DRAFT - SUMMARY

STAKEHOLDER SCIENCE AND STAKEHOLDER COMMUNITY COMMITTEE MEETING

LAKE TAHOE WEST RESTORATION PARTNERSHIP

Wednesday, September 6, 10:00 am to 4:00 pm

North Tahoe Fire Protection District, 222 Fairway Drive, Tahoe City, CA 96154

All meeting materials are publicly available on the Lake Tahoe West website http://nationalforests.org/laketahoewest. *For questions please contact the program manager/facilitator Dorian Fougères at* dfougeres@nationalforests.org *or (530) 902-8281.*

Meeting Synopsis

The Lake Tahoe West Restoration Partnership (Lake Tahoe West) Stakeholder Community Committee (SCC) and Stakeholder Science Committee (SSC) met jointly on September 6, 2017, at the North Tahoe Fire Protection District in Tahoe City. Both Committees reviewed a memo on the Completion of Phase 1 and Overview of Phase 2, and associated updates to the Values-Disturbances-Indicators table. Discussion included comments and questions on individual indicators of landscape resilience, as well as how to package these indicators together to give an overall assessment of the landscape. The afternoon focused on further discussion of the components and process for Phase 2, as well as discussion on a detailed presentation for the modeling components and how they will fit together. The next meeting will be a SSC meeting on October 3, 1 to 5 pm, location TBD, which will focus on completing the "roll-up" of indicators. The meeting will also include a proposal for the following SSC meeting on November 7, 9 am to 3 pm, location TBD, which will focus on developing a series of Potential Landscape Restoration Strategies.

Contents

This meeting summary paraphrases individual comments and suggestions. Statements do not indicate consensus of the group unless they are preceded by the word "AGREEMENT".

Action Items

1. **All stakeholders** to provide their biographies (if have not already done so).
2. **Mr. Garrett to follow-up with Ms. McCarthy** regarding Great Basin Landscape Conservation Cooperative Request for Proposals associated with traditional ecological knowledge, as a possible partnering opportunity with the Washoe Tribe.
3. **Mr. Garrett** to ask the Washoe Tribe whether in future meetings member(s) of the Stakeholder Science Committee might join.
4. **Mr. Fougères to request of Ms. McCarthy** a link to the Tahoe Science Consortium synthesis work on air pollution.
5. **Mr. Garrett and Ms. Maloney** to talk with Ms. Manley, Mr. Long, and Mr. Scheller about adding additional west shore plot data to LANDIS.
6. **Mr. Long and Ms. Maloney** to talk to Mr. Scheller about species-specific data about beetles, and the possible aid of Mr. Chris Fettig.
7. **Mr. Fougères and Mr. Long** to request that Mr. Scheller provide a list of assumptions that go into LANDIS, for review by the IADT and SSC.
8. **Mr. Fougères and Mr. Long** to call out peer-reviewed publications available on the LTW Living Library that involve LANDIS modeling**.**
9. **Mr. Fougères to connect Mr. Schafer and Ms. Manley with Mr. Falk** regarding economic data**.**
10. **Mr. Fougères** to circulate link to website of Mr. Todd Gilens, the visual artist that is now contracted for LTW, as well as First Track Productions, the videographer that is now contracted for LTW.

Agreements

1. The Stakeholder Science Committee approved the July 6 and August 10 meeting and webinar summaries.

1. Welcome and Opening Remarks

Chief Michael Schwartz, North Tahoe Fire Protection District and Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team (TFFT), opened the meeting and welcomed participants. Mr. Schwartz noted that the Lake Tahoe West Restoration Partnership (LTW) covers most of his district. District involvement in controlled burning is relatively new, stimulated by the larger TFFT partnership (which is directed by the Multi-Agency Coordinating Group, MAC). He noted that local government is the funding lynchpin that ties local property owners to state and federal programs, and allows for multiple resources to be harnessed (whether for fire suppression or cross-jurisdictional efforts). LTW represents the evolution from community-based efforts that are now being aggregated at the landscape scale. During the working lunch at the recent Lake Tahoe Summit, elected officials asked how to ensure that funding was well spent. The key to this is moving from the local to the landscape. LTW takes a lot of time and is hard, but all the efforts are riding on this, it is where the rubber meets the road and can serve as a model for the whole Basin, and in turn

the whole United States looks at Tahoe. Together we can set the bar for our federal and state partners. The most important work in the Basin is in this room, and success will set the stage for us.

