

SUMMARY

STAKEHOLDER SCIENCE AND STAKEHOLDER COMMUNITY COMMITTEE MEETINGS

LAKE TAHOE WEST RESTORATION PARTNERSHIP

Thursday, July 6, 9:00 am to 12:00 pm (SCC) and 1:00 to 4:30 pm (SSC)

Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, 35 College Drive, South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

All meeting materials are publicly available on the Lake Tahoe West website <http://nationalforests.org/laketahoewest>. For questions please contact 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 on July 6, 2017, at the US Forest Service Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit in South Lake Tahoe. Both Committees reviewed the prefatory language for the Essential Management Questions and provided final feedback. The SSC recommended the questions, including prefatory text and supporting spreadsheet, to the Executive Team. Second, both Committees reviewed the prefatory text, updated citations, and a definition for “untreated areas” in the Planning Scenarios. The SSC recommended the final planning scenarios to the Executive Team. Third, both Committees provided feedback on the Landscape Resilience Assessment, including on the built environment; landscape values, services, and indicators of resilience; and outcomes and performance measurement. Fourth, both Committees reviewed an initial set of general goals, and suggested revisions, reformatting, as well as further development based on the assessment results. The SSC also debriefed the June 7 field visit to the west shore. The next meeting will be a joint SSC and SCC webinar on August 10, from 9 to 11 am, which will focus solely on the Landscape Resilience Assessment, and then an in-person meeting on September 6, 10 am to 4 pm, location still to be determined.

Contents

Meeting Synopsis	1
Action Items	2
Agreements.....	3
Stakeholder Community Committee Meeting	
1. Welcome and Opening Remarks – SCC	3
2. Essential Management Questions – SCC.....	3
3. Planning Scenarios – SCC.....	4
4. Landscape Resilience Assessment – SCC.....	4
5. General Goals – SCC	5
6. General Updates – SCC.....	6
7. Review of Near-Term Work Plan – SCC.....	7
8. Closing Remarks – SCC.....	7

Stakeholder Science Committee Meeting	
9. Welcome and Opening Remarks – SCC.....	7
10. June 7 Field Visit Debrief – SCC.....	7
11. Essential Management Questions – SCC.....	9
12. Planning Scenarios – SCC.....	9
13. General Updates – SCC.....	10
14. Landscape Resilience Assessment (LRA) – SCC.....	10
15. General Goals – SCC.....	12
16. Review of Near-Term Work Plan – SCC.....	13
17. Action Items, Next Steps, and Closing Remarks – SCC.....	13
18. Attendees at the SSC and SCC Meetings.....	13

This meeting summary paraphrases individual comments and suggestions. Statements do not indicate consensus of the group unless they are preceded by the word “AGREEMENT”. Statements are not attributed unless spoken by one of the organizing or participating agencies, or by a presenter.

Action Items

1. **Dorian** to update the prefatory text for the Essential Management Questions to recognize that even science-based decisions with good intentions can have unintended consequences.
2. **Dorian** to update the Planning Scenarios to include labels on the page 2 diagram that reference the titles for the four scenario narratives, and adding the additional citations from the climate graphs to the final list of citations at the end.
3. **Interagency Design Team** to add an explanation of the built environment to the Landscape Resilience Assessment, and relabel the assessment accordingly.
4. **Dorian** to verify whether the inholding west of Homewood still exists, and update the boundary map accordingly.
5. **Maureen** to share human-created microclimate research questions with Dorian for sharing with LTW representatives participating in the upcoming meeting with the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California.
6. **Dorian** to add clarifying note to Essential Management Question #3 that explains desire to better use limited air quality credits and staff and equipment resources.
7. **Dorian** to finalize the Planning Scenarios, including adding the additional citations from the climate graphs to the final list of citations at the end.
8. **Dorian** to add prefatory language to the Landscape Resilience Assessment noting the focus on indicators of resilience to disturbance.
9. **Dorian** to reinsert the indicators that the IADT identified as potential, but ultimately removed because of lack of spatially explicit data, or otherwise carried forward in modified form.
10. **IADT, Pat Manley, and Jonathan Long** to discuss developing indicators of disturbance regimes to pair with indicators of current conditions.

