TAHOE BASIN FIRE COMMISSION
MEETING SEPTEMBER 10, 2007
Lake Tahoe Community College
South Lake Tahoe, CA

**INDEX**


| Agenda Item | Subject | Page No. |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Call to Order and Roll Call | 1 |
| 2. | California Report offered by Co- Chair Kate Dargan | 1 |
| 3. | Nevada Report offered by Co-Chair Sig Rogich | 2 |
| 4. | Information Reports | 2 |
| | Open Meeting Laws | |
| 5. | Discussion and Adoption of Bylaws | 2 |
| 6. | Discussion and Presentation of Public Entities | 2 |
| | Lake Tahoe Basin Fire Chiefs | 2 |
| | Lake Tahoe Science Consortium | 3 |
| | USDA Forest Service | 4 |
| | Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board | 5 |
| | California Air Resources Board | 10 |
| | Tahoe Regional Planning Agency | 10 |
| 7. | Public Comments | 11 |
| 8. | Discussion and Appointment of Committees | 20 |
| 9. | Discussion and Action on Initial Implementation Steps | 25 |
| 10. | Discussion and Adoption of Future Public Meetings Calendar | 26 |
| 11. | Adjournment | 26 |

CALIFORNIA-NEVADA
TAHOE BASIN FIRE COMMISSION

Lake Tahoe Community College
Library Board Room
1 College Drive
South Lake Tahoe, CA

September 10, 2007

MEETING MINUTES

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Commission Co-Chair called the meeting to order at 9:00 am.

Members Present:

Kate Dargan, Sig Rogich, Pete Anderson, Michael Brown, Bob Davidson, Ruben Grijalva, Bud Hicks, John Koster, Ron McIntyre, Jeff Michael, John Pickett, Jim Santini, Cindy Tuck, John Upton, Patrick Wright, Jim Wright

Member with official status pending:

Jim Pena

Ex-officio members:

Allen Biaggi, Leo Dorzdoff, Amy Horne, Julie Motamedi

2. CALIFORNIA REPORT – CO-CHAIR KATE DARGAN

Ms. Dargan began the meeting with introductions of the members of the commission and staff assistants. She continued with an introduction of Mike Chrisman, Secretary of the California Resources Agency. Mr. Chrisman delivered a message from Governor Schwarzenegger who wished to express his thanks to the members of the commission for their willingness to take on this challenge and opportunity. Mr. Chrisman continued by saying that he is impressed by the expertise and experience of the members. He believes that the commission members will have the insight and background that will allow them to take bold action and to search for new solutions.

Ms. Dargan discussed the purpose of the commission and her perspective of its goals. She said that the Angora fire raised questions of both public policy and public safety. The members will have an opportunity to dissect, to understand, and to educate themselves about the conditions that lead to the fire. She said that the commission will have to make decisions about the direction it takes. She said that we can choose to be bold or we can choose to be cautious. She continued by saying that

some decisions will take courage. She looks forward to a process that is open, frank, and direct as possible. She concluded by saying that she hopes to conduct the meetings as informally as the law allows.

3. NEVADA REPORT – CO-CHAIR SIG ROGICH

Mr. Rogich stated that his basic philosophy is to allow homeowners and residents as much access as possible during this process. He continued and said that it is vitally important to listen carefully to the people who are in the business of fighting fires because they are the experts. He and Ms. Dargan are available to anyone who might have questions or concerns.

4. INFORMATION REPORTS – DEPUTY ATTORNEYS CALIFORNIA AND NEVADA

Ms. Dargan introduced Christine Sproul, Deputy Attorney General, California, who outlined requirements of the open meeting law. Josh Hicks, Legal Council and Deputy Chief of Staff, Office of Governor Jim Gibbons continued with additional information.

- The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between California and Nevada determined that the committee's work will be considered a public meeting and as such is required to comply with open meeting laws.
- In the event of a conflict the stricter provision will be applied.
- Notice and agendas will be posted 10 days prior to meetings.
- Notice and agendas will be posted on the California Resources Agency's web-site.
- Nine members constitute a quorum.
- Audio recording and minutes are required.

5. DISCUSSION AND ADOPTION OF BYLAWS

After discussion and clarification a motion was made and carried unanimously to adopt bylaws.

6. DISCUSSION AND PRESENTATIONS – PUBLIC ENTITIES

A. <u>Lake Tahoe Regional Fire Chiefs Association</u>

Duane Whitelaw, Lake Tahoe Basin Fire Chiefs, outlined the responsibilities of the organization. He said that as a group they are loosely organized and are known as the Lake Tahoe Regional Fire Chiefs Association. They work to assist in mutual aid agreements to fight fires in the basin. They do not charge for their services and work in coordination with state and federal partners. Chief Whitelaw stressed four major topics:

- Mixed messages that homeowners are hearing concerning defensible space.
- Fire districts view their priorities as 1) lives of public and fire fighters; 2) property; 3) environment.
- Fire districts are charged with completing wildfire protection plans and with funding the effort.
- Private land protection on the California side of the basin and the perception that there are

different levels of service afforded to property owners outside the basin. This is an issue referred to as "balance of acres."

Ms. Motamedi asked Chief Whitelaw to elaborate on the balance of acres. He stated that in most areas of California private lands are protected by CAL Fire, but in the Tahoe Basin the state forest service is responsible for fire protection. Unlike CAL Fire, the forest service does not have 24 hour, seven day a week response capabilities. Additionally, they are not equipped to assist with home inspection services. As a result, homeowners in the basin do not receive the same level of service as those in other areas of California. Chief Whitelaw believes that Lake Tahoe has outgrown the balance of acres concept.

Mr. Bud Hicks asked that staff supply a list of contact information for all fire protection agencies in the basin and also an example of a model community fire protection plan. Chief Whitelaw said that he would provide the information at the commission's next meeting.

Mr. Davidson asked for clarification of fire agency priorities, and Chief Whitelaw restated: life, property, environment. Mr. Davidson also asked about defensible space. Chief Whitelaw confirmed that when he speaks of 100 feet clearance around structure he is referring to defensible space. Ms. Dargan stated that this concept will be discussed throughout the meeting.

Mr. Upton asked Chief Whitelaw to discuss the challenges and the proposals that his group might have. Ms. Tuck asked for any document that might help explain the agreement for fire protection of homeowners in the Tahoe Basin.

Ms. Dargan tasked Chief Whitelaw and Mr. Grijalva with preparing a presentation for the next meeting of the commission on September 21, 2007. Mr. Pena of the National Forest Service offered to assist.

