Opinion: Gather emergency supplies before they are needed

By Tracy Franklin

This is the second of a series of articles highlighting emergency preparedness. Use these tools to prepare yourself for an emergency. More information is available in the city's website.

Storing emergency supplies

Chances are you will have to rely upon supplies you have available in your home for at least the first three days following any major disaster.

Store these items in something that is portable and can easily be carried, like a plastic tub with a tight-fitting lid. In the event of fire or rapid evacuation, you'll appreciate having more than just the clothes on your back.

The container should be able to withstand moisture, insects, and some abuse when the emergency occurs. If you have a large family, several smaller tubs may be easier to carry than one large container.

Place items in reusable bags to protect against condensation, which causes mildew and rust.

Locate these supplies as close to your primary house exit as possible. You may have to find it in the dark or after the

upheaval of an emergency.

Preparing for emergencies is a long-term goal. To make this task manageable, choose just two or three items that you will get each month.

Water: Keep at least a three-day supply of water for each person in your household. Two-liter soda pop bottles work great. That means six 2-liter bottles per person.

Food: Store at least a three-day supply of non-perishable food. Select foods that require no refrigeration or cooking and little or no water.

• Canned meats, fruits and vegetables

• Canned juices and soups

• High energy foods – peanut butter, granola bars, trail mix, beef jerky

• Comfort foods – cookies, hard candy, etc.

First aid supplies:

• Bandages and adhesive tape

• Scissors and tweezers

• Moistened towelettes

• Bar soap

• Latex gloves

• Aspirin and non-aspirin pain reliever

• Antacid

• Anti-diarrhea medication

• Insect repellent

• Hydrogen peroxide to disinfect wounds

• Antibiotic ointment to dress wounds

• Sunscreen

• Safety pins

• Needle and thread

• Reusable bags

• Instant cold packs

• Pocket knife

Tools and supplies: Paper cups, plates and plastic utensils, battery operated AM radio, extra batteries, flashlight, non-electric can opener, ABC fire extinguisher, whistle, toilet paper and towelettes, liquid soap, roll of plastic and duct tape to seal broken windows.

Special items: Extra eyeglasses, prescription medications, family pictures, games and books, copies of insurance policies, bank account numbers, inventory of valuables, family record.

Clothing and bedding: One complete change of clothes, blankets or sleeping bags, blankets, sturdy shoes, warm socks, hat and gloves.

Tracy Franklin is the public information officer for South Lake Tahoe.

Opinion: Lawsuit against TRPA absolutely necessary

By Roger Patching, Dave McClure, Ellie Waller and Ann Nichols

That a lawsuit has been filed by the Sierra Club and Friends of the West Shore against the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's Regional Plan update should come as no surprise to conservationists, politicians and governmental officials involved with it, as well as citizens who have been following the process and ignored the propaganda that duped many. Quite simply, serving as a blueprint for both urban sprawl and densification in the decades to come, while a dream come true to developers, the RPU is an environmental and economic disaster for the Tahoe basin.

Efforts to politically mitigate the damage having failed, the only remedy remaining to save the lake and the bulk of its inhabitants and nonresident property owners is the court system. It is as simple as that. No entity is ever eager to file a lawsuit; it is done when there is no other recourse.



Politics at Lake Tahoe can be a rough ride. Photo/LTN

While the specific reasons regarding why the RPU is a disaster are addressed in the legal complaint, the general reasons are neither complicated nor difficult to understand.

First, the RPU is badly flawed. Supposedly founded on principles of “smart growth” that foster “sustainable communities,” the RPU is premised on conditions that don’t and won’t ever exist in the basin. Still, the environmental language of such development is so pleasing that it allows public relations image makers to “greenwash” such planning with lofty rhetoric about science and prosperity. The unvarnished facts specified in the lawsuit explain that the RPU will actually retard the attainment of the environmental thresholds that the TRPA is chartered to achieve. The new type and magnitude of corporate resort development that the RPU will allow, in addition to the monumental increase in the authority of counties to permit bigger, higher, and denser growth, represent not a minor tweaking of existing regulations but a return to the 1950s. In addition to environmental deterioration, small businesses will suffer from the invasion of corporate giants in both states.

