope you will remember these restaurants for their generous donations to help feed our less fortunate and keeping South Lake Tahoe a unified community.

Diane Weidinger, Bread & Broth

Letter: Meyers development needs more scrutiny

Publisher's note: *This letter was sent to the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and is reprinted with permission.*

I am writing to oppose the hearing and potential approval of the subject proposed project as the impacts analysis are inadequate and improper notice of the project to neighboring uses. Unfortunately, I cannot make the meeting on May 25 as I am working in Sacramento with a full schedule of meetings that day.

My family lives at 2648 Wailaki St., in the neighborhood below the proposed facility known as Tahoe Par 60. Our neighborhood falls just outside the Meyers Area Plan of January 2014. The proposed project is only about 2,500 feet away and is approximately 200 feet higher in elevation from the residential uses in Tahoe Par 60, which is outside the Meyers Area Plan.

This recreational group facility project was previously approved in 1995 by TRPA Governing Board. After 20 years of languishing, residents of the immediate area received no public notice this was being reconsidered. It is inconsistent with California public agency transparency laws to run this application through without notifying impacted residents. Constructive notice by publishing of an agenda in a newspaper without providing actual notice to impacted residents does not meet the intent of the law.

In looking at the recommended action, I find the TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) that was completed to be inadequate. Staff prepared a finding of no significant effect. The scale and intensity of the use are determined to be appropriate for the surrounding area without creating conflicts with adjacent land uses. This appears to mean immediately adjacent. However, the neighboring owners outside the Meyers Area Plan must use the same ingress/egress and are not considered when analyzing impacts. No consideration was given to the noise impacts from this proposed project or its proximity and/or elevation to the residences of our community. Noises include, but not limited to, daily noise from playing hockey, such as fans cheering, coaches yelling out

instructions, slapping sticks and bouncing pucks, as well as proposed tennis court noises of similar traits will affect the peace and quiet enjoyed by nearby neighborhoods.

The findings mentioned the project will generate 116 daily vehicle trip ends which they considered a minor increase in traffic by the Code of Ordinances. The new vehicle trips will be mitigated by payment of an air quality mitigation fee. No traffic mitigation has been indicated. This is totally inadequate given it is already too difficult to exit the area via South Upper Truckee Road during peak traffic to get to our daily tasks of school, shopping and jobs. The 2010 peak traffic count for the area is over 15,000 daily trips in the immediate vicinity. The Level of Service (LOS) is already at E for many hours during peak traffic on weekends and holidays. This would add more back-ups, congestion and pollution to our quiet lifestyle chosen for this area. When combined with the proposed traffic roundabout that intends to slow traffic in Meyers on USD 50, this would be a complete traffic nightmare for residents on or near South Upper Truckee Road. The pavement condition will only worsen beyond its current Pavement Condition Index (PCI) of approximately 45 percent with additional traffic, especially if heavy vehicles are included as proposed.

I propose the TRPA table the agenda item until further study and notice of proceedings be made to the affected residents and proper hearing of impacts to those living outside the Meyers Area Plan and proposed mitigations be inclusive of those residents.

The TRPA put this on their consent calendar with barely a word about it. It could have easily slipped through the process. This calls to question the transparency and representation of Lake Tahoe residents by TRPA in other matters in our region.

Jeffrey Spencer, Meyers

Letter: Vote for Brooks for judge

To the community,

It is with the greatest regret that I must inform the public what the current contested judicial election between Judge Nelson Brooks and Roland Tiemann is really all about. Obviously, there are two people who desire to be judge and the voters must choose. But behind all that is a power struggle for control of the administration of the court.

Judge Steve Bailey desires to be presiding judge of the court. That requires a positive vote by a majority of the current judges. He cannot achieve that now because a majority of the judges, including Judge Brooks, do not support him. So he is willing to challenge a respected colleague in order to achieve his objective. If Tiemann wins, Bailey will have one more vote for presiding judge.

This is a sorry state of affairs. It has created a serious, negative rift at the court. Do we want our judges to thus engage their ego pursuits and subject the public to the expense and ordeal of a contested election? Is this the kind of conduct we expect of our judges?

I hope not.

Please reject this challenge as the shabby and inappropriate behavior that it is. Stop the power grab. Vote for Judge Brooks.