11. **Dorian** to revise Values by Disturbances spreadsheet to include ecosystem services and clarify linkages between indicators of resilience, indicators of outcomes, and performance measures.

Agreements

1. The SCC recommended the Essential Management Questions, including prefatory text (and added bullet about unintended consequences, and clarifying note about Question #3) and supporting spreadsheet.
2. The SCC recommended the Planning Scenarios (following addition of the graphics citations to the full citation list at the end).
3. The SCC approved the June 6 meeting summary and June 7 field visit summary.

STAKEHOLDER COMMUNITY COMMITTEE (SCC) MEETING

1. Welcome and Opening Remarks – SCC

- Ms. Lesley Yen, Acting Deputy Forest Supervisor, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, welcomed participants. She mentioned that the June 7 field visit struck her insofar as the thoughtful conversation and open thinking, even though people brought different perspectives.
- Mr. Mike Vollmer, Lead of the Lake Tahoe West Restoration Partnership's (LTW) Interagency Design Team (IADT), thanked the stakeholders and interested parties for attending. He noted how much change he has seen across the landscape since he started working on these issues in the Basin 14 years ago.
- Mr. Dorian Fougères, LTW Facilitator, reviewed the agenda, materials, and ground rules.

There were no interested party comments.

2. Essential Management Questions – SCC

Mr. Fougères reviewed changes to the documents since the Stakeholder Community Committee last met on April 4. Discussion followed.

- Will LTW make the case for proactive restoration rather than reactionary responses? The science is recognizedly complex, yet it will still be critical to communicate this politically and to the public. We need to make the case for why our actions will be the best choices. For example, can we show that pre-treatments will reduce the probability of uncharacteristic wildfire? We need to be able to show benefits.
 - We also need to establish appropriate economic benchmarks for the area, and costs that are relative to our own special constraints, rather than very different parts of the country that are significantly cheaper and treatments significantly easier.
 - Ms. Patricia Manley, Science Coordinator, noted that the economics analysis anticipated would look at costs of suppression and possibly also avoided costs. It's likely we'll be able to quantify some benefits, and qualitatively describe others.

- The potential downstream ripples and impacts of not restoring the landscape are the story. This is about our health, our quality of life, and avoiding having post-fire “moonscapes” in the Basin.
- We need to acknowledge in the prefatory text that even science-based decisions with good intentions can have unintended consequences. In the 1980s and 1990s at the ski resorts, we contour-felled trees to minimize erosion, which made sense. Yet this ended up having great costs in terms of the additional snow production needed to cover the trees, injuries and equipment problems for staff, and eventually injuries and litigation involving skiers.
 - **ACTION ITEM: Dorian** to update the prefatory text for the Essential Management Questions to recognize that even science-based decisions with good intentions can have unintended consequences.
- Once planning is complete, who will implement this work, and what impediments are likely?
 - Mr. Fougères referenced the LTW phases and governance structure. Per the Charter, the organizing agencies will work together to jointly develop a multijurisdictional restoration plan and, following the documentation and permitting, the three land management agencies (US Forest Service, California State Parks, and California Tahoe Conservancy) would work to implement the project on their respective lands. Regarding impediments, Mr. Fougères noted that LTW included a Documentation and Permitting Coordination Team (D&PCT) that has already begun strategizing how to prepare for, write, and complete the documentation required for the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) review, as well as permitting from the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board.

3. Planning Scenarios – SCC

Mr. Fougères reviewed changes to the documents since the Stakeholder Community Committee last met on April 4. Discussion followed.

- It would be helpful to add labels to the diagram on page 2 that reference the titles for the four scenario narratives.
 - **ACTION ITEM: Dorian** to update the Planning Scenarios to include labels on the page 2 diagram that reference the titles for the four scenario narratives.

