



Lake Tahoe

Federal Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes
 Wednesday, January 21, 2009, 1:00 to 5:00 p.m.
 Sierra Nevada College
 Tahoe Center for Environmental Sciences, room 141
 Incline Village, NV

Attendees:

LTFAC

- Colleen Shade, Rochelle Nason, Dave Childs, Michelle Sweeney, Steve Teshara, Alonzo Rusk, Michael Berg, John Pang, Gregory McKay, Bob Anderson, Mark Kimbrough, Jim Thomas, Jim Lawrence, Peter Kraatz, Patrick Wright, Andrew Bray, Chairman Waldo Walker, John Singlaub

LTFAC Chairman:

- Andrew Strain

Designated Federal Official (DFO):

- Terri Marceron

Other Representatives:

- Julie Reagan, Paul Nielsen, John Hitchcock, TRPA; Steve Chilton, FWS; Duncan Leao, Richard Vacirca, Pam Robinson, Linda Lind, Arla Hains, USFS; Jack Landy, Jovita Pajarillo, EPA; Myrnie Mayville, BOR; Phil Brozek, USACE; Carl Hasty, TTD; Jonathan Adams, PSW, Zach Hymanson, TSC

Members of the Public:

- Dan Potash

Welcome, Introductions, Approval of Preview Minutes and Review of Agenda – Andrew:

- Andrew welcomed the committee. Arla gave the role call.

Review of Minutes from 11/06/09

- Rochelle Nason – (page 2 bottom) this is the opposite of what I said so I would like it deleted or make a suggestion on how to change the text.
- Andrew – page 6 top of page – should be “rebuild the dam”.
- John S. – motion to accept the minutes with corrections.

- Chairman Walker – seconded.
- The minutes were approved. Two committee members abstained from the vote.
- Rochelle – I ask that the minutes be circulated again with the changes.

Post Angora Fire Restoration – Duncan Leao, Richard Vacirca:

Handout – Angora Fire Restoration Project

- Jim – where is material moving to from the site?
- Duncan – the majority will be biomass and will go to Carson City or Loyalton, Nevada.
- Bob – the conifers you are planting, do they have resistance?
- Duncan – they are Jeffrey Pine, a native Nevada stock. The majority of selected tree species are native.
- Bob – will you monitor to see how it turns out?
- Duncan – normally we plant in intervals of three and six years. Mortality is monitored.
- Rochelle – has the Forest Service (FS) or California Tahoe Conservancy (CTC) acquired land in the area – retiring SEZs?
- Richard Vacirca – there has been no land purchase.
- Rochelle – SEZ lots are now vacant lots because of the fire, they are desirable for SEZ repair.
- John S. – it is sensitive to approach those owners. It is very political.
- Terri – sellers come to us and to my knowledge none are interested in selling to the FS.
- Rochelle – there is no active program for retiring the vacant SEZ parcels? It should be a priority.
- Patrick – it is a very small number (1/2 dozen). **Action item:** I will check on the number and bring it back to the LTFAC.
- Peter K. – owners think the lots may be buildable down the road.
- Rochelle – it might open up an opportunity especially with the collapse in prices it is an opportunity to get SEZ lots retired.
- Andrew – we can have this be a future agenda topic.
- Peter K. – where does the funding come from for this effort?
- Duncan – funding is from various sources depending on the part of proposal. Funding for fuels work is through the FS.
- Richard – channel restoration projects were identified for Round 11 SNPLMA. In Round 10 we are looking at funding for the Gardner Mountain Meadow piece. The noxious weed piece and roads and trails are funded with future appropriated dollars.
- Andrew – will the project be on the ground in 2009?
- Duncan – we are finishing off hazard tree removal from roads and trails. Urban lot areas are being reforested. On Public Stewardship Day for we are looking at planting 130 acres.
- Andrew – length to complete?
- Richard Vacirca – 2015.

- Rochelle – it would be good to know how much was spent on pre-fire activity in the area. That way we would know after the fact whether funding was spent the best way it could have been.
- Michelle – regarding noxious weeds – when is that part scheduled?
- Terri – we will be treating weeds this summer.

Committee Operations – Andrew Strain

Handout: Operation Memo

- Andrew - in the past we used a working group to work on SNPLMA, their role is spelled out in the Implementation Agreement (IA). It is now time for LTFAC to launch the TWG to work on SNPLMA. To follow department regulations, we want to make it a formal action.

Handout: SNPLMA Process Flow Chart

- Looking at the flow chart - the nomination process has come and gone. We are done with the first line and now go to second line on the chart. The working group needs to get together this month to stay on track with this schedule.
- John S. – move to approve the Committee Operations.
- Seconded by John Pang

Consensus Gauge – by show of hands:

1. – Yes and I support it - 12
 2. – Acceptable and I support it - 5
 3. – Can live with it and I support it - 1
 4. – Willing to step aside and I support it – 0
 5. – Willing to step aside – do not support it – won't block it - 0
 6. – Blocking, don't support it (must give an option instead) - 0
 7. – Need more information - 0
- One committee member was out of room for the vote – Lon Rusk.
 - Andrew - there are binders containing the Round 10 projects assembled and available for the TWG. Project nominations are also posted on the LTFAC website.
 - The TWG will be headed up by two people as co-chairs, one member from LTFAC and one member from LTBEAC.
 - Rochelle – so Steve Teshara is not eligible to chair the committee?
 - Steve – that is correct.
 - Rochelle – I have a campaign statement – if elected to chairperson, I would ask Steve Teshara to join me in this activity. He has served well before. It is an unfortunate failure of the system he was excluded. No disrespect to Andrew. Steve and I would chair the TWG well.

