Lake Tahoe

Federal Advisory Committee

Final Meeting Minutes
November 18, 2011 – 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.
USFS – Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit
35 College Drive, South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Attendees:

- John Rueter, Suzanne Garcia, Natalie Yanish, Jim Lawrence, Michelle Sweeney, Ann Nichols, Patrick Wright, Michelle Sweeney, Bob Cook, Natalie Yanish

Designated Federal Official (DFO)

- Jeff Marsolais, USFS

Chairperson:

- Steve Teshara

Agency Representatives:

- Woody Loftis, NRCS; Steve Chilton, USFWS; Jack Landy, EPA; Tim Rowe, USGS; Myrnie Mayville, BOR; Nancy J. Gibson, Linda Lind, Joey Keely, Winnifer Simmons, USFS; Steve Lewis, Facilitator, University of NV Cooperative Extension

Members of the Public:
Bill Boosman, Bob Hassett – Camp Richardson Resort & Marina

Opening Comments – Jeff Marsolais, Steve Teshara

- Jeff - I will give a quick safety message due to the weather turning. LTBMU will monitor the snow and the fires in Reno throughout the course of the day. Jeff welcomed everybody in attendance and turned it over to Steve T.
- Steve T. – We did build in some time this morning to ask our agency partners to give us some input on what they would like to see the Federal Advisory Committee (FAC) do from their perspective. We wanted to do this early on so we could factor it into our considerations and priorities in the latter part of the day. Over the course of LTFAC's history, we not only advised on matters of the Federal Interagency Partnership (FIP) but more broadly the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP). Now we are at a point where we have some capacity to come

back and look at broader non-SNPLMA issues. The purpose of today is to see what issues are out there. What folks might want us to do as a FAC, what we need to do to be consistent with our charter and purpose, and look at some other possibilities? One other thing that has changed is that the process of re-chartering the committee. It seems to be taking longer and longer. After our LTFAC meeting on the 23rd, Jeff and I reached out to Steve Lewis to facilitate a meeting for our strategic planning session. We took all the comments that members made at the August 23rd meeting and gave those to Steve L.

- Steve L. – Our goal for today is to establish a new vision of LTFAC post SNPLMA, identify some priorities, and determine action strategies. We are going to do a charter review because we need to periodically reflect on that charter to see if we are remaining consistent. Then we are going into ideas to pursue. We are going to take your input from August 23rd and prioritize what should be the LTFAC's primary focus. Then we are going to look at what are the possible desired conditions we want to create. The vision has certain elements. Do we want to remain under the FAC charter or is a better structure more suited to what you want to accomplish? Then we are going to talk about what LTFAC needs to do in the next six months with the new focus in mind, the logistics of the next meeting.
- Jim asked the date through which LTFAC is currently chartered.
- Jeff – I think it goes through February of 2013. The timelines on the re-chartering is a year in advance so he is expecting to start having the conversation about re-chartering the next FAC in February.

What gives you reason to come back to LTFAC for more?

- Michelle – I'm optimistic that we could see Basin agencies that are in better alignment with one another, given we are seeing reduced resources coming the Basin's way. We could see our Basin agencies be clearer about goals.
- John – this whole process is to figure out what has to be done. I think LTFAC has accomplished things but the Basin is far from being restored.
- Patrick – it's clear among the EIP agencies that we collectively need a public outreach component of new EIP management structure that's evolving.
- Suzanne – the Lake is very important to the Tribe. Protection and restoration of the Lake are the top priorities and the Tribe wants to be part of that process.
- Bob – I love Lake Tahoe and we want to do what we can to preserve it. Everybody has invested interest in what happens at Lake Tahoe.
- Jim – the core function still is to make the best of the highest priority work with the resources available. In many ways we will have to think about getting additional funds.
- Natalie – I think our committee has a lot of opportunity to be powerful.
- Ann – I'm concerned with the focus on development to solve Tahoe's problems and the focus on economy. I'm hoping we can stay on the track of achieving and maintaining thresholds.
- Jeff – this is a remarkable group, during SNPLMA Round 12 we were rushed, but the Basin is complex. I have learned so much hearing the conversations of the committee.
- Steve T. – I think this is one of the few forums where members of the community can engage in interactive dialog with the agencies and the many partners involved.
- Nancy – my background has been involved in FACA and a lot of what has been said absolutely rings true. It has proven benefits both financially an ability to better secure funding streams because there is strength in numbers. Also, there is that community collaboration that comes from grassroots understanding of where people's perspectives come to the table. What I have

seen achieved through the FAC forum is that ability to relate to each other more on a human level and less on a political level.

