



P.O. Box 2428 · Truckee, CA 96160 · p. 530.582.4800 · f. 530.582.1230 · www.sbcouncil.org

**TO: Eric J. Taxer, P.E.**  
**Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (LRWQCB)**  
**2501 Lake Tahoe Boulevard**  
**South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150**

**Quarterly Report Review: #3**  
**Reporting Period:** 10/1/09 – 12/31/09  
**Submittal Date:** 1/29/10  
**Project #:** R6T-2009-0012  
**Project Name:** Waddle Ranch/Northstar Watershed Improvement Program  
Supplemental Environmental Project (SEP)  
Northstar Mountain Properties, LLC

**Third Party Review Subcontractor Name:** Sierra Business Council  
**Third Party Review Project Director:** Nicole DeJonghe

This is the third Quarterly Report Review submitted to LRWQCB by Sierra Business Council (SBC). It provides third-party review of the work completed by Integrated Environmental Restoration Services (IERS) and Northstar Fire Department (NFD) from October 1, 2009 through December 31, 2009. During this time period, SBC received three invoices from IERS, three invoice from NFD, and the attached Quarterly Report from IERS which also reports on work completed by NFD. Additional documents such as As Built reports and meeting minutes were submitted, which are attached.

Nicole DeJonghe, the third party reviewer from SBC, met with Kevin Drake of IERS to get answers to various areas she was questioning in regards to their work completed and money spent. A few answers are as follows:

- IERS is over budget for Work Item 1.2 Steering Committee Meetings and Work Item 1.3 Steering Committee Coordination. Ninety-two percent of the year 1 budget has already been spent in Work Item 1.2, and 100% of the year one budget has been spent in item 1.3. IERS is aware that they are over budget. Their explanation is that the steering committee has had more meetings early on in the project than initially budgeted for, and more hours have had to be devoted towards these work items than anticipated.
- IERS is over budget on Work Item 2.4 Project Coordination and Work Item 2.5 Direct Overhead. IERS explained that for these work items, the year one budget is 99% and 98% respectively expended, but the work items are not complete. IERS explained that some tasks were unforeseen and some tasks took longer than expected, therefore most of their budget is already spent in these areas.
- IERS is discussing how they will handle future costs in work items that are over budget and they will evaluate what the appropriate next steps are. IERS is aware



P.O. Box 2428 · Truckee, CA 96160 · p. 530.582.4800 · f. 530.582.1230 · www.sbcouncil.org

that there are 2 more steering committee meetings in year 1 of the project (June 1, 2009 – May 31, 2010).

- Work Item 3.1 PAEP document and table is near complete, which matches their expenditures (92% in year one).
- The year one budget for Work Item 3.1.1 Northstar PAEP & QAPP integration is completely (100%) expended and the task has been completed.
- The year one budget for Work Item 3.3 Monitoring Plan is 85% expended and it is near complete.
- Similarly, the year one budget for Work Item 3.4 QAPP Documentation is 93% expended and it is near complete, with only final formatting work left to be completed.
- The PAEP, MP, QAPP have all been completed and submitted.
- The year one budget for Work Item 4.1 Site/Watershed Evaluation (EfRA) Summary Document is 97% expended. This item has not been submitted yet. IERS stated that this would be a memo, and the conclusions will be reviewed at the next Steering Committee Meeting (2/24/10).
- Although the year one budget for Work Item 4.3 Treatment Sites Identification is 84% expended, Kevin stated that they are not worried, they will have enough \$ in the work item within the year 1 budget.
- The year one budget for Work Item 4.7 Water Quality Monitoring is 99% expended. Kevin reported that this budget was expended early because water quality monitoring was conducted before the project started. IERS may need to conduct water quality monitoring when the spring snow melts, which would be within the year 1 budget timeframe. IERS would need to figure out how to manage the expenditure in this situation.
- The year one budget for Work Item 4.8 Road Removal 98% expended. IERS stated they are done with road removal for the year, with no other anticipated expenditures. IERS has submitted As-Build Reports for Beacon Road Meadow, Road Infiltration Basin, Unit 3 Landing C, Unit 3 Haul Road, and Landing A.
- The year one budget for Work Item 6.1 Forest technical group formation is 99% expended. IERS stated that this task is complete, with no more anticipated expenditures.
- IERS stated that for Work Items 6.1-6.5, they are in good shape and are in line with the budget for the remainder of the year.

Nicole DeJonghe, the third party reviewer from SBC, met with Joe Barron of Northstar Fire Department to get answers to various areas she was questioning in regards to their work completed and money spent. A few answers are as follows:

- The year one budget for Work Item 7.1 Permitting and Notification is 100% spent. Joe reported that this is on budget, there are no anticipated expenditures between now and May 31, 2010 (the end of year one budget). Permitting and notification was



P.O. Box 2428 · Truckee, CA 96160 · p. 530.582.4800 · f. 530.582.1230 · www.sbcouncil.org

a onetime expenditure, and is taken care of for the remainder of the project. The archeological record search is good for 5 years.

- The year one budget for Work Item 7.2 Pre Treatment Monitoring is 100% spent. Joe reported that this is on budget; there are no anticipated monitoring needs and expenditures between now and May 31, 2010 (the end of year one budget). Joe stated that they may want to conduct pre treatment monitoring for mastication, but that would take place in September, which would be within the year 2 project budget.
- The year one budget for Work Item 7.4 Hand Crew Work (Treatment) is 100% spent. Joe reported that he may want to conduct hand crew work between now and May 31, 2010 (the end of year one budget). Since work cannot be done June 1 – Aug 31 in and around the willow flycatcher habitat, Joe may want the hand crew work to be conducted in May of 2010, depending on the weather and ground conditions. We discussed the conflict that his year 1 budget is completely spent yet he may want to do work within the year 1 time period. There is a possibility that hand crew work may be conducted in May but would be invoiced for starting in June so that the invoice would fall within the year 2 budget timeframe. Joe will discuss this with the Steering Committee and will ask if this strategy is permissible.
- The year one budget for Work Item 7.7 Mastication is 100% spent. Joe reported that this is on budget, there are no anticipated mastication needs and expenditures between now and May 31, 2010 (the end of year one budget). The next anticipated mastication event is likely to take place in September, 2010.
- Work Item 7.8 may be merged with work item 7.3; this will be discussed at the next steering committee meeting (2/24/10). Sixty-nine percent of the year one budget has been spent in work item 7.3. Joe stated that this is on budget; the expenditures for the rest of year 1 are not anticipated to exceed the amount left in the year 1 budget.
- The year one budget for Work Item 7.9 Post Treatment Monitoring and Reporting is 26% spent. Joe reported that the expended amount is due to the task of collecting data from the field. Now the data needs to be analyzed, which is the bulk of the expenditures. Joe stated that this is on budget, and the funds left in year 1 should be adequate to pay for the tasks left to complete in year 1.

