

CARSON RIVER ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Minutes of the March 2, 2005 Meeting
Page 1

A regular meeting of the Carson River Advisory Committee was scheduled for 5:30 p.m. on Wednesday, March 2, 2005 in the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada.

PRESENT: Chairperson Charles Zimmerman
Vice Chairperson Paul Pugsley
Tom Farrer
Dan Greytak
Mark McCubbin
Randy Pahl
Keith Wills

STAFF: Linda Ritter, City Manager
Roger Moellendorf, Parks and Recreation Department Director
Juan Guzman, Open Space Manager
Kathleen King, Recording Secretary

NOTE: A tape recording of these proceedings is on file in the Clerk-Recorder's Office, and is available for review during regular business hours.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL (1-0007) - Chairperson Zimmerman called the meeting to order at 5:32 p.m. Roll was called; a quorum was present.

CITIZEN COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDIZED ITEMS (1-0019) - None.

1. ACTION ON APPROVAL OF MINUTES - February 2, 2005 (1-0025) - Vice Chairperson Pugsley moved to approve the minutes. Member Pahl seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0-2, Members Greytak and Wills abstaining.

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA (1-0035) - None.

3. AGENDA ITEMS:

3-A. DISCUSSION ONLY REGARDING CARSON CITY'S INTERNAL AUDIT REPORT OF BOARDS, COMMISSIONS, AND COMMITTEES (1-0037) - Ms. Ritter provided background information on the purpose of the audit, and advised that she had subsequently developed a plan of action based on policy decisions to be made by the Board of Supervisors and administrative matters to be addressed. She further advised that the Board of Supervisors will be presented with decisions regarding eliminating a Board of Supervisors-assigned representative to the Committee, as well as the possibility of consolidation.

Ms. Ritter discussed the recommendation to enhance communication between the Board of Supervisors and their advisory committees by requiring an annual work plan from each advisory committee. At the end of each year, the advisory committee would provide a report to the Board of Supervisors, based on the accomplishments of the annual work plan, and proposed plans for the following year. Ms. Ritter described the role of advocacy groups, which have a much broader scope, are not subject to the requirements of the Open Meeting Law, and still advise the Board of Supervisors. She discussed the Youth Sports Association as an example.

CARSON RIVER ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Minutes of the March 2, 2005 Meeting
Page 2

In response to a question, Ms. Ritter advised that she would not be recommending consolidation of this Committee with any other. She noted that the areas of interest of each of the advisory committees are very diverse. Member Farrer commented that the types of issues addressed by this Committee are more aligned with the Open Space Advisory Committee and the Shade Tree Council. He inquired as to whether the number of members on each advisory committee would be reduced or the committees combined into one "super committee." Ms. Ritter advised she would first be discussing with the Board of Supervisors their interest in pursuing consolidation. She suggested that consolidation would represent a "pretty radical change." Member Farrer noted that the Open Space Advisory Committee and the Shade Tree Council have funding sources; the Carson River Advisory Committee does not. In response to a question, Ms. Ritter advised that advocacy groups enjoy some funding from the City. The Shade Tree Council and the Youth Sports Association raise their own funding. Ms. Ritter further advised that consolidation would not guarantee funding for special Carson River Advisory Committee projects.

In response to a question, Ms. Ritter requested the Committee to remember that the City staff which serve the advisory committees did not develop the recommendations contained in the audit report. One of the Internal Auditor's concerns was over alignment and communication, in that the advisory committees should advise the Board of Supervisors only on those issues directed by the Board of Supervisors. Ms. Ritter pointed out that this will limit the Committee's scope, and reiterated the possibility of developing into an advocacy group. She acknowledged that the alignment and communication tool would be the advisory committees' annual work plans. Member Farrer concurred with improving communication between the Committee and the Board of Supervisors. He noted that the Committee members have the best interests of the community in mind when addressing issues pertinent to the River, but acknowledged that the Committee "has no idea what the Board is thinking."

Mr. Moellendorf pointed out that once goals and objectives are developed into an action plan, the Board of Supervisors may also suggest projects in which the Committee is not interested. He reiterated that an advocacy group has more latitude with regard to projects and direction, and noted the advantage of not being constrained by the Open Meeting Law. Ms. Ritter advised that most advocacy groups create a non-profit corporation through which certain funding and grants can be accessed that would not otherwise be available to a government entity.

