



Tahoe Keys Aquatic Invasive Species Integrated Management Plan Stakeholder Assessment Report

Prepared by Zephyr Collaboration

At the Request of Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

October, 2018

Introduction	3
Executive Summary.....	4
Background.....	7
Summary of Interests Related to AIS, Water Quality and Lake Tahoe	8
Topics for Joint Fact Finding.....	9
Perspectives on Analyzing a Range of Alternatives.....	10
Recommendations for Coordination with an EIR/EIS Technical Team	11
Recommendations for Convening a Stakeholder Committee	12
Recommendations for Public Engagement	14
Appendix A: Stakeholder Committee Membership Recommendations.....	15
Appendix B: List of Stakeholder Interviewees.....	16
Appendix C: References	17

Introduction

This document is a summary of interests, themes and questions surrounding Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) treatment and water quality issues within the Tahoe Keys. This summary is derived from 29 interviews with 44 stakeholders between August and October 2018.

It includes:

- A summary of the range of stakeholders' concerns, interests and perspectives regarding AIS, water quality and the future of the Tahoe Keys and Lake Tahoe
- Stakeholder perspectives on a range of alternatives for weed control in an environmental analysis (EIR/EIS)
- Recommendations for a Stakeholder Committee process and timeline
- Recommendations for coordination among stakeholders, the public, technical experts and the EIR/EIS team
- Recommendations for public outreach and engagement

The information in this document summarizes the perspectives of the stakeholders interviewed, and is intended to set the stage for a constructive Stakeholder Committee (SC) process and coordination with the Environmental Impact Review / Environmental Impact Study (EIR/EIS) team, once selected. This document is a draft, intended for review and represents the facilitators' best attempts to summarize the range, breadth and nature of interests.

Executive Summary

Aquatic invasive species infestations in the Lake Tahoe Keys (Keys), particularly of the plants Eurasian watermilfoil and curlyleaf pondweed, have been expanding since the early 1990s and now have reached a level of urgency that threatens native species, and contributes to the diminished water quality of Lake Tahoe. Low water quality has led to recent cyanobacteria blooms which pose a health threat and limits recreation access. Longstanding efforts to manage the problem, such as harvesting, contribute to the growth of AIS in the Keys, increase risk of migration to other areas of Lake Tahoe and its tributaries, and are not economically viable with ever-increasing costs.

Lake-wide Problem

All interviewed are keenly interested in finding long term, durable solutions to AIS in the Lake Tahoe Keys and Marina. Interviewees describe AIS in the Keys as a lake-wide problem, with the Keys and Marina as priority locations for management controls. Respondents differ widely on who should bear financial responsibility for solutions. After almost thirty years of combating AIS in the Keys, one measure of success for this collaborative stakeholder process and associated EIR/EIS may be reaching a point where key partners can consider how to fund a set of agreed upon long-term solutions.

AIS and Water Quality

In addition to being considered a lake-wide problem, virtually all stated that they hope the purpose, alternatives and criteria of this EIR/EIS can be framed more broadly than just AIS mitigation, and instead can include criteria for water quality and ecological health in the Keys and the lake, with a long-term perspective.

Long Term Solutions Desired

There is virtual unanimity that herbicide treatment should be the last resort for AIS mitigation in Lake Tahoe, a unique and treasured environment, and one of few Tier 3 “Outstanding National Resource Waters” under the Clean Water Act. However, there are a wide range of perspectives as to whether we have fully considered or exhausted other treatment methods, how much we know about herbicide treatment and the implications of its use, and how to combine the range of treatment methods for effective, long term mitigation.

Strong and Varied Views on Potential Use of Herbicide

Use of EPA approved aquatic herbicides as a potential treatment method is perceived as one of the most divisive and controversial choices for Lake Tahoe. After several years of stakeholder and independent technical review of herbicide and other treatments, some are convinced herbicides offer the only method to effectively treat the AIS crisis in the Keys. Others may be convinced that a limited application of herbicides may be necessary to change the trajectory of AIS in the Keys, but are deeply concerned about paving the way for herbicide use in perpetuity. Some believe herbicide, if used, would be the next giant, regrettable mistake for the ecology, economy and communities of Lake Tahoe.