- Linda – the whole point of the FAC is to provide support to the federal agencies to solicit and collect public feedback so we can use that in part of the recommendations that the FACA has to move forward to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Public Comment

- None at this time.

Introductions

- Steve T. – I would like to start off with introductions starting with Winny Simmons who is sitting in for Arla Hains.
- Introductions were made around the room.

Charter Review – Steve Teshara

- Steve L. – I have the purpose, scope and duties on the wall and you also have a handout on the full charter. I asked Steve T. to go through and describe in his own words on what this charter is meant to accommodate.
- Steve T. – I'm going to focus on the Description of Duties because it's broader than the focus on SNPLMA.
    a. The Committee shall be solely advisory in nature.
    b. When we first started there was not a robust reporting mechanism. We still have an opportunity as a FAC to have some reports coming from a community perspective rather than solely an agency perspective. The EIP was structured to help achieve and maintain thresholds and sometimes we forget that this is the purpose of the EIP. We should take the opportunity to revisit the importance of the EIP as it has evolved.
    c. In the beginning, LFAC wrote many letters to secretaries of various EIP partnership agencies. There's a lot to be said for interacting not only with the Department of Agriculture but with the other federal agencies that are at the table.
    d. The Federal Partnership has a chair but has not been as active over recent years. We are here as a group in the community to respond to requests that come from one of our local agency representatives, or the regional level, or the Washington level.
    e. LTFAC previously had a subcommittee that looked at federal agency budgets, got information from the agencies, and wrote letters. A lot of this has been taken over by other agencies. Now that there is the process of shrinking resources, there may be a value in LTFAC reinforcing particular agency/partnership needs.
    f. (1) In the past, LTFAC actually looked at different issues including some that had elements of controversy in the community. There were times when the room was full of people who wanted to speak to this committee in our advisory role.
    (2) This has fallen to the agency partners but again it's in our list of duties.
- Steve L. – I think there is a broad range and the LTFAC charter is fairly well crafted. The chief opportunity that we are sitting here to discuss today - is there anything in this description of duties that is missing? Because this is FAC and we are advising the Forest Service, they are

required to provide staff support. I think the charter has been flexible enough to adjust to changing conditions and it gives us broad latitude.

- Jeff – through the memorandum between secretaries, part of the role the Forest Service also plays is as a lead on behalf of the other federal agencies.
- John – has this group been able to be an advisory committee to non-federal groups?
- Steve T. – I think we have but invite Patrick and Jim to help respond to that.
- Patrick – I think when there is so much less money it's a lot more important to be thinking about not just what are the Feds doing but what each level of EIP partnership is doing. One option worth pursuing is to build a public advisory process into the evolving EIP management plan and have that advisory group bring back to the whole coalition of agencies.
- Linda – I think FAC has become a defacto stakeholder group for the whole EIP. It's a legal vehicle that the federal agencies have to move forward any recommendations we have to Washington including requests for funding. We are trying to maximize that role of LTFAC and capture these other stakeholder groups.
- Patrick – what I'm emphasizing is the global buy in on where the EIP is going.
- Jim – I would be foolish spending my time here listening to advice from federal agencies and not take that back to Carson City.
- Steve T. – when we talk about the intergovernmental relationships, it also involves the Tribe. I want to give Suzanne the chance to comment on any of this. At the Presidential Forum, there were several specific deliverables for the Tribe. Moving forward we should have some emphasis on what can the Tribe get as a value from this forum and what we do to help the Tribe.
- Suzanne – we are constituents of the state so in a way we are represented three ways here. Our role here is important because the protection of the lake is the top priority of the Tribe and to protect the Tribe's interests.
- Steve T. – to that point, the Tribe and Native Americans as a whole in this country have a very important channel of communication to the Federal Administration that we don't have.
- Steve L. – are there any more points of clarification? We are going to go into deeper conversation on about the structure after we get a better idea of what our focus is.
- Jeff – under FACA, there are three primary reasons where we would create an advisory committee. The first is the perspective of the community. When we need an advisory committee to make recommendations on significant permissible services where there are reductions to costs. The third, when advisory committee deliberations could result in the creation or elimination of regulations, policies or guidelines affecting agency business. FACA gives room for committees to actually have that kind of effect.

