



Lake Tahoe

Federal Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes
 June 14, 2012, 9 a.m. to Noon
 Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
 128 Market Street, Stateline NV 89449

Attendees:

- Natalie Yanish, Bob Cook, Mark Novak, Steve Teshara, Bob Anderson, John Pang, Ann Nichols, Joanne Marchetta, Jim Lawrence, Heather Bacon, and Michelle Sweeney. Peter Kraatz and Doug Martin participated via conference call

Agency Representatives

- Karin Edwards, CTC; Steve Chilton, FWS; Maureen McCarthy, TSC; Julie Regan, Shane Romsos, TRPA; Myrnie Mayville, BOR; Woody Loftis, Rachel Kozloski, NRCS; Jack Landy, EPA; Mike LeFevre, Arla Hains, USFS

Chairman

- Steve Teshara

Designated Federal Official (DFO)

- Jeff Marsolais

Members of the Public

- Terry Huff, Bill Boosman

Opening Comments, Introductions, Review of Agenda, Approval of Minutes from 3/21/12-

- Steve – welcome to the Lake Tahoe Federal Advisory Committee (LTFAC) meeting. Now that we have had introductions we will review the agenda. There is one change where we will shift up the Tahoe Interagency Executives Steering Committee (TIE-SC) report to the timeslot after the LTFAC Vision agenda item.
- Jeff – thanks for taking time out of your busy schedules. There are many planning efforts happening with the agencies right now. We have strategic topics covering those efforts today. Our intent is to give details on the two big plans from the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and Forest Service and how the agencies are working together. I am looking forward to that part of the conversation. We are in the opening outreach period for the next LTFAC. Bring any of your questions after the meeting. We are way in advance of the schedule for re-chartering. There will be no decision lag this time with changes in administration. I want to acknowledge the good

work on the LTFAC Vision. It is a strong document. The vision will carry LTFAC beyond the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act (SNPLMA). You should all feel good about that.

- Maureen – can you give clarification on the re-chartering dates?
- Jeff – we are in outreach now for 60 days. Come August, we will send the package to our Washington Office. Then the package goes to USDA for nine weeks. Then we should receive our final approvals.
- Steve – I would like to move on to the minutes of March 21, 2012. Any comments or changes?
 - Jim - I move to approve.
 - Bob C. – second.
 - The minutes were approved by an oral vote of the committee.

Consideration and Requested Action to Approve the Revised LTFAC Vision -

- Steve – thanks to those who worked on revising the LTFAC Vision. We took the essence of the vision that had been drafted at last fall's LTFAC strategy planning workshop, and had an ad hoc committee refine and recommend the attached final vision statement. The vision was sent to the LTFAC via email for approval to use for outreach efforts. Steve read the proposed LTFAC Vision and put it before the committee for consensus.
- Bob A. – I move to approve (with the typo fixed).
 1. Yes and I support it – 11
 2. Acceptable and I support it – 1
 3. Can live with it and I support it – 0
 4. Willing to step aside and I support it - 0
 5. Willing to step aside – don't support it – won't block it - 0
 6. Blocking, don't support it – 0
 7. Need more information - 0
- The LTFAC Vision is approved by the group.

Status Report – Activities and Recent Decisions/Direction of the TIE-SC –

- Joanne - in February of this year, we made a presentation here at LTFAC and gave you an overview of the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) in general and talked about the organizing structure. EIP has evolved in the last 20 years. We have very strong partnerships in respect to funding, administration, and implementation. Thirty agency stakeholders are the foundation. It represents all five funding sectors and how we deliver funding in the Basin. The coordinating council for that partnership has evolved into the TIE SC. It is the representative body of the much broader partnership. The source of most funding was coming from SNPLMA. \$300M from the initial program. This body, LTFAC was authorized in implementing and providing input to the Federal Interagency Partnership (FIP) as to how to use the federal funds. Where are we today? Funding sources are more constrained. We started discussing the needs we have to adjust the EIP coordinating structure. We look at LTFAC to still serve a functioning role. We settled last month on additions to the TIE-SC membership. In the private sector we need a representative that can reflect the broad base of the public/private sector here in the Basin. We have added the chair of LTFAC to the committee to represent a broad set of stakeholders and multiple private interests. We added a representative of the science community from Tahoe Science Consortium (TSC) and the Washoe Tribe.
- Karin – local government agencies have been added also.
- Steve – all of this is very consistent with the mission/vision we have adopted. I attended the meeting on May 10. There is another meeting next week. The LTFAC agenda will have a

standing item to discuss the TIE SC and what happened at the last meeting. **Action item.** I plan to make this an active channel of communications and represent the diverse perspectives of this group.