Secondly, the RPU was drafted in an environment of political duress prompted by a threat from Nevada known as SB271. Passed in 2011, this statute threatens Nevada’s withdrawal from the bistate Compact that established the TRPA in the late ’60s if it doesn’t 1) draft a RPU favorable to massive development, and 2) change the voting procedures of its governing board which it views as restrictive of Nevada’s economic freedom. Its withdrawal would dissolve the Compact and therefore the TRPA. And, while many astute political analysts see it as a bluff due to the current political landscape in Nevada coupled with the problems of both governance and wrath that would accompany TRPA’s demise, others have shuddered at the threat, including a heretofore leading environmental organization, and acquiesced to the deterioration of the lake and Basin in exchange for keeping the Compact. In reality, Nevada already dominates the TRPA’s Governing Board and has more to lose than gain by withdrawing.

Thirdly, having succeeded with the SB271 bluff in terms of

obtaining a RPU that will increase harm to the lake in exchange for high profits for Wall Street financed corporations with grand development ambitions throughout the basin, the bluff was extended to include withdrawal due to any litigation. Well, we shall see. Currently, regardless of the threat regarding litigation, all or portions of SB271 will need to be rescinded because its mandate about a change in TRPA voting procedures locked Nevada on a collision course with California when it became law. And, since the change requires the approval of both states and Congress, which won't happen, Nevada must withdraw or change the law. Many in Nevada are embarrassed by both the threat and the hubris that created it.

Lastly, it is clear to those who have not been duped by the pro-development propaganda spun by the TRPA, which has become, according to California Senate Pro Tempore Darrell Steinberg, a captive of the special interests that it is supposed to regulate, the demise of the TRPA might not really be a bad thing. That is to say, we know that the RPU is guaranteed to damage both the environment and locally owned economy of the lake, so it must be opposed. In addition, California's stake in the lake financially, demographically, and environmentally is much greater than that of Nevada and having its own California TRPA, which can negotiate problems directly with Nevada, could actually be an improvement over the status quo.

Consequently, with or without the TRPA, the lake is best protected by the abolition of the current RPU. And, remember: the TRPA caused the lawsuit when they approved the pro-development RPU, not the Sierra Club and its supporters. It is neither the governing agencies nor their corporate benefactors that are protecting the lake and private and public property from harm; that responsibility has been taken over by our colleagues who filed the lawsuit.

Roger Patching is president-CEO of Friends of Lake Tahoe, Dave McClure is president of North Tahoe Citizen Action Alliance,

Ellie Waller is executive director of Friends of Tahoe Vista, and Ann Nichols is president of North Tahoe Preservation Alliance.

Letter: Heavenly helps keep community fed

To the community,

Continuing with their monthly sponsorship of Bread & Broth's Adopt A Day of Nourishment, Heavenly Mountain Resort generously hosted the Monday evening dinners on Jan. 28 and Feb. 11.



Heavenly volunteers, from left, Kate Tretheway, Sarah Lowman, Jolena Hearn, Colton Terry and David Hellod.

Photo/Provided

Tyler Morris, Heavenly's IT manager, and PC techs David Erickson, Kevin Franzen, Aaron Uretsky and Brett Zingaro assisted the B&B volunteers in January. It was the first time that several of the Heavenly volunteer crew members had been involved with setting up and serving a hot, nutritious meal to over 90 B&B guests. They described their volunteering at the dinner to be a "very fulfilling experience".

In February, Heavenly's volunteer crew was led by Jolena Hearn, a frequent Heavenly volunteer at B&B dinners. Jolena was joined by fellow volunteers Kavid Hellod, Sarah Lowman, Colton Terry and Kate Tretheway, who are members of Heavenly's ski patrol. After spending the evening giving out bags of locally donated food goods to B&B dinner guests, Kate spoke for her volunteer crew. "We are truly grateful to be able to participate in serving our community. A huge thank you to the staff who do this every Monday."

Bread & Broth owes a huge thank you to Heavenly Mountain Resort for their monthly donation of $250 to cover the costs needed to prepare each dinner they sponsor. In addition, B&B is very thankful for and appreciates all of Heavenly's employees who over the years have been giving of their time and energy assisting with the setup, serving and cleanup during Heavenly's sponsorship evenings.

For more information on the Bread & Broth program, please contact me at (530) 542.2876 or carolsgerard@aol.com.

