

SUMMARY

STAKEHOLDER SCIENCE AND STAKEHOLDER COMMUNITY COMMITTEE MEETINGS

LAKE TAHOE WEST RESTORATION PARTNERSHIP

Tuesday, April 4, 9:00 am to 12:30 pm (SSC) and 1:00 to 5:00 (SCC)

Tahoe City Public Utility District (TCPUD), 221 Fairway Drive, Tahoe City, CA 96415

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 Science Committee and Stakeholder Community Committee met on April 4, 2017, at the Tahoe City Public Utility District in Tahoe City. Stakeholders adopted a governing charter, communication and education plan, and final stakeholder assessment findings. Stakeholders also reviewed and provided input on the three major work products. These included, first, a revised draft table of essential management questions meant to guide LTW inquiry and ensure consistency between the concerns and interests of stakeholders, executives, and agency staff. Suggestions included to ensuring that questions have a positive framing, clarifying the relevant time scales, acknowledging the uncertainty inherent in any intervention, addressing invasive species and economics, and emphasizing recreation’s role in increasing stewardship. The second product reviewed was the landscape resilience assessment, where stakeholders discussed further development of key disturbances on the landscape, and how to compare different parts of the landscape. Suggestions included clarifying disturbances relevant to public health and safety and recreation, adding invasive species, and including human disturbances. Third, stakeholders discussed the draft standardized assumptions for their planning scenarios, including climate and management. This included requesting additional information on daytime and nighttime, as well as not only air but water, temperatures, and soil moisture. The next Stakeholder Science Committee (SSC) meetings will be a webinar on May 2, from 9 am to 12:30 pm, and then an in-person meeting on June 6, 1 pm to 5 pm, location to be determined; both the Stakeholder Science Committee and Stakeholder Community Committee will take an all-day field trip on June 7.

Contents

Meeting Synopsis	1
Action Items	2
Agreements.....	2
1. Welcome and Opening Remarks – SSC	2
2. Foundational Documents – SSC	3
3. Essential Management Questions – SSC	4
4. Landscape Resilience Assessment – SSC	6

5. Closing Remarks – SSC.....	9
6. Welcome and Opening Remarks – SCC.....	9
7. Foundational Documents – SCC.....	9
8. Essential Management Questions – SCC.....	10
9. Landscape Resilience Assessment – SCC.....	11
10. Planning Scenarios – SCC.....	13
11. Closing Remarks – SCC.....	13
12. 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 add QR code to project description, and recirculate and post.
2. **Dorian** to finalize charter, communication and education plan, and stakeholder assessment findings (including introductory context), and recirculate and post.
3. **Interagency Design Team** to revise essential management questions (including introductory context), and circulate to Stakeholder Science Committee (SSC) by close of business on Friday, April 21, for SSC comments prior to the May 2 webinar, including input from Jeff Brown and Roland Shaw.
4. **Interagency Design Team** to revise landscape resilience assessment materials and planning scenario assumptions.
5. **Maureen McCarthy, Randy Striplin, and Pat Manley** to gather some additional information and share planning scenario climate assumptions with LTW Science Team.

Agreements

1. The Stakeholder Science Committee recommended the Agency and Stakeholder Charter, Communication and Education Plan, and Stakeholder Assessment Final Findings and Recommendations.
2. The Stakeholder Community Committee adopted the Agency and Stakeholder Charter, Communication and Education Plan, and Stakeholder Assessment Final Findings and Recommendations.

STAKEHOLDER SCIENCE COMMITTEE (SSC) MEETING

1. Welcome and Opening Remarks – SSC

- Mr. Dorian Fougères, Lake Tahoe West Restoration Partnership (LTW) Facilitator, welcomed the SSC.

- Mr. Mike Vollmer, Lead of the LTW Interagency Design Team (IADT), thanked the stakeholders and interested parties for attending, and reviewed how the LTW process is progressing.
- Mr. Kurt Althoff, TCPUD Grants & Community Information Administrator, welcomed the attendees and oriented them to building amenities.
- Ms. Kim Carr, the new National Forest Foundation (NFF) CA Program Director, introduced herself to the group.

There were no interested party comments.

2. Foundational Documents – SSC

Regarding the Agency and Stakeholder Charter, Mr. Fougères reviewed the revisions extract sheet provided to stakeholders prior to the meeting. There were no additional comments or concerns.