4. Landscape Resilience Assessment – SCC

Mr. Fougères reviewed changes to the documents since the Stakeholder Community Committee last met on April 4. Discussion followed.

Regarding the built environment

- “Urbanization” is a misleading term because additional development will not be permitted. Rather we’re talking about adaptive reuse in relation to other conditions.
 - Urbanization can also include related infrastructure like bike trails and access routes.

- While no more development can occur, adjacent cities like Truckee continued to grow and would have an urbanizing influence simply based on their proximity and the number of residents that come into the Basin.
- Urbanization also impacts rivers and riparian areas insofar as it constraints their ability to flood. Similarly, forests in neighborhoods are managed to minimize fuels.
- With regard to transportation demand, the Basin is not built for the amount of visitation it receives. It is an urban corridor to federal lands and waters at the top of the Sierra Nevada.
- A better term would be “built environment,” which does not carry the connotation of expanding development.
- We should also recognize that the built environment is part of the landscape and presents opportunities for restoration treatments that are consistent with fuels management. Public safety will remain the primary purpose in these areas, and there still are connections between forests in urban areas and the rest of the landscape. There may be opportunities to help property owners and fire departments.
 - There are synergies between the larger landscape, and what one can do on their individual properties, such as erosion control and fire protection measures.
- **ACTION ITEM: Interagency Design Team** to add an explanation of the built environment to the Landscape Resilience Assessment, and relabel the assessment accordingly.
- It will be important to package and document the various considerations that go into the Landscape Resilience Assessment when it is complete, so people unfamiliar with the process can pick it up and still understand these things.
- It’s important to consider that the ski resorts are also large-scale, continuous parts of the landscape that are expressly permitted for ongoing recreational use. This is also a different category of land use from the built environment and from the general forest.

Additional considerations

- Drought significantly impacts recreation because it requires much greater snow-making, and the water itself is scarce, too.
 - Drought also impacts the location and timing of other types of recreation.
 - Drought can also exacerbate erosion by reducing snowpack coverage of bare soils.
- Why limit erosion to human-caused erosion? Erosion is also a natural disturbance process that also leads to beneficial soil deposition in the floodplain.
 - Erosion is also caused by high-severity fire.
 - The current indicator focuses on road and trail use. The Team could also try to identify an indicator for erosion as an ecological process.
 - It’s important to recognize that not all roads are equal. Erosion is caused by roads that are improperly engineered or maintained.

5. General Goals – SCC

Mr. Fougères reviewed the draft goals and their context, noting that, per the Calendar of Activities, the goals will be refined (likely converted to objectives that are quantifiable and come with a discrete timeframe) at the start of Phase 2, the Landscape Restoration Strategy. Discussion followed.

- In the opening paragraph, it would help to say that the purpose of the Assessment is to ground-truth field conditions.
- The first goal could be reworded as, “Reintroduce the use of ecological fire to manage forests where possible, while protecting life and property and improving or maintaining water quality.” This is because reestablishing a fire regime may be extremely ambitious and unrealistic, because it will be hard to apply fire in some places, and because water quality may be degraded in some places.
- The second goal should include managed natural ignitions, as well as uncharacteristic wildfires. This is because restoration treatments will hopefully help minimize air quality impacts from fire, no matter what kind of fire.
- Goals 4, 5, and 6 could be reworded to say “enhance,” particularly #4 (wildlife), because restoring populations may again be overly ambitious and unrealistic.
- Goal 7 could be reworded as, “Recognize the importance of recreation to future landscape conditions, and the ability for mutual benefit from restoration.”
- The goal should refer to restoring the resilience of various qualities, rather than restoring them themselves, which can confuse people by signaling that we aim to return to pre-European settlement conditions.
- A goal needs to be added around the utilization of restoration byproducts where applicable, and more generally, to do as much as we can and do it cost-effectively.
- (As noted above) We need to establish appropriate economic benchmarks for the area, and costs that are relative to our own special constraints, rather than very different parts of the country that are significantly cheaper and treatments significantly easier.

