



Lake Tahoe

Federal Advisory Committee

Final Meeting Minutes

March 31, 2011

USFS Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit

35 College Drive, South Lake Tahoe

Emerald Bay Conference Room – 10 a.m. to 4 p.m.

Attendees:

- Peter Kraatz, Patrick Wright, Joanne Marchetta, Doug Martin, Steve Teshara, John Reuter, Suzanne Garcia, Bob Cook, Mark Novak, Michelle Sweeney, Heather Bacon, Lisa Foley, Steve Teshara, John Pang, Natalie Yanish, Ann Nichols, Rochelle Nason (via conference call)

Designated Federal Official (DFO):

- Jeff Marsolais

Agency Representatives:

- Steve Chilton, Jill Ralston, Lisa Heki, USFWS; Tim Rowe, USGS; Linda Lind, Arla Hains, Brian Bartlett, Sue Norman, USFS; Zach Hymanson, TSC; Jeanne McNamara, TRPA; Harold Singer, Hannah Schembri, Lahontan; Myrnie Mayville, USBR; Jack Landy, Jovita Parajillo, USEPA (via conference call); Woody Loftis, NRCS; Russ Wigart, Eldorado County; Katie Huff, USACE; Robert Gregg, NDSL; Dave Roberts. RCD

Members of the Public:

- Dylan Zigens

Welcome and Introductions – Jeff Marsolais

- We will start with a safety moment. Emergency exits are posted. Convene in the parking lot if there is an issue. We have been struggling with slips on ice. We practice the penguin walk since we have had people injured. Please keep an eye out for ice. Logistics – restrooms are in the lobby. Coffee is available in the lunchroom.
- I will discuss the selection of a chairperson. That person will play a prominent role in chairing this group with condensed timelines for the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act (SNPLMA). Tim Rowe and Peter Kraatz co-chaired the Tahoe Working Group (TWG). They helped us through scaling the projects. We have some presentations today and if we can get to a preliminary recommendation list today, that would be good, otherwise we have an April 6

meeting to follow-up. The LTFAC Chairperson will have a lot of work to do. It is important as we transition from the SNPLMA process to how we want to work together after SNPLMA. We are not going to get a chairperson today. We are still getting to know each other. I would like those interested to speak a few minutes on why they are interested.

- Michelle – this is my second time on the committee. I observed during the first round and am now ready to step up. I am very motivated. I respect the experience that exists on this committee.
- Bob – I served in elected offices for 20 years, I serve on seven currently. I have a lot of experience and knowledge in that area. I have no experience as far as LTFAC. Michelle would make a good chair.
- Jeff – there are others that are not here but that hinted they would consider it. I want us as a group to think about the establishment of the chairperson. Those who have been on the committee for a while – does anyone have comments on a chairperson? I see the chairperson helping us do different things in bringing funding to the Basin. Helping re-establish what our role is outside of SNPLMA.
- Steve – I was chairman my first two terms. I spent a lot of time with the Forest Service (FS) staff, and letter writing. The chairman was the designated spokesperson for the group. You need a full scope of understanding of what the committee can do and have the time to commit.
- Joanne – the chair has to be someone willing to put in time as the spokesperson and understand points of view. They should not advance their own agenda, but the point of view of the LTFAC. That can be a challenge.
- Jeff – over the next week, if individual members are thinking about it, let me know. I want to engineer discussion about the chair to be the most meaningful.