Additional information on the work preformed for each work item is detailed in the attached quarterly report.

The third party review Project Director, Nicole DeJonghe, of the Sierra Business Council has completed the third party review of this Quarterly Report and has ensured that it accurately reports on activities undertaken to complete the Waddle Ranch/Northstar Watershed Improvement Program SEP. As specified in the ACL Order #R6T-2009-0012 and the Waddle Ranch/Northstar Watershed Improvement Program SEP document, this quarterly report includes:



P.O. Box 2428 · Truckee, CA 96160 · p. 530.582.4800 · f. 530.582.1230 · www.sbcouncil.org

- ✓ Complete description of all activities undertaken and/or completed during the relevant quarter, including draft products and photographs if necessary
- ✓ Cost tracking and invoices
- ✓ Minutes of public or advisory meetings
- ✓ Other pertinent information which could include: information for the previous quarter, correspondence, specific direction provided by Advisory Group, permits, other documents, budget modifications

I certify that the descriptions and accounting provided in the report are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge:

**Project Director Signature:** N. DeJ **Date:** 1/29/10

**Project Director Printed Name:** Nicole DeJonghe



PO Box 7559  
Tahoe City, CA 96145

## Quarterly Report

To: Sierra Business Council  
PO Box 2428  
Truckee, CA 96160

**Project Name:** SEP Waddle Ranch / Northstar Watershed Improvement Program

**Project Number:** R6T-2009-0012

**Quarterly Report #:** 3

**Reporting Date:** Jan 15<sup>th</sup>, 2010

**Reporting Period:** Oct 1, 2009 to Dec 31, 2009

This quarterly reports covers work done in following three invoices:

(1) # 5 October 2009 (2) # 6 November 2009 (3) # 7 December 2009

*Quarterly Progress Report Produced by IERS*

**IERS Printed Name:**

KEVIN DRAKE

**IERS Signature:**

Kevin Drake

Date: 1/29/10

As specified in the NMP SEP Project Description document, this quarterly report includes:

- All activities undertaken and/or completed, including draft products and photographs if necessary
- Cost tracking
- Minutes of public or advisory meetings
- Other pertinent information which could include: information for the previous quarter, correspondence, specific direction provided by Advisory Group, permits, other documents, budget modifications

**Attachments to this report:**

Attachment 1 – Cost Tracking Worksheet

Attachment 2 – Work Log Narrative

Attachment 3 – Task 4.8 As-builts

Attachment 4 – PAEP

Attachment 5 – Monitoring Plan

Attachment 6 – QAPP

Attachment 7 – Steering Committee meeting summary notes from 10/7/09 and 12/2/09

Task No.	Subtask No.	Product Description	Product Due Date	% Expended Budget to Date	Product Completed/ Submitted Date
<b>1</b>		<b>Project Initiation</b>			
	1.1	Steering committee development and facilitation		55%	
	1.2	Steering committee meetings	Ongoing	92%	
	1.3	Steering committee coordination	Ongoing	100%	
	1.4	Review and integration of pertinent Martis Valley projects (memo summarizing relevant projects and relationship to SEP)	Jan 31, 2010-2013	32%	
<b>2</b>		<b>Project Administration</b>			
	2.1	Quarterly progress reports  <u>Quarterly periods / Report due:</u> January – March / April 15 April – June / July 15 July – September / Oct. 15 October – December / Jan. 15	July 31, 2009 Oct. 31, 2009 Jan. 31, 2010 April 30, 2010 July 31, 2010 Oct. 31, 2010 Jan. 31, 2011 April 30, 2011 July 31, 2011 Oct. 31, 2011 Jan. 31, 2012 April 30, 2012 July 31, 2012 Oct. 31, 2012 Jan. 31, 2013 April 30, 2013 July 31, 2013 Oct. 31, 2013 Jan. 31, 2014	74%	
	2.2	Draft project report	April 30, 2013	N/A	
	2.3	Final project report	April 30, 2014	N/A	
	2.4	Project coordination	Ongoing	99%	
	2.5	Direct overhead	Ongoing	98%	
<b>3</b>		<b>PAEP and QAPP</b>			
	3.1	PAEP document (and PAEP table)	Jan 31, 2010	92%	Jan 15, 2010
	3.1.1	Northstar PAEP & QAPP integration	Jan 31, 2010	100%	Jan 15, 2010
	3.2	PAEP Annual Oversight and Documentation (QAPP annual report)	Apr 30: 2010-2014	31%	
	3.3	Monitoring Plan	Jan 31, 2010	85%	Jan 15, 2010
	3.4	QAPP Document	Jan 31, 2010	93%	Jan 15, 2010
<b>4</b>		<b>Waddle Ranch Restoration</b>			
	4.1	Site/watershed evaluation (EfRA) summary document	July 31: 2010-2014	97%	
	4.2	Environmental/permitting	July 31: 2011,	N/A	

Task No.	Subtask No.	Product Description	Product Due Date	% Expended Budget to Date	Product Completed/ Submitted Date
		documentation (summary of permit submittals and permitting efforts in quarterly report)	2012, 2013		
	4.3	Treatment sites identification (prioritized list of proposed treatment sites)	July 31: 2010-2014	84%	
	4.4	Permitting assistance (summary of permit submittals and permitting efforts in quarterly report)	July 31: 2010-2013	N/A	
	4.5	Treatment specifications	April 30: 2010-2013	62%	
	4.6	Pre-treatment sites monitoring (memo summarizing results)	April 30: 2010-2013	86%	
	4.7	WQ monitoring (memo summarizing results)	April 30: 2010-2014	99%	
	4.8	Road removal (as-builts)	Jan 31: 2010-2014	98%	Jan 15, 2010
	4.9	Stream/wetland restoration (as-builts)	Jan 31: 2012-2014	N/A	
	4.10	Forest vegetation demonstration treatments (as-builts)	No budget items exist for this task	N/A	
	4.11	Post treatment monitoring (memo summarizing monitoring results)	April 30: 2013, 2014	N/A	
	4.12	Site tours & technology transfer (outreach materials and tour handouts)	April 30: 2012,-2014	N/A	
	4.13	Public outreach program and materials	April 30: 2012,-2014	N/A	
<b>5</b>	<b>Watershed Evaluation, Treatment and Monitoring Handbook</b>				
	5.1	Technical group development and meeting minutes	April 30: 2010-2013	46%	
	5.1.1	Technical group review (summary of tech group members and comments)	April 30, 2013	N/A	
	5.2	Literature summary	April 30, 2011	54%	
	5.3	Handbook outline	April 30, 2011	39%	
	5.4	Draft handbook	April 30, 2011	1%	
	5.5	Revised draft handbook	April 30, 2013	N/A	
	5.6	Handbook distribution and review	April 30, 2013	N/A	
	5.7	Final handbook	April 30, 2014	N/A	
	5.8	Handbook layout and printing	April 30, 2014	N/A	
<b>6</b>	<b>Forest Vegetation Treatment/Water Quality Protection Handbook</b>				
	6.1	Forest technical group formation (summary of forestry tech group members and comments)	Jan 31, 2010	99%	
	6.2	Forestry technical group meeting minutes	April 30: 2010-2013	36%	
	6.3	Literature summary	April 30, 2012	30%	
	6.4	Draft handbook outline & guiding principles (Document outline)	April 30, 2011	3%	
	6.5	Identify treatment options (memo summarizing treatment options and recommendations)	April 30, 2011	38%	
	6.6	Forest vegetation reduction treatment	April 30, 2012	N/A	

