The following speech was delivered by Joanne S. Marchetta, Executive Director of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, at the California Chapter of the American Planning Association conference, held at the Resort at Squaw Creek on September 14, 2009.

Hello and welcome to Squaw Valley and the spectacularly beautiful Lake Tahoe Region.

You are in one of the world's most treasured and well-loved natural settings.

An estimated three million people come to visit the Lake Tahoe Basin every year.

They are skiers, cyclists, boaters, sightseers, and outdoor recreationists of all categories. Some like motors – snowmobiles, off-highway vehicles, and motorboats. Others like a quieter and slower experience, like cross-country skiers, kayakers and hikers. Some come to get married on the beach, to climb a rock, to hear a favorite music group in concert … or maybe just to breathe the mountain air.

Virtually all come to rest their eyes on a magnificent alpine lake, clear beyond all ordinary experience – and one of the deepest in the world. Its reflection of the blue hue of the atmosphere gives it its remarkable blue color, but make no mistake; it is the clarity of the Lake's waters that give it the capacity to leave you and I awestruck.

I hope you take the time while you are here to enjoy your surroundings.

Lake Tahoe is a source of life, livelihood, and inspiration and I want to thank you for being here to share it with those of us, like myself, who are lucky enough not simply to visit but to live and work here.

I am pleased to be here to speak with you about Lake Tahoe and some of the opportunities and challenges we confront in planning work here.

As planners you have an informed and more schooled way of looking at this Region's landscape, and because you are planners, you may already know (or at least suspect) the power, the promise, and the potential problems of planning in Tahoe.
Today, I can give you only a brief flavor of the planning context that has created the present physical landscape you see.

I'll offer a brief history of the Region – only the relatively recent history

I'll talk a bit about the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) – who we are and why the agency came to exist – TRPA stands out as unique among the limited number of bi-state Compact agencies in the nation because of the authority not only to plan regionally but to enact as law and enforce its regional plan.

I'll also touch on a few planning challenges in the Region – planning in Tahoe because it is multi-jurisdictional is incredibly complex and immensely rewarding. It is however NOT for the feint of heart or for those who require immediate results or lots of short-term gratification.

And lastly, I'll touch on why I believe regional planning like what is being done here in Tahoe stands as a model for the future – because more and more we will need to protect landscapes at the larger ecosystem level, or at some level that crosses political jurisdictional lines. Successful planning for the future will depend upon us as planners deepening the capacity for collaborative problem solving across multi-jurisdictional boundaries at an increasingly regional scale.

So let's start with a little Tahoe history for context.

To fully appreciate the planning challenges that exist at Lake Tahoe today, it is necessary to look back over at least the past century and a half at what has transpired here.

So for our purposes today we will skip the Tahoe Basin's two million years of volcanic, glacial, and geologic history and fast forward past the 10,000 years that the indigenous Washoe inhabited this place and focus on the mid 19th century.

First, here are some facts and figures:

The Tahoe Basin is 501 square miles

There are nearly 200 square miles of lake surface area

Lake Tahoe is 12 miles wide and 22 miles long, with over 70 miles of shoreline

And it's 1,625 feet deep (second deepest lake in the US) at a surface elevation above sea level of 6,225 feet

The Basin spans two states – two-thirds of Lake is in California and one-third in Nevada. California and Nevada often have diametrically opposed political views.

The Lake touches five local counties and one incorporated city jurisdiction.

Eighty percent of the Basin is under US Forest Service management, but in addition there are a multitude of state agencies – both land managers and state regulatory agencies from two states that have an interest in the land use decisions in the Region as well as a multitude of local utility, general management, or special districts to contend with in planning decisions. No simple linear planning gets done here ….

Now, step back to the mid 19th Century. The first Euro-American to stumble upon Tahoe landed here in 1844

Five years later, California's **Gold Rush** was on. Scores passed here and moved on west during the mad rush for gold.

But in 1859 – ten years after the California gold discovery – gold and silver deposits were discovered at Virginia City, Nevada east of where we stand today. It brought a stampede of fortune seekers from the dwindling California gold fields through Tahoe for Nevada's Comstock.

Tahoe was not useful to them, so they again just passed through … until loggers began to clear cut the forests here to provide timber they needed to shore up the silver mines.

In 30 years, two-thirds of Tahoe's forests were cleared and logging continued past the turn of the century, largely uncontrolled.