Mr. Pickett asked for a description of the community wildfire protection plan. Chief Whitelaw said that it is an outgrowth of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act. It encompassed mainly developed land in the wild land urban interface and extends to about one quarter of a mile out from structures. It is an expensive undertaking and his group is working with few resources.

B. Lake Tahoe Science Consortium

Ms. Dargan introduced Zach Hymanson, Executive Director of the Lake Tahoe Science Consortium. Mr. Hymanson explained that the Consortium was formed in 2005 as a partnership among five research institutions, the Desert Research Institute, the University of Nevada, Reno, University of California, Davis, the US Geological Survey, Carson Field Office, and the Pacific Southwest Research Station.

The group has no regulatory responsibility and does not own land or have land management responsibilities. The objective is to provide scientific information and to address the needs in the Tahoe basin.

Mr. Hymanson stressed three functions of the consortium:

- Development of peer review practices.
- Development of a comprehensive science data management plan for the basin.
- Development of a system that provides technical assistance to groups such as the Tahoe Basin Fire Commission.

Technical assistance may include information on the total maximum daily load regulatory effort, means of monitoring the environmental impacts of the Angora fire, and the progress of the post-fire treatments.

Mr. Hymanson asked that members of the commission consider the question of the appropriate role of research science in the general framework of their study. He said that some ways that science might assist are; bringing useful information to the discussion, establishing a standing monitoring plan, developing a system for rapid response to funding needs.

C. USDA Forest Service

Eli Ilano offered a brief overview of the jurisdiction and activities of the Forest Service.
The Forest Service manages 165,000 acres which is approximately 80 per cent of the land in the basin.

Fire prevention falls under four categories:

- Education
- Prevention
- Fuels and vegetation management
- Suppression

Ms. Dargan stated that a more detailed presentation at future meetings will include a draft report of the comprehensive community wildfire protection plan as well as some of the fuels and damage assessment reports from the Angora fire.

Mr. McIntyre asked about the prioritizing system used by the forest service in determining areas that are treated. Mr. Ilano will provide information from the 10 year comprehensive fuel plan.

Mr. Upton asked about the plan in respect to clean up of the Angora fire. He pointed out the value of some of the standing timber and suggested that a timely decision is important.

Mr. Bud Hicks agreed with Mr. McIntyre regarding priorities and assignment of fuels and vegetation projects. He asked for information regarding Luther Pass and said that he will be interested in any information the forest service might offer.

Mr. Wright would like to see information on fire prevention and enforcement activities.

Mr. Davidson asked about the balance of acres plan. He asked if there are areas in the basin that do not have 24 hour fire protection. Mr. Ilano answered that it is true that some areas do not have 24 hour protection.

Ms. Dargan mentioned that she, Mr. Rogich, and staff members are making notes of commissioners' requests and will generate an agenda by the end of the day that should address many concerns.

Ms. Horne asked that the next agenda include a discussion on the availability of contractors to help collect fuels, remove these materials from the basin, and perhaps convert some of these materials to bio-mass fuels.

Mr. Pickett asked for information regarding projects planned for next year, specifically National Environmental Policy Act requirements.

Mr. Rogich suggested that the commission might give consideration to asking congress for some emergency appropriations. The congressional delegation has expressed support for our efforts, both on the California and Nevada sides.

Mr. Grijalva suggested that the commission will need a map of all fire agencies in the basin which would assist in understanding total response capability.

Ms. Motamedi asked that the commission include in its deliberations a discussion of private water purveyors around the lake.

Ms. Dargan said that one of the projects which have been assigned to staff is the building of GIS capacity. This will improve our ability to gain visual understanding of the issue. The goal today is to organize our thoughts and to put together at least two subcommittees.

Mr. Hicks asked about 30 millions dollars that have been allocated to the basin by congress. He requested clarification of the details of the allocation, i.e., where has the money been sent, how much has been spent and how?

D. Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board

Ms. Dargan introduced Harold Singer who gave a general overview of the agency.

- One of nine regional water boards in California
- Jurisdiction covers the eastern side of the Sierra Mountains from the Oregon border to the Mohave Desert.

- Part of the California Environmental Protection Agency, parent agency is the State Water Resources Control Board
- A nine member body appointed by the governor.
- Function is to set state wide water quality policy and work with water rights for surface waters.
- The regional water boards are divided by surface water sheds
- Authority comes from the California Water Code
- Implement the federal Clean Water Act as it relates to federal surface water permits.
- Staff of about 60 people in the region

Mr. Singer discussed the water quality control plan which is referred to as the Basin Plan.
The Basin Plan is a roadmap that guides the board in the way it does its business. They look at various water bodies in the region and determine beneficial uses, set objectives, issue permits, and enforce some prohibitions.

Key issues in Lake Tahoe:
- Water clarity
- Fire
- Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL)

Federal law requires that states develop TMDLs for water bodies that don't meet water quality objectives. This law would apply to Lake Tahoe based on the declining clarity. The board is currently working with the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection to develop a TMDL for the basin that complies with federal law. The key to arresting the process of loss of clarity is the establishment of stakeholder buy-in.

Fuel reduction activities will have an impact on lake clarity and the goal will be to find a balance. He asked that the commission remember to consider water quality in their deliberations. Mr. Singer continued with a discussion of the causes of loss of clarity.

He discussed stream environment zones (SEZ.) The SEZs are a buffer to activities in the general forest. They can mitigate some of the things we do in the general forest. There is no buffer for activities that take place in the SEZs.

Accomplishments of the Lahontan Water Board:

- Modified regulations in 1994
- Allow use of low impact equipment in SEZs
- Worked with TRPA in 2004 to modify codes
- Worked with California Board of Forestry to allow green thinning of trees in SEZs in Tahoe under their exemption language
- Worked on obtaining funding to various groups in the basin that will facilitate education projects
- Worked to obtain funding for fuel reduction in the Tahoe basin

Permitting

The agency issues Waste Discharge Requirement as well as waivers. A waiver operates like a general permit. Waivers cover homeowners who want to do defensible space to 150 feet around their buildings; no notification of the board is required. This goes beyond the 100 feet required under the resources code.

Categories of activities that can begin within 30 days of submitting an application with or without a response from the board include low threat projects, minor fuel hazard reduction projects, and USFS projects. Detailed explanations of these projects will be offered during the course of the commission's meetings.

Post fire emergency projects in the wake of the Angora fire, or any fire, can begin immediately. The only request that the water board has made is that they be notified within seven days of the start of the project.