Task No.	Subtask No.	Product Description	Product Due Date	% Expended Budget to Date	Product Completed/ Submitted Date
		implementation (research plots) - as built report			
	6.7	Draft handbook	April 30, 2012	N/A	
	6.8	Monitor treatments (memo summarizing monitoring results)	April 30: 2011, 2012, 2013	N/A	
	6.9	Handbook distribution and review	April 30, 2012	N/A	
	6.10	Final draft handbook	April 30, 2013	N/A	
	6.11	Handbook printing and distribution	No budget item exists in SEP	N/A	
<b>7</b>		<b>Northstar Riparian and Forest Enhancement Project</b>			
	7.1	Permitting and Notification	Oct 31, 2009	100%	
	7.2	Pre Treatment Monitoring (summarized in quarterly reports)	Oct 31: 2009-2013	100%	
	7.3	Field Work (Site Preparation) (summarized in quarterly reports)	July 31 and Oct 31: 2010-2014	0%	
	7.4	Hand Crew Work (Treatment) (summarized in quarterly reports)	July 31 and Oct 31: 2010-2013	100%	
	7.5	Hand Crew Work (Chipping) (summarized in quarterly reports)	July 31 and Oct 31: 2010-2013	0%	
	7.6	Hand Crew Work (Pile Burning) (summarized in quarterly reports)	July 31 and Oct 31: 2010-2013	0%	
	7.7	Mastication (summarized in quarterly reports)	July 31 and Oct 31: 2010-2013	100%	
	7.8	Project Inspections and Forestry Management (summarized in quarterly reports)	July 31 and Oct 31: 2009-2013	69%	
	7.9	Post Treatment Monitoring and Reporting –included in PAEP annual report	April 30: 2010-2014	26%	
<b>8</b>		<b>Project Implementation and Monitoring Contingency</b>			
		<i>(document as needed)</i>			

**Narrative:**

*(IERS, please describe work done in each task area. Also include a description/information for attachments. Simply note if, at the time of Quarterly Report submission, there is no completed product for the task.)*

**Work Log for Q4 (October through December) 2009:**

**Task 1 – Project Initiation**

**Task 1.1 SEP Steering Committee Development and Facilitation**

**Task 1.2 SEP Steering Committee meetings**

**October** - IERS staff attended the October 7<sup>th</sup> Steering Committee meeting at TTAD. Michael Hogan, Kevin Drake, and Don Triplat were in attendance, but only two representatives from

IERS charged time to project. Topics of discussion are covered in the summary notes. A field tour was conducted after the SC meeting to inform members of 2009 project treatments at Waddle Ranch. A draft of the meeting minutes, schedule, and future agenda items were outlined and sent out for review by members.

**November** - IERS staff prepared meeting agenda and coordinated meeting schedule and agenda with Steering Committee members.

**December** - Kevin Drake coordinated Steering Committee (SC) meeting logistics with members, prepared meeting agenda and materials for presentation, and summarized SC meeting notes which were reviewed by SC members and edited to include full coverage of meeting content. The meeting minutes were emailed to members and posted on the SEP sharepoint website. Michael Hogan prepared materials for the SC meeting and attended the meeting on Dec. 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2009.

### **Task 1.3 SEP Steering Committee Coordination**

**October** - IERS staff prepared a field tour handout to inform SC members of the process for site selection, treatment specifications and a GIS map showing the watershed assessment progress. IERS also demonstrated the rainfall simulator to illustrate the erosion impacts of unpaved roads.

### **Task 1.4: Review & Integration of MV projects**

**November** - Michael Hogan had a phone meeting with Lisa Wallace to discuss Martis Valley and Truckee projects of pertinence to the Waddle Ranch SEP. General coordination of SEP projects with other TRWC projects were discussed.

## **Task 2 – Project Administration**

### **Task 2.1 Quarterly Progress Reports**

**October** - IERS staff drafted the September quarterly progress report and integrated Northstar Fire Dept. project budget expenditures and work log progress into reporting format for submission. Reviewed and edited report by internal staff to create final draft for submission to Sierra Business Council (SBC).

**November** - Product due dates of the quarterly report were brought to light by Eric Taxer. These dates are not in line with SEP table 5 Deliverable due dates. Several phone meetings were held to discuss the options and direction of work between Hayes Parzybok, Nicole DeJonghe, and Don Triplat. The deliverable table was updated and vetted for format changes along with the quarterly report product due dates. This issue has not been settled as of November invoice and is currently being discussed to reach an amiable outcome.

**December** - Revisions were made to Q3 SEP report per comments by Eric Taxer and submitted for approval.

**Task 2.4 Project Coordination** - K. Drake participated in a conference call with H. Parzybok to discuss comments by E. Taxer pertaining to deliverable dates for the SEP project. He edited and revised the table of project deliverables due dates for review.

### **Task 2.5.3 Travel**

### **Task 2.5.4 Budget and Project Tracking**

### **Task 3 – PAEP and QAPP**

#### **Task 3.1 PAEP Document -**

**October** - Michael Hogan reviewed and edited the PAEP document.

**November** – Kevin Drake integrated Northstar Fire District’s monitoring elements into the PAEP document and submitted the PAEP to the steering committee for review.

#### **Task 3.1.1 Northstar-at-Tahoe PAEP & QAPP**

**October** - Northstar Fire Dept. project PAEP was revised by Kevin Drake, sent to Joe Barron and iterated several times to reach completion.