6. General Updates – SCC

Mr. Fougères provided a series of updates, including noting that the Truckee and Pacific Ranger Districts (Tahoe and Eldorado National Forests, respectively) had been briefed, and that the Charter signatures were complete. Discussion followed.

- Regarding logo development, logos are iconic and are important to do well. Hiring a design consultant also protects the group from potential copyright infringements.
- Regarding secured and requested funding to date, the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit and National Forest Foundation also requested \$250,000 in supplemental hazardous fuels funding, for science needs and collaboration, in November 2016.
- Does LTW have access to State Responsibility Area (SRA) funding collected over the past three years? SRA funding goes toward chipping of fuel debris, and community engagement within the Wildland Urban Interface. There is a potential connection, though this would be down the road when LTW gets into project planning and implementation.
- Regarding the Explanation of Boundaries, it is likely that the inholding shown west of Homewood no longer exists.
 - **ACTION ITEM:** Dorian to verify whether the inholding west of Homewood still exists, and update the boundary map accordingly.

7. Review of Near-Term Work Plan – SCC

Mr. Fougères reminded the group of his upcoming departure in September. He reviewed the preparation that the Core Team and all other teams have done to anticipate and manage the transition. He reiterated the desire to complete the Landscape Resilience Assessment at his last stakeholder meeting on September 6.

8. Closing Remarks – SCC

There were no interested party comments.

Mr. Vollmer thanked members for participating and providing feedback, and adjourned the meeting.

STAKEHOLDER SCIENCE COMMITTEE (SSC) MEETING

9. Welcome and Opening Remarks – SCC

- Ms. Lesley Yen, Acting Deputy Forest Supervisor, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, welcomed participants for this second meeting, too. She reiterated that the June 7 field visit struck her insofar as the thoughtful conversation and open thinking, even though people brought different perspectives.
- Likewise, Mr. Mike Vollmer, Lead of the Lake Tahoe West Restoration Partnership's (LTW) Interagency Design Team (IADT), thanked the stakeholders and interested parties for attending, remarking on the intensity of work in June and commensurate progress.
- Mr. Dorian Fougères, LTW Facilitator, reviewed the agenda, materials, and ground rules.

There were no interested party comments.

10. June 7 Field Visit Debrief – SCC

Mr. Fougères reviewed highlights from the June 7 draft field visit summary. Discussion followed.

Regarding Protected Activity Centers (PACs) for California Spotted Owl (CSO)

- Landscapes do allow for sequencing work across space and time. However, the challenge is that it takes a long time to create suitable old-forest habitat. We would need to be able to see this in the modeling, which would have to extend sufficiently far in the future. The aim would be to create conditions that are equivalent to or better than those that exist currently.
 - Ms. Patricia Manley, Science Coordinator, noted that the LANDIS modeling goes out 50 years in the future (in 5 year timesteps), which is a common timeframe. Around 100 years is the timeframe around which many western forests begin to develop

complex structure. The question for treatment becomes how long it will take for the forest to grow back and support a multiple-layer canopy.

- The recent call regarding climate assumptions discussed looking out to 2100.
- EcObject might be able to help the Interagency Design Team (IADT) delineate more accurate PACs than currently exist. The existing Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit Forest Plan has desired conditions.
- Ms. Manley noted that the challenge was to envision a dynamic landscape and species populations that have large territorial needs.
 - One approach was a meta-population model that is compatible with forest heterogeneity and can identify core populations (even though the west shore does not contain enough habitat to maintain an entire population).
 - In such a model, one could identify anchor areas (e.g., north-facing, cooler areas with less frequent fire), as well as more mobile/transitory areas subject to turnover, and the desired proportions of each on the landscape.
 - Anchor areas and transitory areas could include areas that have more frequent disturbance or are already resilient.
 - One would need to link population dynamics with fire and succession.
 - One could also identify older forest-associated characteristics as a desired condition for a heterogeneous landscape that provides desired ecosystem services.
- We need to recognize that the timeframes for various activities may be incompatible. If the future holds drier conditions, and fire and insects and disease increase, many habitat elements may be impacted and in turn wildlife populations. For example, white fir is critical for snag creation, but with drier conditions, it will become harder to recruit larger trees.
 - Ms. Manley noted that the Caples Lake area has large trees. On the west shore, such trees could provide irreplaceable, spatio-temporal anchors that become an intentional focus of management.
- What regulatory constraints would prevent our ability to look at the landscape, anticipate future old growth areas, and make the transition from where we are today to that future? Is this impossible?
 - Socially, we do not discuss moving people out. The desire for social-cultural flexibility and activity can compete with the persistence of old forest habitat, whether we're looking out 5 or 25 or more years.
 - It would appear to make sense to focus on owl occupancy and invest in knowing and protecting areas with high fidelity, and then having some more flexibility elsewhere on the landscape, including accommodating high-risk areas.