Carol Gerard, Bread & Broth

Opinion: Suing TRPA doesn’t help Lake Tahoe

By Joanne Marchetta

Following years of public process and serious discussions to improve one of the strictest environmental plans in the nation, the Sierra Club recently filed suit on the update of Lake Tahoe’s Regional Plan, a blueprint for the region’s long-term sustainability. As the litigation deadline loomed, the options were clear – further extend discussions that started a decade ago, or stand up for the positive progress that Lake Tahoe residents and visitors have made toward true environmental stewardship. We chose to stand up for the lake and the thousands of stakeholders who have brought us to this critical moment in time.



Joanne Marchetta

It’s relatively easy to make regulations, and Lake Tahoe has no shortage of them, but ensuring they continue to work toward the underlying goal takes real commitment. Changing them to improve environmental benefits takes courage and insight. What the proponents of the litigation have failed to understand, despite best available science and repeated documentation, is that maintaining the status quo at Lake Tahoe will not only fail to restore the ecosystem but it also will not address the communities surrounding this national treasure that are in

decline and crisis.

Under 30-year-old rules, rows of outdated motels and strip development were locked in place, complicating efforts to update needed environmental protections. Environmentally beneficial change requires investment, either public or private. Without investment in change, Tahoe's struggling communities can only dream of ever achieving the scale of environmental restoration that Lake Tahoe needs.

But the plan gave something far more important than new tools to encourage environmental investment. A side effect of the process to update the Regional Plan is a new positive spirit in Lake Tahoe – something we haven't seen in the region for decades. The culture surrounding Lake Tahoe has tended to be cynical and focused on what isn't possible. An intangible benefit of the groundswell of support for the 2012 Regional Plan is new-found momentum toward renewal and possibility. More people have shown they are willing to step in, participate, engage, and even lead Lake Tahoe's communities forward. More than ever we are hearing about what is possible when people come together and work together—environmental improvement, economic sustainability, and positive social change.

Litigation by well-meaning but uninformed activists throws a wrench into the spirit of the possible. Pointless litigation, without solutions, by those who cling to an outdated environmental strategy works only to kill the renewed spirit of a community just when we are taking responsibility and stepping up more collectively than ever before. Why would the Sierra Club want to kill a community's new-found vitality which is grounded in environmental restoration?

Besides missing the opportunity to play a role in Lake Tahoe's future, the litigants are not offering any new arguments or groundbreaking information. TRPA staff spent hundreds of hours in stakeholder meetings with representatives of these groups

and never hesitated to consider and respond to concerns. Each of our reasoned responses was met with the same negativity: “It can’t be done.’”

Worse still, the lawsuit espouses a backward-looking philosophy for Tahoe that appears hostile to local residents and the millions of visitors who marvel at this spectacular natural wonder. This philosophy fails to acknowledge a key fact – that we can live in harmony with our fragile environment.

Let’s be clear, the 2012 Regional Plan is not a development plan, it is an environmental restoration plan that focuses on the largest contributors of pollutants to Lake Tahoe. The plan keeps regional caps on growth and requirements to preserve open space, and prohibits land subdivisions.

With a few modest amendments in defined high-use areas, the plan works to accelerate restoration of Lake Tahoe’s famed water clarity and is projected to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the Basin by 7 percent per capita by 2035. By that time, the basinwide population is projected to equal only what it was in 2000.

Looking at the details of the plan under litigation, you might join me in asking the question, why exactly are the litigants suing?

If you supported the plan, or even if you simply recognized the need for a renewed approach to save Lake Tahoe and support its communities, now is the time to stay the course. Let’s keep moving forward.

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

Letter: Commending Barton for excellent care

To the community,

I was awakened the other morning morning with a bad belly pain.



I have been a patient of GI problems most of my life and do not hesitate when problems arrive. I went to the Barton emergency room where I was diagnosed with gallstone problems. A couple of days later I was released.

Two days later I was back and my gallbladder was removed.

I have been treated for GI problems my whole life and I do have the background and experience to judge proper care. We are very lucky to have a hospital where everyone I had contact with gave proper professional care. I will not attempt to identify all the staff I had contact with because it was for most part a blur of time and people.

I know it is hard to provide care of all types of problems.

From a small hospital I must say I was treated well by everyone there. We are very lucky to have the Barton hospital and their staff in our community. As an 80-year-old patient, I am really glad they are part of my community.