Mr. Singer offered one final point. He discussed the South Shore Project near Spring Creek where a field hearing was held to work out a plan for removing downed timber. During the course of the hearing Mr. Singer made several suggestions and the general response was that the answers to his questions are unclear. Mr. Singer called for an open dialog and new perspectives in understanding all of the possible solutions within the existing regulatory structure. We can deal with both the water quality issue and the fire threat issue together.

Laurie Kemper will likely represent the Lahontan Water Board at the next meeting.

Mr. Davidson asked about agency relationships and the defensible space requirements.

Mr. Singer stated that the water board is comfortable with homeowners who would like to clear more space than 100 feet and the standard applies to all structures, including those that back up to a stream zone.

Mr. McIntyre called for increasing the knowledge of the public regarding what can and cannot be done in the basin.

Mr. Patrick Wright also called for gathering information from all agencies involved in the process, Cal Fire, the TRPA, and the water board.

Mr. Singer stated that he can best speak for his agency, but believes that it will be possible to work out agreements with the other agencies for a basin wide permit system that will be understandable to the public.

Mr. Rogich pointed out the fact that it would be useful to understand the reasons for any reluctance on the part of the agencies to agree to action in specific areas such as sediment. It will be important to make the discussions and conclusions a part of the public record.

Mr. Grijalva asked about the goal of returning clarity to 100 feet and wondered if there is a timeline in place to achieve that goal.

Mr. Singer said that there is no timeline in place. Currently we are setting interim goals. At this point there are no regularly scheduled meetings between the water board members or their field agents and basin fire fighting agencies.

Ms. Dargan asked about the setting of clarity goals, who sets them. She also asked about equipment in SEZ, defensible space, and the South Shore project.

Mr. Singer said that goals were set in 1972 and are both self imposed and federally mandated. It is possible to change the goals through pre-determined process. Currently the water board is working to reverse the decline. He discussed the type of equipment that is allowed in SEZs. He said that the board is looking at low impact equipment that can be used when conditions are dry. Defensible space is not necessarily defined by the water board. They suggest that homeowners look to other agencies and codes for guidance for allowable activities within the 150 foot space around structures. The South Shore project was probably created by a variety of conditions including wind and snow.

Mr. Singer believes that the role of the water board is not to define defensible space but to provide a no permit opportunity for people to do the work.

Michael Brown asked about the SEZ and said that he believes that they have, historically, contributed to fires in the basin.

Mr. Singer said that he would defer to the fire experts for the answer.

Mr. Brown asked if regulatory conditions have changed since the Angora fire.

Mr. Singer said that no changes have been made since the fire and pointed out that these are all permitted activities that have been on the books since the modifications in 1994. Four projects to do work in SEZs with equipment have been requested since 1994. They all have been approved.

Mr. Brown stressed the need to take care of problems now before the next fire. In this way we may avoid the threat to water clarity that is the result of run off after a fire.

Mr. Pickett asked about direct measurement protocols for soil compaction and ground disturbance and grant funding windows. He asked if projects could be implemented in a way that will match up with grant requests.

Mr. Singer said that once we have learned from past projects in SEZs, we may be able to streamline the process in order to work with grant deadlines.

Allen Biaggi asked about forest health in the basin.

Mr. Singer said that we cannot allow any long term degradation of the water body. We are basically allowing short term degradation, but the long term goal is to reverse the process and restore clarity to the lake.

Mr. Davidson asked about the approved projects and the impacts on the lake of the projects. He asked if our models reflect the realities of the possibility of future fires. He also asked if the water board could provide more information regarding the equipment that has been allowed under the permits.

Mr. Singer said that he understands the perspective. He said that the board thinks in terms of the day to day discharges in the basin and the causes of these discharges. He acknowledged that it is not always possible to predict factors that will affect run off and the resulting damage to the lake. It comes down to not deciding whether or not to reduce the load but to decide where to reduce the load from. This will mean making some difficult policy choices. All will involve some cost.

Mr. Davidson suggested that fuel reduction will reduce the sediment load from fires.

Ms. Dargan said that watershed management plans need to account for the role of fire occurrences in any comprehensive plan. Water quality management agencies and the scientific world are beginning to take this fact into account.

Mr. Bud Hicks said that he is not familiar with the agency, statues, or chartered documents. His question concerns emergency declarations and the suspension of regulatory rules.

Mr. Singer said that he can only answer for California and that he understood that in the case of the Angora fire Governor Schwarzenegger did declare a state of emergency and did suspend some regulatory rules. His understanding is that it would be possible in the future to suspend rules again in the case of an emergency.

Ms. Tuck asked about other sources of sediment reduction that we could consider.

Mr. Singer said that 75 percent of the fine sediments come from roads and paved surfaces. We have to look at opportunities from all sources and are studying ways to reduce from all areas, including paved surfaces.

Mr. Upton asked where SEZs are designated and what agreement exists between the TRPA and the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Mr. Singer said that there is no major disagreement about the definition of SEZs. The question is in the practice. Do the codes translate easily? This might be an opportunity to work together with the scientific community to develop some guidelines. Where do we get reduction and where to we allow “head space” for activities meant to reduce risks of fire when these activities may contribute to sediment and run off? These are issues we will have to face during this process.

Mr. Upton asked about the waivers and wondered if they sometimes have actually made it more difficult to reduce fire threat.

Mr. Singer said that in regard to the waivers as related to fuel and forestry activities the California legislature passed a law that required the board to include more criteria and conditions in their waivers. The current system is a result of that legislation. The changes included the need for monitoring and are only valid for five years.

Mr. Grijalva suggested that for a future meeting we might invite staff from both California and Nevada to explain the standard for a governor's declaration of a state of emergency.

E. California Air Resources Board

Ms. Dargan introduced Marcella McTaggart, Air Pollution Control Officer, El Dorado County and Tom Christofk, Air Pollution Control Officer, Placer County.

Mr. Christofk said that they are not with the California Air Resources Board but that they had been asked to make some comments redressing regulatory and process issues for the commission. There are three levels of regulation dealing with air quality; federal (EPA), state (Air Resources Board), and local (35 local air districts – county, regional or unified districts). Another layer is air basins which are meteorological air sheds. There are a number of these air sheds across California.

Lake Tahoe is part of a unique air basin and is called the Lake Tahoe Air Basin.

Mr. Christofk said that air districts regulate relative stable sources of pollution such as businesses and open burning. Open burning encompasses everything from backyard burning to agricultural burning. Prescribed burning is a sub set of agricultural burning and includes wild land and fuel load reduction.