Chairperson Zimmerman advised that the Board of Supervisors inquired of his vision for the Committee at the time he interviewed for reappointment approximately two years ago. He suggested to the Board of Supervisors that the Committee may be consolidated with other, similar advisory committees. He acknowledged that consolidation makes sense from a variety of perspectives. He noted that the Committee's actions are done in conjunction with the Carson River Master Plan, which the Board of Supervisors approved. With regard to the composition of the Committee, Chairperson Zimmerman advised that it was formed during a time of many contentious issues regarding property rights along the River. He noted that these issues and concerns have not been raised in a number of years, and suggested that the Committee may be able to evolve along with those changes. He expressed support for consolidation in that it would save staff time.

Member Farrer expressed concern with regard to how consolidation would be accomplished. He noted that "too large a group would become unmanageable." In response to a question, Ms. Ritter stated that all advisory committees are separate from each other and report directly to the Board of Supervisors. In response to a comment, Mr. Moellendorf advised that the Parks and Recreation Department provides staff support to the Shade Tree Council. Member Greytak discussed the concept of working groups within this Committee's framework. The Committee reviewed the resolution which created it to develop goals and

CARSON RIVER ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Minutes of the March 2, 2005 Meeting
Page 3

objectives. At the same time, the Committee is responsive to items which come up in the course of each year relating to the Open Space Advisory Committee, the Carson River corridor, flood control, etc. Member Greytak discussed the importance of getting information to the public and assisting staff to develop recommendations which are forwarded to the Board of Supervisors. He expressed support for advisory committees in the role of citizens government. Vice Chairperson Pugsley suggested that each of the advisory committees should develop a work plan and, once the Board of Supervisors has an opportunity to review them, a determination can be made with regard to the number of advisory committees needed. He suggested including the Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife and noted that, although its structure and operation is very different, "it's got some overlap with these committees as well." He suggested that considering consolidation may be "a little premature" until there is some concept of the work plans among the various committees. Ms. Ritter advised of having met with the Shade Tree Council, which expressed the same observation and suggested going through a whole year with the work plans in place prior to making a decision regarding consolidation.

Mr. Guzman requested the Committee members to consider that the audit report considers efficiencies, formal relationships, the number of times the Board of Supervisors agreed with the advisory committee recommendations, etc. Ms. Ritter pointed out that Mr. Guzman was describing an advocacy group, and suggested that title and structure may need to be considered. Chairperson Zimmerman inquired as to the number of recommendations formally forwarded to the Board of Supervisors from this Committee during 2004, and their importance. Mr. Moellendorf could not recall any recommendation formally forwarded to the Board of Supervisors over the last five months. Ms. Ritter agreed. Mr. Guzman explained that staff receives input from the advisory committees to formulate recommendations. Mr. Moellendorf advised that the Board of Supervisors receives minutes of the advisory committee meetings. Chairperson Zimmerman advised that Supervisor Williamson most likely saw and heard more by attending the meetings of this Committee than by simply reading the minutes. He suggested eliminating the Board of Supervisors representative from attending some or all of the Committee meetings will potentially cutoff a "pretty critical communication link."

In response to a comment, Member Farrer advised that Supervisor Williamson had attended Committee meetings and contributed comments, but not as a member. Chairperson Zimmerman clarified that this Committee has never had a Ward Supervisor as a member. The Committee has had a member of the Board of Supervisors involved in some capacity or other since its inception. In response to a question, Mr. Guzman explained one of the auditor's criticisms that the ratio between Open Space Advisory Committee agenda items and subsequent recommendations forwarded to the Board of Supervisors was very small. Member Farrer advised of the understanding that staff communicates the Committee's positions and discussion to the Board of Supervisors in some form or another. Mr. Guzman requested the Committee members to consider whether their jobs could be done more effectively if organized in a different fashion or continuing to work in the same way. Chairperson Zimmerman thanked Ms. Ritter.