Additional discussion

- “Fire compartments” include those areas on the general forest that could be used to manage natural ignitions or prescribed burning, including more remote area and strategic locations. The “low-hanging work” around urban areas and the wildland-urban interface (WUI) is well underway.

- It might be helpful to distinguish between desired conditions by vegetation type, and proximity to the built environment, and then discuss how to manage the “fire compartment.”
- Mr. Fougères noted that this kind of thinking could form a foundation for the Landscape Resilience Strategy developed in Phase 2. This is because looking at the landscape as a whole and what areas might become “fire compartments” that help to manage fire across the landscape is different from piecemeal approaches.
- Ms. McCarthy and Mr. Mike Dettinger are working on a proposal regarding resource management strategies involving microclimatic buffers for climate change, including remote sensing, climate modeling, and paleoecological studies. The aim is to better understand how people create microclimates (fire, vegetation types), and to test methods for such research on the west shore as well as with several Native American tribes in Montana.
 - **ACTION ITEM:** Maureen to share human-created microclimate research questions with Dorian for sharing with LTW representatives participating in the upcoming meeting with the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California.

11. Essential Management Questions – SCC

Mr. Fougères reviewed changes to the documents since the SCC last met on June 6, and noted that he would add a bullet to the prefatory text flagging the potential for unintended consequences, per the morning’s Stakeholder Community Committee discussion.

- The third question is confusing. The methods for minimizing residual material are clear: carry, drag, or fly out.
 - The desire was to explore whether the management tools and infrastructure are available to do this to use limited air quality credits for ecological fire purposes such as broadcast burning, rather than for pile burning. The same thing applies to the efficient use of resources.
 - **ACTION ITEM:** Dorian to add clarifying note to Essential Management Question #3 that explains desire to better use limited air quality credits and staff and equipment resources.

AGREEMENT: The SCC recommended the Essential Management Questions, including prefatory text (and added bullet about unintended consequences, and clarifying note about Question #3) and supporting spreadsheet.

12. Planning Scenarios – SCC

Mr. Fougères reviewed changes to the documents since the SCC last met on June 6. Discussion followed.

- **ACTION ITEM:** Dorian to finalize the Planning Scenarios, including adding the additional citations from the climate graphs to the final list of citations at the end.

AGREEMENT: The SCC recommended the Planning Scenarios (following addition of the graphics citations to the full citation list at the end).

13. General Updates – SCC

Mr. Fougères provided a series of updates, including noting that the Explanation of Boundaries now had updated acreage figures, and that the Charter signatures were complete. Discussion followed.

- Regarding logo development, LTW will likely solicit a professional design consultant. Members are welcome to make suggestions.

14. Landscape Resilience Assessment (LRA) – SCC

Mr. Fougères reviewed changes to the documents since the SSC last met on June 6. Discussion followed.