- **AGREEMENT:** The SSC recommended the Agency and Stakeholder Charter to the Executive Team.
 - Members present: see Attendees section below.

Mr. Fougères reviewed the revisions made to the Communication and Education Plan (CEP), including additions to the events and contacts in the tables, and additions to education objectives and strategies (more information on fire, need for riparian restoration, air quality effects, herbicide treatments, and potential impacts to recreation). He noted that the CEP can be considered a working document and can be updated.

Discussion followed:

- Can a one-page handout with a Q-code be created?
 - **ACTION ITEM:** Dorian to add QR code to project description, and recirculate and post.
- You should prioritize meetings under the table of briefings given the large number.
 - Mr. Fougères: The Core Team will take this advice and discuss and prioritize briefings.
- Does Appendix E, 15.3 and 15.4, refer to County of Placer and County of El Dorado staff?
 - Mr. Fougères: Yes, we will specify “staff” in the CEP.
- Will organizations be added and deleted since this is a working document?
 - Mr. Fougères: We will see who we are able to reach and update the document accordingly. Send us any additional organizations and we will add them. All of the final foundational documents will be on the LTW website so members of the public can view and comment as needed.
- **AGREEMENT:** The SSC recommended the Communication and Education Plan to the Executive Team.
 - Members present: see Attendees section below.

Mr. Fougères reintroduced the Final Findings and Recommendations from the Stakeholder Assessment. Since he incorporated the feedback and results into the LTW design process he felt the current document illustrates the final assessment findings appropriately. He asked if stakeholders would want a longer document or if the current document is sufficient.

Discussions followed:

- How did the interviews shape participation?
 - The interviewees that expressed an interest in the process are now part of the LTW process. This includes a larger than expected interest in the Stakeholder Science Committee.
 - Implementing the Communication and Education Plan will also be essential, since it is hard to involve some audiences like homeowners in the Stakeholder Community Committee.
- Must interviewee names be included in the document?
 - Comments are not attributed but documenting who was interviewed ensures transparency.
- If the concerns of colleagues are reflected in the bullets, then the document is sufficient.
- The document should state up front how it informed the design of the process and also requires implementing the Communication and Education Plan for success.
- It should also state that the interests therein are from the interviews at that time. People's concerns may change over time as we review more information together.
 - Mr. Fougères: We will add a preface and overview of the process.
- **AGREEMENT:** The SSC recommended the Stakeholder Assessment Findings and Recommendations to the Executive Team.
 - Members present: see Attendees section below.

ACTION ITEM: Dorian to finalize charter, communication and education plan, and stakeholder assessment findings (including introductory context), and recirculate and post.

3. Essential Management Questions – SSC

Mr. Fougères explained the structural changes made to the Essential Management Questions (EMQ) document. He also noted that terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems were both included in watershed questions since the ecosystems are intertwined in that category.

Discussion followed:

- Are the EMQs the highlighted questions and sub-questions in the column titled sub-questions?
 - Mr. Fougères: Yes.
- I only remember there being 8 EMQs initially.
 - Mr. Fougères: Many questions were added after the March 7 meeting.
- The spreadsheet documents each person's concerns and can help hold the process accountable.

- Mr. Fougères: This is a great learning exercise because the IADT and Core Team now have a sense of each stakeholder's concerns. This is why we attributed names to questions.

Mr. Fougères asked the SSC if anyone has input on EMQs 1-4.