Adaptive Management Process

While there is expected to be additional information coming in late 2018 and in the summer of 2019 regarding the efficacy of cutting-edge treatment methods such as ultraviolet radiation and laminar flow aeration, there will nonetheless remain throughout the timeframe of this collaborative stakeholder process and associated EIR/EIS a dearth of information in advance of treatment about how to package treatment methods together, how, where and how often to treat different areas of the Keys, and how to prevent and mitigate secondary or unintended impacts from all treatment methods, including the potential use of herbicide. For these reasons, a preferred alternative for weed control that enjoys broad support from the public and key implementation partners will likely need to include a phased, adaptive process for permitting, treatment and monitoring, and environmental documentation.

Comprehensive Consideration and Study of Alternatives for Treatment Options

For the development of a preferred approach to weed control to be credible and defensible, the stakeholder process and associated EIR/EIS should analyze a range of options that address the key interests and concerns of stakeholders. A multi-stakeholder Stakeholder Committee (SC) should be convened to consider the wide range of interests, develop feasible options for consideration, explore focused technical and procedural questions, and participate in the development of recommended criteria and alternatives for the EIR/EIS.

Independent Technical Experts

Additional and ongoing independent expertise will likely be useful in the near term for commenting on an SC joint fact-finding process, and perhaps to help develop management targets and metrics which are adaptive. New subject matter experts may be needed to supplement the comments of local and regional experts who are seen by some as biased and/or to have fixed opinions.

EIR/EIS Team

In order that the development of the EIR/EIS document be an efficient and timely process it is important to recruit a technical team that can build on previous work to develop a thorough, rigorous and accessible environmental document. Due to the precedent and passion surrounding Lake Tahoe, the technical team should have, or be able to recruit, capacity for developing highly effectively multimedia public education materials including videos, digital and geospatial media.

Stakeholder Committee

To meet the desired timelines for permitting and treatment, it will be important that the Stakeholder Committee commit to an ambitious work plan through the end of 2019. Wherever possible this committee should strive for consensus recommendations. As a tool for expediency, the SC may agree to milestones whereby they define agreement, describe disagreement and identify key remaining questions, and then proceed to the next phase of deliberations. These milestones may include developing a joint fact-finding report, providing suggestions on how criteria are considered and integrated, commenting on a range of feasible treatment approaches, and recommending a preferred option.

Broad Support

There are several indications that suggest it is possible to develop a preferred approach to weed control in the Keys and Marina that enjoys broad support among the public as well as the boards and staff of key implementation partners. All interviewed are deeply committed to finding durable solutions for AIS and water quality in the Keys. The urgency of the problem, coupled with the uniqueness of Lake Tahoe, means that it is likely that resources can be brought to bear to develop, implement and monitor context-specific, cutting edge solutions.

Board Engagement

In order for a preferred alternative to be selected and implemented, it is critical that the boards of all key implementation partners be engaged early and throughout the EIR/EIS development, permitting, and public engagement processes. This is especially important for the decision makers, regulatory authorities, and for the EIR/EIS lead agencies - TRPA and Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (LRWQCB).

Timeline and Milestones

Due to an increasing sense of urgency around containing AIS, feasible and effective management controls in the Keys and Marina are increasingly important to containing the spread of invasive weeds around the Lake. For this reason, a rigorous schedule of Stakeholder Committee meetings is recommended, with monthly meetings to undertake the work of joint fact finding and development of recommendations.

Of consideration is a limited window of opportunity during late spring that is appropriate for testing and application of herbicides, and an IMP that includes their use needs to be approved and permitted by early spring of the year applications are slated to begin. To give lead regulatory agencies enough time for staff and board review and approval of the associated EIR/EIS it is desirable to have it submitted the previous fall.

A more specific timeline of activities and milestones will be developed during the initial meetings of the SC, in coordination with lead agencies and the EIR/EIS team.