Ideas to Pursue Discussion – Steve Lewis, Steve Teshara

- Steve L. – Below are the ideas from the August meeting minutes:

Build Relationships	Community Forum Dialog & Outreach	Public Education	Gateway for Information	No Duplication of Information with Congressionals
Find Funding Locally	Coordinate Funding Regionwide	Communication Among Agencies	Leveraging Information	Outcome Based Alignment
Prioritize Projects & Report Accomplishments	Advocacy	Balanced, Informed & Relevant	Pulse of the Basin	Bring Federal State and Local Interests Together
Blur the Line between Jurisdictions	Secure Common Objectives	Funding	Education	Communication
Liaison	Feedback	Analysis	Monitoring	Watchdog
Planning	Exploration	Partnerships	Field Trips	Direction

- Steve L. – I thought of these as functions and then we got into more specific topics:

Aquatic Invasive Species	Fuels	Erosion Control	Fund BMPs for Community	Conservation
Ensure Conservation on the Lake	Total Maximum Daily Load	EIP Funding Priorities	Transportation	Funding
Protection of Cultural Resources	Develop Protocol on how to Approach Tribe	How to Work on Agreements		

- Steve T. – we want to invite some of the agency partners to contribute to this list.
- Ann – determine carrying capacity thresholds.
- Steve C. – I'm going to speak to aquatic evasive species and funding. With the AIS Program we got a lot of interest from across the country about the Tahoe program. It becomes important to have partners across the country. I recommend the FAC work with other states to put together some funding packages.
- Steve L. – **partnering with "like" areas on issues and funding outside of the Basin**.
- Linda – it all encompasses **strategic packaging** across the board.
- Jim – I don't want to lose sight of **support for local economies**.
- John – **influence agency policies**.
- Tim – I would like to **maintain the science**.
- Jeff – I have a message that Katie Huff sent to me on behalf of the Army Corps. She talked about the idea of the Corps having access to potential co-sponsors for projects. Communication and the sharing of information. Figuring out how to capitalize on all the good work we have already done to catalyze that next and continued ongoing investment.