With slopes disturbed and denuded, massive erosion and widespread indiscriminate impairment of the ecosystem here devastated the Lake.

Clarity declined.

When the mines went idle the forests grew back, but denser than before. Second growth had far more stems per acre than the old growth logged for use in the mines.

The lake rebounded in the post-mining era…. But the Comstock period can be looked upon as an environmental catastrophe … and – just as the California Gold Rush continues to affect San Francisco Bay, the Delta and its tributaries to this day – the Comstock's after effects are still with us today in Tahoe.

Our forests are now unhealthy – overloaded with excess fuel because they are overstocked and because natural fires have been kept at bay causing build up to hazardous levels of forest fuels. This is a danger we live with as part of our daily lives and which significantly affects the decisions we make today in our planning.

With Virginia City no longer the center of northern Nevada, the Tahoe area began to emerge as a resort destination in the early 20th century.

Camp Richardson came into being, private summer residences emerged, the Cal-Neva Lodge on the north shore of the lake materialized, DL Bliss state park was established.

With the economy in decline after mining, state leaders in Nevada were in search of a new game … and they found one, literally.

Gaming was legalized in Nevada in 1931, about the same time that the highway system around the lake was completed. A rock prevented completion of the US Hwy 50 connection to Carson City – so a hole was cut through it to create the Cave Rock tunnel on the south shore that I'm sure many of you have driven through and some perhaps have climbed over (although it is now prohibited due to the recognition of Cave Rock as sacred site of the Washoe).

By the mid 1940s, legitimate casino operations began to appear and attract visitors. These included the Biltmore at Crystal Bay. The casino corridor along the south shore of the lake began to fill in … individual counties around the lake looked toward a larger future.

I referred to the Comstock era as an environmental catastrophe, but that was not the last.

About 100 years after the Comstock – in 1960 – a second environmental catastrophe of equal if not greater significance occurred at Lake Tahoe – and it occurred right here where we're gathered today.

I am talking about the 1960 winter Olympics at Squaw.

Now some of you may be looking at me and looking at this place and wondering how in the world I can stand here at this beautiful resort on such a gorgeous day and say such a thing.

Let's be clear.

Although I have nothing against this place and most certainly have nothing against winter sports, environmentally speaking, the 1960 Winter Olympics were bad news for Lake Tahoe – and here is why.

The 1960 Olympics here at Squaw touched off a period of rampant and uncontrolled growth at Lake Tahoe during which we paved over about 75 percent of the marshes, half of the meadows and 35 percent of the stream environment zones that act as natural filters for the lake.

Just as was the result from the clear cutting in the 1800s, lake clarity began a new and rapid decline as ecosystem function was impaired.

In the 1960s, clarity was measured at over 100 feet — absolutely remarkable. It stands at around 70 feet today and until recently had been declining at about 1 foot a year. We believe the recent improvement over the record low is because of restoration work that has been completed over the past 15 years. But this job is not finished.

Much of this uncontrolled development occurred during the mid-20th century, as Tahoe became an increasingly popular tourist spot.

Much of it occurred in preparation for the Olympics itself. Many of the small motels that proliferated like a spreading fan around the Basin were never meant as anything more than sleeping quarters for the athletes.

The construction of US Interstate 80 – which comes within just a few miles of here – was expedited to give Olympic Game visitors from out of the Basin a straight shot vehicle trip access to Tahoe.

And more important, the games turned all eyes on Tahoe – they put Tahoe on the map – and like a steamroller we ended up with a subdivision of luxury homes on the marshes of the Upper Truckee River, a golf resort town on the north shore, and an intensification of private investment and poorly conceived growth of every variety – in particular on the south shore. The Basin's first, and to this date only, incorporated city came into being in 1965.

It was then that an ill-conceived plan began to emerge for Lake Tahoe. That plan was for enough growth to accommodate a population the size of San Francisco at the Lake.

It was also planned that a system of six-lane freeways would surround the lake – with the freeway system's engineering centerpiece a bridge spanning the spectacular jewel that is Emerald Bay.

Can you imagine that?

Fortunately, amidst all of these ambitious and grandiose ideas, there were other forces at work in Lake Tahoe.

So let me now touch on the history as a regional planning agency for Tahoe …

In our nation, the late 60s and early 70s were a defining time for environmental protection.