Background

AIS Management is a Priority in the Lake Tahoe Basin

Combatting and controlling AIS in Lake Tahoe is one of the highest priorities identified for the basin's Environmental Improvement Program (EIP). Recognizing the threat that AIS poses to the quality of water in Lake Tahoe, the Basin's multi-sector partnership formed the Lake Tahoe Aquatic Invasive Species Coordination Committee (LTAISCC) to develop and oversee a comprehensive Lake Tahoe Region AIS program with the goal of controlling AIS. The LTAISCC and other stakeholders helped advise on the 2009 Lake Tahoe Region AIS Management Plan, which was updated into the 2014 [Lake Tahoe Region Aquatic Invasive Species Management Plan, California-Nevada](#), and both plans were approved by the national Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force (ANSTF). In 2015, scientists at the University of Nevada, Reno developed an [Implementation Plan for the Control of Aquatic Invasive Species within Lake Tahoe](#) overseen by the LTAISCC. This implementation plan ranks the Tahoe Keys and Tahoe Keys Marina as the number one and two priorities for control of AIS, and recommends an integrated program for control of AIS and removal of unwanted biomass. Specifically, the authors stated:

"due to the notable abundance of invasive and nuisance native aquatic plants in [the Tahoe Keys] system, an integrated program for removal which not only includes the use of non-chemical removal efforts such as bottom barriers and diver assisted suction removal, but other actions such as the reduction of nutrient loads, plant fragment collection, and herbicide application is recommended to reduce unwanted plant biomass" (p. 39).

AIS Management Work is Ongoing in the Tahoe Keys

The Tahoe Keys began working toward mitigating aquatic plants in the 1970s, increasing control efforts in the 1990s and 2000s while consulting and collaborating with various organizations and agencies also working on the problem of AIS in the Lake Tahoe Basin. In 2015, the Tahoe Keys Property Owners Association (TKPOA) launched a two-year stakeholder planning process that included input from an expert panel to develop a plan for testing various control methods (including herbicides) to evaluate the efficacy and environmental effects of proposed control methods prior to developing a long-term Integrated Management Plan (IMP). In December 2017, an application for permits was submitted to TRPA and LRWQCB to implement a test in the Keys that would have involved a one-time application of three herbicides (to treat three targeted species, Eurasian watermilfoil, curlyleaf pondweed, and coontail) followed by two years of non-herbicide control methods. The test was to be within limited areas of the West Lagoon of the Tahoe Keys to test and evaluate the safety, efficacy, compatibility, and utility of the three aquatic herbicide products, in combination with subsequent non-herbicide treatment methods, as the basis for an integrated methods strategy for bringing aquatic invasive plants under control. This triggered the need for an EIR/EIS as regulatory agencies concluded that an EIS/EIR would be necessary to fully analyze the effects of the implementation of the IMP and would be a more effective path forward.

Summary of Interests Related to AIS, Water Quality and Lake Tahoe

AIS in the Tahoe Keys and Marina are seen by all interviewed as a primary and urgent threat to water quality throughout Lake Tahoe. All are keenly interested in finding implementable and durable solutions. Themes below are those which were commonly referenced in interviews.