Placer and El Dorado air districts adopted a smoke management plan in the last months of 2001. The state recognized burning as a resource management tool and as a disposal method. The objective of the smoke management plan is to provide more opportunities for burning while minimizing the impact on public health. If anyone is interested in burning they file a smoke management plan with the air district and, once approved, apply for a burn permit. Once the permit is issued no burn can take place before the day is determined to be a burn day. Burn days are determined daily in California by the air resources board based on meteorological information.

Ms. McTaggart discussed activities of air quality districts during wildfires:

- Act in an advisory capacity
- Provide assistance to Incident Commander
- Provide monitoring stations
- Provide public with information regarding smoke and air quality

F. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

Ms. Dargan introduced John Singlaub, Executive Director of the TRPA. Mr. Singlaub said that five members of the governing board are in attendance at this meeting. The agency is a bi-state board that was chartered under the states of Nevada and California and approved under federal law. The purpose is to regulate and oversee all developments in Lake Tahoe. The governing board has 15 members, seven from each state, and one appointed by the President of the United States.

Mr. Singlaub said that a question has been asked about the TRPA's regulatory role in fire protection at the lake. He said that TRPA is required to regulate and have standards for tree removal at the lake. This includes living trees that are over six inches in diameter.

Mr. Singlaub continued by referring to a hand-out and a presentation. He said that the Angora fire showed that the message is not getting out on defensible space. The TRPA has distributed 20,000 home landscaping guides on allowable action for fuels reductions around homes.

He continued by saying that the TRPA has worked with others to try to get word out to demonstrate there is not a conflict with TRPA and the defensible space including removing pine needles around homes.

Moving forward they plan to support those agreements and continue to support efforts to get additional Southern Nevada public land management money. In the past three years, ten million dollars per year are dedicated to the forest service for their work. This year there may be an additional twelve million dollars for fire fuels reductions.

The TRPA is open to policy changes and recommendations that are made by the commission.

Mr. Anderson asked Mr. Singlaub about his philosophy for fuel reduction regarding access and removal of biomass.

Mr. Singlaub replied that the TRPA considers temporary roads created to remove fuels as "part of doing business." Creation of new permanent roads is looked at very carefully and not often done. The basic thinking is that temporary roads are good and permanent roads are bad.

Mr. Biaggi stated that they had been given the landscaping guides. He further stated that the different fire districts all had different rules and there was not one common place to go to understand what all the requirements are. He asked if the TRPA believed that their outreach materials provide the information or if there is a need to have a more comprehensive location to understand the entire plan for forest health.

Mr. Singlaub replied that one of the confusing issues is they way in which fuel management and defensible space relate to best management practices; how source controls to prevent erosion apply to homeowners. He believes they could do a better job in that area. It would be good to develop a system for single home inspections of both BMP and defensible space and to have one single number to call regardless of where you are in the basin.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Swobe thanked both Governors for creating the Tahoe Basin Fire Commission. He provided the commission with the latest TRPA Resolution 2007-16 which creates the TRPA Fire Prevention Committee. He advised the committee would be operational September 19th. The committee would be glad to assist in anyway they can with regard to reviewing, upgrading, and streamlining TRPA regulations.

He commented that in regard to removal of fuels in stream zones and removal of fuels, there were four permits requested in 10 years while there are 66 steam zones.

Bud Hicks thanked Coe Swobe for his work and the work of all the members of the TRPA on the Slaughterhouse Canyon fire clearance project.

John Pickett commented that with Mr. Swobe's staff's assistance, people would be able to apply for permits and definition of the delineation of the stream environment zones. In the past they have not been scientifically delineated and it has been up to fire services to decide where they are located. Mr. Pickett requested TRPA's assistance with the matter. Mr. Pickett requested access to Tim Hagen and to the process to get the permits to accomplish this matter.

Mr. Swobe stated that TRPA would do its best to get the information requested.

Mr. Swobe commented that one of the first issues to be addressed is defensible space and that the fire districts and fire chiefs will take the lead and will come up with a consensus to build on.

In response to a questions regarding the structure of the TRPA Fire Prevention Committee and who was on the committee, Mr. Swobe responded that the board is made up of seven members of the board of governors, Norma Sandiago, Bruce Cranz, Mike Webber, Jim Galloway, Mr. Swobe, Steve Merrill, and Nancy McDermit. The make up of the committee is representative of county leadership. The goal is to set up a minimum standard for defensible space and to have the cooperation of the counties and the fire districts within the counties to work on it.

Mr. Swobe also commented, in response to Mr. Rogich's suggestion, that he would forward the resolution to the Congressional delegation for both Nevada and California.

Ms. Dargan stated that the TRPA resolution would be posted to the website.

Mr. Rogich introduced Dr. H. Mehrens, member of the public.

Dr. Mehrens commented that four words "common sense" and "bold action" had not been spoken in the basin for the past 32 years in regard to fire issues. He spoke on several issues:

- Defensible space
  There is a difference between the TRPA code for defensible space and the California code 4291. The TRPA relies on 5 feet of non-combustible space while California relies on 30 feet. He asked that the California standard be adopted and the matter be put in the hands of the fire prevention people/fire districts and taken out of TRPA and forester hands.

- Stream environment zones
Lahontan had been the main hindrance to the SEZ health. He commented that according to the USADA Angora Fire Report, SEZ of the Angora Creek was a contributor to the ferocity of the fire. He requested an emergency declaration from the governors which would suspend the maximum daily load and begin to clear the remaining SEZs.

- Slash piles behaved as if the area had not been cleared.
  The slash piles have been there for a number of years. He suggested using the piles for biomass and not burn them.

- Best Management Practices

Dr. Meherns also stated that pictures of the Angora fire and Washoe fire shows the fire creeping along the pine needles. He asked that the TRPA and Lahontan know that these prescribed methods be abolished.

- Use bold actions in the Basin to make Tahoe safer

Ms. Horne asked why Dr. Meherns felt that Lahontan was the barrier to treatment of SEZ based on the fact it had never turned down an application?

Dr. Meherns replied that based on Ms. Horn's statements in the newspaper, that the elevation and stream environment zones and flat areas are different. He asked why SEZs are in such terrible shape. He also asked why, if there were no major restrictions to treatments in the SEZs, do they continue to be in such bad shape.

Ms. Horne stated that Lahontan didn't stop anyone from treatment of the SEZ.

Dr. Meherns replied that he believed that her article showed that Lahontan had significant restrictions. It is a conclusion he has come to based on his understanding of the situation, though he has not attended meetings of the Lahontan water board.