- Steve L. – **understanding member roles, capitalize on accomplishments to capitalize further action**.
- Steve T. – agencies like BOR and the USACE had the ability to bring in money and provided a significant capacity that we wouldn't have had in any other way. The Bureau and the Corps contributed a lot of money to restoration projects.
- Jack – the EPA recognized the value of being based up here to play the role in partnership. What we want to do is develop a wetlands restoration program in the Basin. Near shore water quality has become an issue as well.
- Steve L. – **wetlands & watershed restoration, near shore water quality**.
- Jeff – Lake Tahoe rises into the national view and this place could be an example of good government. An advisory committee can be the glue that binds and to make this place a national model.
- Steve L. – **national model for the "Glue that Binds"**.
- Patrick – if this group went away tomorrow, does that prevent the Forest Service from doing anything?
- Linda – if we want legal input from stakeholders to provide input in formal way for any kind of recommendations that we want to move forward, we have to have a FAC.
- Nancy – it would stagnate our processes and put us back into an old model.
- Jeff – when looking at the Interagency MOU, this advisory committee is specifically called out. I don't know if we could meet the intent of that interdepartmental agreement, if we didn't have a FAC.
- Patrick – when dreaming of ideas if there is a core thing they have to do, we need to do that first.
- Jeff – we achieved the core functions. I think we could define a new core function about the role this FAC could play in supporting of bringing in internal lines of funding.
- Suzanne – the key is bringing together Federal, State and Tribal interests because when we ask for funding, we are going to be a lot more effective if we could say we have an agreement on the ground and we are all in this together.
- Nancy – you can't go forward or be competitive in any kind of grant process if you don't have a whole array of partners lined up.
- Steve L. – **Bringing Together Local, State, Federal, and Tribe Interests**.
- John – maybe something we should do is identification and promotion of programs.
- Steve L. – **Identification of Program Priorities**.
- Steve L. – do any of these ideas not fit the charter?
- Steve T. – we need to articulate what the one word ideas mean, like watchdog activities.
- Linda – I think the **Advocacy links to the Constituency Representation and Outreach**.
- Suzanne – I saw advocacy as different from the Tribe's point of view. When I come to these meetings this helps inform on what I bring back to the Chairwoman.
- Nancy – when I think watchdog and trying to link the charter from where we have been in the past to where we could see it in the future is adaptability or adaptive management. **Adaptive Management/EIP**.
- Linda – make sure it's generic and broad enough to encompass all their ideas. Section 3 provides the framework.
- Steve L. – this is the opportunity for you to make your case or change other's opinions on which way you think we should go.
- Ann – I think we need to lobby for funding because it's $1500 a piece for people who do BMPs. We would have to go out and try and get bonding.

- Bob – the problem I have with BMPs is that they are consistently changing. I think there are a lot of more important things we need to do here. AIS, Watershed, TMDLs, and the National Model.
- John – I think there needs to be a "Watchdog" group that has the guts to and ability to **Ask the Hard Questions**.
- Jim – in the time of limited resources what are going to be our highest program priorities?
- Patrick – If the Basin and agencies are going through an annual priority setting process of funding and cost sharing, it includes all of the ideas on the board. The charter does a good job of encapsulating all the boxes. The EIP itself is huge enough that going beyond that is a step from almost exclusive focus on the federal share of the EIP to be talking about the Federal, State, Local, and Private Share. **EIP Advisement**.
- Steve T. – maybe one way to prioritize is to use the notion of the National Model.
- Nancy – why aren't we a pilot to let us prove something different here?
- John – I think the EIP Advisement covers everything up there.
- Patrick – what I think is different about this place is this joint priority setting of projects. We could do this here because of groups like this.
- Suzanne – if we have a unified message for all the federal agencies, we will be more effective. **Packaging with a Unified Message**.
- Jim – whatever we build, we need to make sure we build it because it works and it's the best structure.
- John – this group should do something of its own. It could be a **Force of Its Own**. If we are going to do EIP advisement, what do we mean by that?
- Steve L. – I was trying to bring forward where this conversation is going in terms of prioritization.
- Bob – at the forum what was discussed is there was not going to be any SNPLMA. Federal funding is really going to be tight and what they need to do is form private and public partnerships.

Break 12:15 p.m. to 12:45 p.m.

Primary Focus – Steve Lewis

- Natalie – I don't see anything on community and private partnership. I see the value of getting the community on board. There are a lot of passionate people in the community and some of them are misinformed or don't understand the other side of BMPs or all of this.
- Linda – Kim Gorman has just been hired by the California Conservation District to do more education at the community level about the impacts of BMPs.
- Natalie – it's not just BMPs. The base being the community on the top being governmental side of it.
- Steve L. – are there some common things we could identify or categories of things that you do. I'm looking for some organization.
- Suzanne agrees that the National Model should be the result, not on the top.
- Jim – I disagree with that because it should be our goal.
- Bob – The National Model should be on top and EIP Advisement is really what they are all about. Adaptive Management and Bringing Together Local, State, Fed, Tribe Interests.
- Michelle – what's unique about this group is we have the ability to inform that prioritization with an understanding of the return on investment per dollar in terms of our state and

performance measures. We need to make a priority to be better at this. I think there is no better mechanism for informing how we should prioritize moving forward than understanding our investment to date has performed. **Analyze Performance Feedback**.