SNPLMA Round 12 TWG Recommendation – Peter Kraatz

- Jeff – let's jump into the SNPLMA projects themselves. Peter Kraatz, co-chair of TWG has been asked to share with this group any issues they wrestled with, and key discussions on the TWG side.
- Linda – I met with the new LTFAC members last week to discuss the steps of the Partnership Coordination Team (PCT) and TWG. Each member was given a binder of information. I tried to help those new members with the process.
- Peter – handout: Spreadsheet from TWG meeting of 3/21/11 (includes project scaling). We had to cut a lot of dollars. To get there, no projects were dropped. All were cut or scaled to some degree except four projects. One project was added. We had to go from \$46M to \$34M. All projects were discussed in detail, some more than others, and it took three meetings to get there. As we go through the discussions today, there is always the potential that projects could fall out. As a footnote, we noted three projects that could come in if any projects fall out. Look at project #20, that project would go up \$100K. Project #3 would come back to \$1.58M. The third - #6 would go back to \$1.25M. A footnote, this is not a formal secondary list. This spreadsheet shows we are ready to spend the full amount.
- Linda – the process changed a little this year, usually the PCT does the initial review process and a scaling of projects. They didn't this year. That's why TWG took three meetings. Project #24 and #25 came in from NRCS. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) was thought to be a better sponsor so they split the proposals. The Upper Truckee River project – Patrick Wright brought it up that it is a high priority project and the Corps might not get funding for the project.

That project did not go through the normal process. I checked with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), they said if TWG felt comfortable, it is up to them to accept a late project.

- Jeff – a lot of last minute things happen during the last round. We did the same process as always but there were late considerations. We made sure we didn't step outside the bounds of the process that was approved. TWG spent a lot of time shoring up the process with BLM. You are looking at a clean process.
- Peter – we are looking again at the potential of getting funding from other sources
- Linda- the executives looked at the criteria and they really wanted to finish projects. Everyone was careful about proposing something new.
- Peter- is it our intent to go through this list now or after lunch?
- Linda – I went through the spreadsheet and then reviewed every project. If during this process you want additional information on any project, let me know. The requests for more information included Area- wide Planning, Lahontan Cutthroat Trout (LCT), and Upper Truckee River Restoration. So what I would like to do is move forward to that. That does not mean we can't have presentations at the meeting on April 6th.
- Jeff- any questions on how we got here on the spreadsheet, please speak up or should we just jump in?
- Linda – we do have the meeting minutes from the TWG meetings available for background.

Lahontan Cutthroat Trout (LCT) presentation – Lisa Heki

- Lisa Heki gave a PowerPoint presentation on LCT. Handout attached.
- Michelle – are there alternative sources for funding for LCT?
- Lisa – hopefully we have established a maintenance strategy for stocking. The Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (LTRA) includes funding for a long term recovery program. The base is stable.
- Bob – can the fish co-exist? Fallen Leaf Lake has a woody habitat, Lake Tahoe doesn't. How significant is that to LCT?
- Lisa – the thermocline gives us a barrier. Once LCT get a certain size, they will be okay. LCT are fish-eaters. They do okay in their own right. I don't know any programs where you can eliminate non-natives. We have a maintenance program where we monitor LCT and Lake Trout. We are not eliminating any species. This time next year we will have a better idea. The LCT have come a long way. We have been gathering information, Lake Tahoe is a bigger system, and we won't know anything until we take a look under the water. We try to keep the community informed as we go, as we gather information, we will use new management strategies to communicate.
- Mark – is hybridization a problem?
- Lisa – yes, it hurts the recovery program. It was manageable in Fallen Leaf. Lake Tahoe will be more complicated.
- John R. – how many years until we know LCT is sustainable without stocking? Should you wait until you know more before planting in Lake Tahoe? Are there risks if we don't know what happens in Fallen Leaf Lake?
- Jeff – for now ask questions about the proposal. Other questions, ask Lisa at lunch.
- Steve – while Tahoe is a big lake, there may be pockets where LCT can survive.
- Heather – for gaming and recreation, has conservation occurred at Lake Tahoe?
- Lisa – we hold annual meetings with CalTrout, and the Eldorado Fish Commission. There are a lot of groups to meet with but we are open to opportunities for more discussion.
- Steve – guide service people should be involved.

- Jeff – we have a natural tendency to have discussion outside of SNPLMA. We can continue to have a dialogue. Any other questions on the proposal?