- AIS in the Keys is a lake-wide problem. TRPA asserts that "strategies need to be developed that recognize that the Tahoe Keys AIS issue is a shared lake-wide problem and not solely the problem of the TKPOA" (TRPA, 2018, p.3). All stakeholders interviewed agree. If AIS cannot be controlled in the Tahoe Keys and Marina, it will continue to be a growing issue, with impacts to the water quality and ecology of the entire Lake.
- The Tahoe Keys and AIS is a water quality problem. In terms of drinking water certification and standards, status as Tier 3 waters under the Clean Water Act, and the goals for clearer lake waters, the criteria and alternatives should all be framed to include the larger context of overall water quality.
- Stakeholders desire to act decisively in the near-term, but seek long-term solutions. All acknowledge the urgency of AIS infestation in the Keys and that we may be near a threshold, that if crossed, would result in rapid AIS expansion in other parts of the Lake and its tributaries. Therefore, all seek near-term action. However, virtually every person interviewed came with warnings of selecting a quick fix over long term, durable and sustainable solutions.
- This EIR/EIS sets the stage for future weed treatment protocols lake-wide. All understand that the scope of this EIR/EIS must focus on management actions within the Tahoe Keys and Marina in order to complete a robust and actionable environmental document. In addition, most suggest that the approaches decided upon and permitted during this process will likely set precedent for weed treatment protocols lake-wide.
- Public safety and health are now at risk in the Keys. Weed proliferations have created conditions conducive to algal blooms. The resulting water quality conditions have posed health threats to residents, visitors and pets who come into contact with water in certain areas of the Keys.
- If not addressed, AIS in the Keys may accelerate other AIS infestations. Not only are these species noxious and damaging unto themselves, the propagation and die-off of these species affect water chemistry, turbidity, temperature and nutrient loading, which may increase risk of additional aquatic invasive species (animal and plant) establishing themselves in the Keys.
- All solutions impact real property values and recreation access. There are a variety of levels of sympathy for Tahoe Keys property owners and perceptions of their role and responsibility for the problem and any solutions. No matter how one perceives culpability for the existence of the Keys and the development of AIS problems, it is clear that TKPOA and their members are most immediate to the problems resulting from AIS, and will necessarily have to be at the center of any durable solution.

Topics for Joint Fact Finding

Since there have been several iterations of technical, stakeholder and agency review of management plans in the last decade, as much as possible, the Stakeholder Committee should build on rather than replicate past work and focus on remaining questions that are important for developing, implementing and monitoring an Integrated Management Plan.

However, this collaborative stakeholder approach is an opportunity to restart discussions with a range of constituencies, and as such it will be important to review key technical and procedural information. While there are a suite of unanswered technical and policy questions, the following are the questions most frequently referenced in interviews. It is upon these questions that a joint fact-finding process for the SC should focus.

- How effective will herbicides be, and what are the potential impacts?
 - What are the standards for anti-degradation of Tier 3 waters, and what does that mean for the potential for herbicide use?
 - Will the use of herbicide incentivize or even necessitate future use?
 - Are there physical barriers or other methods which mitigate the risk of errors, accidents or incidents during application and treatment?

- How much can be mitigated using a combination of management tools and strategies other than herbicide?
 - What is known about emerging technologies such as UV and LFA and their application in Tahoe? How much more will we know with preliminary results from pilot projects?
 - What are the costs/benefits and efficacy of combining multiple treatment methods?

- How can the EIR/EIS alternatives, and any subsequent permitting, be structured to allow for sequential testing, learning, permitting and monitoring?
 - For what timeframe should alternatives be constructed and how does this match with the duration of permits?
 - How to construct and analyze adaptive alternatives? How to permit adaptive management strategies?

Perspectives on Analyzing a Range of Alternatives

In order to have a credible study with thorough analysis, and to develop a preferred alternative which can enjoy broad support, the range of alternatives should be developed with the following considerations in mind:

- Define a geographic scope of treatment options that include the Tahoe Keys Marina. Any analysis or alternatives that do not consider the Marina would result in an incomplete EIR/EIS, potentially wasting funds and time.
- Develop treatment options and approaches which support adaptive learning and management. Given the uncertainty around the efficacy and potential side effects of using herbicide in the Tahoe Keys, as well as the limited information available about emerging technologies, and how to implement management tools together, AIS management in the Keys is by definition experimental. Therefore, stakeholders expressed a strong desire that alternatives be constructed to foster adaptive management and learning, with specific targets and metrics to evaluate any treatments.
- Explore methods to physically separate Keys and lake water during treatment and/or seasonally. Whether with temporary or permanent infrastructure, many want physical barriers to stop water flow between the Keys and the lake to be included in alternatives analysis, or explain why this element is not feasible or suitable for analysis.
- Examine partial restoration of the Keys. No interviewee suggested it is within the realm of feasibility to restore the Tahoe Keys to pre-development conditions. However, many are interested in an examination of whether partial restoration of parts of the Keys to wetlands can be a part of AIS and water quality solutions, while also serving recreation, wildlife and property value goals.
- Define criteria which have a long-term (50+ year) perspective. Few believe that these AIS species can be completely eradicated from the Keys. Even if possible, the conditions of the Keys relative to circulation, temperature, and nutrient loading will require ongoing management for water quality and to prevent/mitigate AIS in perpetuity. Therefore, even while the alternatives analyzed may describe treatment plans that take place in the near term, criteria to evaluate alternatives should maintain a long-term perspective of addressing mutually desired outcomes.
- Develop a range of treatment options that incorporate, but do not duplicate, past and existing plans. The TKPOA has spent extensive time and resources developing multiple IMPs and permit applications at the request of regulatory agencies, as well engaging the public and seeking independent expert review of previously proposed plans.