Judge Eddie T. Keller (Ret.), Shingle Springs

Opinion: ‘Dedication to upholding the law’



Judge Nelson Brooks is up for re-election on June 7. Photo/Provided

Publisher's note: *Lake Tahoe News* asked both candidates for El Dorado County Superior Court judge to write a guest column. To date the incumbent is the only one to do so. The election is June 7.

By Nelson Brooks

I am honored and proud to be one of your judges here in El Dorado County. I graduated from the University of California's Hastings College of the Law, and have been on the bench now for approximately seven years after practicing as a trial attorney in Sacramento and El Dorado counties for over 25 years.

I was first appointed to the bench by Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger in 2009, and retained by a vote of over 75 percent of our county's voters in 2010.

My opponent is a trial attorney with barely 10 years total experience as a licensed lawyer (the absolute minimum required before an attorney may even apply for a judicial position), who earned his law degree at night school. His primary area of practice has been DUI and marijuana defense cases.

I see my role as a sitting judge to be the tireless and unswerving dedication to upholding the law and applying it fairly, without prejudice or preference to all of our counties' citizens who come before me. I believe that our judicial system must provide a respectful, efficient, no-nonsense forum for the fair and equitable resolution of disputes, and that it is an honor and a privilege to have been selected to serve the people of El Dorado County in this capacity.

I am committed to justice and common sense. Being a judge in the El Dorado Superior Court is about experience, integrity and fairness. My opponent is a criminal defense attorney who does not have the knowledge or understanding of the rule of law to do this job. I am endorsed by District Attorney Vern Pierson, Presiding Judge Suzanne Kingsbury, Judge James Wagoner, Judge Ken Melikian, Judge Vicki Ashworth, Chief Public Defender Teri Monterosso, Presiding Appellate Justice Vance Raye and all of the associate justices of the Third District Court of Appeals, which is the appellate court that reviews any of my decisions that might go up on appeal.

I have also been endorsed by the South Lake Tahoe Police Officers Association, South Lake Tahoe Mayor Wendy David, County Supervisor Sue Novasel, the Mountain Democrat newspaper and many others.

I believe that justice should be dispensed without bias and

with fiscal efficiency. I have served in virtually every division of our Superior Court, presiding over both court and jury trials.

I was born in Columbus, Ohio, and traveled quite a bit growing up – my father served our country in the Air Force and was one of the original Tuskegee Airmen during World War II. He continued in the Air Force after the war ended, rising to the rank of full colonel. Over his career our family lived in many places including Germany, the Philippine Islands, and tours at the Pentagon in Washington, D.C., before his final assignment at Hamilton AFB in Marin County, where he retired.

Prior to becoming a judge, I practiced law for about 27 years in El Dorado and Sacramento counties. I graduated from UC Hastings College of the Law in 1982 after earning my undergraduate degree from Santa Clara University. I am fully committed to our community. My wife and I met and married here in El Dorado County in 1976. My wife, Tish Starr Brooks, graduated from UC Davis Veterinary School in 1988. She practiced in El Dorado County for many years. We have two adult children who were born and raised on the West Slope in the home in which we still live today.

As an attorney for approximately 27 years, I successfully litigated many thousands of business and personal injury matters, representing both plaintiffs and defendants, and earning one of the highest ratings available from Martindale-Hubbell. As your El Dorado County Superior Court judge I have handled virtually every case type and courtroom assignment. I have gained broad judicial experience in my time on the bench, having worked in every division of our county's court system, including civil and probate, family law, dependency-delinquency, traffic, and, for approximately the past six months, in the criminal arraignment department.

I have presided over jury and/or court trials in all of these areas, and have imposed one of the highest criminal sentences

in our county's history in a multiple child abuse-molestation trial: 750 years to life. Handling this volume of cases requires swift but well thought-out determinations as to how these matters should proceed: all the way to trial in the trial courts; or resolution at the arraignment stage, with the commiserate cost savings to the court and the county, but without compromising the defendant's constitutional rights to a full and fair hearing.