Area-wide Planning – Jack Landy

- We have included a new name for the project – Community Watershed BMP Strategy. Includes a PowerPoint presentation and two handouts - Placer County Stormwater TMDL Strategy, and Community Based Watershed BMP Strategy Project Formerly the Community Watershed Planning Project.
- Discussions started 3-4 years ago. We have started post SNPLMA funding strategies by identifying a need for a coordinated strategy development, working on a holistic outreach, and the education need.
- Michelle – six watersheds? What’s the priority?
- Dave – the number is four now; we will identify efficiencies and be able to implement more.
- Michelle – do we know the jurisdictions are fired up about using what comes out of this?
- Dave – absolutely. El Dorado County wants to lend support of the proposal. They are behind the concept. There is a lot more work for coordination including outreach. Those we have represented this to have been excited. Harold Singer is here to lend his support.
- Heather – is the Round 11 funding used?
- Dave – we are operating off of Round 9 funding. This fall we will access Round 11, Round 12 after that.
- John P. – are priorities skewed by what communities are receptive to program, instead of the highest priority areas?
- Dave – that could be the case.
- John P. – picking low hanging fruit may not be the best for the Lake.
- Linda – at the recent TWG meetings there were a lot of questions on the local jurisdictions buy-in.
- Peter – the idea was for the jurisdictions to get on board; we looked to elected officials to buy into this with a resolution. We need to put some teeth into this. We are not going to sit back.
- Patrick – this form of the buy in doesn’t matter as much as they are on board over the long term. They are on board as long as someone else pays. You need to integrate into the jurisdictions a long term strategy.
- Doug – that’s exactly the point of the whole project. This is not a pilot. Dan St. John (Washoe County) wants you to know that his goal to include public and private. It is possible to bring in private people, their contribution is a fee, and it is an attainable goal. Dave and I embrace this and support the project transfer to EPA. They are more focused on run off.
- Jeff – that was a good last word on this topic. There will be more debate after lunch. Lahontan will be offering their perspective. Then no more questions.
- Harold – thank you for the opportunity. This is very consistent with the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) moving forward, no conflict. The key concept is the public acceptance. Until we get public to understand what they do effects water clarity, we won’t make progress. This gives us a chance to do that. Flood control wasn’t mentioned, but a lot of work will be effective towards that. People complain about a flooding problem, we need to link that in. It helps public acceptance of the program. As part of TMDL approach, local communities have to identify high watershed load areas. This will help partner programs, it is very important. I see a lot of linkages, details will be worked out. This is clear and consistent with TMDL implementation.
- Jeff – please be back here at 1 p.m. We will discuss the Upper Truckee River project first and then jump into other projects.

Upper Truckee River Restoration project – Sue Norman

PowerPoint presentation. Handout attached.

- Jeff – if this project is funded, money could be funneled into design work on Reach 6 and getting permits. We are completing environmental analysis on two reaches. We are able to put most the money on the ground. The Corps is a major partner; we both have lots of experience. Any questions?
- Mark – looks like a good project. Sue used the term risky – would the project be blown out with a catastrophic event?
- Sue – there is a very low risk. It is designed to make it through big events. The risk is during construction. We will work closely with Lahontan on nailing down BMPS and the capacity we need.
- Jeff – this is not the first of this kind of project. Each time we learn how to attack projects better. Risk now in comparison is a lot lower.
- Sue – the Blackwood project was much harder. We were working in a channel all the time. This project is easier with just a bigger volume of flow.
- Mark – does the fact that the golf course reach is not complete affect this?
- Sue – no.

Round 12 Project Discussion – Jeff

Basin Wide Transit

- Lisa – do you have the rider data we requested?
- Steve went over the ridership data given at the last meeting.
- Bob – can you bring a bike on board?
- Steve – yes. There is limited bike capacity, but yes.
- John P. – we have been lobbying for more bike racks. Is it possible LTFAC could write a letter?
- Natalie – are there fees?
- Steve – yes. Revenue goes into two systems that connect.
- Bob – is there sustainable funding for ongoing operation?
- Steve – we are waiting for reauthorization of the transportation bill, which is one potential funding source.
- Lisa – how is the marketing done?
- Steve – through the existing marketing of transit. There is funding for marketing.