Dorian Fougères, NFF facilitator and project manager, reviewed the agenda and ground rules and upcoming dates, and led introductions.

There were no interested party comments.

2. Landscape Resilience Assessment, Part A

Mr. Fougères reviewed the *Completion of Phase 1 and Overview of Phase 2* handout. Discussion followed.

- The approach looks sensible.

Mr. Fougères reviewed the revisions to the Values-Disturbances-Indicators table. Discussion followed.

- Does the Washoe Tribe desire to engage?
  - o Mr. Brian Garrett: Yes, they expressed a desire to get involved as their staffing and funding allows. As opportunities arise, LTW will look to pursue joint funding to support their involvement. The Tribal Chairman has also mentioned to his Council that a dedicated liaison for all things in Tahoe would be helpful. The Tribal Chairman plans to attend the October 4 field visit. LTW staff will work with Tribal staff this autumn to develop indicators for the Cultural Landscapes value.
  - o Mr. Fougères: If the Tribe designates a representative to the Stakeholder Science Committee (SSC), the SSC could choose to revise its stipend policy to support tribal participation. The Tribe ultimately may choose to receive twice annual briefings, join the Stakeholder Science Committee, and/or become a Participating Agency with a unique role.
- The Great Basin Landscape Conservation Cooperative (LCC) has an upcoming Request for Proposals that will include traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) and would be a great opportunity for Lake Tahoe West to partner with the Washoe Tribe.
  - o **ACTION ITEM: Mr. Garrett to follow-up with Ms. McCarthy** regarding Great Basin Landscape Conservation Cooperative Request for Proposals associated with traditional ecological knowledge, as a possible partnering opportunity with the Washoe Tribe.
- Would it be possible for SSC members to join the LTW staff meeting with the tribal staff?
  - o Mr. Fougères: We cannot speak for the Tribe but can ask them about this request.
  - o **ACTION ITEM: Mr. Garrett** to ask the Washoe Tribe whether in future meetings member(s) of the Stakeholder Science Committee might join.
- In practice air quality monitoring looks at ozone and particulate matter and nitrogen oxides altogether, so why is fire-related smoke separated from other types of air pollution? Also, the biggest impact to air quality is from fires outside the Basin. Why are we trying to be

resilient to things we cannot control that occur outside the Basin? And why are we including wildfires, rather than just prescribed burns?

- o Mr. Fougères, Mr. Forest Schafer, Mr. Randy Striplin:
    - ▪ There are many things that we cannot control but still want to be resilient to; this includes any kind of fire, whether natural ignitions or prescribed fire or accidental fire caused by people.
    - ▪ Second, there are many drivers of change that are external to the Basin – for example, climate change – that affect what happens in the Basin. While we ideally could have an indicator of resilience to fire that distinguishes smoke coming from fire that we manage in the Basin, we will also need to have an indicator of resilience to smoke from fires that occur outside the Basin.
    - ▪ Generally, the Air Quality indicator and indicators of smoke are extremely hard to differentiate geographically – there are only 2 or 3 monitoring stations for the entire basin. LTW may choose to invest in more monitoring stations which would allow for the deployment of better indicators of resilience to fire-related smoke and to other sources of air pollution, from both within and outside of the Basin. While indicator development is hard, the topic is so important we had to at least try.
- If we lump fire-related smoke with other types of air pollution, we are letting people continue to bifurcate the ecological fire needed to restore the landscape from the potential public health impacts, and make blanket statements that we cannot have any smoke.
- Lumping fire-related smoke with other air quality concerns let's people readily say "no smoke," period.
- Mr. Fougères: To summarize, rather than separating fire from smoke, we need to help people understand that ecologically beneficial fire will incur some smoke as well, and help them make informed tradeoffs about ecological health and air quality.
- Other public health concerns associated with air quality include localized pollution along roadways, and from construction sites.
- Mr. Dan Shaw: The Science Team may be able to look at air pollution more broadly during modeling, and fire that we manage on our terms compared with wildfire. High nitrogen loads are also a concern. However, we have reduced air quality monitoring these days, and lacked the data to differentiate between in-basin and out-of-basin sources.
- We could differentiate between in-basin and out-of-basin fire in our management, but in terms of the resilience of public health, the distinction is irrelevant. People will need to deal with smoke no matter its source.
    - o Mr. Fougères: One potential indicator that came up that speaks to social-ecological resilience was the number of partners in the public health notification system for smoke alerts. This would help communities regardless of the source or intent of fire-related smoke.
    - o Ms. Stephanie Coppeto: Another could be sharing our technologies and approaches to managing smoke with other parts of the Basin and broader region.
- Air pollution tree problems are rare in the Basin but well-documented in Teakettle Experimental Forest and in Southern California conifers and oaks. Ironically impacts decline