3-B. ACTION TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TO ADOPT THE U.S. FOREST SERVICE CLEAR CREEK / KINGS CANYON LANDSCAPE ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY (1-0487) - Mr. Guzman provided background information on this item, and narrated a PowerPoint presentation. Discussion took place regarding the recommendation to use grazing animals for vegetation management and fuels reduction. Member Pahl expressed concern with regard to overgrazing in stream zone areas.

CARSON RIVER ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Minutes of the March 2, 2005 Meeting
Page 4

(1-0619) Jon Nowlin advised of at least one controlled experiment conducted on C-Hill using penned sheep and a prescribed amount of grazing time. The cheatgrass was measured before and after the grazing experiment, and Mr. Nowlin explained that feedback from the experiment resulted in a favorable response from the Open Space Advisory Committee.

In response to a question, Member Greytak explained that results of the sheep grazing experiment weren't evident during the Waterfall Fire because the experiment was conducted approximately five years ago. Grazing would have to be done every year for a number of years in order to affect the cheatgrass. In response to a question, Member Farrer expressed the opinion that some grazing would reduce the fuels. He expressed support for the recommendation. Mr. Moellendorf suggested the need for a balance between reducing fuels and not causing watershed or streambank issues. Vice Chairperson Pugsley discussed the requirement to move sheep quickly in a grazing situation because they tend to graze close to the ground. He suggested including livestock grazing with the other treatments as part of the fuels reduction and vegetation management equation. He advised of the U.S. Forest Service ("USFS") difficulty in funding projects, and suggested that eliminating a less expensive option is not reasonable. He explained that the USFS is not favorable toward using cattle or other range animals. He suggested the concept should be pushed toward the same level as mechanical means and prescribed fire for fuels reduction and management. He advised that USFS experiments with prescribed fire haven't been very successful, and that grazing animals cannot do the level of damage to the ground as quickly as fire can. He clarified that the approach depends upon the type of vegetation. In response to a question, Mr. Guzman explained the method by which mechanical treatments are applied.

Mr. Guzman pointed out various properties on a map included in the PowerPoint presentation, as well as strategically placed land area treatments ("SPLATs") which have been designated for vegetation management. With regard to Cultural Resources recommendations, Mr. Guzman advised that Kings Canyon Road has been improved to a certain point as part of the Waterfall Fire rehabilitation. The USFS anticipates receiving additional funding to improve the road further. Mr. Guzman advised that the City is considering a memorandum of understanding with the USFS for management of the Old Clear Creek, Kings Canyon, and Ash Canyon Roads, together with all roads which are part of the interface. He noted that road improvements will assist in forest management. He acknowledged that the Landscape Analysis recommends Kings Canyon Road to be open to vehicle traffic. Mr. Guzman reviewed the Watershed and Roads recommendations, and discussed a road needed to serve a development proposed by John Serpa in Douglas County which will have an underpass onto Highway 50.

With regard to recreational uses, Member McCubbin expressed a preference for prohibiting motorized vehicles. He discussed problems created by motorized recreation in the area of Prison Hill. In response to a question, Mr. Guzman described the USFS plan implemented at Peavine Mountain which accommodates both motorized and non-motorized recreation by designated areas. Member Greytak suggested considering areas of potential development adjacent to USFS lands, and ensuring that areas designated for motorized recreation do not conflict. Mr. Guzman responded to questions regarding roads depicted on a map displayed in the meeting room, their present designated uses, and methods by which to separate motorized recreation and equestrians.

(1-1052) Mr. Nowlin advised of having lived on the east side of Prison Hill for approximately the last 27 years. He observed that, although the south end of Prison Hill has been designated for off-road vehicles, it "doesn't work." He expressed the opinion that the only way to accommodate "the mixture of hikers, mountain bikes, off-road vehicles, and four wheel drive vehicles, is to spend money and actually manage it." He noted the lack of enforcement on Prison Hill, and advised that the fences break down each year

CARSON RIVER ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Minutes of the March 2, 2005 Meeting
Page 5

“and there’s no money to fix them.” He expressed the further opinion that a plan is “meaningless” unless management and enforcement resources are available. He noted that the Landscape Analysis encourages multiple uses, and suggested an implied obligation that the City and the USFS fund management and enforcement.