#### **Task 3.2 PAEP Oversight and Documentation**

#### **Task 3.3 Monitoring Plan**

**October** - Monitoring plan was completed and sent to SBC for review and approval.

#### **Task 3.4 QAPP Preparation**

**October** - The QAPP document was completed by IERS and submitted to SBC for review and approval.

### **Task 4 – Waddle Ranch Restoration**

#### **Task 4.1 Site/Watershed Evaluation**

**October** - A watershed assessment coordination meeting was held within IERS to review site evaluation progress and GIS maps. Further GIS mapping was conducted to organize GPS field survey elements and to develop watershed evaluation layers including roads, trails, landings, and erosion hotspots. A draft of the watershed assessment methodology was developed by IERS and reviewed by Matt Kiese (River Run Consulting) for submission to Steering Committee members. IERS coordinated with the Tahoe National Forest to acquire historic aerial photos that will be used to assess large-scale changes and a timeline of watershed impacts at Waddle Ranch. An initial stream assessment of East Fork Martis Creek was started in order to define and characterize the condition of different reaches and identify potential restoration needs.

**November** - Kevin Drake made contact with the Tahoe National Forest to locate historic aerial photographs covering the Waddle Ranch property and ask for permission to borrow these photographs to duplicate for efforts to identify historic changes within the East Fork Martis Creek watershed. Kevin also conducted a site visit to delineate functional reaches and geomorphic conditions of East Fork Martis Creek.

**December** - GIS maps were produced for the watershed assessment documentation to present at the Dec. 2 SC meeting.

#### **Task 4.2 Environmental Permitting Documentation**

#### **Task 4.3 Treatment Sites Identification**

**October** - Matt Kiese (River Run Consulting) made a site visit with IERS staff to assess potential project sites in the East Fork Martis Creek watershed.

#### **Task 4.4 Permitting Assistance**

#### **Task 4.5 Treatment Specifications**

**October** - Developed treatment specs for 2009 restoration treatments and draft specs for Steering Committee field tour to inform members of the treatment process and goals.

**December** - 2009 restoration project specifications were organized for presentation to the SC meeting on Dec.2, 2009.

#### **Task 4.6 Pre-treatment Site Monitoring**

**October** - IERS's monitoring crew conducted implementation monitoring at 2009 project sites to assess conditions immediately following treatment implementation. Some data entry was also conducted.

**November** - IERS conducted implementation monitoring upon 2009 projects, data entry, and QA/QC procedures to verify data quality (as per QAPP).

**December** - Quality assurance for implementation monitoring was conducted by Rachel McCullough to verify procedures and data quality.

#### **Task 4.7 Water Quality Monitoring**

#### **Task 4.8 Road Removal**

**October** - IERS's restoration crew completed the soil prep and restoration treatments at five project sites. As built reports are being created to document site-specific treatments and share with Steering Committee members.

**November** - IERS staff planted 45 rust-resistant Sugar Pine seedlings in Landing A to complete restoration work on this site. Lorenzo Worster began as-built reports for all 2009 project sites to document procedures, methods, and outcomes of restoration work.

### **Task 5 Evaluation, Treatment and Monitoring Handbook**

#### **Task 5.1 Watershed Technical Group development, meetings**

**October** - Michael Hogan coordinated with members of the WTG and reviewed content for this group. He also attended a Fire and Fuels Team meeting to discuss SEP coordination with fuels program managers of area Fire Departments. Kevin Drake coordinated with WTG members to schedule first meeting.

**November** - Kevin Drake coordinated and scheduled the first Watershed Technical Group meeting to be held at Truckee Town Hall in early December. An adaptive management plan was drafted to guide the meeting process.

**December** - Michael Hogan met with Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team and Tahoe Science Consortium to coordinate work efforts between these groups and the Forestry Handbook effort to integrate research opportunities with the Watershed Technical Group (WTG). Coordination time was spent with Susan Clark and preparation for the WTG meeting and attendance at meeting. Kevin Drake developed and revised the agenda for the WTG meeting with Susan Clark and prepared presentation content for the meeting. Kevin Drake and Michael Hogan worked with Susan Clark to develop an Adaptive Meeting Planner (AMP) framework for the kick off meeting. WTG meeting coordination and attendance on Dec 10<sup>th</sup>, 2009 and debriefing with S.

Clark and M. Hogan to review progress and define future direction was accomplished. Summary notes from the Dec.10 meeting were drafted and emailed to committee members for review.

#### **Task 5.1.1 Watershed Technical Group Review**

#### **Task 5.2 Literature Summary**

**October** - Michael Hogan began a review of literature, existing research, and discussion of potential information gaps with Lahontan staff and NRCS.

**December** - M. Hogan reviewed the White Creek watershed plan. K. Drake prepared a literature review work plan and entered and organized references in EndNote. An initial citation list was started.

#### **Task 5.3 Document Outline**

**October** - IERS began the outline of the handbook, assessing linkages to relevant documents.

**December** - K. Drake outlined the watershed handbook format with M. Hogan and prepared watershed assessment GIS maps, which will serve as example content for the draft handbook.

#### **Task 5.4 Draft Document**

**December** - K. Drake developed a work plan for the Watershed Handbook.

#### **Task 5.5 Interim/working Document**

#### **Task 5.6 Document Iteration**

#### **Task 5.7 Final Document**

#### **Task 5.8 Document Layout and Printing**

### **Task 6 – Forest Vegetation Treatment/Water Quality Protection Handbook**

#### **Task 6.1 Forestry Technical Group Formation**

#### **Task 6.2 Forestry Technical Group Meetings**

**October** - Kevin Drake coordinated with FTG members to schedule first meeting.

**December** - M. Hogan prepared justification matrix describing the qualifications of each of the members of the Forestry Technical Group (FTG) and coordinated agenda and adaptive meeting planner (AMP) with S. Clark and K. Drake. A handbook approach overview and presentation was developed for the FTG meeting. K. Drake and M. Hogan prepped for and attended the FTG meeting on Dec. 16<sup>th</sup> 2009. K. Drake coordinated the meeting schedule and winter travel logistics with members. Meeting notes were summarized and edited following the FTG meeting.

#### **Task 6.3 Literature Summary**

**October** - Michael Hogan began a review of literature, existing research, and discussion of potential information gaps with Lahontan staff and NRCS.

#### **Task 6.4 Develop Draft Handbook / Guiding Principles**

**December** - K. Drake developed a work plan for the handbook

### **Task 6.5 Identify Treatment Options**

**November** - M. Hogan and D. Triplat met with Phred Stoner to discuss treatment options and future forestry work at Waddle Ranch to coordinate project efforts and discuss collaboration opportunities between TTAD and SEP program.