Steve Teshara, Executive Director of the North Lake Tahoe Chamber of Commerce, commented regarding the formation of the Tahoe Basin Fire Commission. He stated that the Chamber would be very active in the process.

He asked that fire service professionals have input into the proceedings as they would have more success in passing the message to the public. He further stated that he lives in Round Hill, and his community in conjunction with the fire service professionals has been very successful at clearing around homes in their community and removing the debris. The fire service professionals can be extremely helpful is disseminating messages to the public as the public is sometimes distrustful of agencies in the basin.

Steve Teshara continued that a collaborative effort would be needed and the Commission should take that into consideration. He stated that the Forest Service is closing the Angora burn area and dropping the aerial mulch to seal the area. However, scientists have expressed an interest in going in to do some research in the area. He commented that a resolution to those types of conflicts is needed.

Steve Teshara added that they favor combining information to make it easier for the public to understand, having the right expertise to deliver the message and having one stop centers around the basin. He asked that the Commission not waste the opportunity.

Garry Bowen stated he served on both conservation districts in the basin with his specialty being biomass enforced help. He participated in the presidential summit 10 years earlier. He also stated that whatever is going to be done should be done quickly. He is working on two projects, one with the American Institute of Architects from Washington, D.C. with an eye toward using ember and fire

resistant materials to build houses. Center for Communities by Design uses materials that are fire resistant and efficient. He handed out the agenda for an AIA regional conference to be held in the area in a few days. He will be sharing comments from the meeting with the disaster team at the conference.

In terms of forest health, he worked with many heads of the forest service including a review of the aftermath of 750,000 acres and 3500 homes. The work of this Committee will help others understand what the issues are. He offered a quote "Those who fight fires best are those who fight least" and related that to stewardship issues and the preventive aspects of fire. He will be submitting information in writing including an article that suggests that forests are water factories. He further stated that with regard to funding it is obvious that we can't afford not to do something. The timing of speeding things up, funding and refining doing it is paramount. He will be forwarding information from the Sierra Nevada Alliance conference regarding biomass. A few years ago there was a Memorandum of Understanding signed between the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Energy to resolve the issue of what to do with 200 million acres of forest. He is interested in knowing the outcome of this MOU.

Mr. Rogich asked what the appetite would be to offer a tax incentive for people to change out architectural details such as a roof to be more fire resistant.

Mr. Bowen stated that the idea of holistically designing a building with materials that are fire resistant are a great idea, but has not been promulgated.

Mr. Rogich clarified that he meant on existing homes as well as new structures.

Mr. Bowen stated that of course changing materials such as siding and roofing on existing structures is a good idea.

Ms. Dargan asked, what is the source of the information on fire resistant materials?

Mr. Bowen replied that in some degree Chief Dargan is as she has provided him with some websites on the matter. There are several people that specialize in fire resistant building. Also manufactures are starting to address those issues.

Ms. Dargan stated that she wanted to clarify fire resistant from ignition resistant. Fire resistant is an old term from building codes of the past, while ignition resistant is a more appropriate way. A fire resistant structure that is a wood side structure with a sheet rock underlay that will not sustain ignition resistance. And so the ignition resistance is designed to not only resist direct flame, but has an enhanced capacity to resist embers. Ignition resistance is more appropriate in the wild land/urban interface environment and so is more important to the work of the commission.

Mr. Bowen stated that most materials have a four hour resistance rating and in some cases cannot be lit at all which addresses the ignition question. Regarding stewardship issue, a healthy forest will withstand fire to a great degree itself. The biomass and the dry material relate to the fact that the water is not getting to the growth of the forest where needed.

Tony Morris of the Wildfire Research Network (WRN) stated that efforts to improve fuel management should be vigorously pursued along with improvements in the technology of fire suppression systems. He stated that prescribed burns are often the most cost effective means for implementing fuel management. WRN suggests that the commission agenda specifically allow for other means of reducing the wildfire threat in addition to fuel management.

In response to a question regarding what Wildfire Research Network does, Mr. Morris responded that they research fire issues and research firefighting aircraft. He further stated that California has one of the best firefighting fleets in the world. The federal fleet has been reduced due to the age of the aircraft.

California has one of the best fire fighting aircraft fleets in the world, though the fleet now is reduced to 18 airplanes.

Mr. Grijalva commented that the WRN was very supportive of Cal Fire's efforts in obtaining a DC10.

Mr. Wright inquired as to what other methods should be used in fuel treatment.

Mr. Morris stated that night vision goggles are very helpful in fighting fire at night. There are few that do that. There are a number of areas WRN is looking into, though funding is a problem. They are a part of a network of about 75 people around the country and are continuing to work to improve their resources.

Mr. Davidson asked if you get to a fire quicker it is easier to put out a fire.

Mr. Morris stated that yes that was the case. He offered to provide a chart regarding the statistics.

Mr. Davidson asked what that would mean in relation to Lake Tahoe for air resources that need to be on the ready – was there some sort of guideline?

Mr. Morris stated that according to their research, you have to look at what is practical. It is based on what you can afford, i.e., a brand new super scooper water carrier would cost $26 million.

Tom Pandola, a concerned resident spoke next stating that for 25 years he was with the Los Angeles City Fire Department and spent some time as the commander of air operations.

Mr. Pandola believes that, in his professional opinion, the most important factor in reducing the effects of fire in the basin is a timely response. Mr. Pandola stated that as to a time frame, his experience has been that you have 15 to 20 minutes to get water on a fire to keep it small. He explained that he spoke with a pilot who flew over the Gondola Fire when it first started and was the size of a picnic table. He called the South Lake dispatch and then just watched the fire get bigger and bigger. Had he been able to call directly or if South Lake could have called directly to the South Lake Tahoe airport and had a helicopter standby, the Gondola fire would not have happened the way it did. Mr. Pandola continued by saying the best case scenario would be to have a helicopter at Truckee and one at South Lake Tahoe not attached to the Cal-fire or Forest Service systems. Tahoe has a helicopter, but it is at Minden or some other place, many minutes away. Everything we are talking about as far as thinning the forest,

making defensible space is important. The best chance is a helicopter knocking the fire down while it is small. He went on to say that there are always variables and no guarantees, but the best chance to knock down a fire early is with dedicated helicopters, one at Truckee and one at South Lake Tahoe.

Mr. Pandola also mentioned that communities need to look at their ground forces and see how many firefighters they need to keep fires small. Because they also go on medical emergencies, sometimes they are not available for fire duty and can't be counted.

Mr. Davidson asked how to spot the fires quick enough. Is there technology to help spot fires quicker?