President Nixon signed into law during this period most of the federal environmental laws we still know today as foundations of the command and control environmental protection regulatory structure:

The Clean Water Act

The Clean Air Act

And the Endangered Species Act

He signed the legislation that created the federal Environmental Protection Agency

But most do not know that he also signed into law the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact on December 18, 1969. The Tahoe Compact had been adopted by the states of both California and Nevada and ratified by the US Congress under the Compact Clause of the United States Constitution.

This is the legislation that created the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and set into motion one of the most unique, highly controversial, and innovative planning structures in the country.

This year is the agency's 40th anniversary

In that 40 years, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency has been a driving force not only in creating a better vision for the Lake Tahoe Basin – that big city and that bridge were never built thanks to us – but also in the restoration and revitalization of this place.

TRPA likely was the first growth control agency. Four decades ago when TRPA was created, the idea of regulating and controlling growth was a pretty radical one. People were talking about it, but nobody was actually doing it.

With five counties and one incorporated city in two states and land speculation running rampant, a handful of leaders from both states including Paul Laxalt and Ronald Reagan saw the Compact as the best hope for protecting Lake Tahoe.

As environmentally damaging development unfurled, the lake had begun to decline … and this solution was thought of as one way of preventing irreparable damage…

But that original compact was far from perfect, as it left too much of the decision-making in the hands of local elected officials who were under a great deal of pressure to allow inappropriate development to continue.

In 1980, the compact was revised to change the balance of power and authority on the TRPA Governing Board to give more voting power to state level interests, less beholden to short-term development interests. The revised compact also authorized TRPA to establish environmental standards for the Tahoe Basin, known as environmental threshold carrying capacities – and then work toward meeting those standards through scientifically based land use policies outlined in a Regional Plan.

It was this improved compact from 1980 that gave us the framework we needed for making real progress at Lake Tahoe.

The environmental thresholds we ultimately adopted coincide with what we know is important to sustain the economy at Tahoe. They protect:

- Water Quality – to maintain and recapture the legendary clarity and pristine ecological condition of the lake itself.
- Scenic Resources – to maintain the mountain character – and make sure that sky full of stars remained visible.
- Recreation – to keep the Basin open for all to enjoy

- Soils and Vegetation – you cannot have a healthy lake unless you have a healthy forest … the watershed starts at the top of the highest peak.
- Air Quality – we manage and regulate our own air basin
- Wildlife

… all of the things we value – and which are the essential qualities that make Lake Tahoe the national treasure that it is are rolled up into measurable and sometimes qualitative standards that we must strive toward and adhere to as we go about our efforts.

We are also charged with making certain that orderly development is allowed to occur here that is consistent and compatible with the lake – and the established environmental standards.

And so over 40 years we have accomplished quite a bit.

In the first decade, I think TRPA's greatest successes were changing the vision for Lake Tahoe from one of rampant real estate development to controlled growth and environmental protection as well as working out some of the major flaws in how the agency's regional authority would work.

During the 1980s, although that decade was tumultuous and litigious – we adopted the environmental standards and adopted a regional plan that attempted to allow for orderly and environmentally compatible development. TRPA adopted the environmental threshold standards in 1982 and the Board adopted the current Regional Plan in 1987.

You must understand however that only about 13 percent of the land in the Tahoe Basin is privately owned … the rest is federally owned forest and state and regionally owned parkland and open space. Only three percent of the Basin is authorized for development and within this area only a few thousand dispersed private lots suitable for building remain.

The urban growth boundary will not expand. There will be no large new subdivisions … we're on the verge of buildout.

The additional building that happens will be limited, phased, and have minimal environmental impacts. But there is still restoration and revitalization work to be done in areas of existing previous development and that badly needed revitalization will be the focus of the next several decades. It is just this three percent of the Basin that is a big focus of the Regional Plan Update we are now in the process of developing.

In the mid-1990s, Lake Tahoe entered a restoration age. We knew that a regulatory approach alone to managing the Basin would not be enough to reverse the environmental damage of the past. TRPA working with other Basin partners launched the Environmental Improvement Program in 1995, a program of investment in environmental restoration projects.

When President Bill Clinton visited Lake Tahoe in 1997 for the first presidential forum at the lake to endorse the environmental improvement program for Tahoe, he gave momentum to the Region's ability to leverage federal monies, which in turn leveraged state and local contributions. Since then about $1.4 billion dollars in state, federal, local and private investment has come to Tahoe for restoration projects – and all indications are that the lake is responding. Water clarity is improving, and most of the indicators we use to measure the status of our environmental conditions are moving in a positive direction.