**December** - K. Drake entered and organized technical references in the EndNote reference database.

### **Task 6.6 Forest Vegetation Treatment Implementation**

### **Task 6.7 Develop Working Draft Handbook**

### **Task 6.8 Monitor Treatments**

### **Task 6.9 Distribution Copy-Forest Vegetation Treatment/Water Quality Protection Handbook**

### **Task 6.10 Final Draft Forest Vegetation Treatment /Water Quality Protection Handbook**

## **Task 7 – Northstar Riparian and Forest Enhancement Project**

**Task Item 7.4 (Hand Crew Work Treatment)** – Hand crew treatment work performed by Cal Fire, (Washington Ridge) has been completed for the 2009 Field Season. Two invoices were submitted for the project work and the bill for September’s work was submitted late, (December 2009). This was due to a late receiving of this bill from Cal Fire in Sacramento. Revisions were made with management in Cal Fire to allow Washington Ridge and Northstar Fire Department to work exclusively in the billing process; eliminating billing to go through Sacramento.

The Cal Fire crew was able to initially treat 10 acres of forested terrain in 12.5 days. The budgeted cost of \$2,500.00 was spent. Cal Fire crews performed tree, brush and ground fuel removal with chain saws and hand tools. Also, they created and prepared burn piles for biomass disposal. The crew sizes ranged from 10-15 individuals and worked in areas that were deemed sensitive, too steep or rocky for mechanical equipment to work. 1-2 crews worked per assignment and averaged .8 acres treated per crew day worked.

No work for Task Item 7.5 (Chipping) was performed, and Task Item 7.6 (Pile Burning) is expected to take place in January after the New Year’s Holiday. Pile burning was decided to take place following the Thanksgiving, Christmas and New Years holidays to reduce the economical and aesthetic impact of the area due to the high out of town visitor and seasonal homeowner volume.

**Task Item 7.8 (Project Inspections and Forestry Management)** – Consulting Forester Bill Banka’s job duties were as follows for the following months:

#### **October:**

- Establishing areas of work for Cal Fire Crews. This included ensuring that project boundary, wildlife protection zones, watercourses and historical site flagging were clearly identified and established and observed.

- Tree marking for removal with orange paint and ensuring that trees marked for removal had been removed, cut and disposed of in the prescribed manner.
- (Project Inspections) Ensuring that Cal Fire crews hand treatment methods were in accordance to the SEP project prescription and in accordance to state regulations. This included the collection of total burn piles created, dimensions of piles (pile size) and estimated emissions based on pile size and material to burn. Data collection was done at the end of the day, or prior to the next crew work assignment.
- Continue work on the establishment of 67 Pre-Treatment Forest inventory plots, collecting initial data. 86 plots was the expected goal for the 2009 season.
- Office work consisting of the preparation of work to visit 15 Post Treatment plots to collect data.

**November:**

- Complete work on the establishment of 67 Pre-Treatment Forest inventory plots. The majority of inventory work for this month was collected in wet and riparian areas where the fall weather produced less deciduous foliage, allowing better viewing for forest inventory data collection.
- Begin work to Revisit the 15 Post Treatment plots and collect post treatment data.
- Assist NFD Forestry Supervisor Joe Barron in collecting inventory plot site photos in all cardinal directions. This was for pre and post treatment plots, and to assist in collecting GPS coordinates of plot locations.

**December:**

- Finish and complete the inventory of 15 total post treatment plots. This included the revisiting of 2 pre treatment plots due to missed data.
- Begin the office portion of pre and post treatment data by reviewing, organizing material and preparing it for data analysis. Missed data for 2 plots were revisited as indicated above.

As of December, 2009 NFD has spent \$6,940 on the services of Bill Banka. \$10,000 was allotted for the 2009 field season and \$3,060 remains in the budget for Bill Banka's services.

It is expected to have Bill Banka complete his services for this field season with Project Management in pile burning, data analysis of inventory and assistance in the end of season report writing. In addition Bill Banka will assist in 2010 project season planning for field work and monitoring locations.

**Task Item 7.9 (Post Treatment Monitoring and Reporting)**

- Three days of pre- and post-treatment monitoring were completed by IERS on two forestry treatment plots. The field portion of the data collection was completed and a memo summarizing results will be submitted in April 2010.

**Comments:**

- It should be noted that a log will be created and established by NFD to submit to Sierra Business Council (SBC) and Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (LRWQCB) for the 2010 project season. The log book will record the number of

inspections and by whom per project day. This will be submitted to SBC (Monthly) and LRWQB (Quarterly).

- NFD has sent a proposal to SBC which will go to LRWQB for review regarding the potential re-structuring of the language of Bill Banka's task duties for his remaining two seasons of work.

### **Task 8 – Project Implementation and Monitoring Contingency**

# SUMMARY NOTES

## **Waddle Ranch/Northstar SEP Steering Committee Meeting**

**October 7, 2009**

**Truckee Tahoe Airport**

**12:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.**

### **Attendees:**

Phred Stoner (TTAD)  
Nicole DeJonghe (SBC)  
Mike Hogan (IERS)  
Lisa Wallace (TRWC)  
Eric Taxer (LRWQCB)  
Don Triplat (IERS)  
John Svahn (TDLT)  
Hayes Parzybok (NMP)  
Kevin Drake (IERS)

### **Desired Outcomes and Progress Toward Outcomes:**

- Approval of technical committee members or alternative suggestions - COMPLETED
- Set number of meetings, meeting dates and approximate agenda items for each meeting through 2010 - COMPLETED
- Agree on process for alternative (outside of meeting) info dissemination and decision process - IN PROGRESS
- Tour treatment sites and treatment outputs including as-builts, monitoring approach, watershed assessment approach to date - COMPLETED

### **Action Items:**

- IERS to coordinate with Phred on developing RFP and contract language for road treatments/BMPs for TTADs' 2010 forestry contracting work
- Determine whether or not SEP funds can be used to address watershed issues outside of the Waddle Ranch property boundary (i.e. assisting TTAD for its forestry management work, private land above Dry Lake)
- IERS to clarify approval items/dates for Steering Committee
- IERS to email draft meeting schedule and agenda items to Steering Committee

### **Summary Notes:**

Michael opened the meeting with an overview of the meeting agenda and the desired outcomes.

Phred asked if it was appropriate to discuss next year's forestry treatments and how they relate to potential watershed restoration treatments. The group agreed that this coordination should take place within a larger watershed planning process over the winter.

Phred also asked if he could request input from IERS (using SEP funds) on developing appropriate post-harvest BMP/treatment specifications (particularly for roads) for the 2010 forest management contract. The group felt that this would be an appropriate use of SEP funds, particularly since it could result in additional land area being treated at Waddle Ranch in cooperation with TTAD and the 2010 forestry contractor.