- Ann – can we hear the latest on TIIMS?
- Jack – there have been three rounds of TIIMS funding approved - Rounds 9, 11, and 12. We created the EIP reporting tool on the nonpublic TIIMS website. We are developing a strategic plan to enhance that tool with the last round of money. It has useful functions to help report on EIP achievements. It made sense to combine the pots of money and divide the pot into three functional areas through a grant to TRPA. Those three areas are to develop a strategic plan, integrate the EIP reporting tool into TIIMS, and to continue to operate and maintain TIIMS. TRPA had a Request for Proposal and selected Environmental Incentives to develop the plan. The project will be for six months and wrap up by the end of the year. There is a newly created TIIMS over site committee. Karin Edwards is chair.
- Ann – how much is spent to date?
- Jack – in excess of \$1M to 1.5M. There was investment starting in 2001. Also there were in-kind contributions for staff from TRPA. They still house the server. It has been dormant with no coordinator for a couple years. Functions will start up again.
- Heather – when will the tool be fully functional?
- Jack – the strategic plan will help make that determination.
- Ann – who is the software person in charge?
- Jack – Data Transfer Solutions. They are out of Florida, but have a presence in the Basin.
- Joanne – TIIMS is a platform for a few important data sets including the defensible space data sets. We are looking at how best to evolve it over time.
- Karin – there will be a long term finance plan for TIIMS.
- Jim – the finance plan is critical. My perspective is that TIIMS is very ambitious, they have done a few things well, but absent of a financial plan. Given funding constraints, what can we afford? We need to ask where is the best place for it to be housed. Since everything is on-hold, we need to have a more solid foundation before continuing to spend funds.
- Ann – what is the problem, why such a ragged project?
- Jack – we have a big vision to combine a lot of information floating around in the Basin. The Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) has been a profound effort in the Basin to reduce sediment loads. TMDL has provided the data framework. We have the elements to build a reporting tool. We are going to start with TMDL to define what we want the EIP report to look like. Every program area will have its own sources of data and we can combine into one report.
- Heather –to clarify, you talked in several prior meetings about needing proper reporting. Are we capturing the data? By not losing the ability for proper reporting in the future it is important for future funding.
- Steve – TIIMS is not the only reporting tool in play.
- Jeff – all the agencies have their own reporting systems for virtually everything. The difference in TIIMS is through the tools in that database, it makes connections for thresholds for the whole basin. The agencies have their own reporting system and could give you information you asked for. TIIMS is a database unlike any out there, it is the bridge.
- Karin – EIP reporting has not ceased. We are trying to improve the process and the tools. We are doing accomplishment reporting for 2011 right now.
- Jim – if all are reporting information, can TIIMS serve as a better platform to pull it together?

- Joanne – there are 33 performance measures we measure and report on. They are not in TIIMS right now, but we are still collecting, reporting, and maintaining data sets.
- Peter – TMDL is for water quality projects, it's now all about pounds of sediment removed. That is the entire focus now. Other things sound great but to be honest we are focused on sediment removed. We need a more streamlined effort for that. We are treating so many acres of the watershed by pulling out so many tons of sediment.
- Maureen – from an external perspective – the peer review group said we needed one database for threshold standards. Those out of the Basin said it doesn't exist and would like to see TIIMS accessible and useable by people on the outside. The wealth of the monitoring, if TIIMS can do that, it will be great. The science community would like to see a broader usage.
- John P. – I appreciate the fire agencies got to work with this but it hasn't helped the public get involved. It has created challenges. We have kept a database for a number of years and it has not been seamless to put the information into TIIMS. We do our own because TIIMS is a moving target. We can't pay to do double entry. There have been challenges among the fire agencies on who would pay. There is no crosswalk, and it should be put in any plan.
- Steve – the Basin Chiefs will be on the committee to give feedback.
- Maureen – reentering data is a huge cost and you run the risk of errors.
- Steve – thank you for the good information and questions. The Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) finance plan is a similar situation where we need annual reporting for the Tahoe Summit.
- Ann – for AIS, what have we allotted? Enough for this year?
- Steve – there is long term plan.
- Julie – we have funding through 2013.
- Steve C. – possibly 2014. We spend \$5M per year including SNPLMA, state funds, TRPA fees, and personal donations.