So what of today and where we are headed … Today, we are moving toward an era in Lake Tahoe during which improved science and better technology will play a larger role in helping us make decisions about where we can invest most wisely for the greatest environmental gain to continue restoration of the Lake, the forests, and the other sensitive ecological systems of the alpine environment ….

In these times of shrinking public funds, we will look to the private sector to play a larger role. And we are committed to delivering the next phase of the program – another $2.5 billion in environmental improvement investments here in Tahoe over the next decade – water quality improvements and habitat restoration, recreation amenity improvements, forest health and fuels reduction treatments

especially in the wildland-urban interface, and science, more funding to understand the systems we are working to reestablish….

We are learning to live more compatibly with this Lake by embracing science, technology and our best ideas ….

I look at the direction we're headed in Tahoe as quite analogous to where air and water quality and wildlife management have arrived nationally over the past 40 years – since our landmark environmental protections became law.

The air is cleaner

The water is healthy and safe to drink

Species of concern are rebounding

And conditions at Lake Tahoe are generally improving – and this will accelerate in coming years.

Have we achieved in full what we set out to do? NO, but at the 30,000-foot level, the trends are positive, and we will keep working in a positive direction.

So what are some of the challenges and opportunities that we face in keeping positive trends positive and reversing any negative trends?? ….

Let me give you a sense of what planning "challenge" means in this Basin by talking about the last major planning effort we moved to conclusion – we thought. It relates to what is allowable in the shorezone (or at the lakefront) of Lake Tahoe.

Twenty-two years ago, we carved out one area of planning from the 1987 Regional Plan when it was adopted. That plan element was called the "Shorezone" and deferred policies and ordinances to implement those policies. The then plan prohibited adding piers and buoys (shorezone structures) in fish spawning and feed and cover habitat.

At the time, the shorezone plan element was deferred to allow completion of fish studies on the effects of piers and buoys on fish. The conclusion of scientific studies was this: There is no adverse effect of piers on fish. Easy solution, right – lift the prohibition. Wrong.

It took us 20 years, 5 environmental impact statements and ultimately personal negotiations between the lieutenant governors of California and Nevada to reach a grudging agreement on a planning approach to allowing new piers and buoys in Lake Tahoe. That approach included a development cap and many other environmental benefits for the Lake.

The battle lines were fierce – private property rights of multi-million dollar lakefront property owners who desire a pier and who maintain that every private parcel should be entitled to a private single use pier and environmental interests who say no more piers or buoys, period. We must balance the wishes of two states, private property owners, and diametrically opposed interest groups in the lake shore with scenic, fisheries, water quality, public access – and more – in implementing our shorezone policies.

It took us 22 years to finally move the issue to a vote and it passed – and now?? We are defending that program in court.

With that as backdrop to set the tone, fast forward to today where we are currently in the process of updating the 1987 Regional Plan for the Basin, now more than 20 years old. All I have time for today is to give you a taste of the issue highlights and the controversy. There are 4 essential drivers in this Plan Update:

- The need for Water Quality gains is central.
- Those gains will come from the already developed town centers, so land use form and design are key.
- Related to land use patterns always are transportation systems – the ability to move people in and out, between, and within.
- And there are known and emerging issues of controlling catastrophic environmental risk – forest fire, aquatic invasive species control, and climate change.

Let's touch briefly on these …

The latest water quality science tells us explicitly that the greatest environmental impact on the lake itself is polluted runoff from areas of existing development.

We have been able through ten years of science at a cost of $10 million to quantify the problem – we must reduce the flow of fine sediments – particles 16 microns or less in diameter – by 32 percent over 20 years to gain another ten feet of clarity. Price tag – about $2.5 billion. Worth it – yes, if we can maintain and strengthen Tahoe's economy as a state and national benefit.

In Tahoe, coverage is a planning concept. Coverage is impervious surface that contributes to runoff that pollutes the lakes and streams of the Basin.

In other words, as we remake Tahoe's built environment, which is now grossly over-covered at 70, 80, or 90 percent impervious surface, we will need policies that reduce coverage in over-covered areas.

Every major project where excess on the ground coverage is contributing to fine sediment runoff must not only mitigate effects, but also deliver substantial water quality improvements over existing conditions.

This means roadway agencies may have to change sanding policies or the type of sand or roadway treatments.

It means more sophisticated technology to treat stormwater runoff.

It means street sweeping with state of the art equipment,

and it may mean public treatment systems to treat particulates.

Not only open lands but private projects themselves will have to be designed to deliver "ecosystem services."

What does this mean? This means targeted and strategic revitalization projects that leverage environmental improvement –

water quality, scenic, recreation, transportation improvements -- with private investment will be one among many important tools as we move forward. By providing incentives for revitalization of this type, we can give the economy and the environment the simultaneous push they need. Several revitalization projects within already built community centers are in the permitting pipeline and this concept will be a focus of the regional plan update.

Now I'm going to say something that may seem surprising or even insulting to some.

Those who believe that private development ruined Tahoe 30 years ago want to put the brakes on using revitalization to drive environmental improvements. The significant challenge here will be to demonstrate to conservation groups and others that there can be such a thing as environmentally beneficial development.

The old warriors of economic development and environmental protection must lay down their arms here in the Tahoe Basin, as they have already done or are starting to do elsewhere. Here, they have not yet done so, nor do they seem willing.

Honestly, this impasse is the greatest obstacle to environmental good here in Tahoe, a greater obstacle even than bad development – why, because we already have growth control and that isn't going away; the Basin is at buildout.

The fact is that bad past development is the greatest environmental factor leading to continued degradation of the Basin's sensitive ecosystems, and that bad development needs to be fixed through revitalization projects that remake and reorder the built environment. That creates incentives to move harmful projects of the past out of sensitive riparian and stream environment zones and more appropriately into town centers.

But habits die hard and distrust is hard to let go of when it has been the lifeblood of fundraising for the NGOs of the Basin. For decades, the environmental groups needed an enemy and that enemy has been TRPA.

Until the paradigm shifts here as it is shifting in other localities outside of Tahoe, only limited environmental progress will continue to be made here. And in the meantime, private interests who want to revitalize the built environment here will overdesign their projects because they are building in the cost contingency of years of legal defense of lawsuits.

I would rather that they build in the cost contingency of commitment to deliver on the ground environmental gains – but the organized environmental interests will not let them put those gains on the ground because they sue to stop projects. Lawyers are benefiting but not the environment.

Future success here will depend upon this Region's will to deepen its capacity for collaborative problem solving across jurisdictional boundaries at the regional scale. And I'll get to that shortly.

We require a transportation infrastructure designed to support about 65,000 year-round residents – but three million annual visitors come to Tahoe now and more will come in the future, so we need a transportation system that doesn't pollute the lake or the environment. For the future, we must design and implement a system that can move people at three levels – into and out of the Basin, between the communities and recreation points within the Basin, and within communities themselves.

How do we move people within communities? We will look to a Tahoe-appropriate application of smart growth planning principles – in town centers, we will look to slightly greater allowable height and density plus mixed-use to promote walkability. Right now people come by car – we want them to park and walk once they arrive.

How do we move those visitors into and out of the Basin to prevent congestion and over-reliance on the private auto? Those entry and exit points will become more and more congested. What is the solution – train to Truckee? Air travel? There are huge differences of opinion to be brokered. Some would like us to put up gates and close them when "too many people" want to visit. What do you think??

How do we move people between communities and move visitors from the places where they stay to recreation starting points with less use of the private auto? Transit transit transit. We are starting to plan for a ferry system to shuttle visitors and residents. In addition, we'll look to well managed and timed systems of shuttles.

More important, how do we manage for the temporary peaks that now cause congestion which ruins the experience of residents and visitors alike. We don't want a year-round system scaled to the expected growth in visitorship or even to the 3 million visitors it is today. We will look instead to best practices from other locations to temporarily accommodate those peak weekends or weeks when vistorship spikes – such tools perhaps as removable bollards to allow parking in summer where it otherwise would be prohibited say in winter or off seasons.

Yes, Lake Tahoe is complicated and controversial.

The planning framework here reaches beyond land use and zoning – and is rather driven by environmental standards and protection.

We must concern ourselves with water quality and clarity for certain, but there are also imminent threats to the lake and the basin

I mentioned **catastrophic wildfire** earlier. Huge efforts are now going into treating acres of forestland to remove excess hazardous fuels. The result will be healthier forests and less loss of property or life in the event of a forest fire. We learned the lesson here the hard way when the Angora Fire burned 254 homes and devastated the community on the South Shore – I know, I evacuated my home as I watched homes across the street from mine burn to the ground. We are now planning for catastrophic wildfire risks. We can't afford not to.

We are also working aggressively to protect the lake from aquatic invasive species. We prepared and are now implementing an aggressive management plan to control the introduction of new invasive species – especially quagga and zebra mussels which have devastated lakes in the eastern US – as well as to eradicate noxious aquatic weeds before they spread beyond a tipping point – Eurasian Milfoil and Curly Leaf Pond Weed are among the greatest problems.

This season we passed laws that instituted mandatory boat inspections and we are moving toward entry point inspection stations. Now that mussels have devastated Lake Mead, the threat was too close to ignore, and the devastation once introduced is too costly not to have acted early and aggressively.

And then too, there are the emerging issues related to climate change – and we are looking for ways to work those issues into the planning mix. Like other jurisdictions, we here in Tahoe manage our own Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and are subject not only to the greenhouse gas reduction standards of (CA) Assembly Bill 32 but also to (CA) Senate Bill 375's requirements to integrate land use planning and transportation policies. We will have to determine how to integrate these changes across state lines, but Nevada too is concerned with climate change effects, but has not legislated to the same extent as California on the issue.

The good news for Tahoe is that we are a couple decades ahead of other jurisdictions on limiting sprawl. But there is still much we can do here to reduce reliance on the personal auto, to create walkable communities, and to reduce the risk of greenhouse gas emissions through catastrophic wildfire.

We are now also beginning to look at possibilities for biomass utilization, working closely with local jurisdictions to build economically viable and environmentally clean biomass utilization solutions.

Let me wind up by addressing what I see as the growing role for Regional Planning not just here in Tahoe but elsewhere.

More and more places are facing the kinds of complex challenges we here in Tahoe have been coming to grips with for decades. Why? More and more localities understand and are integrating principles of sustainability – the necessary balance between environmental, economic, and social goals in planning.

As we come to better understand systems, we see connections and connections are calling for more integrated solutions to planning problems. In this context, the importance of ecosystem planning, as

well as interest in the preservation of large scale landscapes and mega-region planning is moving more to the forefront because it must.

The creation of TRPA was a harbinger – the first real regional planning agency that could back up a large scale regional approach to planning and implementation with laws and enforcement authorities to make it happen.

As we incorporate sustainability goals in our general plans, ask yourselves whether you shouldn't be looking to solutions at a broader scale. Ask, on what scale does it make sense to think about planning for a place. In other words, at what scale is planning for sustainability possible?

I'll leave you with this thought: Regional planning works, but it is hard, harder than planning within any single jurisdiction. Why? Planning for sustainability takes a broader view. And that broad view cannot be accomplished simply. It takes time to build the governance structure and to build the partnerships and then nurse the common ground and the stakeholder participation that is needed for regional solutions.

But without making the effort, we are selling our planning solutions short. Many are moving in the regional planning and large landscape planning direction. TRPA may have been the first, but now we will move to be the best. Study the possibilities, study TRPA, and study other examples:

- There are Network Formats: The Ecosystem Charter for the Great Lakes, the Roundtable on the Crown of the Continent.
- There are Partnership Formats: The Northern Sierra Nevada Partnership, the Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor
- And there are Regional Institutions: TRPA, the Columbia River Gorge Commission, and the most ambitious Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative.

These name only a few. But these regional planning formats are what I believe will be a growing trend. And the trend will require greater collaboration, a difficult search for common ground, and all the horse-

whisperer skills and personability traits you as planners can muster. Regional planning takes agreements, and agreements if forced meet resistance and fail. They must instead be nurtured.

It has been a difficult 40 years here at Tahoe, but our successes are immensely gratifying, far more so than had we limited ourselves to the insular, local interests of each individual political jurisdiction. Had we done so, Tahoe would not be what you see here today. There would likely have been a City the size of San Francisco. The Lake would not be so clear as it remains. And it would not be the kind of place you would want to come to find peace for your soul.

As to that, I call TRPA a success. Use our success as a model, and to build your own new regional large scale planning successes.

And with that, I thank you for your time and attention and welcome any questions.