Phred asked for clarification on whether or not the SEP funds could be used to address watershed issues outside of the Waddle Ranch property boundary (i.e. SPI land above Dry Lake). Need to review notes from previous conversations and potentially consult the legal team. For the time being, the assessment will identify all erosion/water quality issues affecting Waddle Ranch, whether they are on the Waddle Ranch property or not.

### Selecting and Approving Technical Group Members

IERS received no feedback from Steering Committee members prior to today's meeting. Michael and Kevin reviewed the experience/credentials of the proposed technical group members for both the forestry and watershed technical groups. Lisa indicated that it would be nice to have some local USFS representatives on the Forestry Technical Group, but not critical. Eric expressed appreciation for the breadth and depth of skills and experience represented on the Forestry Technical Group. After some discussion, all voting members of the Steering Committee that were present at the meeting approved the proposed members put forth by IERS for both the forestry and watershed technical groups.

### Future Steering Committee Meeting Dates and Draft Agenda Items

#### Meeting 1 (Wed. Dec. 2, 2009)

- Discuss PAEP, MP, QAPP (general overview) and **approve** PAEP for entire SEP
- Review Waddle Ranch watershed assessment outline and initial findings (inc. general treatment opportunities for 2010)
- Review as-builts for Waddle Ranch projects constructed in 2009
- Review progress on Watershed and Forestry Technical groups
- Northstar Fire project update (Joe Barron), including SEP goals, monitoring, treatments and as-builts
- Agree on process for alternative (outside of meeting) info dissemination and decision process
- Review progress on tasks relative to budget for entire SEP

#### Meeting 2 (Wed. Feb. 24, 2010)

- Review Waddle Ranch watershed assessment conclusions and recommendations (SEP and otherwise)
- Review pre-treatment monitoring results at Waddle or Northstar or both?
- Review and **approve** draft work plan for 2010 Waddell and Northstar?
- Review handbook outlines and progress on technical groups
- Review progress on tasks relative to budget for entire SEP

#### Meeting 3 (Wed. April 14, 2010)

- Review generalized work plan for 2011 – 2014 for entire SEP
- Review 2010 project goals and treatment approaches, for entire SEP
- Review progress on tasks relative to budget for entire SEP

#### Meeting 4 (Wed. August 25, 2010)

- Visit field projects at Waddle Ranch, review progress
- Review Waddle Ranch water quality monitoring results
- Review key findings from spring/summer Waddell Ranch watershed assessment
- Review progress on tasks relative to budget for entire SEP

#### Meeting 5 (Wed. Nov. 10, 2010)

- Review progress on project goals (from PAEP table) for entire SEP
- Review as-builts for Waddle Ranch projects constructed in 2010
- Review/discuss public outreach options
- Northstar Fire project update (Joe Barron), including SEP goals, monitoring, treatments and as-builts
- Review progress on tasks relative to budget for entire SEP

Hayes announced that he has been laid off from NMP. His last day is November 30. He is discussing options that may allow him to stay involved as NMP's representative on the SEP. He will inform the Steering Committee of his status in early November. Hayes asked that no Steering Committee members contact NMP to lobby for his continued involvement until he meets with his supervisor in early November.

# SUMMARY NOTES

**Waddle Ranch/Northstar SEP Steering Committee Meeting**  
**December 2, 2009**  
**Truckee Tahoe Airport**  
**12:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.**

Meeting began at 12:15 p.m.  
Meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

## **Attendees:**

Phred Stoner (TTAD)  
Nicole DeJonghe (SBC)  
Mike Hogan (IERS)  
Lisa Wallace (TRWC)  
Eric Taxer (LRWQCB)  
Don Triplat (IERS)  
Hayes Parzybok (NMP)  
Kevin Drake (IERS)  
Susan Clark (DC)  
Mark Shadowens (NFD)  
Joe Barron (NFD)  
John Svahn (TDLT)

## **Desired Outcomes and Progress Toward Outcomes:**

- Approval of PAEP – unanimously approved by all voting members present
- Agreement on process(s) for communication and decision-making outside of meetings - completed
- Develop clear understanding of progress to date and upcoming tasks/deliverables/priorities - completed

## **Action Items:**

- Phred will contact Army Corp to discuss project coordination
- Phred and Mark to develop proposed key agreement to define voting rules for NFD and TTAD
- Email out updated and approved PAEP (with changes highlighted) with meeting notes
- Nicole will work with Hayes on any budget changes and will review proposed changes with the SC by email. Proposal: Allow a set percentage of budget shift to allow projects to keep moving and set an upper limit beyond which the SC must approve changes.
- Include Key Agreements from 6/8/09 meeting in these minutes for review and confirmation
- Kevin to add notes from 6/8/09 meeting to communication item (Item V) regarding voting rights
- IERS to request invoices from TRWC and TDLT for Steering Committee meetings
- IERS to prepare cost breakdown between 2008 and 2009 for WQ monitoring and submit to Hayes/Nicole
- Hayes will facilitate conversation between Joe, Eric and Nicole and develop a proposal for clarifying tasks 7.3 and 7.8.
- IERS to update SEP sharepoint site with all past meeting notes and relevant docs and email SC when its up to date
- Susan to grant SEP SC access to online AMP tool to facilitate and track communication outside of meetings
- Joe to change colors on forest vegetation treatment map to more clearly delineate land ownership of NMP and NPOA
- Joe to determine if conservation easement exists within or near project boundary and communicate findings to TDLT

## **Future Agenda Items:**

- Revisit voting rights and membership, draft language and propose new agreement at next steering committee meeting for voting rights on specific projects

## **Summary Notes:**

### **Opening: Importance of process to TMDL and future forestry impact research**

The meeting was opened the meeting with an overview of how the Forestry Handbook element of the SEP fits into the larger context of agencies, practitioners and researchers grappling with the lack of understanding of the impacts of various forest management practices. It was also noted that there is a pending lawsuit that's putting great pressure on the Lahontan and TRPA to develop and enforce clear standards using real-time, direct measurements rather than relying on models to predict project impacts. The Forestry Handbook element of SEP will help to develop consistent and clear monitoring methods, data and direct linkages to the needs and concerns of a wide variety of end users (agencies and implementers). The project will use an adaptive mgmt framework to refine our information and understanding over a couple years and develop practical, useful tools for low-impact project implementation and monitoring.

A concern was expressed that monitoring for forestry projects needs to be cost-effective and relatively easy to implement and not required on every project. This project will employ a "bottom-up" approach by developing information and recommendations in direct partnership with field-based practitioners.