Round 10 Status and Calendar Update – Terri:

- The Tahoe Regional Executive Committee (TRES) met in early December and directed the Partnership Coordination Team (PCT) to produce one package for SNPLMA Round 10 (both science and capital) to total between \$25-28M. The TRES is looking at the long term SNPLMA budget situation.
- The LTFAC can put forward several packages. PCT was given specific instructions for one package of \$25 to \$28M. The total number of projects were

24 for a total of \$40M. The Tahoe Science Consortium (TSC) will review the capital projects for the monitoring effort. The projects will be released today on the LTFAC/SNPLMA website. You have the ability to look at the projects. The PCT recommendation will go to TSC and TWG directly.

At their first meeting they will receive a notebook of Round 10 nominations and other information the PCT used to make their recommendation. Any LTFAC members that wish to attend TWG meetings are welcome. If any FAC members want a book of Round 10 nominations let Arla know.

Calendar – Terri

- LTFAC – Feb 17, South Shore, 1 p.m.
- TWG – Feb 3, South Shore, 2-4
- Rochelle – if the meeting is purely informational why not make it just a conference call?
- Steve T. – any member can call in to an in-person meeting.

Public Comment

- None

Science Update:

Handout: PowerPoint presentation – Zach Hymanson, Jonathan Long

Zach – Brief overview on four subjects

- Status of science projects approved in Round 7, 8
- Status of Round 9 science proposal review
- Overview of new science resources available
 - Finalized Tahoe Science Plan available at www.tahoescience.org
 - Literature review and on-line bibliography (www.tiims.org) on the effects of fuel reduction treatments (in review)
 - Initiated Regional Stormwater Monitoring Plan (RSWMP)
 - Monitoring protocols for forest management in sensitive areas (draft in review) **Action item:** Zach will email the draft to Arla to disperse to LTFAC.
- Upcoming science meetings
 - Climate change symposium March 17-18
 - Fall 2009: Water Quality Modeling Workshop
 - March 2010: Biennial Lake Tahoe Science conference
- Andrew – we will not have a climate change agenda item for FAC. We encourage members to go to the symposium.

Monitoring protocol:

- Rochelle – I am not hearing that everyone is buying into the same monitoring protocols.
- Terri – the FS is looking at everything being produced for site applicability.
- Rochelle – are we spending well if the FS is not using the protocols?
- Terri – we are engaged.
- Terri – the FS will frame protocols that are useful. We will look at, reference, and note these on the scope of the projects.

- Zach – smaller groups don't have the internal infrastructure so we hope those groups will use the protocols. TSC can't force agencies to accept the protocols. We had meetings that included all agencies and asked what would help them.
- Rochelle – in terms of developing information I don't understand why there is a difference of opinion on different monitoring protocols. Is PSW not involved?
- Zach – there was a reviewer from PSW.
- Andrew – we need to keep moving on the agenda. We will add this to our topic list.
- Greg – I am comfortable with the representation.
- John P. – monitoring can be interpreted differently.
- Rochelle – the dispute never comes to an end.
- John P. – not one gold standard.
- Steve – LTFAC needs to read the document.
- Jonathan – we have summarized by project area the status of science projects approved in Round 7, 8. Project areas:
 - Fires and Fuels Projects
 - Conserving Special Communities and Wildlife
 - Air Quality
 - Water Quality Modeling
 - Pollutant Reduction
 - Stream Restoration
 - Lake Quality
 - Climate Change
- More information is at the PSW website:
<http://www.fs.fed.us/psw/partnerships/tahoescience/>
- Jonathan is taking a new position with the Nature Conservancy in Sacramento.
- Rochelle – as an advisory committee to the Secretary of Agriculture – I think it would behoove us if we want to see a unified protocol for monitoring, that the FS tell us at next meeting what they would need to get shoulder to shoulder with TRPA. At a minimum reach an agreement on what monitoring principals should look like. What does the FS want to see before we work on something with the Secretary? What parts of the draft does not work for them?
- Andrew – there will be a reading assignment for this group. Zach and Arla will email out the mentoring protocols to LTFAC.
- Rochelle – I propose writing to the Secretary of Agriculture to tell the FS to use this document. We need to hear from the FS why it does not work for them.
- Andrew – it can be part of the agenda but we need the prework to educate ourselves.
- Rochelle – ask Terri to tell us what is not workable for the FS about this document before we make any recommendation. If it is not good science, we shouldn't be putting money into it.
- Andrew – who is the right person to lead the discussion of the document?
- Zach – myself and Mark Walker for nuts and bolts.
- Andrew – let me work with Terri (DFO) for sequencing.
- Coleen – it is not just the FS technical staff reviewing these. It will be used within the Basin to collaborate. There are other implementing agencies.