Mobile BMP Implementation on Paved Roadways in the Tahoe Basin

- Linda - Washoe County can't fund operations and maintenance purely. This proposal is getting sediment off the roads and not into the Lake. The depreciation of equipment is in question. The federal entity would have to repay BLM for the value of equipment after five years. We may go with leasing. I did verify with BLM that for Erosion Control Projects local counties can still apply. We need to package the project as getting sediment off the road. The federal portion is 50% so depreciation would not be as big an issue.
- Jeff – the original proposal was five sweepers, it got scaled to two. This had to do with the notion of entities – States had a higher need and are not eligible for the Erosion Control Grants (ECG). The grants require a match that takes depreciation off the table. The project can stand alone. It deals with removing sediment that would go into the Lake, not salaries.
- Bob – is high efficiency the same as regenerative?

- Hannah – we didn't specify so we can get the best cost for the best load reduction.
- Bob – the lease sounds like the way to go.
- Hannah – good question – the purchase price is \$266K, which would last seven years. The lease would cost \$20K more for four years (not seven).
- John R. – under the ECG the counties can apply with match?
- Peter – yes, in kind or cash.
- Hannah – I'm not sure about auctioning after the five years. I don't know how much sweepers are worth after five years. The counties that got scaled – El Dorado, Placer and Douglas do have the opportunity to go through the ECG program. I would like the group to realize that there are others going after ECG money.
- Peter – the project meets TMDL with high efficiency sweepers. There is science to back up the proposal.

Forest Health -

- Aspen Community Restoration – no questions
- Big Meadow Fire Regime – no questions
- All other Forest Health projects:
- Steve – in the TWG process, there was collaboration in agreeing to cut some important projects. We used good logic for changes. We discussed the fact that the congressionals want to see a certain number (\$8M-10M). We tried to stay with that number. I commend Jeff for the right numbers in tough times.
- Peter – projects #3 and #6 (from spreadsheet), we would look to scale back up with other projects falling through.
- Heather – is there opportunity to increase some of these project like Incline?
- Jeff – the process is that the TWG did the original vetting. This body is where the recommendation list is built. I understand there have been changes from this group in the past. We had quite a bit of debate on completing projects. We had to give somewhere. I'm close to the razors edge on what I think the congressionals can live with.
- Patrick – please comment on the pros and cons on #3 and #4. You have two projects instead of getting one done? I don't want to second guess your ability.
- Jeff – Big Meadow vs. Aspen. Both have higher unit average costs – the places are harder to get to. I like to have a few options and by not finishing both gives me two stories. Better shot to get partial funding to complete than putting all the eggs in one basket. The FS has received reduced appropriated funds because of SNPLMA. I am trying to re-insert the Basin back into appropriated budget. Getting to the high risk stands of Aspen is very important. I will be back asking for help to get funding. We would like to see all projects complete.
- Jim - this is the last guaranteed round of funding. We should look at completing projects in the SNPLMA process. We should be able to say that. It's a balancing act.
- Jeff – if this group says we want to see Aspen complete, you can ask that.
- John P. – I asked that question last week, we need to protect the Aspens.
- Lisa – #7 scaled to zero?
- Jeff – opted to not fund that project so we wouldn't have to scale others so much. We have \$15M on the books already. Other projects are ready to go immediately.
- Natalie – for the Big Meadow area – is it a negative consequence to the project to have people recreating in the area? When are the burns?
- Jeff – the prescription will be written to include recreation.
- Natalie – it goes along major hiking trails.

- Jeff – for example, we are not burning on Labor Day weekend.
- Natalie – I've heard you cut down trees and they are stacked for years, is that an issue?
- Jeff – piles are spread so they are less hazardous. The Urban Forest project has high unit costs; it is right in the middle of the community so it is hard to get outside funding. We will complete the project with this funding.