- John – Monitoring gives you the data to analyze the properties that Michelle was talking about. So you have a set of criteria which is agreed to. You monitor and analyze all that data. On the basis of that what this group can do once we know how things are working than the group can identify the priorities. Once you identify that then that is one aspect of the EIP. The core of what this group may do includes National Model, Funding, EIP, Identification, Analyze Performance, and Monitoring.
- Suzanne – there's a lot of ideas up there and I'm afraid this group may bite off more than they can chew.
- Steve T. – part of the capacity of getting this done is to pick some sort of regular meeting date over a period of time that people will commit to.
- Steve L. – does anybody have a different way of looking at these that they would like to share?
- Michelle – I think there should be a place for things that are not the normal EIP. Maybe under adaptive management.
- John – there are some EIP things that are not measured where this group could say these are important to measure.
- Steve T. – not everything could be measured in a per dollar equation but I agree with the concept. The concept is right but we ought to have the flexibility to have who's ever coming to talk to us about what is the way you measure whether it's in dollars or some other way. **Flexibility.**
- Jim – it's tough for resource agencies because if you are not caseload driven it makes it difficult. It doesn't necessarily come to dollars. You are either protecting the resources or you are not.
- John – we would say if we are going to do EIP advisement, we have to discuss all these boxes. We evaluate performance criteria and the monitoring based on this higher level of what are people going to want to see.
- Michelle – my understanding is the decision has already been made not by us but the agencies. This group shouldn't decide on what those performance measures are but I think it is for this group that once it's been decided upon, we are looking for a return on investment in terms of the performance measures stated and in some cases its dollars.
- Steve T. – if they adopt them, part of our job is where the watchdog part comes in to make sure you are adhering to the measurements.
- Jim – you just can't measure everything and there are a lot of projects that are more than just that specific measurement that showed up.
- John – seems to me that's the responsibility of this team is to understand.
- Steve T. – I think even though you can't specify everything but to put a little bit of pressure on people who are working on that project. I hope people working on that would write down the qualitative values. We better start thinking about what we are doing qualitatively that we can't do quantitatively.
- Michelle – we have accomplished a lot in the last 12 years. What I see as an objective of this group that it be incumbent upon someone to assess where we are occasionally with that.
- John – it seems like at the end of the day all the agencies are going to do what their mission is.
- Steve T. – if we are going to be a National Model as a goal, we really need to pick ourselves up from the bottom end and get everybody elevated to the top.
- Michelle – I'd like to assert the role of this group is to keep perspective on the situation you just described and not to lose sight of prioritizing. So maybe we utilize those things that for some

reason somebody decided to put all that money into. Revisit that priority setting. Look at the tools that we have and allow progress or investment toward two or three things. It's for somebody to be the holder of the records so it's a cycle.

- Jeff – this conversation should be about where this group puts its own focus for funding or new accountability or new projects. I think we could direct a lot of our energy, focus, and funding towards the things that this group could be the bridge to make sure the corporate history or perspective that at the same time we can't not take advantage of the evolving world around us.
- Jim – we need to mindful as we go through this prioritization process to not work against ourselves by doing something like that.
- Steve T. – we could be advocates back to the community and the next time this group meets they would want to come and comment.
- John – I think this group has the skills to promote the funding and the watchdog duties. If we see something going wrong, that somebody could get up there as a group and ask the hard questions.
- Myrnie – in 3.a.) the committee shall be solely advisory in nature. Perhaps the watchdog card should be oversight. Jeff – by **Watchdog** mark **Perspective**.
- Michelle – I think one the hard questions we need to ask has to do with the Tahoe Fund. If you have a fund investing in EIP projects, they have a process parallel to the one we have here.
- Steve T. – my view is that if the funding is for EIP, than we would have input on those projects.
- Jim – typical non-profit organizations will fund projects where donors have more interest.
- Steve T. – I think the whole EIP advisory is the opportunity to connect to not only our Federal Partners but also the Private Sector.
- Bill – there is an opportunity for citizen involvement and power of grassroots.
- Linda – the technical people are bringing forward some of those priorities up through this framework which includes LTFAC. The Basin Partnership, as a whole, has LTFAC as one of the many tools to vet and get that input.