- Zach – that is part of review process we are in now.
- Coleen – part of discussion should be other implementators that can't use the information.
- Rochelle – I'm only hearing the FS can't use this science.
- Andrew – let us figure how to move through the process and bring back to the LTFAC.

Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (LTRA) – Dan Potash:

Where we are with LTRA?

- Andrew – the LTRA was to last 10 years and went into effect in 2002. Senator Feinstein asked Tahoe representatives to start the renewal process. We are still in the idea stage in some areas, but more final stages in other areas. LTRA will move through Congress this year to be voted on as soon as it is ready.
- Dan – as Andrew pointed out we really don't have the luxury of time. We have pressure to act now. It is shaping up to an eight year long authorization period. The target is \$300M. With the new LTRA we will have to be as specific as possible with project authorizations to take to the appropriations committees and ask for funding. A priority project list has been submitted by the agencies. There is a prioritization process within the bill. Projects we don't know about today but clearly need to be done, will be part of the prioritization process in future years. There are a handful of agencies authorized in the bill including the FS, Fish & Wildlife Service, Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Transportation and the Army Corps of Engineers. In response to pressure from Feinstein there will be a reporting process. Other issues for the LTRA: the SEZ restoration program, FS attainment of thresholds, the designation of the Basin, all are still being discussed.
- Rochelle –Coalition meetings are open to anyone here.
- Dan – if you have issues bring them up so we can take care of them.

Status and update of the Two Basin Plans:

LTBMU Forest Plan Revision – Bob King

Handout: Power Point presentation: Forest Plan Revision.

- The Forest Plan is a primary guiding strategic document for management of resources and uses on a national forest. The Plan focuses on achieving desired conditions within a framework for contributions to ecological, social and economic sustainability.

Areas Bob reviewed in the PowerPoint:

- Key Laws, Regulations and Policies
- The Revision Approach
- The 2008 Planning Rule
- The Forest Plan Structure
- LTBMU Forest Plan Contributions to Sustainability
- The Forest Plan Revision Timeline
- Key Pathway Input
- Public Participation Fall 2008

- Public Workshops

TRPA Regional Plan Update - John Hitchcock:

- Why are we updating our regional plan package?
 - Because new science informed us we needed to update our practices.
 - We went out and met with local communities on what the new plan needs to incorporate.
 - We developed a vision statement and desired conditions.
- The results –
 - We need to integrate TMDL into our regional plan.
 - We need to change the thresholds.
 - We need to incorporate new desired conditions into goals and the policy document.
 - Amend and update a small suite of threshold standards.
 - Drop the desired conditions term and use “goals”.
 - Add a new transect system for planning. Not every community in the Basin is the same, we need to plan for that.
 - Update our code of ordinances and streamline.
 - Bring in a new concept for form-based coding.
 - Looking to create consistency between plans in the system including the FS and local jurisdictions where appropriate.

Key issues:

- Continue to concentrate on the urban core.
- Encourage pedestrian transit and less reliance on the automobile.
- Integrate Lake Tahoe Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) into our plan. We are looking to also include climate change and greenhouse gases. We are scheduling a consultant to do the project description. We will be ready for public release the end of February. We will start on the five-month EIP analysis and are scheduled to release the draft in the fall. Board action will be spring 2010.
- Greg – the chiefs in the Basin sent you a letter, they want you to have a dialogue with them.
- John H. – I am waiting for a call from Chief Reuben to discuss.

Public comment –

- There was no public comment.

Logistics and Review – Andrew:

- Upcoming agenda items - Angora Fire purchases of land, monitoring protocol draft paper, LTRA update, Adaptive Management System – TIIMS update.
- Andrew – we cancelled the last meeting in December due to weather. Since this is a volunteer organization we don’t want to put you in peril. We hope the cancellation process worked for each of you.
- Terri – most agenda items were information only – that was part of the decision. We made many calls around the Basin to check on conditions. Those reports were not good. The weather became worst than predicted.
- Rochelle – if the local school district has a snow day, we should have one.

- John P. – the school district calls them too easy.
- Rochelle – we would have known earlier.

Round Robin

- Jim Lawrence – the Nevada legislature starts February 2. They are proposing Assembly Bill 18 that would recommit Nevada to Lake Tahoe.
- Patrick – the State of California is out of money and our projects are shut down. We now have a three-day weekend every month that is unpaid.
- Rochelle – if you want to work on advocacy get in touch with the Coalition.
- Steve – there is very little stimulus money for infrastructure.
- John P. – we received a grant from the FS for \$6.234M for fire agencies in the Basin
- John S. – TRPA is having budget struggles including one furlough day per month. Two MOUs from the Fire Commission were signed and finalized.
- Terri – The Secretary of the Interior approved the funding that was held back until the MOUs were completed.
- Terri – **Action item:** Please turn your TWG Chairman nomination forms into Arla today.

Adjourned 4:18 p.m.

Minutes certified by LTFAC Chairman Andrew Strain

/s/Andrew Strain

3/21/09

Signature

Date