My decisions must be made quickly and efficiently in order to keep the never-ending flow of criminal cases moving smoothly. In the time that I have been in this assignment I have been able to establish a record of efficiency and timeliness in accomplishing these goals. During my over 30-year career as a lawyer and judge, I have worked as a civil litigator and tried cases in both federal court and in state courts throughout Northern California. In those 30-plus years of practice, both as a lawyer and as a judge, I have never been disciplined, sanctioned nor investigated for any alleged misconduct. In my private practice before coming on the bench, I have never had any complaints lodged against me by clients or adversaries for unethical or even questionable conduct.

I take pride in my commitment to this community. Tish and I fell in love with El Dorado County and knew that we wanted to raise our family here and give back everything we could to continue making this an incredible place to live. I served for nearly a decade on the Snowline Hospice Board of Directors, coached youth soccer and basketball, and am a past president of the El Dorado County Bar Association. I have previously served as a trustee for the County Law Library, been chairman of the Evelyn Horn Scholarship Selection Committee and continue to serve as a volunteer judge for the county's Teen Court Program.

Since taking office on the El Dorado County Superior Court, I have worked to improve operations by eliminating unnecessary, duplicative and expensive court appearances. I also helped

implement a new, streamlined system for requesting necessary appearances directly. I would greatly appreciate the opportunity to continue efficiently handling the great volume of cases that must be processed through this department.

In the time I have served on the bench I have assisted in implementing the following:

- We have an online request for oral argument process available online. I helped create that when I was assigned to civil.
- Our public website is more accessible, user friendly, and has more information for attorneys and the public.
- We now have transcripts available online, speeding the process and saving money on copying costs.
- Our court is very fiscally strong and even with the reduction of some of our workforce, we have been able to keep afloat operationally, with little noticeable difference to the public.
- The court now has its own telephone appearance system. This system generates revenue for the court and allows attorneys and parties to appear by phone for brief appearances.
- We now handle most search warrants electronically.
- We have created an online orientation for family law litigants prior to mediation. Prior to that time, the parties had to come to court for that purpose.
- We now provide interpreters for all case types.
- Other efficiencies include being able to pay traffic and criminal fines, fees and restitution online and via credit card. People now also have the ability to handle some aspects of their traffic tickets remotely.

It has been my honor to serve the people of El Dorado County as your Superior Court judge and I respectfully ask for your vote on June 7, 2016, so I can continue to serve our community in the future.

Opinion: Chamber applauds disability bill

By Amber Llovet

State Sen. Richard D. Roth's, D-Riverside, bipartisan measure to protect California's small businesses and the disabled community has been approved by Gov. Jerry Brown. With the governor's signature on May 10, this new law has already taken effect.

"This is a major victory for all Californians," said Roth. "SB269 is a bipartisan, commonsense solution that will guarantee access for disabled Californians by providing small businesses with the tools and resources necessary to comply with state and federal disability access regulations. I am glad the governor agrees with the critical need for this reform, and I am proud to have delivered this victory for California's small businesses and disability community."

SB269 enjoyed widespread bipartisan support and did not receive a single "no" vote throughout the legislative process. It is a narrowly crafted provision to provide businesses with much needed disability access education, resources and training, and allows small businesses that have been proactive in identifying access issues a reasonable amount of time to fix any problems identified before a lawsuit arises. The bill seeks to incentivize businesses to proactively take steps to

become accessible by providing them with 120 days from receipt of a Certified Access Specialist (CASp) report to resolve any violations identified without being subject to statutory penalties or litigation costs.

“Tahoe Chamber has been working tirelessly on the ADA issue for many years in order to educate and protect our small businesses from costly and unnecessary litigation. We supported a variation of this bill last year which failed and thus we were pleased to see Sen. Roth reintroduce it again this year and have supported it’s journey through the legislative process this session. This is another great step in ensuring that the Tahoe business community thrives,” said B Gorman, CEO of Lake Tahoe South Shore Chamber of Commerce.

Tahoe Chamber is a bi-state chamber with 650 members who operate businesses in both states. The chamber’s Government Affairs Committee (GAC) monitors legislation in both Nevada and California to ensure we are representing our members and communicating new laws that impact business.

Amber Llovet is communications coordinator for Lake Tahoe South Shore Chamber of Commerce.

Editorial: Time for Sanders to be honest

Publisher’s note: This editorial is from the May 18, 2016, Washington Post.