Status Report – Efforts to Update the 5-year EIP List and Funding Prospects Areas where LTFAC Input would be of Greatest Value –

- Julie – two years ago we attended a hearing in Washington DC for the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (LTRA). At that time we were on a panel with other lake representatives. We were looked at as a national model because our ecosystem is very complicated with many challenges. We have a great track record. Tahoe has a great story to tell, we are seeing improvements in the ecosystem from the work we are doing. Fifty agencies are doing work for gain to Lake Tahoe. With our more defined implementation framework – reporting is a huge issue. There is a federal fiscal year, state fiscal year, and local governments all have a different way of doing business. We have to merge all that together. These are challenges our EIP working group is trying to solve. The Tahoe Summit can tell our story to national and state leaders. We don't want to go through a fire drill every year; we want to have something strategic tied to the cycle of work. That is what we are involved in now.
- Karin – we have been developing an updated EIP framework. The framework includes an organizational structure and annual plan of work. It is still a work in progress. The workplan lays out the annual process. The 5-year list should be implemented in the next five years. An EIP priority list will be developed and available on the TRPA website. The annual report includes a summary of accomplishments and plan for the year ahead. Reporting is a requirement for LTRA, the California budget process, and the Tahoe Summit. We are trying to have one report for many purposes. The annual cycle will be hammered out and provided to LTFAC so they can figure out where best to engage.

- Steve – good overview that shows the complexity of cycles. Will we be able to weigh in as you set up your annual program? Make sure we have a chance to weigh in on certain programs.
- John P. – we need any requests well in advance. For inspections, we are getting called to data enter those in. There is no money for that now.
- Ann – is EIP money being tracked? You have a way to report it now?
- Karin – yes, we are formalizing it so it is not a fire drill every year. Everyone knows well in advance, every year will be the same process.
- Jeff – within the multi-agency planning, we need to work out actual role of LTFAC. The TIE SC creates a bridge.
- Steve – I want the group to understand the process. Progress is being made to cease the fire drill. The LTFAC needs to understand the bigger picture of how we fit in.
- Ann – is there a report we can see occasionally on how all this is has been going?
- Karin – the annual progress report will be released before the Tahoe Summit.
- Ann – does it show projects given this money? Is it itemized?
- Jim – annual progress is the best report out there to summarize. Ann, I think you are talking about SNPLMA funding.
- Jeff – for the next LTFAC we can bring ideas on what that report would look like. We have the status of the SNPLMA projects. **Action item.**

Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Forest Plan Revision

PowerPoint presentation – handout.

- Jeff – the Forest Plan Review (FPR) and Regional Plan Update (RPU) are coming out for review at the same time. This gives us the opportunity to see how it all works and the role of the two plans. Jeff introduced Forest Service Senior Planner Mike LeFevre.
- Mike L. – on July 17 and 18 there are two meetings each day at 2 p.m. and 6 p.m. The meetings are at the North Shore Conference Center and Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit.
- Bob A. – on the comment deadline. It has taken several years to get to this point; it is burdensome to give comments on both plans at once.
- Jeff – I’ve heard that comment. Alternatives B, C, and D incorporate a lot of the latest thinking developed here locally through scientific efforts.
- Maureen – impacts of climate change on this area are pronounced over the projections of the next 20-30 years. This is an important part of the plan.
- Ann – is there an increase of recreation facilities?
- Mike L. – the percentage increase for overnight accommodations is 5%. We don’t specifically say where the increase is because it is different depending on the alternative.
- Ann – how is Treasured Landscapes in relation to this?
- Jeff – it is not part of the plan. That is an area specific concept moving forward with stakeholders not a change in forest management. It is a way to get things done. There will be things wrong with the draft forest plan, which is part of the process. We want to solicit comments from people with different perspectives. Nancy Gibson and I have discussed that this is a grand moment for us to get comments from the Basin to help us go forward.
- Ann – in the RPU, one alternative would allow development of recreation lands. Is it the same in your plan?
- Jim – I want to ask about you coming to a meeting with Nevada state agencies.