during drought years. Nitrogen oxides can impact mycorrhizal associations and hence water and nutrient uptake by trees.

- The Tahoe Science Consortium synthesis has good documentation of air pollution concerns, and associated monitoring network data.
    - **ACTION ITEM: Mr. Fougères to request of Ms. McCarthy** a link to the Tahoe Science Consortium synthesis work on air pollution.

Regarding Continuing Indicators and Removed Indicators

- Ms. Shana Gross noted that the trees per acre indicator is being revised.
- Seral stage, vertical heterogeneity and horizontal heterogeneity: the approach makes sense. However, the conditions are relative to a huge landscape, and it might help to break things into a smaller scale, so that the thresholds are more context-dependent.
    - There are precedents for such "moving window analyses" (MWA) with changing scales of perhaps 10,000 acres (for example, fisher den habitat models at the 3,000 acre scale). MWA assesses how well conditions in a given scale fit an acceptable range; this is done for each pixel, and shows how much each neighbor varies. The analysis then shows clusters of pixels which match desired conditions.
    - Ms. Gross: We might be able to evaluate this for EcObjects, depending how they were derived.
    - Mr. Mason Bindl: We started with patch size, completed the segmentation, and used this to demarcate clumps. We could try to convert the EcObjects to a raster file, we would need to work with Scott Conway at the Remote Sensing Lab.
- The primary concern is about seral stage, there is very little variation. It would be great to try the MWA analysis first and see if it produces the same result.
    - Ms. Gross: It is tricky because it is a proportional indicator, and we want some bit of all the types.
- It would be helpful to include air temperature as an indicator of resilience to climate change. We can provide this for daytime or nighttime or specific thresholds, based on climate projection data.
    - Mr. Fougères: This would have to somehow indicate resilience to climate change – not just be an indicator of air temperature itself. What would be the connection?
    - Ms. Gross: What period of analysis do you recommend? And what model? What would the threshold be for specific vegetation type? Would this include the past and future, or just the future? The data is easy to pull but the connections are hard to understand.
- Some vegetation data exists.
    - Ms. Gross: We have the Desert Research Institute data from the Southwest Climate Science Center for California spotted owl thermal tolerance. The data grid size is large, 6 kilometers, and it's hard to differentiate at the landscape scale. We can try.
- Mr. Fougères: With all the indicator revisions being requested, the IADT will do what they can to make things work. If we run into further barriers, however, these will have to go into the Removed Indicators document with an explanation of why we could not complete

the analysis at this time, and what would be needed during Phase 2 to further develop the desired indicator.