Ecological Site – Woody

- Heather – the project is science based – would it fit under science?
- Woody – I'm of the opinion of no. It is taking existing data and putting it into a model. Science has already done the data. This isn't research it is putting data into models.
- Jeff – should a scientist come forward he/she would have to go through all the science vetting.
- John R. – the difference is research and learning new things and technical things. All technical things aren't research.

Basin wide Roads and Trails – Jeff

- Jeff – both projects were scaled.
- Linda – we have supplemental information to give you context. Handout.

Erosion Control Grants – Linda

- Linda – this is legislated in LTRA as a call out for up to \$10M to local jurisdictions at a cost share of 50%.
- Peter – it is a big chunk of money that represents almost a third of the total available. Depending on the timing of how projects come in - we submit proposals in the fall. There is discussion at TWG and LTFAC to verify that we bring highest priority projects forward.
- Mark – with the street sweepers, are they guaranteed the money in ECG?
- Peter – no, it is a competition. For sweepers, it will be up to each jurisdiction to decide what is more important.
- Jeff – all projects have to go through a vetting process.
- Peter – Lake Forest is a multi-year project. Next year we will complete it.
- Linda – the erosion control process is very rigorous – sometimes a match can't be met then the money gets recycled into the same program and they will call for more proposals.
- Ann – the extra would stay in Placer County?
- Linda – it goes back into the overall program and out for bid for new proposals across all jurisdictions.
- Bob – do the proposals need to be shovel ready?
- Peter – by honing in on on-going projects, we are focusing on completing projects.
- John P. – we are making sure the projects are top priority, and the biggest impact.
- Doug – a project was pulled last year that wasn't connected to the Lake.

Camp Rich – Jeff

- Jeff went over the latest changes. The backbone of this project is installing BMPs where there is running sediment into the Lake. In the NEPA world we always look at whether to do all at once or scale down to the things we can do in the reasonable future. This project is NEPA related. It will move forward in the next couple months. This project is about investing in BMPs at core visitation areas.
- John R. – there was a lot of discussion about this in TWG. With a \$3M reduction can you get the most bang for the buck?

- Bob – can you complete the project?
- Jeff – no, it is hard to get money for this kind of work. We looked at what was funded in Round 11 and will tackle the worst of the worst areas.

NEPA Resource Surveys – Jeff

- Steve – this was supported because of the longer term strategy and supporting environmental documentation. The FS can tell the Region that NEPA is done and can ask for more money. It is important to keep projects coming down the pipeline. The documentation work is important; a certain kind of field work has to be done.
- John P. – it is an economy of scale to do it all as one. NEPA ready projects can get done in time for grants.

Taylor/Tallac – Jeff

- John R. – we thought about this project having great opportunity for other funding.
- Jeff – this will help us continue to get funding. It sets the stage for the FS.

Upper Truckee River Restoration – Jeff

- Jeff - Patrick made a good argument that this is a high priority area. The Corps funding is uncertain. Receiving \$1M would allow Patrick to match the funds. There is a lot of re-work on authorities through the Wyden Amendment. As Sue described it – the projects align then connect. This is transparent government. This funding gives Patrick tools to push it forward, helps the Corps, and takes the pressure off.
- Natalie – are there public access opportunities?
- Patrick – it is a balancing act, there will be some.
- Jeff – have funding for balancing act. Find out public needs through NEPA.
- Mark – other source secured?
- Patrick – no.
- Linda – proposal is getting redrafted. We will get it out to you. We will talk more about contributions and where they are coming from.
- Katie – the Corps is pushing for the entire 108 program to close out including Sunset Reach. It will be a push next year also.
- Jeff – it sends a message up the line that the FAC thought it was an important project. Gives us a start regardless of what happens with the Corps.
- Katie – NEPA is not finalized, push that forward having a more solid case to get funding.

