



Lake Tahoe

Federal Advisory Committee

Final Meeting Minutes
Thursday, February 9, 2012
9 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA)
128 Market Street, Stateline, NV 89449

Attendees:

- Joanne Marchetta, John Reuter, Bob Anderson, Peter Kraatz, Patrick Wright, Suzanne Garcia, John Falk, Ann Nichols, Doug Martin, John Pang, Mark Novak, Bob Cook, Jim Lawrence, Michelle Sweeney.

Designated Federal Official (DFO)

- Nancy Gibson

Chairman

- Steve Teshara

Agency Representatives

- Linda Lind, Arla Hains, USFS; Karin Edwards, CTC, TRPA; Robert Gregg, NSL; Kristi Boosman, Jeff Cowan, Julie Regan, Jeanne McNamara, TRPA; Woody Loftis, NRCS; Myrnie Mayville, BOR; Katie Huff, USACE, , Jack Landy, EPA; Maureen McCarthy, TSC

Public

- Bill Boosman

Call to Order - Steve

- Steve called the meeting to order and asked the Lake Tahoe Federal Advisory Committee (LTFAC) to introduce themselves. He welcomed Nancy Gibson.

- Nancy – welcome and thanks to everyone for your time spent at the last meeting and working through the visioning. We are excited about the LTFAC evolution. We appreciate what the LTFAC does and I am very pleased to be here.

Steve reviewed the agenda. There were no additions or corrections.

Update on the Forest Service (FS) plan of action for LTFAC re-chartering - Nancy

- The current charter is good through February 2013. We recognize it takes a while to get through the re-chartering process. A lot needs to be done on the front end so we can start outreach efforts in April. Once again, we will need to have a well-rounded committee. Recruitment notices will go out in June for a 30-day process. By July, the Lake Tahoe Basin Executive Committee (LTBEC) will have a role in evaluating the applicants. In the early part of August, we will have a package together for the Secretary of Agriculture for authorization. We encourage diversity. There is lots of enthusiasm now; we want that to go forward. With a formal packet to the Secretary in August, I am confident that positions will be sanctioned by February 2013.
- Bob A. – I admire your optimism. I have seen the re-chartering process go very slowly.
- Steve T. – the Washington DC administration was new during the last re-charter. That's not the case this time around. The FS is starting early to address any issues as soon as possible to keep the re-chartering timeline on track.
- Nancy – I've been involved in the past where we didn't have enough people to commit. Starting early will help us get more players and a greater chance the authorization goes through on time.
- Linda – Arla and I will identify groups to outreach. We will be coming to the LTFAC members for outreach effort ideas to get a broad reach into the community.

Presentation on the Tahoe Interagency Executives Steering Committee (TIE SC) – Joanne Marchetta, TRPA

Handouts: EIP Performance Measures list, EIP Implementation Framework. PowerPoint presentation.

- We have an overview presentation that is split into two parts. First is the overview and refresher on the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP). Later is a presentation on the EIP framework. Then we will turn over the discussion to Steve to review the role of LTFAC in the implementation of the EIP.
- On October 2011 the EIP Working Group presented this framework to the TIE SC. The purpose was to document the processes, procedures, protocols, and organizational structure of the EIP. The framework is not meant as a new bureaucracy, we only want to be more transparency and efficiency. It is an important priority.
- Framework handout:

- **Cabinet-level group** – meets annually at the Lake Tahoe Summit. The purpose is to get Tahoe on the national political agenda. They review progress on high level commitments and provide mechanisms for engagement of those commitments.
 - **EIP Regional Executives** – help elevate Basin-wide priorities up through the political decision-making chain.
 - **EIP Working Group** – a staff level working group that provides support to TIE SC. Prepares agendas, analysis, and prework in support of the discussions at the TIE SC meetings. They are responsible for keeping executives informed of issues needing attention. Implements the annual plan of work for the EIP.
 - **Purple boxes** (on handout) - are different EIP working groups. They develop charter and funding plans and own core prioritization. They report to TIE SC and may give them recommendations. Some of the working groups have not been formed yet.
 - **Tahoe Interagency Executives** – 30 local managers. Multiple levels of representation. Should be meeting annually.
 - **TIE SC** – formed in 2006 to allow TIE to operate and function better. Provides strategic direction for EIP decision-making. Provides overall leadership and direction to EIP across different agencies and groups.
 - **Stakeholder Advisory Groups** – includes LTFAC and Lake Tahoe Partnership (LTP).
- Steve – from our strategic session last November we came up with a LTFAC vision. Steve read the vision. Is the vision consistent with our charter? Questions about the structure?
 - John R. – the first line - adaptive management has never been specified before. What level of thought has been given to adaptive management? Who is responsible? What role do we play?
 - Joanne – multiple mechanisms already exist for learning as we go. The system is built into the EIP. The annual report includes status and trend, and EIP accomplishment. What are the areas where we are falling down? In the ongoing system, we need to look at annual priorities.
 - Jim – we have some sort of adaptive management (AM) through the EIP, and for checking in and adjusting authorities. For a robust need, research questions are asked and answered. We are having problems putting projects on the ground, instead of having money for asking science questions. This committee could ask the question of how much AM we need given the money we have. Where is our best investment? A comment on the framework, from a Nevada perspective, we are smaller and still trying to figure out where to plug staff resources into boxes. A lot of this we are already doing. The single most important thing is to recognize our great partnership in the Basin. It is successful. We have the ability to recognize the differences of partners as a strength. It is an informative structure where certain autonomies need to remain. We answer to other bodies and our legislature. We all need to recognize this.
 - Ann – in terms of the authorized Nevada State Bond Sales for Tahoe EIP Round 2 funding –is it going to happen? LTP – who are they, who decides who is in that partnership?
 - Jim – it is a challenge. We were fortunate to get \$100M authorized in 2009. It is a crafted bill. The treasurer said money fits in with an affordability matrix. During last legislative session, there was not enough for further bond sales. The Tahoe EIP is not the only need depending on general

obligation bonds. We need to articulate that Lake Tahoe needs to be part of bond sales as soon as possible.

- Steve – LTP – in the late 1980's, this network of advocates was previously known as the Lake Transportation and Water Quality Coalition, originally the Tahoe Transportation Coalition. It was an effort to work with a broad spectrum of people. Transportation was one area in which everyone could reach agreement on priorities. Several organizations have mechanisms for advocacy, and it became clear that Tahoe's message was not coordinated. The Coalition took that role on. All had the same talking points when taking advocacy trips. We make a lot of progress doing that. We had a list of things to do guided by Presidential deliverables and the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (LTRA). We weighed in on the Implementation Agreement for the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act (SNPLMA). We worked with agencies to see they had a flow of funds. Currently some vital federal transportation programs are also on the chopping block. As one example, many organizations around the country are busy trying to preserve money for bike trails, etc. For LTRA reauthorization, there are also challenges. The advocacy network includes folks in the ski and resort industry, organizations, and non-profits. It is an ad hoc network, not a formal group.
- Ann – I've seen what happens, the confusion when the group gets up and speaks.
- Steve – we have agreement on issues and focus on those areas. Where people in the network can't agree, those issues are not pursued.
- Bob A. – I have a question on the 33 performance measures – how robust is this program and how effective?
- Joanne – in the spirit that you can't measure everything, we have created systems for ourselves that we can't always implement. This was whittled down from 108 measures. There is reporting on each one of the 33. We had to roll out in increments starting two years ago. The EIP database that has been built and information is there.
- Linda – the evolution of whittling down to 33 performance measures and defining the measures across the agencies would be another presentation. We can go over the annual report and give you history and evolution. **Future meeting topic.**
- Steve – is the TIIMS database the platform for all or some EIP reporting?
- Linda – yes. We are doing a larger scale analysis of TIIMS and EIP to make sure it is doing what it should do.
- Jack – TIIMS was developed before the EIP database. SNPLMA funds for TIIMS are on the development side, we are still in prototype form to evolve and integrate into TIIMS. The approach is to develop an approach and strategic plan including discussion on how the EIP database can be integrated and publically accessible.
- John R. – where do you want to get to?
- Jeanne M. – we will look every year at that list and see what we need to add. Information is in the TRPA four-page report. We are looking how to integrate with Shane Rosmos and TRPA's measurement program and EIP.
- Julie R. – from the previous system of EIP, the biggest challenge is to tell the global story to those who fund projects. Forest fuels – are we counting acreage the same way as FS etc. With no