- Soil health appears missing.
 - The basic advice from experts consulted (e.g., Toby O’Geen, UC Davis, and Matt Busse, US Forest Service) was to keep soil on site, which in turn means maintaining vegetative cover.
 - Soil health would benefit from a better understanding of soil composition and biogeochemical analysis.
 - The challenge in all the indicators is, do we have not only data, but spatially explicit data? We need to be able to compare how an indicator manifests across the west shore landscape.
 - Fire severity also influences soils significantly.
 - Perhaps an indicator exists for microclimatic variability and associated moisture retention.
- Water quality, wildlife, and carbon are other hot topics that are also not immediately apparent in the indicators.
 - It’s not clear whether soil, carbon, and water quality are indicators of a resilient landscape, so much as values that we would like to be resilient.
 - One way to address this would be to add a column for soil productivity and carbon.
 - Existing indicators can speak to this, including vegetation and fire indicators, and could be carried over to the new column. For example, EcObject vegetation indicators and resilience to fire could be developed into a surrogate for carbon.
 - Ms. Manley noted that additional carbon data exists, too. LANDIS will model current carbon.
 - Similarly, the Basin also has T-WILD wall-to-wall wildlife data for the Basin, covering 65 species. And the TMDL might provide a useful water quality indicator.
- It is important to reiterate: **the IADT developed indicators of resilience to disturbance, not generic indicators of “ecosystem health” or “ecosystem integrity.”** This means that the indicators are synthetic insofar as any indicator touches on multiple disturbances and

components of the ecosystem. People looking for the one stand-alone indicator that they care about need to keep this in mind.

- **ACTION ITEM: Dorian** to add prefatory language to the Landscape Resilience Assessment noting the focus on indicators of resilience to disturbance.
- It's also important to recognize that the LRA is the first step in LTW. The Science Team will be able to further explore indicators during Phase 2, as part of their modeling work to support the development of the Landscape Restoration Strategy.
- The landscape values include ecosystem services. Also, the previous spreadsheet included a column tracking indicators that had data now, and those that were promising but lacked data and should be further developed in the future.
 - The Monitoring Continuity Diagram helps to illustrate that we will be developing indicators during multiple phases of LTW. The IADT should display the indicators it worked through but abandoned. We should not skip or dismiss indicators just because we do not have data today, even if we cannot use them in this version of the LRA.
 - **ACTION ITEM: Dorian** to reinsert the indicators that the IADT identified as potential, but ultimately removed because of lack of spatially explicit data, or otherwise carried forward in modified form.
- The indicators currently focus on ecological states, they are indicators of current conditions. To get at ecological processes we should also try to add indicators of the disturbance regime. These are the drivers that affect values like water quality, wildlife, soil, and carbon.
 - **ACTION ITEM: IADT, Pat Manley, and Jonathan Long** to discuss developing indicators of disturbance regimes to pair with indicators of current conditions.
- **Regarding roads and proximity to water courses**, this indicator is confusing because it seems focused on the causes and conditions, not outcomes.
 - The road indicator was originally intended to provide information on the condition of water quality, soils, erosion, and invasive species, including impacts from human activities.
 - It evolved based on available data from a focus on water quality indicators – where spatial data covering the landscape is surprisingly poor – thus to bare soil, which is also hard to measure (as LiDAR does not distinguish between rocky patches, bare soils, and sandy soils), to roads and trails connected to drainages.
 - The LiDAR data actually shows how specific road or trail segments carry and deposit water, so is actually a solid source of data.
- We need to continue to distinguish between **indicators of resilience, indicators of the outcomes of our work, and more general performance measures** for politicians, funders, and publics.
 - We also need to distinguish what we need for the LRA and what we would monitor in the future, which would involve a sampling regime and network of sites to better understand the system. Right now the data we have is only fit for making inferences.

- Desired conditions can be broadly constructed because they are looking out at 50 years on the landscape and cover ranges. The LRA will then examine where we are today in relation to these ranges.
- Principle concerns about water quality and life and property are embedded in other indicators.
 - What is needed is some narrative explanation to explain how the resilience indicators speak to standard public values and services, and what kinds of inferences we can make, and how the overall package of indicators addresses a given concern.
- We will also need to show how the indicators we're developing will speak to the topics that funders care about, such as mountain meadows (which is a landscape value).
- **ACTION ITEM:** Dorian to revise Values by Disturbances spreadsheet to include ecosystem services and clarify linkages between indicators of resilience, indicators of outcomes, and performance measures.