Mr. Pandola replied that at a Lake Tahoe Fire Chief's recent meeting they are talking about returning to using fire lookouts. In Los Angeles they used citizen groups and on high risk days they called people in that group who patrolled the streets. They also used helicopters to patrol and sometimes propositioned water helicopters to get to the fire quickly.

Susan Abrams is a resident of South Lake Tahoe in the Angora fire area. She stated that her home is standing today because she violated every local, regional and state ordinance and followed California's 4291 in creating defensible space around her house. Her house is not habitable because of the smoke and ash. She feels that the Committee has been given misinformation; the biggest example is the TRPA. Ten years before she participated in TRPA's Forest Health Consensus group. The group was formed to get information for the TRPA to establish guidelines, practices, and procedures that would ensure a healthy forest in the basin. Ms. Abrams stated that it was an organization build of special interests and that is why it failed. The data gathered was used to create a maze and did not allow the group to obtain a goal. Ms. Abrams stated that unless the Commission was able to be strong enough to bypass and form conclusions without the TRPA, she feels no one will be better off than they are today.

Ms. Abrams stated that the State of California has no intention of changing anything. The State of California does not enforce 4291 which was put there by the Department of Forestry. She feels that they are correct. Ms. Abrams feels that Nevada has to change the legislature's mind in California. She further stated the fire fighters in the Basin have been fighting for 10 years; telling people what they need to do.

When asked if she had any specific recommendations, she commented that the Consensus Group received information about what needed to be done. She felt the special interests blocked what should have done. She stated that if the Commission breaks into committees, they need to be aware of who is on the committee. She stated she believes that John Upton has the answer. Ms. Abrams commented that people in her subdivision want to be treated as they are in Nevada and allowed to have defensible space. They were not allowed to do that. She stated she felt more homes in her area would have been saved. She asked the Commission to request the TRPA provide the tapes from the Consensus Group so the Commission could hear the testimony of the experts.

Jennifer Quashnick of the Sierra Forest Legacy/Sierra Club and resident asked that the Commission consider the thinning of the forest and homeowner obligations. She asked that the Commission investigate the modeled fire behavior in the SEZs. She also stated that fire is part of the forest ecosystem. She referenced information from Tom Cahill and quoted him as saying the 2007 Angora fire exceeded in many ways the scenarios we evaluated becoming almost the perfect storm for in basin

wildfires. The dry condition of the forest, low snow pack in early spring, the ridge parallel to the winds and very strong afternoon and evening winds contributed to the event. He further stated that they must not lose sight of the unusual conditions which made the Angora fire so damaging. She stated that she is not saying don't treat the SEZs, but to keep in mind that there are other factors at play. The fire was wind driven and when up the ridge that was topography driven. She asked not to send the message that all fires can be stopped. We live in a forest environment and fires do happen.

Ms. Quashnick went on to say that we need to protect ourselves from fires. The treatments will bring the fire down to surface level, but treatments will not stop a fire alone. Ms. Quashnick stated that we need to reduce ember ignitions on new and existing home; replacing roofs with appropriate materials, keeping roofs free of debris and combustible materials. She feels that message is not getting out. She asked if low interest loans could be provided to fund defensible space and for ignition resistant retrofits. She stated that some members of the community feel it is the government's responsibility to protect their home. She feels that proper information must be given out.

Rochelle Nason from the League to Save Lake Tahoe commonly known as Keep Tahoe Blue commented that the Tahoe basin is unique as far as forest management projects. There have been no appeals or litigation over forest management projects because over the years a consensus has been developed as to what should happen. Ms. Nason stated that she was also part of the TRPA's Forest Health Consensus Group and she disagrees that the group did nothing. There was tremendous controversy because they were not focusing on wild land urban interface. Through the work of the Group it was realized that the focus should be on the urban interface. She stated she did not want to minimize the roll of the SEZs, the role of under burning, the role of the type of projects that are appropriate on steep slopes etc. But she feels there is a consensus that the forest should be managed and prioritized at the urban interface. There has been a broad community effort to get the work done and the League has provided funding to get the work done and secure federal funding. The League has also been a leader in community education through its stewardship day.

Ms. Nason further stated that the League is saddened by the effects of the Angora fire and believe there are enormous challenges yet to be tackled. She feels the challenges are getting the political will and the necessary funding. Ms. Nason stated that the Commission should look at defensible space issues and make that a priority as only 30 % of homes in the basin have defensible space. She offered that the city of Oakland has formed a wildfire assessment protection district. Property owners pay a fee for an intensive assessment. She further stated it is more important to make it happen than to argue over the details of what it should be.

Ms. Nason added that the Forest Service operates on a national level and it is handicapped for local issues. The most critical issue is the Forest Service perception that it is not worth doing the work at Lake Tahoe because it is too expensive. It makes it not part of the national priority.

Congressman Santini asked if the Commission is able to formulate federal legislation would the League be interested in supporting it.

Ms. Nason replied that they would. When the League worked for funding they worked specifically for appropriations for forest management. Once the Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act was passed they were notified that the funding should come through the Southern Nevada Public Lands

Management Act. We believe that at this time it is appropriate to ask for reinstatement of the appropriations that were coming to Lake Tahoe before 2004 or some other funding mechanism. We are not advocates for waste. A cost benefit analysis also needs to be performed to make sure resources are properly used. Ms. Nason commented on the EIP approach which is everyone has a share in the problem and hopes it will guide the Commission in its efforts.

Mr. Koster asked if Ms. Nason would agree that the fire experts should establish the standard for defensible space.

Ms. Horne asked if BMP specialists and experts on defensible space had tried to work out a consistent set of recommendations. Ms. Nason indicted that they had not.

Ms. Nason stated that there should be a one stop shop where experts are available to help people. The experts should come to agreement among themselves as to how it should happen. She also feels that fire experts alone should not set the standard.

Mr. Pena commented that she mentioned that the forest service sets priority as it relates to dollars per acre. He asked if she had any suggestion on how it should be prioritized for expenditure on the urban interface as opposed to spending it somewhere more profitable.

Ms. Nason replied that she does not believe they can be persuaded to do it another way because the Forest Service is a national organization. She believes that our congressional delegations must tell them that how it is to be done.

Mr. Pena also asked if she has any ideas on how this Commission can persuade the forest service that it should be done differently.

Ms. Nason stated that she believes that the Commission should ask for the facts. It should find out how much it costs to do "X". The commission might ask; where the money going, how much is going and what is being accomplished. If you have the facts they are hard to deny. She further stated she is not blaming any one person; it is the policy and procedures.