- An "eco-evolutionary indicator" would also be helpful to provide a genetics perspective. Data exists for white pine. This is something that would take time to develop with a researcher in Virginia, but is possible.
- Regarding Roads and Trails linked to Water: even if there is no culvert the crossing could be good, we should not assume all crossings without culverts are necessarily bad. For example, parts of the Rubicon Trail use rock lines instead of culverts and this avoids negative impacts.
  - o Mr. Garrett, Mr. Fougères, Mr. Jonathan Long: This is an important point. A few indicators were developed purposely as simply as possible because, through conversation with experts, the IADT realized that making the analysis more complex without correspondingly detailed data meant that assumptions would compound and make the indicator even less reliable.
    - ▪ In this case, the data was limited, the IADT used LiDAR to see where roads and water courses intersected, recognizing that culverts could be of various shapes and quality. And yes, rocking is a technique that could replace a culvert.
    - ▪ So the choice was deliberate to stick with one basic assumption, rather than multiple assumptions. The IADT recognizes that the data used in planning will have to be much finer-grained and field-verified.
    - ▪ The Science Team includes erosion modelers, one may join the October 4 field visit. Even a culvert's value can flip quickly after a wildfire, when one might want to pull a culvert to avoid clogging. The modeling might be able to develop data on capacity and flood flows and hence highlight hotspots.
- What are meadows connected to?
  - o Ms. Gross: To each other. This is based on the analysis and thresholds developed by Morelli, as cited in the documentation.
- How will indicators of landscape resilience translate to performance measures?
  - o Mr. Fougères: Staff have started developing a table showing how the indicators can inform standard performance measures. Today's afternoon presentation also briefly addresses this. It will take time to line these up, but it is something we are starting to develop now. There is a meeting next week, too, to discuss how LTW's work parallels and can inform the TRPA thresholds and performance measures.
  - o Ms. Patricia Manley: The Ecosystem Management Decision Support tool should also help with this, because it allows us to look at tradeoffs over time and spatio-temporal dynamics, including how benefits change over time.

3. Landscape Resilience Assessment, Part B

Ms. Gross and Mr. Bindl presented slides showing the initial approach to combining individual indicators. Discussion followed.

- Do the tables showing non/resilience overlap with the maps?
  - o Ms. Gross: Yes, they are consistent.

- Are we assuming non-treated stands are necessarily non-resilient?
  - Ms. Gross: Condition Class 3 without treatment doesn't give us new information. But if treated and Condition Class 3, this adjusts the stand. Also, these indicators are on the fire side; vegetation structure and composition also get to resilience for vegetation stands.
- Are treatments that occurred after data collection accounted for?
  - Ms. Gross: Condition Class data is from the past year, while treatment data covers the past 10 years. We only included treatment if it involved fire.
- Why are there patches of high severity fire potential in regions with treatment?
  - Ms. Gross: It may depend on what surrounds the patch, where treatment was too small to limit such fire.
  - Mr. Striplin: This also is based on 10,000+ model runs.
- Why is high severity fire shown in blue here when it was red in previous?
  - Mr. Striplin: The FSIM modeling is based on historical northern Sierra weather conditions, 10,000+ artificial fire seasons and the distribution of ignitions over the past 30 years. 40 acres was chosen as the size because the historical fire regimes for the most common vegetation types had small patches of high severity fire.
  - Ms. Gross: The model pixel size also affected this, we could examine <10, 10-40, or 40+ patches.
  - Mr. Garrett: Blue does not mean that high severity cannot occur in that area; it could, it just would not be expected to be over 40 acres.
  - Mr. Striplin: The fuels data was pre-2014 but based on an exercise with local fuels specialists; some areas could have had subsequent treatment.
- Seven bundles seems about the highest number that is manageable. Will this approach be generalizable to other areas around the Basin, and in the Sierra? LTW needs to advance whatever comes next around the Basin.
  - Ms. Gross: Some analyses will be immediately replicable, some will need to be adjusted based on available data and then geographically-appropriate desired conditions and thresholds. Vertical and horizontal heterogeneity indicators will need to have a proper reference site, because we chose Illilouette Basin which is relevant to the Tahoe Basin.
  - Mr. Bindl: I have parameterized the model analyses so that they are flexible and, if another forest has EcObject data, can be readily run. One could adjust the parameters as needed.
  - Mr. Striplin: We will need to pull in data from the Tahoe and Eldorado National Forests once we are settled in our approach. This will inform our analysis area.
- Generalizability is the main reason I am participating. The work should be generalizable because it is well documented.
- Regarding bundling, this is a helpful concept because it means that people have to wrestle with fewer individual indicators. The IADT can create an amalgam of all the indicators to give a global view, that will tell us something, but I would not recommend spending a ton of time on this, or even in developing the bundles themselves. We are trying to convey a story with a picture, and a more specialized user will want to dive into individual indicators

regardless. We should recognize that one simple product will be a static report, while practitioners will keep developing the materials.