In response to a question, Mr. Guzman advised that the City was an equal partner in development of the Landscape Analysis. He discussed joint management and enforcement between the City and the USFS. He agreed that funding sources will be needed to effectively manage the lands and facilities into the future. In response to a question, Mr. Guzman discussed the successful joint management arrangement between the USFS and Douglas County of a recreation facility along the River, and between the USFS and Washoe County of the Thomas Creek Campground. The Parks and Recreation Departments of both Douglas and Washoe Counties consider USFS lands as an extension of the services provided to their respective communities. Mr. Guzman noted the difficulty of entering into joint management and enforcement agreements without a document such as the Landscape Analysis. City staff is interested in working together with the USFS to extend the range of services for residents and visitors. Mr. Guzman acknowledged that the Committee could recommend no motor vehicle recreation on USFS lands and City property adjacent to USFS lands.

In response to a question, Mr. Guzman provided background information on plans to improve Old Clear Creek Road. Representatives of Carson City, Douglas County, the USFS, private residents, the Washoe Tribe are working together to develop a plan to improve the road so that each of Carson City and Douglas County can accept it, and then to develop a maintenance plan. Member McCubbin discussed safety issues associated with motor vehicles and bicyclists using the road. Vice Chairperson Pugsley advised that the portion of the road between Highway 50 and the USFS gate near the Clear Creek camp is considered privately owned. He further advised of working with the USFS on drainage issues from Highway 50 to Clear Creek. Consensus, at this point, is that the road “creates a barrier of problems and opportunities.” As a result of the drainage work, Vice Chairperson Pugsley expects that the portion of the road, from the USFS gate, will be improved for purposes of fire fighting and accommodating storm drainage flows. He acknowledged that it will not be open to general vehicle use. He described access to the lower portion of Clear Creek Road from Highway 50, and advised that it will segregate accesses to the canyon. The access will eliminate the issue of road maintenance because it will segregate that portion of the road which is in Douglas County from that portion which is in Carson City. Vice Chairperson Pugsley advised that the dividing point will be Tribal property, and that the Tribe has suggested it will block the road. He stated, “as dangerous as that road is, there is no room in the tight parts of that canyon to improve it.” Vice Chairperson Pugsley advised that Douglas County representatives agreed to eliminate the road from their trails plan. In response to a comment, Mr. Guzman advised that the road is part of the Carson City Bicycle Plan.

In response to a question, Mr. Guzman advised that the Landscape Analysis includes recreational access to the Fuji Park urban fishing pond. He suggested that designating the entirety of Clear Creek Road for bicycling and other recreational activities may have to be revisited. In response to a further question, Mr. Guzman described the community survey being developed as part of the master planning process. He commented that City and USFS representatives will always be looking for opportunities to fund recreational projects. The Landscape Analysis is a vision document which describes improvements to be funded on a project-specific basis. Mr. Guzman advised that funding sources have not been identified for all the projects included in the Landscape Analysis. Available funding sources include Question #1, USFS fire protection/ suppression bills, watershed restoration bills, and Question #18. Mr. Guzman emphasized that the projects outlined in the Landscape Analysis will not be accomplished over the next several years;

CARSON RIVER ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Minutes of the March 2, 2005 Meeting
Page 6

however, having the Landscape Analysis and Strategy in place makes it easier to secure funding for specific projects. Member Greytak commented that the Landscape Analysis and Strategy required the USFS to consider what to do with lands in the Carson Ranger District. He advised that it “is a big step over where we were before.” Mr. Guzman agreed, and commented that the Carson Range “disappears” in the USFS Framework Analysis and the USFS Forest Plan.

In response to a question, Mr. Guzman advised that Division of State Lands and Nevada State Parks representatives attended the original scoping session for the Landscape Analysis. Vice Chairperson Pugsley noted the disagreement of some of the Committee members with regard to utilizing livestock for vegetation and fuels management, and with regard to off-road vehicles. He suggested eliminating off-highway vehicle access from Voltaire Canyon Road to the upper Kings Canyon trailhead, and limiting the route to only pedestrian and equestrian traffic. He pointed out and discussed access points using the displayed map, and discussion ensued. In response to a question, Member Greytak advised that the USFS will need “great persuasion” with regard to utilizing livestock for vegetation and fuels management, but suggested leaving the option in the Landscape Analysis. Vice Chairperson Pugsley advised that the recommendation does not suggest a grazing allotment, and that the option will take “every bit as much attention” as other tools such as hand crews and prescribed burning.