David DeWitt, South Lake Tahoe

Letter: S. Tahoe couple deserving of recognition

To the community,

On Feb. 19, two terrific people will celebrate 59 years of marriage and the 80th birthday of wife Joan Young.



Dick and Joan Young on STAR patrol. Photo/LTN

Dick and Joan are long-time residents who have contributed extensively to our community. Both are on the board of the Historical Society and have filled offices over the last 12 years. Joan has researched and written articles on local events and chaired the quarterly meetings of the society. Dick served three years as president and both have worked tirelessly on museum projects.

Also, Dick and Joan are active in the Barton Auxiliary with many hours of work at the Attic and both have driven in the STAR service and both are active leaders in the California-Nevada Trails Association.

All of their volunteer work has been done with a smile on the face!

Congratulations are definitely in order!

Lynne Bajuk and friends

Opinion: S. Tahoe turns deaf ear to younger generation

By Scott Valentine

I spoke at the South Lake Tahoe Planning Commission meeting on Nov. 29 to make some comments on the Harrison Avenue Streetscape Project. There was one other person in the audience beside myself. After making some suggestions about the bikeability and walkability of this area, I was asked: “If there are so many people who believe in these ideas and solutions, where are they now?”



Scott Valentine

I should have told the commission that the reason is simple: They’re at work!

OK, maybe I’m overreacting, but I felt like it was inappropriate and disrespectful to devalue someone’s comment based on the number of attendees at 3 on a Thursday afternoon.

I’m in my late 30s; people my age are spending time trying to manage a family and juggle work, while simultaneously trying to squeak in some world-class play wherever they can so they can justify living in such a junky town. Sorry. I’m not a snob, but this is the dumpiest place I have ever lived, surrounded by the best place I have ever lived.

I recently found a *Tahoe Daily Tribune* article from 1977 that stated that one of the top priorities for City Council was the beautification of Highway 50. So I understand change is slow, either that or our idea of beauty in 1977 was very disappointing.

I was on the steering committee that helped to re-create the beach at Lakeview Commons so I feel like there are a few people doing what they can to fix the dumpy parts. However, one of the public comments we received while trying to improve this area was: “Stop changing our town!” It seems as though the public is as much at fault as our political leaders for slowing positive improvements.

I felt like a fool after speaking in front of the commission that day in November, and I walked away feeling … alone? Not alone in sentiment, because I know there are a lot of people out there that would like to improve the standard of living in this town, but alone in involvement, participation, or unification around a common goal maybe.

The makeup of our city government is not a fair representation of our town and therefore does not accurately represent the views of our town. So why are active young professionals in this town so underrepresented? We are constantly talking about positive change, sustainability, and community vision, but seriously lack the time and energy to get involved. Maybe this apathy can be explained because we think the older generation in this town is set in their ways, fearful of change, and unwilling to listen to a bunch of young, educated radicals. Guess what? We make up a very large percentage of this town,

and right now we are inheriting the mistakes currently being set upon us simply because we don’t have the time to get involved. This is unacceptable.

I focused my frustrations and decided to apply for the recent appointment to City Council. It was made very clear during the interview process that the current council was looking for “qualified” and experienced applicants. It is ignorant of the community and the council to think that our generation is not “qualified” in making informed decisions regarding our town. I lost the appointment after a three-way tie with two older, more “qualified” ex-council members. I hope their qualifications enable them to make decisions that are more representative of the newer, younger demographic prevalent in our town. Is this recent decision by council somehow sending a message to new candidates that this old mentality will never change? I should hope not.

I applaud Trish Hickson and Jason Drew for stepping up to serve on the city Planning Commission. Others should follow their lead and help guide positive improvements for our city. Is this a call to action for the next generation? Yes! We need better representation in this town and we need to show that we are ready to do something about it. It won’t be easy, but we need to show people that the “Stop changing our town” mentality and this short-term vision is not an option.

In the short time that I was campaigning for the vacant seat on City Council people continually mentioned that if the college would only convert to a four-year university we would be able to save our town. The college plays a huge role in bringing people together and has done a lot to revitalize this community, but people also need to understand that the people of this community and the City Council have the capacity to save our town as well … they just haven’t done it yet.