Public Comments

- Written statement given by Russ Wigart – El Dorado County

“I want to encourage the LTFAC to approve the use of funds for the purchase of sweepers using the SNPLMA capital program grant funds. This proposal, which will directly aid in the reduction of atmospheric, airborne dust and fine sediment pollutants, is anticipated to have a large reduction resulting in both atmospheric and water quality benefits for the basin and Lake Tahoe. Erosion Control funding has never in the past been used to fund sweepers for water quality benefits. Sweeping has been used in the past to mitigate atmospheric impact, however, the argument has only in the last couple years been used to justify sweeping in the name of water quality. The sweeper proposal as developed by the jurisdictions and agencies is scaled based on the ability of the State transportation agencies (NDOT and Caltrans) to apply for funding. The argument is that the local jurisdictions are eligible for erosion control funding which supports the purchase of sweepers. This is simply not the case. The precedent simply has never been set to date and Washoe County has not been successful in their efforts yet. To say that local jurisdictions are eligible to purchase sweepers with these erosion control funding sources is simply not true at the current

time. It's been in debate and subject to interpretation of how this funding can be authorized. This item has been back and forth in discussion and it appears some resolution may come in the future, but it has not been widely accepted to date. I want to express my support of the sweeper proposal and would like to encourage the committee to not scale down the proposal as requested, but fund in its entirety to support environmental improvements. This proposal is cross cutting in that it fills many thresholds and goals as understood to date based on the current state of knowledge.

Lastly, there is no dispute that this funding will aid in directly improving air quality by removing fugitive dust on urban roads. Another improvement that may result of increased sweeping frequencies with new generation sweepers is improvements to water quality. Modeling efforts underway are showing that upwards of a 30% reduction in pollutant load in stormwater can be achieved by advanced sweeping practices. That being the case, the El Dorado County DOT is anticipating modeled load reductions as a result of modification to this management practice. This reduction is not guaranteed, so the construction of needed control projects is still needed to result in sustainable projects that meet the goals of the EIP. With the current understanding that sweeping will improve the quality of water and result in significant load reductions, then it appears that this proposal will eliminate large quantities of <16 micron fine sediment loads in an extremely cost effective manner. With the urban being 72% of the clarity loss and atmospheric deposition being approximately 15% of the clarity loss, this proposal will aid in eliminating a large source of fine particulates resulting toward achievement of multiple thresholds. With the emphasis of the program leaning toward sweeping for fine sediment control, here we have a proposal that truly will meet the goals as determined by regulatory and agency staff.

The County has switched its abrasive aggregate to Washoe Sand, a decomposed granite, which has the correct effective size and uniformity for traction, contains minimal fine sediment and has a denser particle capable of settling quicker. A combination of all these management practices will aid us in achieving our clarity goals in a timely manner and begin getting us on the track to air / water quality improvement and TMDL compliance. This proposal will directly reduce over 500,000 lbs of <16 micron particulates annually and assist the local jurisdictions in meeting requirements as outlined in the EIP. There are no other projects that can be funded that will meet these anticipated reductions and result in such large scale cross cutting improvements. I want to encourage the LTFAC to approve the unscaled sweeper proposal as submitted and aid the local] jurisdictions in meeting both air quality and water quality thresholds and standards in the protection of this beautiful resource we are striving to protect.”

- Harold - there is a big pile of fine sediment that I sweep off of my garage floor daily. I sat on the FAC years ago; I acknowledge the tough decisions they make. Looking at the project list, it is an appropriate and good support for science. I applaud FAC for looking at secondary projects. I encourage you to look at the proposals, if additional funding is needed, how can we add to those critical pieces? Additional funding, that is where the priorities should be. Rally around those. Encourage applicants to get funding other places. Continue to seek other funding sources to open up money for projects that can't get other funding. We support # 3-5 (fuel reduction can improve water quality), #13, 17, 22, and 24. Number 24 has multiple benefits that bring the community into the solutions. These are the projects we really support.