**Key Agreement – the project team (IERS and Forestry Technical Group) is committed to making the Forest Vegetation Treatment/Water Quality Protection Handbook practical, accessible and useful to practitioners by developing the principles and practices in the Handbook in direct partnership with practitioners.**

The point was made that we are trying to move away from monitoring for monitoring sake and towards targeted monitoring that directly addresses management questions (in a timely fashion) and provide useful information to base decisions on. We will need to clarify the differences between forest PRACTICES and MONITORING METHODS. Also, some concern that we may be over-promising on what the FTG can deliver (in terms of "answers") in a fairly short period of time. This project is developing "customizable solutions," rather than fixed, black & white standards.

### **Item I. PAEP Review**

Kevin reviewed changes to PAEP document (all changes are highlighted in the attached PAEP). Kevin noted that water quality monitoring and the two Handbooks were identified as deliverables in the SEP Project Description and were translated into goals and outcomes in the PAEP accordingly. Generally, every goal in the PAEP is linked to some element in the SEP Project Description and the purpose of developing the PAEP is to articulate concrete goals, outcomes and measurable targets to track progress toward satisfying the "spirit and intent" of the SEP Project Description. The group had many detailed questions about the PAEP but agreed that if the overall logic is sound, they will vote to approve the PAEP.

Group discussion about whether or not targets seem realistic. Some confusion about whether percent reduction in sediment yield pertained to in-stream monitoring or rainfall simulation. IERS explained that since most in-stream water quality data cannot be directly linked to upslope impacts or treatments, we are relying on non-traditional measurements (such as rainfall simulation) to measure actual erosion at the project scale. Discussion about the role of targets. If we don't hit the targets, we will review our practices and revise accordingly over the course of the project as part of the adaptive management process. It is important to start with quantitative targets so you have something clear and well-defined to shoot for.

**Key Agreement – Projects and activities at Waddle Ranch will consider and minimize impacts to recreational users and facilities, as per the conservation easement.**

Lesson learned – should have set a deadline for comments and emailed out a list of edits for review prior to the meeting. Clarification: work on Army Corp and SPI property is not included in the PAEP or SEP project. However, TTAD will coordinate with Army Corp on improvements planned for main road. Should minimizing impacts to

recreation facilities be a goal in the PAEP? After discussion it was determined that such management needs (especially requirements in the conservation easement) have been and would continue to be a criteria for project selection each year but that recreation interests did not need to be included in PAEP.

Vote: all voting members present voted in favor of approving the PAEP.

## **Item II. Northstar Forestry project review**

Joe Barron provided an overview of the forest vegetation treatments completed to date at Northstar under the SEP. Joe circulated a map showing treatment areas, protected areas (potential Willow Flycatcher habitat) and forest inventory plots. Joe passed out a handout summarizing the measurements included in the forest inventory monitoring conducted by Northstar Fire and soil-vegetation monitoring being conducted by IERS. NFD is also discovering sites of potential archaeological significance and mastication is being excluded from these areas. This summer, IERS was planning to monitor the effects of mastication on soil and vegetation conditions before and after treatment. Two plots were identified in coordination with Northstar Fire's consulting forester and IERS conducted pre-treatment monitoring the same day, but mastication was not conducted in these areas due to the last-minute discovery of potential Willow Flycatcher habitat near the plots. Instead, these areas were treated with hand crews. Due to the limited budget and schedule constraints, alternative monitoring plots were not selected and IERS conducted post-treatment monitoring following hand crew treatments. In order to ensure that monitoring conducted in 2010 produces information on the effects of mastication (as per the SEP Project Description), the following steps will be taken:

- Northstar Fire will complete surveys for Willow Flycatcher and archeological artifacts in all planned mastication areas prior to selecting monitoring sites with IERS.
- IERS will work proactively with Northstar Fire to identify and select appropriate sites for pre- and post-treatment monitoring, including alternative/contingency sites.
- Both parties (NFD and IERS) will clarify protocols for communication/coordination between Northstar Fire, IERS, the consulting forester and the masticator operator

### Feedback from SC

- SC asked when they would see data from soil and vegetation monitoring at Northstar. IERS indicated that the data will be summarized in the PAEP Annual Report.
- Change colors on forest vegetation treatment map to more clearly delineate land ownership of NMP and NPOA
- Joe to determine if conservation easement exists within or near project boundary and communicate findings to TDLT

## **Item III. Overview of watershed assessment methodology; initial findings, treatment options**

Kevin presented an overview of the watershed assessment work to date, initial findings and next steps.

### Work Completed to Date

- GIS data compilation – aerial photos (present and historic), topography, roads, hydrology, soils
- GPS field inventory of roads (existing and historic), recreational trails (existing and proposed), skid trails, landings (existing and historic), erosion hot spots, potential project areas, completed projects areas, streams (perennial and ephemeral), stream reaches on East Martis Creek
- General classification and description of four functional reaches along East Martis Creek
- In total, IERS has completed on-the-ground assessment of 15% of Waddle Ranch property

### Main Problem Areas

- Road-stream crossings: abrupt grade changes causing deposition, roads capturing stream flow (particularly above Dry Lake)
- Past and recent forestry impacts: landings, roads, historic skid trails
- Road drainage: not planned, no on-site infiltration

### General Findings/Observations

- East Martis Creek is fairly stable (and supporting fish) throughout property – currently a low priority for treatment
- East Martis Creek has 3-5 distinct functional geomorphic reaches within property
- Most of the coarse sediment supply affecting the creek within the property is outside of the property
- Legacy impacts from historic logging still persist and some are actively eroding
- The landscape of Waddle Ranch has been formed by large-scale, infrequent flood events transporting/shifting large volumes of coarse sediment (which we intend to learn more about through analysis of historic aerial photos)

#### Next Steps

- Identify and map linkages between problem areas - January 2010
- Analysis of historic aerial photos – January 2010
- Watershed Assessment summary – February 24, 2010
- Summary of monitoring data (in-stream WQ and project-scale monitoring) – February 24, 2010
- Identify, evaluate and select restoration project opportunities for 2010 – February 24, 2010
- Complete literature summary – April 30, 2010
- Evaluate effects of sediment loading on different stream reaches – summer 2010
- Discussions with local natural history experts – ongoing

Feedback – provide an outline of presentation so SC members can follow along. Provide an outline/timeline for next steps and products that will follow.

#### **Item IV. Overview of restoration projects**

Don presented photos to illustrate road erosion issues, how water has been cut off from the meadow, and how roads are very dusty, particularly after forestry hauling work. Don also presented an overview of the projects completed in 2009, including treatment test elements. IERS is making an effort to reduce import-export of materials by using wood chips generated onsite and nearby as soil amendment and mulch. IERS planted 45 sugar pine trees in 3 different soil treatment areas to test and measure difference in tree growth and vigor. IERS constructed two infiltration areas to capture and infiltrate road drainage in critical areas. One new haul road was covered in asphalt grindings and IERS conducted runoff simulation to test effectiveness of asphalt grindings as a dust control and erosion control measure on permanent roads. IERS also replaced a few large water bars with rolling dips to make for easier vehicle passage.