Mr. Pena said that the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit gets most of its funding from the Southern Nevada Land Act. He stated it is more expensive to protect the Basin. You can not eliminate the fact that the Forest Service is a national agency. The national pressures agencies' spending put its funding is something that every State tries to influence to their benefit. There is influence coming from this basin. There has been a tremendous expenditure on fuels issues and the water quality issues. I think it is a mischaracterization to say that the Forest Service is ignoring the Basin. Funding is not the issue driving getting the work done here in the basin. It is important to make that distinction. The Basin received $10 million for a basin that is 165 acres in size.

Mr. Davidson asked if Ms. Nason believed that the concept of defensible space can best be defined by fire fighting professionals. Ms. Nason agreed that fire fighting professional should be consulted.
Mr. Rogich suggested that as the committee moves into the next phase there will be more conversations on the financial and funding aspects of the issue.

Don Porter a citizen representing Talmont Homeowners, Fire Safe Council Chair. He posed a couple of questions that might be of interest to homeowners. He was on the uphill side of the Washoe Fire and feels that most of the homeowners in his area are confused about where to go for information. They are concerned about lots owned by other agencies, i.e., Tahoe Conservancy or the Forest Service. He wanted to that thank all the people involved in the fire fighting effort on the Washoe Fire and commended their work.

He suggested creating an ombudsman position, one person or office that can give residents information.

Mr. Pickett agreed and added a need for an ombudsman or a planning commission that can assist in planning for access across acreage that is owned by various entities and individuals.

Laurel Ames, California Watershed Network, and a resident of the City of South Lake Tahoe. She thanked Congressman Santini and said that one of the unintended consequences of the Burton-Santini Act was that the federal lots that were purchased then proved to be a haven for fire fighters during the Angora Fire.

Ms. Ames discussed defensible space and pointed out that because many homes in South Lake Tahoe are very close to each other in that city defensible space might mean no trees at all. She suggested that in studying the issue we should all be humble when looking at natural events. The Angora fire was a severe natural event. She advised that the commission to be bold when you look at government capacity. Look at managing our forests with a new government structure.

Steve Campbell a resident of South Lake Tahoe who mentioned having seen a choked area of dead wood at Angora Creek and felt that it was part of the problem. He advocated looking at funding and caps on spending. He also suggested looking at priorities and concentrating on the quarter mile interface surrounding existing communities.

Lane Sykes a resident of South Lake Tahoe who wanted to thank the California Conservation Corp and the Forest Service who worked very hard and saved his home. He referred to a letter written as a result of a BMP inspection in August 2005 that advised him not to rake the pine needles from around his house. He believes that the creek beds are a problem for fire protection. He pointed out the fact that many in the basin have lost confidence in local agencies though he believes they have good intentions their science may be flawed. He encouraged the commission to take a serious look at the science behind the assumptions and to continue to seek public and professional input.

Lynn Norton a resident of South Lake Tahoe had to leave the meeting before having a chance to speak. She submitted a letter and asked that it be distributed to the commission members. Please consider offering grants to individuals to help with the cost of tree removal. Consider placing lean and green responsibilities on owners of unimproved lots adjacent to lots with structures. Make use of local volunteers who are willing to help with efforts to clear dead wood in vulnerable areas.

8. DISCUSSION OF COMMISSION'S SCOPE OF WORK AND ACTION ON APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES BY COMMISSION CO-CHAIRS

Mr. Rogich began by suggesting that Ms Dargan lead the discussion of committee focus and assignments. Ms. Dargan said that the commission will refer to the MOU for guidance in forming committees and determining key issues. The commission will begin committee meetings on September 21 and reports will be due from committees on that day.

Discussion of key issues followed.

Mr. Bud Hicks said that from a legal perspective we might look at the organizations involved and their jurisdictions in the basin. If we can facilitate communications among these organizations it will help with some of the problems. The TRPA compact might be review with the idea of recommending some modifications. On issue is the fact that the compact specifically exempts Tahoe basin residents from serving on the TRPA. Mr. Hicks feels that that restriction should be lifted. The Nevada delegation might consider making recommendations to the Nevada legislature.

Mr. Rogich said that he had always envisioned going to the state legislature for assistance, but we might consider going to the US Congress and address these concerns on a national level. Amendments to the TRPA compact might be a workable solution since much has changed since the 1960s. The TRPA might welcome the opportunity to streamline and update the compact.

Mr. Anderson said that Nevada has a different approach in some respects. For example, the state does not have in place a large oversight umbrella. The focus on the Nevada side is generally on the local fire districts.

Mr. Michael discussed the need for consistency around the lake.

Mr. Upton said that we might discuss the process and the project permit approval system. The commission might discuss the standardization of processes.

Mr. Rogich asked about fee structures and wondered if they were an influence the permit process.

Mr. Upton said that he did not think fees were a significant factor. He believes it is important to fix priorities and to get projects that are on the borders of communities up and running. We might think in terms of identifying the most efficient providers of project services, separating projects from monitoring, and providing good fiscal tracking.

Ms. Motamedi discussed private water purveyors, funding cycle; best management practices (BMP), public private partnerships, TMDL, and bio-mass, all are important discussion items.

Congressman Santini asked about private water purveyors.

Ms. Motamedi said that they are not part of the North Tahoe PUD that provides water for the rest of the area. It is a profitable business but they are not under the same production requirements (water

pressure) as the public utility. As a result, in the case of a fire or other emergency, they may not be able to assist with delivery of water. Ms. Motamedi is continuing to research the issue and is looking for some guidance from the commission for enforcement guidelines.

Mr. Davidson agreed with Mr. Rogich regarding taking the issue to Washington and said that we need to demonstrate the ability and willingness to make some substantive changes that will justify monetary assistance.

Mr. Rogich suggested that we might want to invite representatives from neighboring states who might profit by the report generated by this commission.

Ms. Horne asked for a process check and asked for information about the next step in the meeting.

Ms. Dargan discussed the issues and categories as she has understood from the members' comments, named committees, and ask for members' interest in serving on these committees.

Mr. Wright said that he approves the categories and said that there is a lot of temptation now to start by making changes in the funding and in the regulations. He believes that we should begin with the basics and organize one set of rules. For example, what fuel treatments do we need in stream zones? We might take Mr. Singer up on his offer to assist the commission. We can turn to science experts who can help with another layer of information to help guide decisions.

Mr. Rogich reminded the commission that this is a working document and is not set in stone.

Mr. Pickett suggested discussing implementation planning and environmental compliance costs.