Recommendations for Coordination with an EIR/EIS Technical Team

The following are recommendations for reviewing and selecting a technical team to assist with the development, analysis, framing and production of a high quality environmental document.

- Select a team that can incorporate past work and move quickly. If the goal is to implement new treatment regimens as soon as possible, it will be necessary to complete associated studies and analysis in 2019 in order to draft permits and receive and respond to public comments by 2020. Therefore, the technical team will need to be able to construct alternatives and conduct analysis efficiently.
- Ensure that the technical team has public media and outreach capacities. Particularly, the following skills, experiences and resources will be helpful.
 - Generate multimedia materials including video, digital and geospatial information.
 - Manage logistics for public events such as meetings and open houses.
 - Develop and distribute notices to relevant media outlets and organizations. Specific experience working with home owners' associations would be helpful.
 - Collect, collate and develop responses to submitted comments during official comment periods.
 - Capacity to effectively address highly technical and emotionally charged public policy issues.
- Find a team that has experience developing adaptive alternatives in an EIR/EIS. This will be a pioneering effort to develop alternatives which are suitable for adaptive management, and which can meet the needs of permitting from lead agencies. Experience with constructing and analyzing adaptive alternatives may be the most desirable qualification for a technical EIR team.

Recommendations for Convening a Stakeholder Committee

Based on interviews and experience with similar resource management questions, it does appear possible and desirable to convene a multi-stakeholder Stakeholder Committee to help frame planning priorities and treatment options, and to participate in a collaborative process in regards to the development, analysis and recommendation of alternatives. In order to serve the goals of inclusion, expediency and informed decision making, we recommend the Stakeholder Committee include the following elements.

- Lead agencies are active members of the Stakeholder Committee, but maintain decision making authority on the preferred alternative. The lead agencies, TRPA and LRWQCB, are the conveners of, participants in, and audience for the Stakeholder Committee. Agencies' staffs will be important information resources for SC members, taking into consideration interests, recommendations and key questions which will inform eventual selection of a preferred alternative.
- Periodically engage key partners and interested parties. The SC will have an ambitious and demanding work schedule and work load. There are likely stakeholders that would like regular updates and opportunities to inform SC work but who are not able or suitable for regular SC participation. These can include the resource agencies' staffs of California and Nevada, homeowners' and shoreline associations, and drinking water purveyors and marina operators who are not on the SC. It will also be important to coordinate with existing committees focused on AIS, such as the AISCC and Tahoe Interagency Executive Steering Committee (TIE). Approximately quarterly, the SC can engage a broader circle of stakeholders for updates, input and comment. For this, the establishment of a Stakeholder Consultation Circle (SCC) is recommended.
- Encourage participation by the Tahoe Keys Marina. Numerous attempts to engage the Keys Marina in the stakeholder assessment were unsuccessful. Many stakeholders note that solutions that do not include the Keys Marina will be incomplete. All desire to find a way to engage the Marina in a collaborative process for developing and implementing an IMP.
- Develop a joint fact-finding report focused on key important questions. Compiling a report that documents existing technical information and outstanding questions to be reviewed and commented on by independent technical experts is recommended, both to inform the SC process and as a summary report of technical data for peer review. Except for some information about the use of UV and LFA technology, there has not been, nor will there be, a substantial tranche of new data regarding treatment methods since the last round of public engagement and technical review of the proponent's permit application. Joint fact-finding should focus on technical questions related to the effects and side effects of treatment methods, as well as procedural questions about analyzing adaptive alternatives and associated permitting. One of the first tasks of the Committee will be to agree on a range of joint fact-finding questions. It is advisable to

consult with the Stakeholder Consultation Circle on the range of JFF questions in order to ensure key questions aren't omitted.