- o Ms. Manley: Ecosystem Management Decision Support should also help identify linkages between actions and indicators in Phase 2.
- o Ms. Gross: We will of course continue to update the individual indicator write-ups and also document the bundling.
- The documentation is critical for transparency. This also will be needed for the bundling.

4. Launch of Landscape Restoration Strategy, Part A

Mr. Fougères reviewed the second half of the *Completion of Phase 1 and Overview of Phase 2* handout. Discussion followed.

- How will Ecosystem Management Decision Support (EMDS) be used?
  - o Ms. Manley: It is a software package that we can use to build a logic model for our work and decisions. It shows the relationship among individual variables and bundles of variables, including weighting. It can take modeled outputs and help to visual conditions based on different objectives; it provides a spatially explicit depiction of opportunities and risks over time. It also has a strategic planning function that can help incorporate funding, limitations, and the social-institutional context when considering what to do where and when.
- Will the Landscape Resilience Assessment (LRA) and Landscape Restoration Strategy (LRS) help hasten project planning?
  - o Mr. Fougères: The LTW process is purposely designed to achieve this. The LRA and LRS should provide foundational information for existing and desired conditions, possible activities, and the Purpose and Need for work. Phase 3 will then involve collaboratively developing a draft Proposed Action, the release of which will start the NEPA-CEQA-TRPA review process. LRA and LRS information should also help to inform Issue Identification and the Alternatives that get examined during the review process. The NEPA-CEQA-TRPA review process is a public process.
- Does the term "objective" in the Potential Landscape Restoration Strategies signify the term of art from the 2012 Planning Rule of the Forest Service? If not, the term should be modified to avoid confusion.
  - o Mr. Fougères: It was not intended to refer to the Planning Rule. It was used generically as the next level of specification following LTW's broad goals to restore the resilience of the west shore's forests and watersheds within the next 10 years, and serve as a model for other parts of the Basin and Sierra. We will modify the term.
- What does "possible treatment types" signify? Is this going to be very specific? It would help to first get clear on what desired changes we want, and then look at the multiple paths and tools or processes that can make that change. We may then also need very specific treatment assumptions to model.
  - o Mr. Fougères: The LRS "objectives" will provide broad direction, and then "treatment types" will be focused on the landscape scale. So this will not be site-specific or very precise to a location. The October 4 field visit will provide our first

opportunity this year to examine what types of treatments we want to consider. (We also surveyed the group initially last December and January.)

- o Mr. Long: This autumn we will be seeking stakeholder input about specific spatial and temporal constraints, and the frequency and intensity of management activities. These constraints will be more important for modeling than specific treatment types, which might not be possible. These constraints can also be thought of as "rule sets" – the distance of treatments from roads, treatment of steep slopes – or could also be constrained geographically. The LRA should help provide direction for this.
- There are at least three audiences that I need to communicate with: local private property owners, state insurance commissioner, and state and federal elected officials. We need to keep these types of audiences in mind when thinking about how we will package and share the LRS.
- Will the Science Team then identify treatment locations on its own, once we have provided input on modeling constraints or rule sets?
  - o Mr. Long: We could target the work on areas identified by stakeholders, or pursue a randomized approach. So this could be stakeholder-driven and/or modeling driven. Available data will create some limitations. The key question the Science Team will focus on is the effects of various constraints and how they shape the landscape as a whole.
  - o Mr. Fougères: To reiterate, the LRA should provide a foundation of data to help identify locations for inquiry. Similarly, identifying "objectives" for the LRS will also help narrow down where we focus. This will take some time. We also will be trying to develop several Potential Landscape Restoration Strategies (PLRS) to examine, not just one single approach.
  - o Ms. Manley: Constraints can help narrow decision space, and we can see what happens if these are more stringent or more relaxed. It will be important to try to identify constraints that would be informative – that would significantly alter outcomes if relaxed or not.

5. Launch of Landscape Restoration Strategy, Part B

Mr. Long provided a presentation on the proposed model architecture for Phase 2, taking questions intermittently throughout the presentation.