Vision & Vision Elements – Steve Lewis

- Steve L. – what are the conditions we want to create if we want to do this. I want you to break into two groups and come up with bullets of the conditions you want to create. If you have worked with a logic model at all, conditions are the long term outcomes of your work.
- John – I think its desired conditions for what we want this group to be able to do.
- Steve T. – would if we took one item at a time rather than splitting into two groups.
- Steve L. – we are going to come up with some desired conditions if you were successful of doing this right here, what would the conditions be.
- Steve T. – **fully funded EIP with appropriate adaptive management and engaging all funding partners to support achievement and maintenance of thresholds.**
- John – at some point we are going to have to figure what EIP Advisement means to us on what do we want to do.
- Steve T. – I had an opportunity to look at this structure that is being developed by the TIE Steering Committee and the EIP framework. Perhaps at our next session we get a presentation on that.
- Linda – we are getting input from a lot of the entities now but this is the time to come here and present the concept and grab that input.
- Steve L. – do you believe that partners have presently do they feel they are completely engaged.
- Suzanne – speaking from the Tribe's point of view, no.

- Steve L. – what would describe engaged partners.
- Suzanne – communication is key.
- Steve L. – what we want to do is at some point in the future be able to question the partners and say how would you rate this on a scale and is there a free flow of communication. What we are going to come up with eventually is how we get to that point.
- Steve T. – the free flow of communication is we are all interacting at some level. If there are ways we have communication and liaison going back between the different groups, than I don't have to be at every meeting.
- Linda – that's what this implementation framework is as well as the EIP framework and there is complete integration of LTFAC and others for that purpose.
- Steve L. – would this be a descriptor, **All Partner Voices are Heard and Influence Outcomes**.
- Steve T. – we need to give people their own personal invitation to engage at whatever level they want.
- Steve L. – any other things that are desired conditions of engagement.
- Steve T. – transparency. On Michelle's website, people saw the input they actually gave is captured and acknowledged.
- Steve L. – **Partners/People Acknowledge Use of Their Input**.
- Steve L. – what are some desired conditions of this appropriate adaptive management.
- John – a willingness on whoever is doing the actions to commit to that.
- Steve L. – **Partners Commit To & Act on Advised Adaptive Management.**
- Michelle – perhaps this group has a role in compelling appropriate monitoring per expenditure per project.
- Steve T. – in the EIP framework is there some sort of adaptive management cycle in that construct.
- Jeff – it's probably not called out directly as it should be. Linda would know more directly.
- Steve L. – **Monitoring is Held as an Important Critical Component for Adaptive Management. LTFAC is a Champion for Adaptive Management.**
- Steve L. – how would you describe the LTFAC conditions as they are right now?
- Steve T. – what we are struggling with are the mission and the ability to engage.
- Suzanne – is conditions the environment in the room.
- Steve L. – yes, you could describe those as being not free flowing.
- Michelle – dissipate, there are only a third of us here.
- Suzanne – if we are going to have an effective adaptive management program, the various agencies are going to have to feel comfortable being completely honest with us.
- Steve T. – part of the condition is not too many people know that we exist and what we do. Awareness of the forum we provide and to interact with us. We don't want to get involved in the regulatory thing.
- Jeff – the advisory committee itself is a trusted entity.
- Steve L. – **Partners and Community Understands the Purpose and Opportunity to Engage in LTFAC and is Considered a Trusted Entity. LTFAC is Known to Encompass Diverse Representation. Balance and Broad Array of Interests.**
- Steve L. – the attempt of this exercise is to get a handle on your ultimate goal and to put some meat around the ultimate goal. So actions are built from those most important things down. This is your ultimate goal and these are pieces of that ultimate goal. What are the conditions we want to create under engagement and under adaptive management? We are going to transition right now to another question that we said we were going to ask.