Tension in the Democratic presidential race exploded in Nevada last weekend. Supporters of Sen. Bernie Sanders, I-Vt. shouted, cursed and threw chairs during a state party

convention in which they failed to force rules changes they wanted.

Even though they were attempting to get more delegates than the caucus results in the state suggested they deserved, they attacked the process as unfair. The state party chair subsequently received death threats against her and her family.

Mr. Sanders responded with self-righteousness and hypocrisy. He released a statement in which he listed a series of procedural complaints about the Nevada convention, attacked the Democratic Party for not being inclusive enough and warned that “millions of Americans are outraged” and that “the political world is changing.” He offered a throwaway line, three paragraphs down, condemning his supporters’ hooliganism in a statement that mostly justified it.

Read the whole story

Editorial: Nev. needs legislative sessions every year

Publisher’s note: *This editorial is from the May 16, 2016, Las Vegas Sun.*

A recent gathering of politicians, businesspeople and other civic leaders at UNLV offered an insightful peek behind the curtain to see how sausage is made in the Nevada Legislature.

The view was both uplifting and discouraging.

On the one hand, it was instructive to see how issues for the 2017 Legislature are identified. The city of Las Vegas and the Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce hosted a series of meetings, open to the public and known as the Southern Nevada Forum, for interested residents to ruminate on the main issues that dominate political decision-making in Carson City: K-12 education, higher education, transportation infrastructure, economic development, health care and good governance, which goes to the heart of this editorial.

Read the whole story

Letter: A plea to change SLT VHR rule

Publisher's note: *The following letter was read at the May 17 South Lake Tahoe City Council meeting and is reprinted with permission.*

My name is Asha Whipple and I own two cabins in South Lake. I have been an Airbnb property renter for a couple years and I use the additional income to help pay for repairs and to make property improvements.

I am permitted, have adequate paved parking, have always had smoke detectors, carbon monoxide detectors, proper signage and fire extinguishers as well as a local contact. I have paid thousands in TOT taxes and permitting fees on time. I have never had any problems, not with neighbors, trash, noise complaints. Nothing.

I take issue with you singling out multi-family properties to exclude [them] from the VHR program.

I recently spent nearly a thousand dollars making additional renovations per your exhaustive new requirements to be able to continue as a VHR, only to find out you are now considering revoking my permit simply because I own two cabins on one lot. I do not understand why you would recommend to discriminate against a property like mine. It is the perfect situation for a VHR. My front house has long-term renters, they are my local contact and they keep an eye on the property. It ensures that none of the typical VHR problems occur. In return they get a nicer place for more affordable rent. My back cabin is for our family's use and we rent it out on holidays and weekends we are not up here on Airbnb.

My cabins are surrounded by low income apartments, a strip mall with a smoke shop, a cheap motel and vacant land. I can hardly see how someone like me could be doing anything but improving the neighborhood. But you seem to have no interest in looking at homes on a case by case basis, rather preferring these broad sweeping restrictions which only haphazardly address the issues. To be perfectly clear, I rent my personal home. Our cabin would never be leased long term regardless and this ban only disrupts my ability to provide my front renters with affordable housing. By revoking my permit you are forcing me to raise the rent on my front lease, thus working against your own goal of achieving more affordable housing. Why not just look at these few multi-family situations on a case by case basis? We already have to be inspected and approved individually.

You have already spent exorbitant time and energy continuously tightening and restricting good owners who pay thousands in taxes and are following all the rules. I have seen restriction after restriction come my way despite my rental having zero problems ever. Meanwhile there has been minimal effort on cracking down at all on all the people renting unpermitted and

under the table.

Please stop limiting opportunity for owners like me trying to improve their properties. VHRs add to the tourism economy and enables people to buy and fix up otherwise crumbling properties, thus improving neighborhoods and the real estate economy. Start putting your energy into enforcing the rules you have already established and getting more unpermitted owners on board, and then let the restrictions you have already set have some time to work before continuing to slowly choke this revenue possibility to death.

I am very disappointed in our current City Council and I will be trying to vote in leaders that take a more open-minded, community involved approach to leadership this next election. I urge anyone looking to invest in small business or thinking of running a VHR to do so in the county, this city council has made it a nightmare to operate within the city limits.