With the passing of the [Tahoe Regional Planning Agency] Regional Plan update more power will be returned to local

government. The city has an opportunity to prove that it is ready to move forward with sustainable economic development while balancing both community needs and environmental protection. If we do not change our ways and put forth a solid effort to demonstrate that we can conduct ourselves appropriately, we will loose the respect of our community and miss out on this awesome opportunity. How are we currently showing we are making responsible decisions?

The city of South Lake Tahoe just sold the property on the corner of Ski Run and Highway 50 to a Rite-Aid developer. With decisions like this we are clearly not making any effort to improve the attractiveness of our town, revitalize the economy, or prove to the TRPA we are responsible stewards. No wonder businesses and young professionals are reluctant to stay or perhaps relocate here.

Businesses in South Lake have made it clear that they are not doing well and the economy is suffering. Why then do we continue to use the same old model? Why don't our decision makers think outside the same box they have been planning with for the last 50 years and try something new? How can we achieve economic viability and sustainability if we can't be more creative than just having another Rite-Aid?

Our community is demanding positive change. We want more bike trails and access to the beach. We want diverse shopping and dining opportunities. We want local business to experience economic success. We want to beautify the city and be proud of our town, but this community vision is constantly crushed by the nearsightedness of the City Council and a very small number of our own community members. Instead of a pedestrian-friendly shopping and dining experience with locally unique shops and cafes with a view of the lake we'll have just another Rite-Aid.

There are plenty of other progressive uses for that space, but if this "old economy" mentality keeps up, the educated

citizenry and the “high dollar” visitors that this city desperately need will just have to find another town, one that makes a concerted effort to make community desires a priority. It seems as though we can’t even do something as simple as banning plastic bags. We are basically telling the world that we are not serious about saving the lake. We need to unify around some common goals and show our city leaders that we are ready and willing to work to effect change and make difficult decisions that benefit the community in the long term.

Together we can adopt a city vision … and possibly a region wide goal of making positive improvements… insuring that our generation, and the generations that come after us, aren’t going to be disenfranchised with the state of the town being left to them.

Scott Valentine is the head of the Earth Science Department at Lake Tahoe Community College.

—-

Publisher’s note: The property where Scott Valentine says a Rite-Aid is going is in escrow. It was owned by the city’s Redevelopment Agency and had to be sold per state law. The buyer at this time has not been disclosed. And any building that would go on the site would have to be approved by the city and other permitting agencies. None of that has happened. So it is not factual at this time to say what may built at that location. And the city cannot deny a certain type of business if the use is allowable in that location. It’s partly called free market.

Opinion: Watching out for signs of mental illness

Publisher's note: ***The following column is the first of a two-part series that looks at the availability and impact of mental health services in Northern Nevada and across the nation.***

By Kristin Hestdalen

As Nevada and the Lake Tahoe Basin greet 2013 with a mix of optimism and concern, we have great issues facing our nation, including looming debates on the state of mental health services, gun control, and protecting Second Amendment rights.



We continue to collectively mourn the devastating loss of life in Connecticut, as 27 people were killed (mostly first-graders). As unbelievable as this tragedy was (and many recently like it), we still face multiple questions: What are we as a nation prepared to change? How can we prevent this from happening again? And what exactly are the possible causes of these horrific acts?

Many commentators and politicians, say it is our "broken mental health system" that needs to be fixed. I am certain that something needs to be fixed, particularly our access to mental health services. But to declare there is a system, broken or otherwise, is naïve. In Nevada, the legislative body has cut 38.1 percent from the total general fund mental health

budget over the past three years, making it the state with the fifth highest cut to mental health funding in the U.S. (Statistic from the National Alliance on Mental Health.)

And while legislators and mental health professionals continue to debate next steps, the question remains, “What leads a person to commit such a horrendous act?” I’m not sure there is an easy answer to this question.

Given that hurdle, we do have some ideas about what might predispose someone to consider mass homicide. In a detailed case study done on five mass murderers it was found they all shared some common characteristics and background history. First, the individuals in the study were all bullied as children and often experienced painful loneliness, leading to despair and feelings of social alienation. These were loners who eventually developed extreme anger at their perceived injustice by others, externalized blame, became suspicious and paranoid of others’ intentions and lacked the capacity to look inward in order to create real change. Instead they tended to be rigid, inflexible and narcissistic, unable to see the world except through their narrow lens. Addition of a mental illness (i.e. schizophrenia) exacerbates all of this and further distorts already flawed perceptions of others and their world.