- Jeff – our intent with federal and state partners is to continue and that we have been coordinating our plans. This plan is complimentary to all other plans and efforts including the TRPA RPU. We will take you up on offer Jim. **Action item.**
- Peter – does your plan address requirements for BMPs?
- Mike L. – BMPs and standard mitigations are called out in the document.
- Bill – alternative C is a more aggressive approach to fuels management. Is it relative to FS intent or what has been accomplished?
- Jeff – we have support for active fuels management. We identified lands as needing treatment but not as aggressively as what you see in alternative C.
- Mike L. – from the assessments we did, South Shore was approved at maximum annual production of the work. It is a greater intensity from a forestry standpoint. We will cut to the maximum, but may only need to reenter every fifteen years. We take down more trees but not enter as frequently. There is more visual impact, but less impact on watershed.

Relationship to the TRPA RPU -

- Joanne – let me re-enforce Jeff’s point. If you go back to the Pathway Forum, we set up the foundation to conceive consistency between the two plans. The intent at that time was to bring all the agencies together actively involved in updating plans. There was a high level of agreement on vision, goal, and policy level. You will see the FS is very similar to TRPA on statements of goals and policies. Timelines diverged for different reasons but quite nicely with TMDL. The relationship of our two plans includes the FS working in support of Basin threshold standards. The FS is an important land manager and we look to the FS as an important resource steward. Our plan is more on development/private sector/private property, whereas the FS plan is on resources. The plans go together quite well.
- Bob A. – from a lake clarity point of view – where’s the action?
- Joanne – the FP is less prescriptive, there are still 114 management prescriptions. You will find ones that relate to water quality. FPR is at the programmatic level. We implement the prescriptions through Memorandums of Understanding.
- Jeff – we included in the FPR, a section of standard operations procedures. Most of the issues with fine sediment only focus on TRPA RPU. I say we want your comments, we think they are important.
- Joanne – in the RPU, we conformed our regional scale zoning to back country designation. It is fully in conformance. The rezoned areas from conservation to recreation include Van Sickle State Park, and Friday’s Station.
- Ann – what about the 1300 acres top of Ski Run in alternative 5?
- Joanne – I would have to check.
- Jeff – the two agencies are trying to have these conversations inside and outside of the public. Give TRPA and us that comment and we will incorporate it as we move forward.

Public Comment

- There was no public comment.

Presentation – Overview of 2011 TRPA Threshold Evaluation Report and Peer Review Process

PowerPoint presentation.

- Joanne – this outlines the health of the Tahoe ecosystem and was on the street April 25th. It is a very positive move. It was peer reviewed by an independent panel of seven scientists that

found it technically sound. Generally the news is good with some exceptions. We will look at exceptions today. The RPU directs us to prepare evaluations and to provide action recommendations to future plans. Also to recommend changes to the threshold monitoring system.