- Utilize independent technical expertise to review joint fact-finding report. The SC can develop a joint fact-finding report which identifies areas of agreement, the nature of disagreement and remaining questions for future study. This report should be developed by the SC based on existing data and information, and agreed upon independent technical experts can then review and comment on this joint fact-finding report. Rather than convening a panel of advisors that meets regularly, a broad range of agreed upon experts can comment on the joint fact-finding report(s) as they are released. Any comments or findings from technical experts will serve to inform Stakeholder Committee work, and will provide additional information for consideration by the EIR team in their analysis of alternatives.
- Utilize existing resources for independent technical expertise, and reach to new experts. Because some local and regional experts are seen by some as either biased or to have fixed opinions, the SC members should agree early on a process to select independent technical experts with whom they can consult during the joint fact-finding process.
- Considerations for identifying SC members.
 - Small and nimble. Given the workload and timeline, the SC needs to be able to coordinate efficiently and effectively.
 - Representative. SC members should represent a clear constituency of the range of stakeholder perspectives.
 - Time available. Members need to be able to commit to a rigorous schedule of meetings and data review.
- Strive for consensus, prioritize informed decision making. Consensus recommendations will be sought wherever possible. When there is not consensus, it will be important to note the levels and nature of agreement and disagreement, along with any questions for future inquiry or monitoring. In some instances, a lack of full consensus with a full record of interests and reasons may better inform agency decisions than consensus agreements built on compromise, especially if there are strong disagreements about technical information or foundational assumptions.

Recommendations for Public Engagement

Citizens and stakeholders in Lake Tahoe, California, Nevada, across the country and around the world are interested in the management practices and fate of Lake Tahoe. Therefore, a robust public outreach and engagement plan is critical.

- Utilize Summer of 2019 for public and board education and engagement. Coordinate with key stakeholders to assist with outreach recommendations, efforts and materials.
- Meet locals where they are. Hold public meetings in North and South Lake Tahoe, and utilize local media outlets such as KRLT, Tahoe Mountain News, Tahoe Weekly, Lake Tahoe Daily Tribune, and Moonshine Inc. Work directly with HOAs to outreach to members.
- Meet non-locals where they are. Offer webinars during important public engagement phases. Develop accessible, creative multimedia portals and materials that curious citizens can easily locate for quality information.
- Communicate regularly with friends of the Stakeholder Committee. Ensure all stakeholders are updated on the SC process and emergent information, as well as have the opportunity to provide feedback. A list of suggested stakeholders is provided in Appendix C.
- Develop a focused strategy for board engagement. Engage boards of SC members and other stakeholders early and often in the process to ensure they are informed and updated along the way.
- Create a project website. Coordinate with lead agencies and stakeholders to link the website to pertinent AIS and project information, continuously updating the website with content for public education.

Appendix A: Stakeholder Committee Membership Recommendations

Lead Agencies

- Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

Recommended Core Stakeholder Committee (meet approximately monthly)

- Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board
- League to Save Lake Tahoe
- Tahoe Keys Property Owners Association
- Tahoe Keys Marina
- Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
- Tahoe Resource Conservation District
- Tahoe Water Suppliers Association

Recommended Stakeholder Consultation Circle (meet approximately quarterly)