robust systems in place, we need to spell out exactly what is in the performance measures. Our vision is to take information into the public arena so the public can go on-line and look at projects they see in TIIMS.

- Bob A. – it is a list of activities, really. You need to get results from them but that is a subject for another time.
- Michelle – we are wildly at different levels of development. It is a huge relief that this list exists. Four years ago we couldn't even discuss these. That is the reason why I was adamant we add that line to the SNPLMA package. I wanted those receiving money to be compelled to take the next step.
- John R. – this list interacts with the LTFAC vision. I think the development of this list is a huge accomplishment. I request that LTFAC get periodic updates.
- Steve – we can be a community based sounding board for EIP and data reporting before a report is completed.
- Peter – this group has always struggled how best to determine the highest priority projects. There is work to be done on the ground in the science world on what are the best products. We all have pet projects, we have tried to come together each round. We need to say to leaders what the best projects are for the available funding.
- Patrick – our congressional delegation (Feinstein) was skeptical and forced us to list the highest priority projects in LTRA. We need to focus limited dollars on priorities. This list is a one-page snapshot. It doesn't begin to describe. As agencies, we need to go back and develop a mini briefing document on the issue on how we are measuring success. I know that's what the annual report is supposed to do. You need stakeholder input to make sure it is something that resonates.
- Steve – it provides value of what we have to offer – LTFAC is a “rehearsal stage”.
- Suzanne – in the foundational documents for the partnership, language was included to protect the Washoe Tribe's cultural uses. I would like to see Tribe's cultural uses worked into the performance measures. What the Tribe has to offer is not tapped at the Basin. The Tribe needs to be included as much as possible. We would be happy to sit down with everybody to describe where leadership time is best spent to make sure this happens.
- John F. – item 23 would flush out the Tribe's interests.
- Suzanne – it underlays every project on here. Every time you move ground you affect the Tribe.
- John R. – can you do a presentation to help us?
- Suzanne – we can't talk about sites in a public meeting. Resources get stolen.
- Steve – I anticipate inviting the Tribal leadership to speak to us. **Future agenda topic.**
- Suzanne – the vice chairman wanted to be here today, but had other obligations.
- Bob A. – on the chart – the TIE and TIE SC – who is on the SC and how does it work? How active is it?
- Joanne – the TIE SC was formulated to represent the EIP. Patrick represents California and Jim represents Nevada. Also included is Suzanne for the Washoe Tribe, the Forest Service as the Federal representative, and El Dorado County as the local government representative.
- Bob A. – if we issue advice who receives it?