Public Comment Period Closed

- Jeff – can we come to a consensus today? I'm hearing committee members can't make April 6 meeting. There is a time delay if we wait until April 19.
- Michelle – would a macro change have to go back to public comment?
- Jeff – we will double check that but we don't think so.
- Steve – we all represent groups, the 30 days gives us time to tell them, we need to get done today.

- Linda – what will happen – we will ask project proponents for revised proposals to post on the website along with the spreadsheet. The public will see the projects written to the amount scaled back.
- Jeff – can we get to that point for consensus? Committee members can say no. I can say the sweepers can go into the ECG. BLM has ruled on that.
- John R. – what you said this morning still holds.
- Peter –the FS has done their homework to pave the way, we can go forward.
- Doug – I don't believe Washoe County is only operations and maintenance. This is not just an operations and maintenance issue with them. They recognize the value as a Mobile BMP.
- Jeff – on the erosion control side, we will work with the local jurisdictions to make sure the same thing will not happen again.

William Kent -

- Natalie – is this a partnership with CalTrans?
- Linda – we are not reconfiguring the entry way – that's what we would coordinate with CalTrans.

Snow Creek –

- Steve – we gave them the option to go with the ECG.
- Peter – it is contaminated soil, SEZ restoration.

Preventing AIS –

- Jeff – there is a small change in the funding request. It had more to do in making the recommendation goal.
- Ann – they need more money to spend. AIS are getting worse.
- Michelle –from working with Steve Chilton on AIS – I have learned what we are doing and not doing, and based on Round 11, I want to share a macro piece of information (flipchart). It is an educated estimate – to hit middle range for performance out of this program we need \$6M per year. It is important for you to know. The program needs encouragement to leverage the other \$3M. They need the ability to put money into management. We are good at putting stuff on the ground. When the AIS group came back last year, my expectation was everything would be spent in 2011.
- Steve – what we are looking at is \$3M without leveraged money. **Action item:** Presentation from the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) to see where other funding pieces are coming from. The boating on the Lake is in decline. It is a key part of recreation. If we continue to raise fees and boating goes down, revenue could go down. There is a Nevada fee coming also, boaters will pay two fees.
- John R. – I worked on AIS for years. Michelle is saying that as LTFAC gets down the road we need to help sow seeds for coming years' funding.
- John P. – some of us meet with Senator Feinstein, we make sure she knows it is a priority.
- Jeff – yes we can bring in an AIS presentation.
- Steve – Michelle spent a lot of time on this, I commend her.
- Jim – AB167 is getting a lot of discussion.

Lake Tahoe Stormwater Tools –

- Peter – I mentioned this earlier, the \$900K number helps ECG with their program. The Stormwater Quality Improvement Committee (SWQIC) has met for several years to talk about how we do our projects. I would encourage EPA to get in front of SWQIC to make sure they are on board for this proposal.

Tahoe Integrated Management System (TIIMS) –

- Ann – I don't understand the TIIMS project.
- Jack – this proposal is keeping TIIMS going for a couple more years. It is integrating EIP reporting and a tracking database into the TIIMS website. We would develop teams to report out on project accomplishments. TIIMS has had a long history, this EIP database will be the primary use for TIIMS in the future. It is organizing the framework.
- Linda – as a partner in the Basin, the Corps did provide funding for the EIP database work, we saved money by using the TIIMS infrastructure. Part of the problem is people are not up to date on TIIMS. We have to report to congress whether LTRA passes or not. We need funding for integration.
- John R. – the title is unfortunate – this project is really not about TIIMS but about the EIP reporting database.
- Jack – we can revise the title.
- Michelle – this grant funding will address software licensing needs? Does this request duplicate other things?
- Steve – the proposal could be re-titled. When we have the annual get together with Senator Feinstein we have to have a database for accurate information. I see a strategic reason now.
- Linda – Tricia York is revising the title.
- Patrick – we want to know information – I don't care what we use – we need to be able to get information. Congressionals don't trust the Basin. We want to reassure Senator Feinstein and Harry Reid that we have our act together and it needs to be the cheapest solution.
- John P. – the Fire Chiefs balk every year when asked to pay for this system. It's all we have right now. The fire agencies use it very little but need some kind of tool.
- John R. – we really need this.

