

**SUMMARY: STAKEHOLDER SCIENCE AND STAKEHOLDER COMMUNITY COMMITTEE
LAKE TAHOE WEST RESTORATION PARTNERSHIP**

Tuesday, February 5th, 2020, 9:30am – 12:30pm

Lahontan Water Board, 971 Silver Dollar Avenue, South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

All meeting materials are publicly available on the Lake Tahoe West website

<http://nationalforests.org/laketahoewest>.

For questions please contact facilitator Julia Golomb at jgolomb@cbl.org.

Meeting Synopsis

On February 5, 2020 the Lake Tahoe West Interagency Design Team (IADT) and the Stakeholder Science and Community Committees met to seek the Joint Stakeholder Committees’ endorsement of Lake Tahoe West Proposed Action to recommend to Executive Team for approval. The IADT and Stakeholders made progress on:

- **Scoping Package/Proposed Action Presentation:** Kat McIntyre of TRPA provided a presentation to the Stakeholders on Scoping and the Proposed Action.
- **Scoping Package/Proposed Action Discussion:** The Stakeholders provided Scoping Package edits to the IADT. The Stakeholders had numerous edits and felt that the Proposed Action required additional detail before they could formally recommend its approval to Executives.
- **Next Steps:** The IADT will review the Stakeholder comments from today. The IADT, ERT and Attorneys will meet to determine where more detail can be added to the Scoping Package. According to the LTW charter, the Proposed Action is the last time for the Stakeholders to comment but this is not entirely settled. The IADT will have a conversation with the Executives and the Core Team about Stakeholder involvement post-scoping.

Contents

Meeting Synopsis.....	1
Action Items.....	1
Scoping Package/Proposed Action Presentation	2
Scoping Package Discussion.....	2
Next Steps.....	1
Meeting Attendees.....	5

Next Steps

- **The next Stakeholder meeting will take place on the afternoon of March 3.**
- April 7th or May 5th: Review Monitoring Plan and “Lessons Learned” survey analysis.
- January-February 2021: The Stakeholder Committees will work on the Monitoring Plan.
- The IADT will review comments received at the Stakeholder meeting. The IADT, ERT and Attorneys will meet to determine where more detail can be added into the Scoping Package.

- According to the LTW charter, the Proposed Action is the last time for the Stakeholders to comment, but this is not entirely settled. The IADT will have a conversation with Executives about Stakeholder involvement post-scoping.
 - **Brian** will talk to his regional office about how stakeholders can be engaged in planning post-scoping (any FACA violations).
- The editing process on the Scoping Package will be iterative; IADT can send drafts to Stakeholders as they are developed.
- **Eric** will schedule a follow-up meeting with Dan Blood to review what projects LTW is proposing to do on Homewood’s property.

Scoping Package/Proposed Action Presentation

Summary: Kat McIntyre of TRPA provided a presentation to the Stakeholders on Scoping and the Proposed Action. The presentation highlighted that key purposes of scoping are to identify potential gaps in data and informational needs as well as to develop the scope of issues and alternatives to be addressed in analysis. The Scoping Package will look at the full 59,000 acres without reanalyzing the actions already approved on the landscape. Project refinement will occur during triple document preparation and analysis, at which point unit boundaries, access, type, pace, and sequencing of treatments will be refined based on operational feasibility, environmental conditions, and thresholds of concern.

Scoping Package Discussion

Summary: Stakeholders felt the Proposed Action requires additional detail before they can formally recommend its approval. Stakeholders provided the following feedback to the IADT regarding the Scoping Package.

- Pace and scale of treatment, especially of prescribed fire
 - Pace of thinning (how many acres/year)
 - Pace of stream restoration (how many miles (or feet)/year)
 - It is fine to use high estimates
- How we would analyze “programmatic” elements
- What a prescription looks like – images and narrative (or include this in Draft Triple Document)
- What’s happening within WUI versus outside of WUI
 - Especially in relation to treatment of PACs
- More specifics on Resource Protection Measures, Design Standards, and what actions we are proposing (currently not enough info to comment) Better maps and more images (e.g. pictures of before and after treatment) (make sure maps are legible to colorblind)
 - Shaded relief can make it difficult to distinguish when using color gradient
- In maps and narrative, show as many existing projects as possible to show what LTW adds/enhances
- Describe what’s currently being done on the landscape for context; how LTW adds to that
- Discuss how treatments advance strategic fuels management (e.g., how they reinforce community protection, how they use fuels breaks and address likely ignition spots)
- Describe goals/intentions for treating in Roadless areas, PACs, high quality late seral habitat