Mr. Wright said that in addition to this body forming committees, the agencies in the basin might work to improve inter-agency communication. He suggested working toward a basin wide conversation, between land managers, local fire districts, federal agencies, Fire Safe Council, TRPA, etc. The commission might include this in their recommendations.

Mr. Upton said that he believes that the agencies are anticipating some changes and are prepared to cooperate and comply.

Mr. Bud Hick suggested that the commission meet as a whole one more time before splitting into committees. This would give agencies more time to give presentations. Mr. Rogich said that he agreed that the commission will benefit from more presentations, but he did not feel that breaking into committees would preclude that. He prefers to keep the process moving and Ms. Dargan agreed.

Mr. Biaggi discussed the importance of long term maintenance and the fact that the work that the commission recommends will not end with the report.

Ms. Tuck suggested holding another meeting of the full commission before breaking into committees. She said that we might add water quality as part of defensible space.

Mr. Rogich reminded the commission that we are working on a short time frame and that we should move ahead.

**Motion**: Mr. Rogich asked for a motion for accepting the broad overview, the template, of the committee structure with the understanding that the commission has the option to amend as necessary.

Bob Davidson moved and Jeff Michael seconded. Passed unanimously.

Discussion of the categories and a concern about overlaps followed. Ms. Dargan said that we will work out the placement over the next meetings and make needed adjustments. Mr. Rogich said that no one will be discouraged from participating in either committee based on their interest and expertise. He said that no knowledge will be lost.

Suggested Committee Topics

FIRE PREVENTION
Education
Fuels Management
Defensible Space
Water Quality / Erosion
Codes / Construction
WUI Building Standards
Resource Management / Healthy Forests

FIRE PROTECTION
Balancing of Acres
Structure Protection
Aviation Needs / Dozers
Hand Crews
Mutual Aid

FINANCIAL / FISCAL IMPACT
Incentives
Cost of recommendations
Obstacles to spending
Monitoring funding cycles

ADDITIONAL NOTES (From flip chart)

- Facilitating Communications between entities
- TRPA Compact Changes?
- Nevada law Changes
- Process of permit approval – ONE-STOP PROCESS
- Prioritizing projects

- Project delivery
    - Monitoring
- Quantifying impact of wildfire/tradeoffs
- Private water provider

**<u>HOMEOWNER'S & COMMUNITY SAFETY</u> (Private Lands)**
Infrastructure [Water, Roads & Businesses]
Defensible Space
Community Planning & Risk Assessment
Insurance
Fire Protection / Suppression
CWPPs
Building Standards
Existing Homes
Water Quality
Balance of Acres
WUI
Water Quality

☐ Funding (Economic/Local Business) and Fiscal Impact (CB Analysis template)

☐ Leg/ Regs / Permitting recommend

☐ Science & Tech

☐ Education & outreach

☐ Org / Gov't structure
- Compact – Charters – Accountability – Resource & Info Sharing & Coordination

**<u>FOREST FUELS</u> (Public Lands – Fed, State, Local)**
SEZs
Fuels Treatment Practices and Priorities
Fuels uses and Disposal [Biomass]
Operational Constraints
Monitoring Reqs
Post Fire Planning
Air Quality
Water Quality

**<u>SCIENCE & TECH</u>**
Weather Predictions
Modeling
Fire Management /Behavior

Water Quality / Clarity
Fire Technology
Watershed
Monitoring needs
Fire effects on Environment

## ECONOMIC

| FUNDING | FISCAL IMPACT |
|---|---|
| SNPLMA | Cost of recommendations |
| Prop 40 | CB Analysis |
| CA/NV Gov Fund | Cost / acre $$ |
| Fed | Agency Accounting |
| Local Assessment | |
| Visitor Fees | |
| Donations | |
| Grants | |

## COMMITTEE PREFERENCES

| COMMUNITY | FUELS |
|---|---|
| Pickett | Upton |
| Grijalva | Horne |
| J. Michael | Santini |
| McIntyre | Anderson |
| Tuck | Pena |
| Drozdoff | Motamedi |
| J. Wright | Biaggi |
| Davidson | Brown |
| Hicks | P. Wright |
| Koster (Alternate #1) | Koster (Alternate #1) |

Committee structure:

- Eight members of the committee are appointed by the commission
- Committee members can appoint three members of the public, non-commission members
- Committee can be supported by technical groups
- Committee will offer reports to commission as a whole
- Committee will have an agency person serve as a nominal chair who will be tasked to provide support and minutes

9. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON INITIAL IMPLEMENTATION STEPS

Ms. Dargan said that we don't have to necessarily wait under March to make or offer recommendations. We might choose to make draft recommendations.

Mr. Koster said that we could move on the "low hanging fruit" or recommendations that are easy at this point to see. Mr. McIntyre agreed and said that it would be a good system for understanding the process.

Mr. Upton agreed and said that the commission might discuss potential emergency recommendations and get approvals on line if there is some process that would work in the near future. Mr. Grijalva said that a fiscal note should be added to any recommendations that are made to California and Nevada governors.

Ms. Dargan asked for any issues that commission members would like to have included on meetings' agenda.

**Motion**: Agencies to come forth with a plan for sharing their processes for inter-agency communication and the development of a streamlined permitting system.

John Upton motions; John Pickett seconds.

Discussion of motion. Does this commission give direction or does it make recommendation? This commission makes recommendations to the governors only. The commission reports directly to the governors of California and Nevada.

Ms. Dargan said that this motion would provide commission direction and guidance to some of the key agencies in for both implementation and for fuels planning and for a streamlined permitting system. There will not be an expectation that anything formal will be presented at the next meeting on September 21, but it is direction for the following meeting.

Passed unanimously with Sig Rogich, John Koster, and Jim Santini absent.

**Motion:** Place a discussion of an emergency declaration on the next agenda with possible action.

Moved by John Upton; seconded by Bud Hicks

Discussion: We would keep public health issues in mind. This would be in the form of a recommendation. What specific rules are we discussing? There was some discussion of extending the grading season to facilitate fuels removal in the basin.

Passed unanimously with Sig Rogich, John Koster, and Jim Santini absent.

Discussion on process for including items on future agendas.

10. DISCUSSION AND ADOPTION OF FUTURE PUBLIC MEETINGS

Discussion of next meeting agenda and strategies for future meetings.

September 21, 2007
October 11 and 12, 2007
November 8 and 9, 2007
December 11 and 12, 2007
January 14 and 15, 2008

11. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Dargan adjourned the meeting at approximately 5:15 pm.