- Steve – good points for another meeting. **Future agenda item.**
- Steve –we will talk about more details at our next meeting. Linda can share some things with us. We will still look at dates and Bob Anderson’s proposed edits to the LTFAC Vision. We still want to discuss our charter and solicit public comment in the next hour. Anything else to bring up?
- John R. – will we have an opportunity to blend our vision with this framework?
- Steve –yes, I’d like to bring up TIIMS. There has been some confusion in the past about where our priorities are with TIIMS. As a member of the Tahoe Fuels and Fire Team (TFFT), Patrick works a lot with TIIMS, it shows value as a data platform. A Request for Proposal (RFP) is going out and we hope to hear about that. **Agenda item.** Currently you can look at TIIMS for fuels information including acres, and partners in a project etc. It can be a great tool. Any other comments?
- Bob A. – for edits to the vision: I was not in the meeting so I looked at it with fresh eyes and maybe improved it. I could tell it was written by a committee. I made some significant edits including a reorder of sentences, but principally achieving environmental thresholds is the most important thing. Some of the ways we go about that – adaptive management etc. I put these before you for consideration.
- Joanne – thresholds are important but they alone will not meet our needs.
- John F. – I appreciate your attempts to edit since I also missed last meeting. I like the draft the way it is. It couches the committee’s objectives in a broader fashion. It is more than the sum of the Compact. I like the idea that we are not boiled down to a particular objective. What makes this group function is the diversity of interests and facilitated outreach that informs those making decisions in the Basin.
- Bob C. – I like the way it reads. On AM – does that include fiduciary commitment?
- Patrick – real AM is applying hypothesis to data and adjusting to meet target. Very few places that do true AM because it is too hard politically. I don’t want to imply that we are there. The Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) is a step in that direction but is not structured as AM. Don’t get carried away that we are doing something we are not.
- John R. – I like the way it is stated there. It helps define what we’re doing down the road. The problem I’ve had with it is that everybody says it and nobody knows what it is. The fiduciary part is overstepping the AM line. Whether a project is giving us the most “bang for the buck” goes to the other group armed with the results.
- Bob C. – it gives us the ability to be flexible. We need to be able to roll with it and continue on and improve it. We want fiduciary responsibility somehow.
- Steve –it is important but not necessarily part of AM.
- Suzanne – fiduciary responsibility is important, but does it belong in a vision statement?
- Steve – we are making sure to underscore the importance of the responsibility.
- Bob A. – I don’t think I went far enough in editing. The mission stated in the charter is different. It doesn’t measure up to my standards.
- Steve –that is an important concept for discussion – Tahoe is an intersection of legislation to tie to the Compact. Can you think of other ways to connect?

- John R. – I'm not concerned with word smithing – how does this vision fit into what we heard from Joanne? LTFAC would like to be a bunch of things. From the chart it looks like we are advisors. We need a vision statement that reflects reality on the ground. What would the other groups like to see us do? We don't want a vision statement in conflict. It is all good but not specific enough to give us direction to where we want to go. We need to get TIE to tell us what they want, come up with lists and horse trade.
- Steve – bringing the draft Vision back gives us additional time to think about it. We can ask TIE to think about it too. I spoke with FS leadership and LTFAC needs to strengthen its service in the national interest so as to not be on the termination list.
- Joanne – in partial response to the question – the Basin suffers from process paralysis. LTFAC has existed for a number of years and functions very well on decision-making on EIP project priorities. My perspective –we need public input into that EIP decision-making framework. This body exists and knows how to function that way and is an elegant way to get stakeholder input. It's that simple. Let's not try to overthink it.
- Patrick – rather than having conversations on AM, we have a priority list to put together. We need input. A companion piece to the framework is the annual cycle. We need to see where this plugs in. We need to make sure we have buy in for making continued public investments in Tahoe.
- John F. – a key component of our value is the evolving model of public/private participation. Input going in and out makes this a strategically important FAC.
- Steve – on the next agenda we need to get more information out on the process of EIP decision making and opportunities for input. We need to come back and make sure our vision is appropriate. We will take edits and at the next meeting get more details. **Action item.** Can we have a vision and mission? We are a representative body of many sectors, we need to utilize that. We can invite others to speak to us on EIP issues.
- Suzanne – we need a flow chart of our decision-making process.
- Linda – the EIP working group has that for you.

LTFAC Charter – Steve

- As a group we looked at the LTFAC charter in November and felt good about it. I wanted to provide this opportunity for any member to make further comments.
- No additional comments by the group.
- Steve –if there is a gap period when between charters, our administrative support is not the responsibility of the FS. EIP partners could volunteer.

Agenda Items for Upcoming Meetings – Steve

- AM – what does that look like?
- Review the Presidential Commitments to the Tribe.
- Communications tool – how does LTFAC communicate to the public?
- More general public participation by using LTFAC to communicate to the partnership.