Restoration and monitoring budgets are small for the first 2 seasons, then larger in years 3-5. The intent is to implement and test small-scale demonstration treatments in years 1 and 2 and then to scale up the most effective treatments in years 3-5 based on monitoring results.

There has been active coordination between TTAD and IERS on the type, location and timing of restoration projects, as well as to develop tighter contract language for 2010 forestry work at Waddle Ranch.

#### **Item V. Communication process and decision making outside of meetings**

- Public perception is an important consideration for the overall SEP project, and the way in which decision-making responsibilities are divided between Northstar Fire and TTAD is important.
- Griz had personal objection about funding being diverted to Northstar Forestry Project
- At the 6/8/09 Steering Committee meeting the following Key Agreement was recorded:  
*On the role of the individual organizations:*
  - a. DLT and the TRWC will be treated similarly and will be compensated for their participation on the Steering Committee.*
  - b. There is value to having Northstar Fire District at the Steering Committee table. To this end, NFD is a non-voting, non-compensated member of the steering committee.*
  - c. Michael and IERS are non-voting and compensated members of the steering committee.*
  - d. Airport district will vote on all matters except those having to do with the SEP work at Northstar*

- The PAEP is a document that pertains to activities on both Waddle Ranch and Northstar. Therefore, it seems appropriate that Northstar would be allowed to vote on this and other matters that directly affect Northstar property.
- Phred and Mark will develop a proposed key agreement to more clearly define the voting rights of each entity and proposed this key agreement at the next SC meeting.
- Susan will provide access to the new web-based version of the Adaptive Meeting Planner in order to facilitate and track communication outside of meetings

#### **Item VI. Review progress on tasks, budget and near-term deliverables**

Don and Kevin reviewed progress on tasks and budget expended through October 2009 (see attachment). The following issues were identified and discussed:

- The budgets for Task 1.2 (SC meetings) and Task 1.3 (SC coordination) are 76% and 100% spent (respectively) yet there is still SC coordination to complete. Also, invoices from TRWC and TDLT have not been submitted to IERS for previous SC meetings, which will come out of Task 1.2. IERS will request invoices from TRWC and TDLT as soon as possible to accurately account for budget remaining for task 1.2. Also, it is likely that technical group meetings were over-budgeted for in year 1.
- Task 4.7 (WQ monitoring) is already 100% spent because monitoring began in 2008 and SEP approval occurred later than expected. Also, the annual budgeting cycle starts over on June 1, which is after IERS will have begun WQ sampling to catch runoff in March or April 2010.
- Northstar Fire sought clarification on how to account for their consulting forester's time spent on the SEP forestry work at Northstar. Hayes will facilitate conversation between Joe, Eric and Nicole and develop a proposal for clarifying tasks 7.3 and 7.8.
- Request for clarification on how budget is moved from year to year and task to task. What are the criteria for changing budget items? Nicole will work with Hayes on any budget changes and will review proposed changes with the SC by email. Proposal: Allow a set percentage of budget shift to allow projects to keep moving and set an upper limit beyond which the SC must approve changes.

**Key Agreement: project team agrees to use the following tiered system for quarterly reporting and budget tracking**

- **Tier 1 – budget expenditures match deliverable progress**
- **Tier 2 – budget expenditures are not commensurate with progress on deliverables and require additional explanation in quarterly report**
- **Tier 3 – budget expenditures are grossly out of alignment with progress on deliverables and budget reallocation needs to be considered and/or performance on task needs to be evaluated**

**Key Agreement: project team will email quarterly progress reports to SC within one week of approval by Lahontan**

#### **Feedback on Overall Meeting**

##### What worked about this meeting?

On task, focused, relatively on time  
 Good to have everyone present at meeting  
 Good to have Mark and Joe from NFD at meeting to provide input  
 Having Susan facilitate made the meeting very effective  
 Nicole came out to Northstar to better understand forestry treatments

##### What could be improved?

Few agenda items with time for greater depth in discussion  
 Continue to do more work outside of meetings so that time spent in meetings is used as effectively as possible

Meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

### Key Agreements from 6/8/09 Steering Committee Meeting

1. Key Agreement: The group is in agreement on the boundaries described in question three of the adaptive meeting planner.
  - a. SEP and ACL agreement (tasks, expectations)
  - b. Legal requirements
  - c. Operational requirements of TTAD
  - d. Legal and operational requirements of the Conservation easement and general plans of TDLT.
  
2. Key Agreement: It was agreed that it is the Steering Committee's role to deliver all of the eight tasks outlined in the meeting.
  
3. Key Agreement: It was agreed that the Steering Committee will be made up of representatives from the Truckee River Water Council (TRWC), Northstar Mountain Properties (NMP), Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (LRWQCB), Truckee-Donner Land Trust (TDLT), Truckee-Tahoe Airport District (TTAD), Northstar Fire Department (NFD), Integrated Environmental Resource Solutions (IERS) with Dynamic Competence Consulting as Strategic Facilitators.
  
4. Key Agreement: On the role of the individual organizations:
  - e. TDLT and the TRWC will be treated similarly and will be compensated for their participation on the Steering Committee.
  - f. There is value to having Northstar Fire District at the Steering Committee table. To this end, NFD is a non-voting, non-compensated member of the steering committee.
  - g. Michael and IERS are non-voting and compensated members of the steering committee.
  - h. Airport district will vote on all matters except those having to do with the SEP work at Northstar
  
5. Key Agreement: The Steering Committee agreed to the following decision making process:
  - a. Primary decision-making will be based on consensus
  - b. If unable to reach consensus before the end of a discussion time point, then the decision-making will revert to 2/3 majority
  - c. Furthermore, if a decision appears to fall outside of an agreed boundary, any Steering Committee member could question the validity of that decision
  
6. Key Agreement: The general operational guiding principles of the Steering Committee include agreements to:
  - a. Do the best work possible with the existing money for this project
  - b. Commit to accountability and will work to ensure that deliverables and expenditures are in alignment with the budget
  - c. Commit to the people and process behind SEP. A byproduct of this agreement is that members of the Steering Committee will accurately and thoroughly represent decisions of the Steering Committee to the public
  - d. Represent their organizations and their agendas as a means to move the process forward.
  
7. Key Agreement: The Steering Committee agreed that the roles and responsibilities of the two technical Committees are to
  - a. Produce the Watershed and Forestry Handbooks. The committees are to develop the proposed content of these documents and are on call to give technical recommendations when needed.
  - b. Use a simple majority vote for decision making (51%)