Asha Whipple, South Lake Tahoe

Opinion: Tahoe at forefront of controlling AIS

By Joanne Marchetta

Around the world, invasive species are notorious for their ability to out-compete native plants and animals. Once introduced to an area, they can spread out of control and fundamentally change both landscapes and ecologies, and then pose incredible challenges to manage or eradicate.

With another boating season under way at Lake Tahoe, invasive species remain one of the greatest and most persistent threats

to our mountain lake's unique environment and clear blue waters, as well as the recreation-based economy that it supports. Fortunately, Tahoe is a national leader in the fight against invasive species.



Joann
Marchetta

Our region has taken major steps to protect Lake Tahoe. More than 40 agencies and private and nonprofit partners are working together to prevent new introductions of invasive species and control populations of invasive species already in the lake. But we can and must do more.

Last month, TRPA received an update on plans to fight invasive aquatic weeds in the Tahoe Keys. The canals, lagoons, and marina are ground zero for invasive weeds and warm water fish. The Tahoe Keys Property Owners Association is spearheading a plan, which has generated significant discussion because of its proposal to test and potentially use herbicides to fight the weeds that choke the lagoon's waterways.

While specially-designed herbicides are used to fight invasive weeds in other lakes, some of which likely could not be cost-effectively controlled or eradicated in any other way, their use would be a first for the Lake Tahoe Region. And the subject has rightly prompted serious discussions about potential impacts to drinking water, other plants and animals, and the environment at large.

While conversations continue about whether herbicide use is appropriate for lagoons so close to Lake Tahoe, there is no

doubt a problem with invasive species in the Tahoe Keys. Every summer, weeds must be cleared from its waterways to keep them open. The harvesting or "mowing" process costs hundreds of thousands of dollars. It also creates small weed fragments that threaten to spread and colonize the lake and leave the weeds growing back year after year.

This is a difficult issue to work through. But it should inspire each of us to see Tahoe Keys property owners cooperating with agencies, scientists, researchers, and community members to find innovative solutions to the problem.

Once fully analyzed and approved, the comprehensive weed management plan for the Tahoe Keys will contain a suite of options. For example, the plan calls for better ways of using barrier mats to block out sunlight and kill weeds, improving harvesting methods to reduce the number of weed fragments, and reducing the amount of nitrogen and phosphorus pollution from lawn fertilizer and other sources that washes into the lake and helps weeds grow. One researcher is even testing new ways to use ultraviolet lighting systems to kill the underwater weeds.

The community and agencies are embracing innovation and new technologies along with more cost-effective ways to fight invasive species at Tahoe. Our work is already paying off.

Tahoe's boat inspection program is nationally recognized as a model for the rest of the country. This frontline defense has successfully stopped any new introductions of invasive species since its launch in 2008. Boater outreach and education is paying off, too, with fewer boats needing to be decontaminated because they are showing up "cleaned, drained, and dry." The Tahoe Keepers program has educated more than 3,000 people with kayaks, paddleboards, and canoes about how they can ensure their boats and fishing equipment aren't spreading invasive species.

Researchers at UNR have created a lakewide plan to control existing invasive species populations before they do any more harm to Tahoe's environment and ecology. The plan will guide future control projects, outlining what invasive species we have the best chances to manage or eradicate, treatment techniques, research needs, and locations where projects will be most successful.

Nonprofit groups and research partners at Tahoe have also launched innovative new programs for people to get involved. The League to Save Lake Tahoe's Eyes on the Lake program trains people to spot and report invasive species infestations while they are recreating at Lake Tahoe, compiling information that helps monitoring programs and guides future removal projects. The Lake Tahoe citizen science app created by the UC Davis Tahoe Environmental Research Center helps people report all sorts of useful information about invasive species and beach and water quality conditions.

There are many ways for people to get involved to protect Tahoe from the harms of aquatic invasive species. To learn more, please attend an upcoming public event about the past, present, and future of aquatic invasive species control and prevention work at Lake Tahoe. The event is scheduled for June 14 from 5:30-7:30pm at the Tahoe Center for Environmental Sciences in Incline Village. By working together and bringing forward our best ideas for innovative solutions we can and will make a difference, and help ensure the lake we all treasure is passed on for future generations to enjoy. Please join us in this important work.

Joanne Marchetta is executive director of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency.