SLT council agrees to help pot shop get permit

By Kathryn Reed

Tahoe Wellness Cooperative could have medicine on its shelves this weekend.

Cody Bass, owner of the lone medicinal marijuana shop in South Lake Tahoe, told *Lake Tahoe News* he intends to be calling people first thing this morning to have supplies replenished in a matter of days.

All of this is allowable because the City Council on March 27 unanimously agreed to have the city attorney write a letter to the state saying Bass is in compliance with city laws per court order and therefore should be granted a state license.

After the vote – which came at about 9:30pm Tuesday – there was applause, disbelief and relief.

TWC has been unable to stock everything people need because Police Chief Brian Uhler at the beginning of the year wrote a letter to the state Bureau of Cannabis Control that essentially put the kibosh on the business.

"In order for a state license to be issued, the local government must also agree to permit the business, and the local government was not willing to permit the activity. So we couldn't license Tahoe Wellness," Alex Traverso with the state Bureau of Cannabis Control told *Lake Tahoe News* earlier this year.

Sergio Rudin, who on March 27 was the attorney from the law firm of Burke, Williams and Sorensen representing the city, said crafting the letter isn't a problem. The state still would need to give its OK for the 120-day permit.

Some of Tuesday night's discussion pertained to the **June 2015 raid** on TWC. This then led to a criminal complaint being filed against Bass last fall regarding **income tax evasion**.

A judge on Monday could rule on whether the search warrant affidavits could be unsealed. The thinking is this would give the city an indication of the evidence against Bass. Bass has not seen the information and could choose not to make the documents public.

It was pointed out, though, that in this country a person is innocent until proven guilty – no matter the evidence.

The whole goal of the council's was to be able to provide this type of medicine for people in town.

The issues between the city and Bass remain to be worked out. For now, though, there should be ample medical marijuana in South Lake Tahoe in a matter of days.

SLT recreational pot ordinance takes shape

By Kathryn Reed

Recreational marijuana is going to be for sale in South Lake Tahoe. When still remains to be seen, but most likely by summer.

The City Council made substantive progress March 27 in regards to this controversial topic that has languished for months.

Some of the major decisions the council agreed to include in the proposed ordinance:

· Up to three recreational marijuana shops.

· Development agreements would be allowed.

· The applicants will go through a merit based process, with preferential treatment to locals.

· Special use permits would be required.

· Background checks would be a necessity.

· Staff will look at the public safety and application procedures.

· No micro businesses will be allowed in the first year.

· There will be no limits on the various license types with exception to retail.

· Delivery services will be allowed.

What will come back is a draft ordinance, which should be at the April 17 regular City Council meeting. The public will still have time to sway the council at at least two public hearings on that document.

The council members can also add, delete or amend what the city attorney brings forward. Sergio Rudin with Burke, Williams and Sorensen law firm handled the city attorney duties for the night.

Application procedures and minimum requirements for development agreements will be created by staff. These will likely be handled by a separate resolution and may not be ready in April.

Onsite consumption is one of the sticking points. The city attorney will bring the council more information. Tahoe Wellness Cooperative, the medicinal pot shop in town, has allowed onsite consumption since Day 1, so there is a precedent for this activity.

The special meeting started with a presentation from the planning department and then one from law enforcement. Acting City Manager Jeff Meston then wanted to go over seven pages of questions.

At that time Councilwoman Brooke Laine said it was more important to be answering questions the community cannabis working group came up with and flushing out concerns the council had. Meston's questions never got addressed, at least not how he intended.

Rudin confirmed the draft ordinance for adult use marijuana was 90 percent complete. This is because the council had previously agreed to adopt most of what the community working group had come up with.

Rudin then took over the meeting, getting the council to focus on the handful of issues he needed consensus on.

Opinion: Pointing out SLT's flawed processes



Members of the South Lake Tahoe recreational marijuana working group stand with David Orr as he addresses the City Council on March 27. Photo/Kathryn Reed

Publisher's note: ***The following was read to the South Lake Tahoe City Council on March 27 by David Orr, a member of the city's recreational marijuana working group.***

After South Lake Tahoe voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition 64 in November 2016, the city of South Lake Tahoe began the process of considering local cannabis regulations in August of 2017. As part of that process, the City Council subcommittee opted to create our working group that has dedicated significant time and energy to helping determine the best cannabis regulations for our community. The working group met seven times over 12 weeks and spent a total of 24 hours discussing potential commercial cannabis policies for the city of South Lake Tahoe.

Members of the committee represented a full range of perspectives, from those who voted against Proposition 64 and were inclined to enact a local ban to those who wanted to see the proliferation of a robust cannabis industry in the city.

The group recognized that state law permits recreational cannabis, and even those who would prefer a ban recognized the impact that state law would have on our community. With a ban, we would not be able to eradicate a black market and there would still be impacts on our youth, health system and medical services.

As such, the group consensus moved to developing smart policy that regulated local cannabis operations, while providing resources for enforcement, education, and prevention that would otherwise be unavailable to our community.

The group focused on developing a framework that allowed commercial activity in the city, that balances the desire to avoid a proliferation of businesses, but embraces a tightly regulated structure that allows smart local growth of the industry. This group is standing here together because we came to 100 percent consensus in our recommendations, and we stand by those recommendations.

Democracy is messy, which means that although we didn’t always agree completely, we did agree that coming together and compromising on recommendations was the best path forward to achieve good, and democratic policy in our city. We also understood and recognized our recommendations would provide a framework for City Council and community discussion and not necessarily translate into the final policy adopted by council, similar to what happened in the VHR process.

However, what started out as a positive, constructive process has instead devolved into a process excluding our group and left us dismayed by a dismissive staff process. We understand that we all have biases, but the way staff has dismissed consideration, conversation and engagement as a result of those biases isn’t just frustrating, it is damaging to the public’s trust in the City Council’s process.

We cannot emphasize enough the work that went into this

process. Our recommendations were the culmination of significant, thoughtful analysis in consultation with lawyers, law enforcement, industry experts, healthcare providers, educators, parents and community leaders. Our preparation packets included robust data and credible studies on both sides of the issue from California and other states that have legalized adult use cannabis. We encourage you to review those packets, minutes and report, as they were prepared thoughtfully and with the goal of helping determine the best local policy for our community.

We twice presented the report that came from hours of deliberation to City Council, and neither time were we asked a single question about our detailed and comprehensive recommendations, even as part of the council workshop. A month and two additional council meetings later, council has yet to meaningfully discuss our recommendations or policy direction at all despite having tasked us – committed community members – with the important responsibility of crafting a framework for that discussion. Those recommendations have been covered in the press and there has been no public outcry by pro-cannabis activists or anti-cannabis activists, demonstrating our recommendations are not controversial.

Additionally, we have concerns about how staff has set up [Tuesday's] meeting. For example, staff has provided numerous questions for council and included columns for council to essentially "vote" on each of these, presumably ahead of the meeting, which could be viewed as making decision outside of the public process, which would be illegal.

The current process set up by staff diverges from council direction and the process used in previous subcommittee structures. Without a consistent and transparent approach, fewer and fewer citizens will trust the City's process or be willing to engage in future subcommittees knowing that their time and effort could be tossed aside, as ours has been to date.

We urge the council to be consistent with the process it used in the VHR debate, where they convened a subcommittee, reviewed and considered their recommendations in the form of an ordinance and made changes to that policy. Staff's professional recommendations in VHR discussion were generally limited to their role in implementation, such as how to implement the VHR cap, etc.

An ordinance consistent with Proposition 64 has been drafted that follows our recommendations and would allow such a discussion. We appreciate your consideration and ask to be meaningfully included as you develop the next steps in your conversation on this important policy.

Peggy Eichorn, Jane Flavin, Julie Garrett Wright, Liz Hallen, Kelsey Magoon, Rosemary Manning, Kevin McHugh, David Orr, Francisco Rodriguez, David Turner, Christina Wilson, Jude Wood (Devin Middlebrook is out of the country)*

Ski resorts fight climate change with snow blowers and buses

By Eric Niiler, Wired

After a wimpy winter, spring break has arrived, and skiers and snowboarders from Maine to Mammoth Lakes are stoked. More than 18 feet of snow has dropped at Squaw Valley in March; Utah's famed powder resorts have finally broken the 100-inch mark; and New England has been pummeled by four big storms pushing closing dates to late April.

At the same time, there are warning signs about the future of the sport. Climate change has already made winters warmer and shorter, while a March study by researchers at Oregon State University found North America's snowpack has declined up to 30 percent in the past century. By 2050, climate change will cut ski resort winter seasons by 50 percent, with the hardest-hit in the Pacific Northwest, Southwest, and Upper Midwest, according to a 2016 study by the University of Colorado, the Environmental Protection Agency, and consulting firm Abt Associates.

Mountain snow isn't just important for shredding; it also provides drinking water for urban dwellers and irrigates farmers' fields.

Read the whole story

Opinion: SLT police chief's views on marijuana

Publisher's note: ***The following is an email sent March 24 by South Lake Tahoe Police Chief Brian Uhler to David Orr of the subcommittee working on recreational cannabis after learning the group was convening without him or the two council members assigned to the working group. Lake Tahoe News was sent the letter by a community member. The City Council is having a special meeting at 4pm March 27 at Lake Tahoe Airport to discuss recreational marijuana and Tahoe Wellness Cooperative.***

Hello David [Orr],

Thank you for letting me know. Hope you have a good meeting.

Please email any questions or concerns—if there are any particular concerns I could address in advance, I'd appreciate it.



Brian Uhler

I realize that the subcommittee's position for the best path forward may be different than the city staff position (and my individual position).

I hope you and the rest of the subcommittee do not hold any ill feelings. I assure you, my concern on the issue of MJ is focused on the health and we'll-being of the community as a whole. I make no extra money for caring, which I most definitely do (or conversely for not caring). To be completely open with you—it would probably be much better for me (professionally speaking) if I could have a little less heart in this. I am rather sure a more "milk toast," safety-net oriented and politically concerned chief would be more universally liked—especially on this polarizing issue…but that's not me. I am rather certain that their might be a City Council member (or members) who would prefer I not do the"police chief thing" on this issue—not doing so would probably help me with political "points" (but also, I am confident that some council members appreciate my honest, consistent and clear perspective).

I have made no secret from the subcommittee members (or co-chairs) regarding the potential "clash of opinions/ideas" path we have been upon for the last several months. However, during the process, I hope the subcommittee members have found me to

be respectful and pleasant despite my “police centric” viewpoint. I hope you realize that I am just doing my job.

It is through my work life that I have closely witnessed the downside of MJ (especially when mixed with life emotional upheaval, mental health problems, other drug use, crime, etc). It’s at least a once a week thing for the officers in our town to see nice young lives in a downward MJ related spiral (sometimes causing lifelong harm … often accompanied/complicated by co-existing issues).

Further, I regularly attend meeting of the community health advisory council (CHAC) and mental health consortium. In these venues community drug use is routinely considered by most in these “helping profession” roles as being a significant problem for SLT (for years, assessments/surveys have demonstrated the recurring theme).

I recognize the police experience can be slanted. As an officer, we are trained to try and guard against being “jaded” or forming strong opinions about the broad human condition when, day in and day out, you see the ugly, bad, sad, and tragic. I ask you (and other subcommittee member if you choose to share this email) to try to guard against any bias you may have for me because I happen to wear a police uniform and my perspective has been shaped by more than 35 years of police service/experiences.

This said, I do realize and agree that many, successful and productive people who use marijuana exist and never come into the view of police. I hope that you likewise realize that just because I am a police officer and an employee of the city my role or experiences count less (or shouldn’t be included). It could be easily argued that I am specifically expected (and compensated) to bring the real life SLTPD experiences which relate to our community’s health into the view of the community and especially our elected officials so they have meaningful insights to make well-informed, tough decisions.

Would you agree that if I stayed clear of this unfolding situation and an ugly picture emerged later, some elected officials would complain they were not properly informed?

The way I see this is pretty simple … the subcommittee, staff, public, those who want to make money in MJ business, those who represent community interests (school officials, mental health service providers, hospital representatives), those who don't want MJ to harm their business interest (e.g. tourism), etc., all make their voices heard to our elected officials. The elected officials are entrusted with the duty to represent and protect the public, make well-reasoned decisions with community interests over personal or political advantage, and at the end of it all make the really tough choices (even if they are unpopular). When all this is done, we should be thankful that they took all of our input, weighed it, and were willing to be "out there" and have courage on issues like MJ.

In August, as the dialogue on MJ was just warming up, I spoke with our City Council and explained that I would ultimately respect their decision and carry out my duty accordingly (even though I believed anything beyond a complete ban was wrong).

When the dust settles, I suspect neither the subcommittee, I, or anyone else, will feel like we got what we wanted. That's just the messy method of how things work in a complicated democracy.

While I appreciate the enthusiasm demonstrated by the subcommittee members (many of whom are also TRYP members), I wonder if the TRYP goal of ensuring economic opportunities has been overly emphasized in the subcommittee's work. As I look back over the last few months, I cannot help but feeling like I was on an island when talking with the subcommittee about things like risk, unintended consequences, community harm, or slow/low risk progress. It really seems like the group members lost individual identity and instead viewed social acceptance as more important (group think). I hope that the group's

energy and enthusiasm doesn't lead to bad feelings (if it turns out that the group doesn't get total support). Also, your description of needing "ammo to defend the subcommittee's decision" really makes it seem like this is being viewed as a win-lose situation.

I really hope to move past any such feelings (on my part too) when our City Council makes its direction known (maybe we can go cry in a beer together because chances are we'll feel the same).

Sincerely and with respect,
Brian [Uhler]

Opinion: SLT unraveling as each day goes on

By Kathryn Reed

It's hard to know who is in charge of the city of South Lake Tahoe. It could be the firefighters since their chief is acting city manager. Take a look at the agendas since the full time city manager left – more fire related items than usual.

And with this being an election year, it usually bodes well for incumbents to be throwing cash in the direction of fire and police.

It didn't take long for the need for a dedicated city manager to become evident. It also has become crystal clear how the council is not effective.

Lake Tahoe News sent this email to all five South Lake Tahoe City Council members on March 23: *"I have never seen a staff*

report not have someone's name on it as is the case with the cannabis report for (March 27). How is there accountability? Is this a policy individually or as a group you have endorsed? What are your thoughts about it? And the fact that the agenda item regarding TWC says the info won't be ready until (March 27), I've never seen anything like that either. Any comment?"

Here are the responses:

Councilmember Brooke Laine: *"I am discouraged by the lack of transparency and also concerned about the lack of respect for our internal processes. Every single staff report I have ever read indicates the author of the report and in fact is signed by the author of the report and further acknowledged by signature of the city manager and/or department head."*

Councilmember Tom Davis: *No response.*

Councilmember Jason Collin: *No response.*

Councilmember Austin Sass: *No response.*

Councilmember Wendy David: *No response.*

Usually the person who wrote the report signs it as well as the city manager or the department head.

This isn't the first agenda guffaw since Nancy Kerry left the city manager's office.

City staff scrambled to get the March 20 agenda out on time. Usually it is posted the Thursday afternoon before the Tuesday meeting. It was out Friday. And while that was within the 72-hour time allotment per state law, it did not happen smoothly. On top of that, the cannabis item then had no supporting material, with the two presentations added to the online agenda the morning of the meeting.

During the meeting *Lake Tahoe News* asked Tracy Sheldon, city public information officer, for copies of those presentations.

She said she didn't have them. *LTN* said someone does. The dialogue stopped there.

The Brown Act mandates that every member of the public has a right to hard copies of any item before the council. In this case is didn't matter because the topic was put off until 4pm today.

But the issues about last Tuesday's meeting aren't over. On the evening of March 20, I emailed the mayor asking her if there was reportable action from closed session that occurred after that day's regular council meeting.

Her response: "Yes. Reporting out on negotiations. I did not bring home the language of the report out. Susie has it." [That would be a reference to City Clerk Suzie Alessi.]

In other words, Mayor David and presumably the other four electeds just spent about $1 million a year in perpetuity on employees, but she couldn't remember this fact or how it was divvied up.

Alessi told *Lake Tahoe News*: "The City Council approved memorandums of understanding with the following bargaining units: South Lake Tahoe Police Officers Association, Local 39-Admin/Confidential, South Lake Tahoe Police Employees Association, South Lake Tahoe Fire Association, South Lake Tahoe Police Supervisors Association. These memorandums of understanding will be brought to the City Council for execution during open session on April 3."

However, what Ember Buckman, human resources analyst for the city, told LTN was, "The city of South Lake Tahoe City Council ratified four MOUs and approved one tentative agreement on March 20."

Adding to the confusion is that the council on **Jan. 23 had already approved the contracts** with Local 39 and the police officers' bargaining unit. No one at the city has answered the

question as to whether something changed on March 20.

It is actually unusual for any elected body to report what happened regarding negotiations until the labor groups have ratified the agreement.

The topic is on a closed session so the city's negotiating team can give updates to the electeds. It's the electeds who give direction to the team – such as agreeing to the cumulative dollar amount to be spent, which union might get more, whether pay would be retroactive and other benefits.

And the actual facts about the agreements are usually on an open session agenda, with no reportable action until then. This has a lot to do with who signs first and if there needs to be further negotiations. For example, members of Local 39 initially voted down the contract.

Usually when the vote is taken in open session about labor contracts the fiscal impact to the city is provided at that time. The city has this week to get that together before next week's regular meeting.

With the difficulty the police department has had with recruiting, boosting the pay was a given.

What isn't in these agreements is the fact the council last week agreed to fund three new positions for the fire department. The idea is this will help cut back on overtime which runs about a half million dollars a year. When firefighters lobbied for more employees in 2014 to cut overtime it had little impact – other than to increasing staffing, and therefore the taxpayer burden to these employees in terms of salary, CalPERS and other benefits.

The council chose to increase staffing even though the city is in the middle of a study to assess staffing needs and other concerns of the fire department. The **fire department staffing** has been fluid for years. In part this has to do with internal

chaos and in part the Great Recession demanding across the board cuts.

Here are some details about the contracts:

South Lake Tahoe Police Association (Police Employee Unit)

· Term: Oct. 1, 2017 through Dec. 31, 2018.

· City will pay $250 month in health care not to exceed $3,000/year.

· Salary increase of 3.5 percent per year.

· Employees will be pay an additional 1 percent to CalPERS.

· 1.5 percent of salaries will go into a non-PERSable 401(a), with city matching dollar-for-dollar up to $2,000.

· Each represented employee receives a one-time payment of $1,000.

South Lake Tahoe Firefighters' Association

· Term: Oct. 1, 2017 through Dec. 31, 2018.

· City will pay $250 month in health care not to exceed $3,000/year.

· 4.5 percent salary increase per year.

· Employees will pay an additional 1 percent to CalPERS.

· 2 percent of salaries will go into 401(a), with the city matching dollar-for-dollar up to $3,000.

· Each represented employee receives a one-time payment of $1,000.

· An increase of eight hours accrued vacation.

South Lake Tahoe International Union of Operating Engineer, Stationary Engineers, Local 39 Administrative & Confidential Association

· Term: Jan. 1-Dec. 31, 2018.

· Health reimbursement of $3,000 a year.

· 3 percent salary increase.

· Employees pay 1 percent more to CalPERS.

· $2,000 into 401(a).

· 50 percent matching contribution into 401(a) up to a maximum of $2,500.

South Lake Tahoe Police Officers Association

· Term: Oct. 1, 2017, through Dec. 31, 2018.

· Health reimbursement of $3,500 a year.

· 2 percent salary increase effective Oct. 1, 2017; 2.5 percent increase effective Jan. 1, 2018.

· Employees paying 1 percent more to CalPERS.

· Lump sum of $1,500 into 401(a) effective January 2018 (probationary employees excluded); lump sum of $1,000 into 401(a) effective March 2018; lump sum of 2 percent of base salary into 401(a) effective March 2018; lump sum $1,000 into 401(a) effective October 2018.

· Dollar-for-dollar matching contribution into 401(a) up to a maximum of $1,500.

· Vacation accrual increase by eight hours.

South Lake Tahoe Police Supervisors Association (tentative agreement)

· Term: Oct. 1, 2017 through Dec. 31, 2018.

· $250/month or total $3,000/year for medical.

· Sworn personnel – 4.5 percent salary increase in exchange for employee's additional 1 percent cost sharing pension contribution.

· Non-sworn personnel – 3.5 percent salary increase in exchange for employee's additional 1 percent cost sharing pension contribution.

· Sworn personnel – 1.5 percent of salary into 401(a); dollar-for-dollar matching contribution into 401(a) up to a maximum of $2,500.

· Non-sworn personnel – 1 percent of salary into 401(a); dollar-for-dollar matching contribution into 401(a) up to a maximum of $2,500.

· Additional pay of $1,000 to each represented employee effective October 2018.

Other:

· Battalion chiefs will get a shift stipend of $1,512 for additional 24-hour shifts (pro-rated for shifts less than 24 hours); fire chief may approve administrative time off for extra duty assignments more than four hours.

No one has said when negotiations will start up again since these contracts only go through the end of the year.

Global tourism predicted to slow after best year ever

By Associated Press

LONDON — The travel and tourism sector is set for a modest slowdown in 2018 as a result of higher oil prices and airfares, a year after it experienced its best year on record, according to a leading global industry body.

In its annual Economic Impact Report, the World Travel and Tourism Council said Thursday that the sector was responsible for the creation of 7 million new jobs worldwide in 2017, or one in five new jobs.

Read the whole story

Snowpack water content more than triples in a month



Alec Bowman enjoys the powder at Sierra-at-Tahoe. Photo/Brian Walker

By Amy Graff, San Francisco Chronicle

A series of supercharged storms that blasted the Sierra in March has bolstered the snowpack that was alarmingly low before the start of the month.

The National Weather Service in Sacramento tweeted Saturday that the water content of the snowpack has more than tripled in the past month.

On Feb. 22, an average of 4.6 inches was measured and on March 23 an average of 15.5 inches was recorded, going from 16 percent to 56 percent of the April 1 average.

Read the whole story

EDC wants help in dealing with homelessness

By Kathryn Reed

El Dorado County is trying to get a handle on homelessness by creating a continuum of care for those in need.

Daniel Del Monte, deputy director of the Community Services Division of the county's Health and Human Services Agency, was at last week's South Lake Tahoe City Council meeting painting a bleak picture about housing and homelessness.

He spoke about the desire to create a homeless coordinator position. While a dollar amount was not talked about at the

March 21 meeting, it will be on a future council agenda.

Barton and Marshall hospitals, the cities of South Lake Tahoe and Placerville, and El Dorado County are each being asked to contribute $20,000 a year for the homeless coordinator position. The hospitals have said yes. The county wants a two-year commitment from every entity.

Hospitals suffer financially when homeless people choose to use the emergency room when a doctor would suffice, or if when what they really need is mental health services, or even a warm place to stay.

“The primary purpose of the homeless coordinator is to provide proper administrative support, strategic planning, HMIS administration and capacity building for our partners. Counties who invest in their continuum of care receive significantly more money than El Dorado County has received,” El Dorado County CAO Don Ashton told *Lake Tahoe News*. “If successful, funding the homeless coordinator will bring in more federal money to manage the homeless population. By establishing a multi-agency MOU and partnership with the county, city of Placerville, Marshall Hospital, Barton and the city of South Lake Tahoe, we could share the cost and share in the benefit. We haven’t discussed specific deal points, but conceptually any additional funding the county realizes as a result of the homeless coordinator would be shared based on a formula between the West Slope and East Slope.”

Del Monte pointed out how California has about 40 million residents, with housing for 25 million.

“From 2007 to 2015 was the lowest eight-year economic development period in the last 60 years. It comes at a time when the state population is at its highest,” Del Monte said.

On one slide in the PowerPoint presentation De Monte posed the question: What can be done to increase person centered housing options?

The answers:

· Regions strive to create system responses to housing crises.

· Responses that can help to prevent individual from becoming homeless.

· Responses that maximize the ability to get homeless individuals rehoused with needed supports.

· One that maximizes self-sufficiency for each individual based upon their unique needs.

· One that produces the best results for the individual and the community.

However, how to accomplish those goals was never revealed. Nor were they explained further to get through the government-speak. And the council members, other than Mayor Wendy David, were not very engaged in the presentation.

The thrust behind the continuum of care is to find housing quickly and then provide the support network so the person doesn't return to the street.

Del Monte said in El Dorado County it costs $47 a day for supportive housing, up to $155 for a detox facility, $115 for jail, $850 for a bed in a psychiatric facility, and $4,000 a day at Barton Memorial Hospital for a 24-hour psych stay.

A continuum care approach is supposed to lower the costs of helping someone – and provide them with actual help.

Del Monte said the homeless coordinator would be used to leverage state and federal money. He said that person would manage the system.

He admitted, "Ultimately we will need more housing and more services."

Calif. housing problems spilling across its borders

By Conor Dougherty, New York Times

A growing homelessness crisis. Complaints about traffic congestion. Worries that the economy is becoming dominated by a wealthy elite.

Those sound like California's problems in a nutshell. But now they are also among California's leading exports.

Just ask the citizens of this city, where growing numbers of Californians and companies like Tesla have migrated to take advantage of cheap land and comparatively low home prices. A four-hour drive from Silicon Valley, across a mountain range and a state line, Reno is finding that imported growth is accompanied by imported problems.

Read the whole story