- Maureen will report on the peer review process. The report itself is on the TRPA website. The peer review team was from six different states and very accomplished in their fields. Comments reflected opinions outside the Basin. They worked for three months. They commented that they noticed improvement in the quality of the report from 2007. From their findings to improve the process, most have been addressed.
- Comments on the Relational Database:
 - Where do we go from here? Use a landscape perspective in 10, 20, 30 years. Prioritize.
 - Understand the long term impacts of climate change.
 - Achieve balance between environment and development.
 - Nearshore is an issue.
 - Air quality and human activity.
 - Current standards, some are overly complex (noise standards – too many of them).
 - Comments on social demography information in the front, it is unclear how data gets input into the standards.
- We received input to help strengthen the overall process and possibly restructure to be more beneficial overall. A question came up for the monitoring of Goshawks in their habitats. What does it really mean to the Basin? It is an example to help ask the question, is that important? Are there other things more critical?
- Steve – TRPA is saying they are updating the report every four years in the RPU.
- Michelle – how formalized is the four year update cycle?
- Joanne – we will take recommendations to the Governing Board and get their sanction on the priorities for the four year planning cycle.
- Michelle – Shane Romsos did a good job on the PowerPoint. Thanks to Maureen for the peer review panel. I had a conversation with the head of the panel; he highlighted using quantitative measures when appropriate. It is important for AIS to be using management standards that are immovable.
- Shane – move management standards out of adopted thresholds and into the regional plan. You can read our recommendations and how they are addressed (comments from peer review).
- Maureen – we are concentrating on those things that are measurable.

Future Meeting Topics

- Update on where we go from here on science funding (topic for a Fall meeting).
- TIE
- Presentation of peer group recommendations

Round Robin

- Lake Tahoe Summit – August 13 at Edgewood Tahoe:
 - The theme is public and private partnerships investing in Lake Tahoe.
 - A portion of program will be devoted to the Angora 5-year anniversary.
 - There will be an RPU overview.
 - Includes a presentation on potential of Olympics.
 - EIP and private sector contributions to EIP will be highlighted.
 - There will be a program involving young people.

- 10 a.m.-noon.
 - Booth displays.
 - No information yet from Senator Feinstein's office on a possible lunch.
- Maureen – the 2012 Science Conference was very successful. We are grateful for agency sponsorships. The Tahoe Regional Executives approved the Round 12 science grants. The parties have been notified and PSW is negotiating the contracts now. This is the final round of science funding so I would like to see it as a future agenda topic. We are seeing attrition of people because of no new funding in sight. It is very bleak.
 - Heather – excellent presentations today.
 - Bob C. – I appreciate the presentations. We need input on the TIE committee. **Action item.**
 - John – be fire safe.
 - Natalie – I'm heard about tahoefuture.org. Can you tell me more?
 - Steve – it was launched last week to help people get updated on the RPU, transportation plan etc. It provides links to major documents. Going to tahoefuture.org is easier than going to TRPA.org. We are working on putting more information on the site. Michelle interviews project leads.
 - Michelle – to underscore Maureen's comment – we need to understand the implications of losing the science funding. For AIS – the most valuable thing you have is someone who is a leader (scientists). Without the science you lose value, momentum, and return on the dollar of previous investments.
 - Bob A. – there is a local Sierra Club public meeting every other month with the next being July 18. Laird Blackwell is the speaker. Our annual summer party is August 16. You all can buy tickets now.
 - Jim – BLM is taking comments on hazardous fuels projects for SNPLMA funding until Wednesday, June 20.
 - Jeff – thanks for great efforts today. Thanks to the agencies for their presentations. Acknowledge that today some strategic conversations took place on getting our feedback and recalibrating our role. Hopefully that continues in the future.
 - Jeff – the application is different for LTFAC this time. There is a new application and voluntary question on demographics.
 - Shane - the presentation of the peer group findings for the Threshold Evaluation Report is on our website.
 - Peter – the Regional Transportation Plan comment period is closing June 28. Take time to look at how we get people around the lake out of their cars. There is a lot of bad information out there (Tahoe Pipe Club website) but we are doing good things on the ground.
 - Terry Huff – I am recently retired from the Bay area so I am a member of the public. There is a lot of professionalism I'm seeing in this room. There are a lot of things happening here that I've seen go on before and I am thrilled the way I see you guys working.
 - Michelle – the science conference was fabulous. For water quality and AIS, I did a series of interviews after their presentations. We heard positive and productive conversation.

Adjourned 12:19 p.m.

Certified by Steve Teshara, Chair /s/SteveTeshara Date 6/28/12