- Mr. Long: Based on initial feedback from the agencies and stakeholders, we expect that roads as related to fire and water and air quality will require attention. We will also need help identifying constraints on mechanical and other treatments. We hope to avoid inquiries that would require additional field surveys given our timeline.
- Economic analysis should focus on costs and avoided costs of treatments. Getting into sociological analyses like willingness to pay provide information but are relatively less useful in telling us about resilience.
- Ms. Gross: Will LANDIS modeling outputs be yearly or averaged periods?
  - o Mr. Long: LANDIS can provide both.
- What is the input data for vegetation?

- o Mr. Long: This is being updated, past data was based on Forest Inventory Analysis plots, but we want to build on the EcObject data stream. If this were rasterized it would help greatly.
- The IADT has worked in detail with EcObject and presented the LRA in this format. LANDIS seems limited to the age, species, and number of trees. Making the connection between these two data sets seems crucial, as well as managing expectations about how well they do or do not interface.
  - o Ms. Gross: If LiDAR is not used as the basis for LANDIS, this seems very complicated.
  - o Ms. Coppeto: Some of us had a call on this and the need to rectify some of the existing vegetation data. Some is modeled from eVeg, while LiDAR data does a poor job of picking up the understory. Wildlife in particular needs more vegetation data and higher quality data than other topics. Some field verification is almost surely needed, and staff may do this this fall.
  - o Ms. Manley: LANDIS is based on 50-60 plots of field data on the west shore that is imputed into the model. There is lots of understory data, compared with aerial LiDAR. But how to best capture density, diameter, and vertical heterogeneity will require more focused discussion. Fire modeling will be spatio-temporally explicit.
  - o Mr. Bindl: Recent conversation with Jonathan Greenberg and Scott Conway focused on improving the LiDAR regarding the understory.
  - o Mr. Garrett: Can we add additional plot data? We have West Shore Wildland Urban Interface data.
  - o We also have 20-50 plots from Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act and CAL FIRE work.
  - o **ACTION ITEM: Mr. Garrett and Ms. Maloney** to talk with Ms. Manley, Mr. Long, and Mr. Scheller about adding additional west shore plot data to LANDIS.
- Ms. Gross: Is there a way to translate EcObject to LANDIS? One could run the same regressions on ground-based data and spread this out based on assumptions built from the 30+ plots of data.
  - o Mr. Long: Beyond Phase 2, there should also be continued Science Team capacity for model validation monitoring.
- Will the LANDIS work be distinct from the fine-grained modeling on fire and water quality?
  - o Mr. Long: Yes, because LANDIS is coarse and would lose data less than 1 hectare. This also applies to riparian areas and diameter limits. We have plots of aspen trees from Humboldt State University, including their growth trajectories. Existing research has found that capping conifer removal can influence the longevity of aspen treatments.
  - o Ms. Manley: We also should have some high resolution data for Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) areas.
- We need to talk about how we plan to use these different types and scales of data, including when and for what purpose. The purpose of examining how treatments can improve resilience is the same, but specific application might be different.

- Will EMDS help with Phase 3, Restoration Project Planning? Placer County, for example, has several California spotted owl protected activity centers (PACs). Will the modeling allow us to put in constraints and look at various outcomes?
  - Mr. Long: One can leave out the PACs from treatments and see what happens to the surrounding landscape, and also examine changes within the PACs.
  - Mr. Wright: TRPA and the Lahontan RWQCB also have data on associated benefits and costs.
  - Ms. Coppeto: East-side owls are particular, while most data comes from the west shore.
- How will LANDIS parameterize beetles? There is some very specific data and each species has its own dynamics. Rob Scheller should be working with an entomologist who can provide species-specific input. Mr. Chris Fettig, USFS Pacific Southwest Research Station, can help with this and fact-check and tune the modeling.
  - Mr. Long: This is an area where we can provide input to Mr. Scheller. And again, down the road model validation monitoring can help.
  - **ACTION ITEM: Mr. Long and Ms. Maloney** to talk to Mr. Scheller about species-specific data about beetles, and the possible aid of Mr. Chris Fettig.
- Since there are so many assumptions that go into LANDIS, it would really help to get a list of all the assumptions and to review these. It also would be helpful to get examples of where LANDIS modeling has been used in the past and associated outputs.
  - **ACTION ITEM: Mr. Fougères and Mr. Long** to request that Mr. Scheller provide a list of assumptions that go into LANDIS, for review by the IADT and SSC.
  - **ACTION ITEM: Mr. Fougères and Mr. Long** to call out peer-reviewed publications available on the LTW Living Library that involve LANDIS modeling.
- Regarding economic analysis, I can help LTW get access to pre and post-fire property data, as well as associated state and federal data. For example, days on the market until a property is sold, as well as recreational values like smoke impacts on boats and bikes.
  - **ACTION ITEM: Mr. Fougères to connect Mr. Schafer and Ms. Manley with Mr. Falk** regarding economic data.