To FAC or Not to FAC, that is the question – Steve Lewis

- Steve L. – if this is your ultimate vision and goal for what you want to create is the FAC framework structures the right structure.
- Steve T. – I think we have standing and formal opportunities to be the FAC and I don't want to lose that.
- Jeff – the charter has to acknowledge in a very formal sense but the grey space between the charters, I don't think it matters particularly now without having SNPLMA process that was overriding and required.
- Steve T. – I would hate to give up our roots just because a lot of blood, sweat and tears went into creating the roots.
- Jeff – you couldn't ask a group to formally make a recommendation that was then reviewed by our Regional Executives and made a decision upon without a charter.
- Steve T. – to the extent this group has any opportunities to look at monies from SNPLMA that roll back it seems like we should keep that ability.
- Bob – we should be reviewing the monies on a regular basis.
- Linda – this description of more engagement in the community and using this technology, that's exactly what the Administration is looking for with federal advisory committees. This is a great opportunity to really take the time now to reformulate this to start engineer how to do that.
- Bob – if we have to reinvent ourselves, we don't want to wait until February 2013, we want to start now.
- Jeff – we have intentions to start putting charter packages together right after the holidays.
- Steve T. – if we can't be official, we need to make some mechanism to be official by some empowerment for those in between times.
- Steve L. – it sounds like yes, continue under the charter. Tighten the language up just a little bit. It's sufficiently grey right now to allow you to be flexible. It's not inhibiting any particular actions you would like to take.

Actions – Steve Lewis

- Steve L. – I would like to break into a couple of groups where one group considers these desired conditions you want to take and come up with some actions over the next six months. To think of these as agenda items. The other group works on this adaptive management piece. A worksheet was handed out to each group.
- Jeff – there were a couple of key things that came forward. This idea the LTFAC needs to know this EIP advisement and figure that out and the concept of how does it fit within the framework with TIE Steering.
- Steve L. – how do you propose we talk about that in the action strategy?
- John – we just come up with some big issues where we all could take it home to think about a plan to be set up.
- Steve L. – think of the goal as what you hope to accomplish in one or two meetings.
- John – our group came up with the following on EIP Advisement. The funding is a part of the advisement.
    - Fiscal responsibility.
    - Budgets. What budgets do we have now?
    - Accomplishments. Projects that have been done. What's the performance and actual improvements?
    - Collective funding. It's not just the Feds, it's everybody else. Do we have a sense of what the bigger pot is?

    - How much do we need to fully implement the EIP?
    - How are the priorities determined for funding?
    - Strategy if they go to DC, Sacramento, or Carson City
- John – they barely got into the Adaptive Management but came up with the following.
    - What does it look like?
    - How do we ensure that it's done?
- Steve T. – our group focused on future agenda items for the next three to four months in terms of things from the outcome of today.
    - Presentation from the TIE EIP framework group that includes this annual plan of work which also includes budgets. We would have interactive discussion. This will probably be just one meeting. Linda will do all the EIP pre-work.
    - Discussion on tweaks to the description of duties in the charter. Strategically moving the words around.
    - Get a report from the Tribe on the status of the presidential commitments that were made to the Tribe. Are there things committed that haven't been done and if so, what are they? How to engage with the Tribe?
    - Engaging the contemporary communications technologies. Strategies and tools. Linda – it's not just LTFAC but it's the whole partnership that has to do the same thing.
    - Opportunity to reengage with the TREX after the next few months. Jeff – this was mentioned in a call a couple of days ago both about the framework coming forward but I also mentioned that the FAC's a vision process. Linda – that's what needs to be coordinated with the TIE because it may be timing wise we want the broader EIP working group.
- John – in one of the meetings we should flush out with everybody what the term EIP Advisement means.
- Steve T. – the second meeting when we talk about tweaks to the charter might be a continuation of the discussion.
- Steve L. – do you believe that we established a new vision for LTFAC, identified priorities, and have determined some action strategies.
- Steve T. – my goal, as chair, is to make sure everybody on the committee get the full picture of what was discussed today and the opportunity to comment on it.

Adjourned at 3:08 p.m.

Minutes certified by LTFAC Chairman Steve Teshara

*_/s/Steve Teshara_* _____ _2/23/12_____
Signature Date