- California Attorney General's Office
- California Department of Fish & Wildlife
- California State Lands Commission
- California Tahoe Conservancy
- City of South Lake Tahoe
- Key Concerned Citizens
- Lake Tahoe AIS Coordinating Committee
- Lake Tahoe Marina Association
- Lakeside Park Association
- Local Native American Tribes
- Nevada Department of Environmental Protection
- Nevada Tahoe Conservation District
- North Lake Tahoe Resort Association
- Sierra Club
- Southshore Tahoe Chamber
- Tahoe Keys Beach and Harbor Association
- Tahoe Lakefront Homeowners Association
- Tahoe Fund
- TIE Steering Committee
- U.S. Fish & Wildlife

Appendix B: List of Stakeholder Interviewees

California Department of Fish & Wildlife, Gabriele Quillman, Scientific Aid
California Department of Fish & Wildlife, Patrick Moezsinger, Senior Environmental Scientist
California State Lands Commission, Jason Ramos, Senior Environmental Scientist
California Tahoe Conservancy, Patrick Wright, Executive Director
City of South Lake Tahoe, Jason Burke, Stormwater Program Coordinator
Elise Fett, concerned citizen
Harold Singer, former Executive Officer, Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board
LRWQCB, Bruce Warden, Environmental Scientist
LRWQCB, Doug Smith, Assistant Executive Officer and Ombudsman
LRWQCB, Russel Norman, Water Resources Control Engineer
Lake Tahoe Marina Association, Jim Phaelan, General Manager
Lakeside Park Association, Andy Englehardt, Board President
Lakeside Park Association, Bob Loding, Water Manager
League to Save Lake Tahoe, Darcie Goodman, Chief Executive Officer
League to Save Lake Tahoe, Jesse Patterson, Chief Strategy Officer
Nevada Department of Environmental Protection, Jennifer Carr, Deputy Director
Nevada Division of State Lands, Elizabeth Kingsland, Tahoe Program Manager
North Lake Tahoe Resort Association, Cindy Gustafson, CEO
Sierra Club, Jennifer Quashnick, Consultant
UC Davis, Dr. Geoff Schladow, Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering
Tahoe Fund, Amy Berry, CEO
Tahoe Keys Beach and Harbor Association, Betsy Sommerfelt, Manager
Tahoe Lakefront Homeowners Association, Jan Brisco, Executive Director
Tahoe Resource Conservation District, Mollie Hurt, Director of Programs
Tahoe Resource Conservation District, Nicole Cartwright, Executive Director
Tahoe Water Suppliers Association, Madonna Dunbar, Executive Director
TKPOA, Andy Kopania, Chair of Water Quality Committee
TKPOA, Bonnie Halleran, Board President
TKPOA Greg Hoover, Water Quality Manager
TKPOA, Jim Jones, Water Quality Committee
TKPOA, Jo Ann Wilson, Administrative Assistant
TKPOA, Kirk Wooldridge, General Manager
TRPA, Dennis Zabaglo, Aquatic Resources Program Manager
TRPA, Joanne Marchetta, Executive Director
TRPA, Julie Regan, External Affairs Chief
TRPA, Kim Caringer, Environmental Improvement Division Manager
TRPA, Paul Nielsen, Environmental and Land Use Consultant
University of Nevada Reno, Dr. Sudeep Chandra, Associate Professor of Biology
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Laura, Whitney, Program Manager
U.S. EPA, Jacques Landy, Lake Tahoe Basin Coordinator
U.S. Fish & Wildlife, Corene Jones, Fish Biologist
U.S. Fish & Wildlife, Roger Peka, Fish Biologist
U.S. Fish & Wildlife, Stephanie Byers, Senior Fishery Biologist
U.S. Forest Service, Jeff Marsolais, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit Forest Supervisor

Appendix C: References

TRPA (Tahoe Regional Planning Agency). 2018. Tahoe Keys IWMP Facilitation RFP.

TRPA (Tahoe Regional Planning Agency). 2014. Lake Tahoe Region Aquatic Invasive Species Management Plan California-Nevada.

Wittmann, M.E. and Chandra, S. 2015. Implementation Plan for the Control of Aquatic Invasive Species within Lake Tahoe. Lake Tahoe AIS Coordination Committee.