Area-wide Planning –

- Natalie - \$750K is scaling for doing five areas?
- Jack – yes, it is an approximation.
- Jeff – we have gone through a question and answer phase on all projects. We have heard from the public. Before we go back into dialogue, we need consensus on the preliminary project list. Are there interests from LTFAC member to retool the projects and get into a debate? Anything you can't live with as proposal, do you need to talk to this group about something different? Or do we have general agreement on the package vetted by the Partnership Coordination Team (PCT) and TWG? Are we comfortable with having a consensus vote on a preliminary recommendation list?
- Lisa – I'm not happy with LCT, I'd like to see it at zero.
- Michelle – we have not debated as a LTFAC today. On dramatic changes, where do we stand from public comment?

- Ann – I'd like to see LCT funding used for AIS. I'd like to see a guarantee for Snow Creek.
- Peter – money would come from project number #13 (ECG). Another scenario is to take it out. This is an attractive project from the outside and we have other money already. There is a good chance to receive other funding outside SNPLMA. I feel very strong about that project.
- Steve – think about the audience in the long term. We go through a public process including input from the community and congressionals. The list goes to the Tahoe Regional Executives (TREX) and to SNPLMA Executives. We have been successful because we know what they are thinking, and we know what we want to deliver to them. They have not changed much, there is a lot of trust. Think about who is on the SNPLMA Executives – Tahoe is just one piece. FWS sits on that group – they will be looking at certain things. Keep that in mind.
- Jeff – hearing from both sides, should we run it forward because we have a scoping period? The other side of the coin, should we take time to deliberate since we want to represent all opinions.
- Heather – is there an opportunity to make changes after talking to constituents?
- Jeff – Steve and Rochelle could answer that.
- Steve – changes were made before but nothing radical. The public input is a very important part of our role. Before we were dealing with \$40M. This is constraining having to hit the penny. I appreciate LTFAC hasn't deliberated, but we can come back after the comment period. This is part of process to send to the public, we will come back at least a full day to make changes and discuss.
- Rochelle –this sounds accurate to me.
- Jeff – is there a possibility to join us for partial day on April 6th? Two options – come back after 30 days. The other option is to wait until a later meeting date. There are compressed time lines but we want to balance both.
- John R. – would the deliberation of this group be diluted if it goes out for 30 days?
- Linda – the preliminary recommendation goes out for a 30 day comment period and congressional input. We pull it all together to discuss. Nothing has gone off the map with public comment. We will have an opportunity to discuss and tweak before anything goes out as final recommendation.
- Michelle – I haven't had the opportunity to deliberate, there are others too not given opportunity. I understand that there is possibly no quorum on April 6th.
- Jeff – for those that cannot make April 6th, if you think about what a half day might make, get that information to me before you walk out of here. Exercise the April 6th date as an option; is it a window we can work around? We can have the discussion Michelle is talking about. We can exercise April 19th if necessary. On April 6th we will only run on 11 people. Asking those who can't make April 6th, can you do half day? With the worse case going to April 19th.
- Jeff – I don't want to end on a bad note. I'm trying to balance having the most number of people at the table with compressed timelines. We have to come back on the April 6th. If a decision takes to April 19th we will be comprised on the tail end.
- Steve – anyone that has an alternative should get that to us. We can't just move funding for one project.
- Mark – thresholds and congressional expectation informs our decision.
- Jeff – key folks start the April 6 meeting with that information.
- Peter – don't forget the three footnote projects if you are going to think about moving money around.
- Linda – feel free to call project managers. We are asking project proponents to make changes (TIIMS). We will send the information out.

Adjourned.

Minutes certified by LTFAC DFO Jeff Marsolais
/s/Jeff Marsolais 6/17/11

Signature

Date