15. General Goals – SCC

Mr. Fougères reviewed the draft goals and their context, noting that, per the Calendar of Activities, the goals will be refined (likely converted to objectives that are quantifiable and come with a discrete timeframe) at the start of Phase 2, the Landscape Restoration Strategy. He also recapped the suggestions provided by the Stakeholder Community Committee in the morning. Discussion followed.

- Eventually we will want to show how the indicators speak to the general goals, and corresponding values and ecosystem services.
- Some general goals are very general and could probably already be clarified.
- Goals need to be data-driven, per the explanatory note at the top of the document. For example, until we have data, we cannot know whether carbon sequestration is desirable. Alternate language could be,
 - Restore or maintain a carbon system that matches a resilient disturbance regime.
- The same applies to water quality; for the moment, we do not know how conditions are on the west shore, and whether we need to improve or maintain conditions.
- The same applied to snowpack, which is currently ambiguous. Maximizing water release could imply clearcutting. Alternate language could be,
 - Maximize the retention of soil moisture into the summer, or throughout the year.
- Similarly, for water, alternate language could be something around,
 - Restore or maintain surface and groundwater conditions for ecological, urban, and recreational purposes.
- We also will need to clarify that we're not assume that a goal applies equally everywhere on the landscape.
- We may also want to reduce the number of goals, and either tier sub-goals or, based on LRA data, turn them into quantified objectives.
 - One could include mountain meadow restoration.

- As noted during the Stakeholder Community Committee, another goal should include the utilization of restoration byproducts where applicable, and more generally, to do as much as we can and do it cost-effectively.

16. Review of Near-Term Work Plan – SCC

Mr. Fougères reviewed the near-term work plan, including development of ranges of desired conditions for indicators in July, conducting indicator analyses in July and August, and developing interpretations of analyses in August, with the aim being to recommend the LRA at the next SSC and SCC meeting on September 6.

Also during September 6, Jonathan Long, Science Coordinator, will present an overview of the anticipated modeling work that the Science Team will conduct during Phase 2. In September and October LTW will also work on developing landscape restoration objectives based on the outcomes of the LRA, and clarify exactly what constitutes a “strategy” as compared with simply an assemblage of opportunities.

17. Action Items, Next Steps, and Closing Remarks – SCC

AGREEMENT: The SCC approved the June 6 meeting summary and June 7 field visit summary.

The August 10 Stakeholder Science Committee and Stakeholder Community Committee webinar will be from 9 am to 11 am.

The September 6 joint stakeholder meeting will be from 10 am to 4 pm.

For interested party comments, Mr. Bowen noted that the concept of “desired future conditions” preceded “desired conditions.” He felt that soil and fuel aridity constituted key indicators. He reiterated that the term “regenerative” speaks directly to future conditions. He noted that overall forest conditions are linked to agronomy and dendrology. Finally he noted that Gretchen Daily helped to pioneer the concept of ecosystem services, which shows that clean water, air, and soil are so valuable that people could not actually pay for them.

Mr. Vollmer thanked members for participating and providing feedback, and adjourned the meeting.

18. 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. Jennifer Quashnick
2. Matt Freitas
3. Maureen McCarthy
4. Mollie Hurt
5. Roland Shaw
6. Sue Britting

Stakeholder Community Committee Members

7. Carl Hasty
8. Casey Blann
9. David Reichel
10. Doug Barr
11. Zack Bradford

Staff

12. Brian Garrett, USFS
13. Dorian Fougères, NFF
14. Forest Schafer, TFFT
15. Jen Greenberg, CTC
16. Mike Vollmer, TRPA
17. Lesley Yen, USFS
18. Patrick Wright, CTC
19. Patricia Manley, USFS
20. Randy Striplin, USFS
21. Rita Mustatia, USFS
22. Tamara Sasaki, State Parks
23. Whitney Brennan, CTC

Interested Parties from the Public

24. Garry Bowen