- A lot of this info is in the LRS matrix already
- Effects on neighborhoods, trailheads, trails
 - Timeline / pace and scale of treatment
 - How long will this impact my access?
 - Will staging areas impact parking, or will there be alternate staging areas constructed?
- Alternatives – would expect an Alternative with different pace/scale of treatment
- Explain when reforestation would be used (post-disturbance, any other conditions)
- More specific acreages of treatment if possible (“approximate” is vague; “up to” establishes an upper limit)

Clarify aspen/meadow acreage, pace and scale for treatment, and prioritization for treatment. Generally prioritize aspen and meadow treatment.

Other feedback:

- Condition based documents are being challenged elsewhere; challengers assert that the documents are not being appropriately used. While this is not necessarily the case for LTW, it is something to be aware of.
- Programmatic approach with tiering could be problematic, create trust issue (note LTW intention is to avoid tiering; need a better term than Programmatic)
- Should prioritize aspen and meadow treatment.
- Public may be confused by NEPA/CEQA interface. Different requirements.
- How is Homewood affected by PTEIR? (Eric will follow up with Dan)
- Question for Executives and Core Team: Can we accept an extended timeline and spend more time incorporating Stakeholder feedback now or can stakeholders actively engage in the draft triple document development?

Additional Discussion:

- Stakeholder Comments and/or Questions following Scoping Package presentation:
 - Stakeholder 1 Comment: When will the thresholds of concern be established?
 - IADT response: In the draft triple document.
 - Stakeholder 2 Comments:
 - With respect to air quality, are you going to have enough information on particulate matter that would be put into the air based on treatment?
 - IADT response: This could be a challenge in how prescribed fire is implemented. The IADT has a pretty good sense of the approximate number of acres that can be burned in a day while remaining within the limits of current air district standards. This acreage number might shift if there are changes in regulations. It would not change the analysis, but it might limit the ability to implement prescribed fire.
 - Provide more information on reforestation.
 - Stakeholder 3 Comments:
 - Is this Scoping Package a blend of CEQA and NEPA? A lot of the phrasing in this Scoping Package is related to CEQA.

- More information should be provided on the impact to neighborhoods, trailheads, and trails.
 - Is there need to develop alternative staging areas so as not to impact parking?
 - Multiple Stakeholders: More detail is needed on prescribed fire pace and scale in the Scoping Package (x acres/year). In general, more detail is needed on pace and scale in the Scoping Package (stream restoration, thinning, etc.)
 - The IADT could potentially include a qualifier by watershed if not able to provide acres/year for prescribed fire.
- The IADT and Stakeholders also reviewed the Scoping Package maps and the IADT capture the Stakeholders' map edits.
- Following this discussion, the Stakeholders felt that the Proposed Action required additional detail before they could formally recommend its approval to Executives.

Meeting Attendees

Organizing and Participating Agencies

CTC – California Tahoe Conservancy

FWS – Friends of the West Shore

NFF – National Forest Foundation

USFS LTBMU – U.S. Forest Service Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit

NDF – Nevada Division of Forestry

KTB – Keep Tahoe Blue/The League to Save Lake Tahoe

TRPA – Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

CBI – Consensus Building Institute

CSP – California State Parks

TF – The Tahoe Fund

EPA – US Environmental Protection Agency

CF TFFT – CalFire, Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team

TAMBA – Tahoe Area Mountain Bike Association

HW – Homewood

PCAPCD – Placer County Air Pollution Control District

Stakeholder Science Committee Members

1. Jennifer Quashnick, FOWS
2. Roland Shaw, NDF
3. Zach Bradford, KTB
4. Sue Britting, SFL
5. Ann Hobbs, PCAPCD
6. Jack Landy, EPA

Stakeholder Community Committee Members

1. Skyler Monaghan, TF
2. Patrick Parsel, TAMBA

3. Dan Blood, HW

Staff

1. Christine Aralia, CTC
2. Brian Garrett, USFS LTBMU
3. Kat McIntyre, TRPA
4. Jen Greenberg, CTC
5. Julia Golomb, CBI
6. Silver Hartman, CSP
7. Nadia Tase, CF TFFT
8. Shannon Friedman, TRPA
9. Eric Horntvedt, NTFPD
10. Silver Hartman, CSP
11. Sarah Di Vittorio, NFF
12. Bri Tiffany, NFF