Here are some possible signs that someone needs urgent mental health treatment:

1. An increase in isolative behaviors, such as staying in one’s room, not wanting to interact with family or friends.

2. Changes in mood or personality, especially development of hostility and anger.

3. Changes in interests, particularly an unusual and obsessive interest in guns and violence.

4. Onset of paranoia or suspiciousness.

5. Development of unusual thoughts or ideas and other distortions of reality.

6. Development of frank delusions or hallucinations.

These behavior changes often occur in adolescence or early adulthood and are sometimes the warning signs of very serious mental illness, such as bipolar disorder or schizophrenia. Families or the educational system (high schools, colleges and universities) are often left with the responsibility of finding help for someone who doesn't want it.

In the next article we will discuss where this help may come from, and look at some examples of how residential treatment, counseling or medications can make a positive impact. So, as debate continues on many fronts and we see continuing acts of seemingly random and unexplained violence, perhaps real change, advocacy, and prevention can come from each of us as we bring the issue of adequate mental health services to the forefront.

Kristin Hestdalen is a board certified child and adolescent psychiatrist for Tahoe Family Solutions in Incline Village where she is a staff psychiatrist as well as chief psychiatrist for Sierra Mental Health Associates.

Editorial: Can Obama achieve his goals?

Publisher's note: ***This editorial is from the Feb. 13, 2013, Los Angeles Times.***

In his first State of the Union address of his second term, President Obama delivered the most forceful defense of liberal values uttered on this occasion by any president since Lyndon Johnson. Obama argued for progress on the environment, common sense on guns, decency on immigration. On those issues, he has the support of the American people.

Yes, there are problems left over from his first four years: high unemployment and slow economic growth. He rightly called on Congress to close the nation's long-term budget gap by reforming entitlements and simplifying the tax code, rather than making across-the-board reductions that only chip away at the deficit. But it wasn't clear how he'd get his ideas, many of them recycled from his first term, through a polarized Congress.



President Obama

Many of the proposals Obama laid out – initiatives to promote manufacturing, shore up infrastructure, expand exports, develop clean energy technology, prepare American workers for the demands of today's job market and fix a broken immigration system – would help build a stronger foundation for economic growth. He added a new wrinkle to several of these proposals, calling for public-private partnerships in construction and education to reduce the cost to taxpayers.

The president also renewed his call to reduce carbon emissions, suggesting that he may spend some political capital on that vital issue. He endorsed sensible steps to deter gun

violence, including new protections against sham sales that arm criminals. And he reconfirmed his commitment to ending the U.S. war in Afghanistan next year.

Leaders have to do more than set the right goals; they have to find ways to achieve them. There, Obama's course is unclear. In the first term, he courted Republican support and was rebuffed. With his inaugural address, he suggested a new approach: rallying the public in support of common values, transcending partisanship. This speech extended that idea, but achieving it won't be easy.

Obama did make one significant nod to the other side, announcing that he would pursue a free-trade agreement with the European Union. Although his own party may balk, it was a smart and bold move.

The president rightly argues that Washington should re-prioritize, not just cut back. Before him and Congress stand great opportunities to do just that. Pass immigration reform. Pass sensible gun laws. Work to improve the lives of average Americans regardless of which party benefits. Those are ambitions worthy of a great nation.

Letter: Does South Lake Tahoe have a fiscal policy?

To the community,

Spending, borrowing, taxing. The fiscal policies and practices of the city are a jumble. The city has a large debt. It claims to have a large deficit. It has laid off several city employees to cut costs.

But the City Council is prepared to gamble thousands of dollars on parking meters. The council assumes meters are the answer for increasing city revenue. Where is the money for buying and installing the meters?


Bill Crawford

And the council will spend thousands on hiring headhunters to recruit candidates to fill city staff positions, which is another roll of the dice. Headhunters are not necessarily successful at providing good candidates for the city. Examples: I think of David Childs and Tony O'Rourke who were supposed to be the cat's meow, topnotch city managers. Both resigned after two years. The city doesn't have to send money for headhunters to recruit candidates.

And how much money has been spent on the contract for provide management of the city ice rink? Where is the accounting? Is the deal paying off for the city? A Bud anyone? The city's working on it.

Fiscal policy. Spending, borrowing, taxing. That is the question. What is the answer?

Bill Crawford, South Lake Tahoe