Vice Chairperson Pugsley moved to accept the Landscape Analysis, as presented, with the exception that the portion of road designated for motorized use between Voltaire Canyon Road and the upper Kings Canyon trailhead be reduced to non-motorized use. Member Pahl seconded the motion. Member McCubbin expressed a preference for not allowing any motorized vehicles in the area. He suggested that the residents below Voltaire Canyon will “be very upset if it turns into the same thing as Prison Hill.” He anticipates additional housing development in the open areas below Voltaire Canyon, and expressed the opinion that the opportunity to develop the land will be “ruined,” with the property values reduced due to noise and dust. He discussed the dust problem in the residential areas adjacent to Prison Hill, and noted that the wind blows strongly down Voltaire Canyon. In response to a question, Member McCubbin suggested that motorized vehicle use on Voltaire Canyon Road could possibly be managed. He expressed the opinion that the trails over the top of the hill “are totally unmanageable;” that people will get up there and not stay on the trails. He noted that trail riders quickly tire of existing routes and seek to create new ones. Chairperson Zimmerman advised of also living in an urban interface area, and agreed with Member McCubbin’s comments. He expressed concern that proper management of the area may not be appropriately addressed at this time. Member Greytak noted that people use the area presently, although it is posted closed for fire rehabilitation. He agreed that enforcement will be difficult if not first provided for in the Landscape Analysis. Member Farrer agreed, and suggested amending the motion to limit off-road vehicles only to Voltaire Canyon Road. **Vice Chairperson Pugsley amended his motion to approve the Landscape Analysis, as presented, and request that the existing identified, yellow roads be eliminated for vehicle traffic. Member Pahl continued his second.** Chairperson Zimmerman suggested asking for a more specific vehicular use plan than what is outlined in the Landscape Analysis. Mr. Guzman acknowledged that something more definitive can be requested, and suggested asking the USFS for a full transportation plan which would address pedestrian, equestrian, OHV, and other uses. He advised that USFS representatives have expressed an interest in developing a transportation plan. He responded to questions regarding the status of the BLM Pine Nut Mountains Plan Amendment. Chairperson Zimmerman inquired as to whether the best use of the area is a combination of recreation and fire management. Mr. Guzman named watershed protection and storm drainage, but acknowledged that recreation and fire management were the focus of the scoping session. Chairperson Zimmerman noted that the displayed map

CARSON RIVER ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Minutes of the March 2, 2005 Meeting
Page 7

implied uses by various methods of transportation with which the Committee members were not completely comfortable. He advised of being uncomfortable with the Landscape Analysis at this point because of the map designations. He called for a vote on the pending motion; **motion carried 6-0-1, Chairperson Zimmerman abstaining.**

3-C. PRESENTATION ONLY REGARDING THE “SURVEY OF TOOLS FOR THE CARSON RIVER - LiDAR AND HYPERSPECTRAL ANALYSIS” (1-1974) - Vice Chairperson Pugsley described the boundaries of the hyperspectral imaging and LiDAR survey of the River corridor, beginning on the west fork flood plain in Alpine County and both the east and west forks in Nevada, to the confluence, then through the confluence to the Lahontan Reservoir. He advised that the survey was funded by the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection Bureau of Water Quality Planning and the Carson Water Subconservancy District.

Vice Chairperson Pugsley explained that hyperspectral analysis measures through the near IR invisible signatures of ground cover, wave lengths covering 380 to 960 nanometers, which includes all visible light and approximately 60 “snippets” of the non-visible portions of the color spectrum both in the violet and red ranges. LiDAR is an acronym for Light Detection and Ranging, and Vice Chairperson Pugsley advised that the instrument is primarily a range finder. Using lasers, it measures the distance between the laser and the point at which the light bounces back. He explained the measuring pattern, and advised that the accuracy of the laser is within 6" of the ground. Hyperspectral imaging utilizes the light of the sun and its reflectance rather than providing a light source. It reads the reflectance from the ground in a manner similar to the laser. The two instruments sit side by side in the aircraft reading the same information.