6. General Business
- **The November 7 Stakeholder Science Committee webinar will instead be held as an in-person meeting and extended from 9 am to 3 pm.** The focus will be a workshop-style meeting to develop Potential Landscape Restoration Strategies.
- **AGREEMENT:** The Stakeholder Science Committee approved the July 6 and August 10 meeting and webinar summaries.
- **ACTION ITEM: All stakeholders** to provide their biographies (if have not already done so).
- The new NFF facilitator & project manager, Dr. Sarah DiVittorio, will schedule the 2018 stakeholder meeting dates shortly after starting work on September 18; the format will follow that developed for 2017.
- Ms. Teresa McClung, USFS: Regarding engagement with the Washoe Tribe, this past summer the USFS had a Washoe hand crew doing fuel reduction work in the Basin, and associated job training. The work plan involves three years.

- o Mr. Jason Vasques, CTC: These types of job creation opportunities are linked back to indicators for the resilience of cultural landscapes, and associations with a place.
- **ACTION ITEM:** **Mr. Fougères** to circulate link to website of Mr. Todd Gilens, the visual artist that is now contracted for LTW, as well as First Track Productions, the videographer that is now contracted for LTW.
- The California Tahoe Conservancy is working to try and retain Mr. Fougères to help with LTW during the next few months. Mr. Fougères' last day with NFF is September 15.
- Dr. Sarah DiVittorio, NFF, noted that she is excited to join the group. She has facilitated various processes throughout the State, and has a background in forestry and environmental science as well as social science. She will move to the Basin her family for the work.
- Ms. Kim Carr, NFF, noted that NFF completed an extensive hiring process that received a large number of resumes, and involved two rounds of interviews including facilitation exercises.

7. Closing Remarks

There were no interested party comments.

Mr. Mike Vollmer, TRPA, thanked Mr. Fougères for his work with LTW, noting that he helped both provide guidance as well as help the teams with high productivity. Several other agency representatives and stakeholders similarly thanked Mr. Fougères, and presented him with a parting gift showing the LTW landscape. Mr. Vollmer closed the meeting.

8. Attendees at the SSC and SCC Meetings

Organizing and Participating Agencies
CTC – California Tahoe Conservancy
NFF – National Forest Foundation
RWQCB Lahontan - Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board
State Parks – California State Parks
TFFT – Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team
TRPA – Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
USFS – U.S. Forest Service

Stakeholder Science Committee Members
1. Brett Storey
2. Bruce Springsteen
3. Jeff Brown
4. Jennifer Quashnick
5. Maureen McCarthy
6. Mollie Hurt
7. Roland Shaw

8. Sue Britting
9. Tricia Maloney

Stakeholder Community Committee Members
10. Casey Blann
11. Doug Barr

12. John Falk
13. Kim Boyd
14. Zack Bradford

Staff
15. Beth Kenna, TFFT
16. Brian Garrett, USFS
17. Dan Segan, TRPA
18. Dan Shaw, State Parks
19. Dorian Fougères, NFF
20. Forest Schafer, TFFT
21. Jason Vasques, CTC
22. Jen Greenberg, CTC
23. Jonathan Long, USFS
24. Kileigh Labrado, TFFT
25. Kim Carr, NFF
26. Marcus Selig, NFF
27. Mason Bindl, TRPA
28. Michael Schwartz, TFFT
29. Mike Vollmer, TRPA
30. Patrick Wright, CTC
31. Patricia Manley, USFS
32. Randy Striplin, USFS
33. Sarah DiVittorio, NFF
34. Shana Gross, USFS
35. Stephanie Coppeto, USFS
36. Teresa McClung, USFS
37. Tim Alameda, TFFT
38. Whitney Brennan, CTC

Interested Parties from the Public