Vice Chairperson Pugsley described the pixel spectra images generated by the instruments arranged in a tile scheme to accommodate computer viewing. He advised that the starting point was the Minden Airport, from which the instruments were calibrated based on the airport crosshairs. The Ritchie Ranch in Dayton was a second reference point at the other end of the project. The instruments crossed both points of reference for calibration each day the airplane took off. The area was flown over a six-day period and the instruments calibrated at the beginning and end of each flight. Fourteen quality assurance control points, particularly for elevation, were arranged throughout the project area depending upon where the airplane was flying on any given day. The result is that FEMA mapping can be done based on the LiDAR work because of meeting a ground control FEMA protocol for the elevation models.

The hyperspectral analysis required ground control to identify some of the spectra. A ground crew was in the field for five days to map vegetation using a ground, backpack GPS unit. Vice Chairperson Pugsley narrated corresponding photographs, and advised that representatives of the Nevada Division of Forestry, Dayton Valley Conservation District, and BAE Systems were involved. He reiterated that the airplane flew over a six-day period with “outstanding weather conditions for this type of activity: ... bright, sunny, cloudless days.” He expressed a preference to have had lower flows in the River because the light spectrums used for the lasers find it difficult to look through water. He had hoped to map the bottom of the River. He advised of having done physical survey of sixteen cross-sections of the River at the time it was flown; however, there was difficulty getting the company which did the work to spatially orient the surveys.

Vice Chairperson Pugsley displayed and reviewed the pixel spectral images, one-foot contour mapping capabilities, and photographic images. He discussed algae identification and ground truthing, and described the bloodhound developed from the key characteristics of algae generated by the spectra. He advised that the bloodhound exercise was also applied to cottonwood, white top, and stressed white top. He explained

CARSON RIVER ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Minutes of the March 2, 2005 Meeting
Page 8

the reason for the inaccurate data generated by the cottonwood bloodhound was due to 18 different sets of spectra from cottonwoods. A more sophisticated analysis of the spectra will be required to identify specific points relative to the other plant spectra.

Vice Chairperson Pugsley advised that the database is generally available on a portable 1 terabyte hard drive. He described uses for the data by the DRI and the U.S. Geological Survey. In response to a question, he advised that the pixel resolution in the data set is to 1 meter, particularly with the hyperspectral data. He explained that the LiDAR data is more accurate; the ability to represent it is in 1 pixel data sets. He doesn't anticipate that the cottonwood canopy could be "peeled off" to see underneath, but suggested that height information may be gathered through sophisticated analysis. He responded to additional questions regarding the data format, and acknowledged that pieces of the data base can be made available to the public. He discussed the hope that the various county GIS Divisions can identify enough users of the information to consider the value of contributing significantly toward having the survey conducted again in three to five years. He commented that the real value of the data is comparison with past and future surveys. Chairperson Zimmerman thanked Vice Chairperson Pugsley for his presentation.

4. NON-ACTION ITEMS:

STATUS REPORTS AND COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS (1-3010) - Member Pahl advised that the Nevada Department of Environmental Protection is contributing funding toward a watershed / environmental education coordinator through the Carson Water Subconservancy District. Vice Chairperson Pugsley advised that the Carson River Coalition recently formed a new working group relative to flooding and flood issues in the Carson River Watershed. The first meeting was held earlier in the day. One of the goals is to identify a River corridor and approach the appropriate counties with regard to providing applicable development code restrictions.

STATUS REPORTS AND COMMENTS FROM STAFF (1-3060) - Mr. Moellendorf advised that Mr. Krahn had suggested not scheduling a meeting in April.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS (1-3075) - Vice Chairperson Pugsley discussed the need to develop a work plan for presentation to the Board of Supervisors.

5. ACTION ON ADJOURNMENT (1-3110) - Vice Chairperson Pugsley moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:03 p.m. Member McCubbin seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

The Minutes of the March 2, 2005 Carson River Advisory Committee meeting are so approved this 10th day of May, 2005.

CHARLES ZIMMERMAN, Chair