- I feel that question 4, forest fuels relating to carbon stocks, is more related to watershed questions. Carbon sequestration also involves aquatic ecosystems including lake and wetland deposition.
- How do we ensure that these questions are helpful to the agencies that are addressing them?
 - Mr. Fougères: The Executive Team (ET) will review the questions, and the IADT has helped to develop them.
- There may be questions we end up unable to answer. These questions should be left in the document even if the IADT cannot address them.
- Should the questions address what are we trying to achieve, and how do we design something to achieve that? For example, before talking about how to do things, we should agree on goals, such as minimize or maximize carbon sequestration.
 - Mr. Fougères: We separated desired conditions because we will discuss what we think will be resilient as part of our development of the landscape resilience assessment (LRA). Then modeling will occur during Phase 2, which will be after we determine the desired resilient conditions.
- Can we add a cover page explaining where the EMQs fit into the LTW process?
 - Mr. Fougères: Yes, we will add prefatory text explaining how the questions fit into the LTW process.
- We should rephrase some of the questions from being reactive and focused on mitigating negative impacts, to being more goal oriented and positive.
 - Mr. Fougères: We will review the questions to ensure there is a positive element in each EMQ.
- We're trying to fix non-resilient forests in ways that benefit us in other ways as well. We have huge opportunities but there are trade-offs.
 - Mr. Fougères: The Landscape Restoration Strategy phase will discuss the benefits and trade-offs associated with different management strategies. LTW may work with Keith Reynolds, USFS Pacific Northwest Research Station, to build a logic model to help inform the discussion of tradeoffs, including looking simultaneously at different spatio-temporal scales.
- We should be careful using the word "create" in the document because we don't necessarily know if we can create these ecosystems.
 - Group discussion: We could explain that management means creating, promoting, supporting, etc, depending on the specific question.
- Should a temporal scale column be added for clarity between questions?
 - Mr. Fougères: We can add a column for temporal scale.

- Comment: People may key in on specific questions and reuse them in a different context. To avoid this, I suggest that these EMQs would have temporal or other issues addressed in the questions themselves, not a frontpiece.

ACTION ITEM: **Interagency Design Team** to revise essential management questions (including introductory context), and circulate to Stakeholder Science Committee (SSC) by close of business on Friday, April 21, for SSC comments prior to the May 2 webinar, including input from Jeff Brown and Roland Shaw.

Mr. Fougères asked the SSC whether current meeting schedules allow enough time for discussions. It was suggested to avoid word-smithing when possible, to use small SSC teams as needed to develop particular items, to have longer meetings if needed since most people have to take off the whole day regardless, and to monitor over coming months whether sufficient time exists to complete the work.

4. Landscape Resilience Assessment – SSC

Unit Development Diagram

Mr. Fougères presented the three documents being used in the Landscape Resilience Assessment (LRA). He expanded on the following 4 steps used to develop the Unit Development Diagram: (1) Identify using GIS where ecotypes of a landscape occur, (2) Choose indicator for disturbance with a defined range of desired resilient conditions, (3) Identify an ecologically meaningful unit and put ecosystems together in a watershed boundary, and (4) Give a composite score to each watershed for comparison. The point is to use a relative comparison of each ecotype in a watershed, and to get a sense for overall health of a watershed.

Discussion followed:

- Do we have the same interests with mixed conifer forests? We could focus it a little more on ecotypes that could get lost in a watershed scale assessment unit.
 - Jen Greenberg: We pulled out mixed conifer because they may have different indicators, ranges, and seral stages to compare.
 - Mr. Fougères: We are concerned about each ecosystem as they make up the West Shore and their disturbances. Each indicator in here will have differences in their desired outcomes.
- Is the total composite score the priority?
 - Mr. Fougères: No, we are just trying to separate assessment units and which are more or less resilient, without presuming these will be management units used for project planning and implementation. The assessment will inform the management process, but we do not need to use the same units down the road.
 - Jen Greenberg: We can shuffle scale and assessment units in the future as well as weight the outcomes by percentage of unit and importance.
- What's the use of this rolled out table? How is it going to be used down the road? Are we doing this correctly for its intended use?

- Mr. Fougères: The IADT explained that many projects are done for single resource purposes, rather than addressing all resources in an area at once. The Executive Team would prefer integrated, multiple-benefit projects rather than separate, single-resource projects, hence the value of seeing how different ecosystems overlap in specific areas.
- How does this help for those type of projects?
 - Mr. Fougères : The intended use of the assessment is to inform the identification restoration goals at the start of phase 2. For example, if we find in the assessment that meadows as a whole are in bad condition across the landscape, restoring meadows would likely become a goal of LTW.
- What does the product look like for meadows?
 - Jen Greenberg: The 4 indicators go 0-4. EcObject, the tool that links ecological conditions to specific polygons (geographic areas) on the landscape, can help to easily show how different meadows rate in comparison to one another.
- Are there any outputs that are going to be the result of dynamic modeling?
 - Patricia Manley: The landscape modeling outputs will be dynamic. We are using a 50-year timeframe, so over the course of the 50-years we can apply different regimes over that timeframe for each landscape scale. We're just getting to know all the capabilities of the LANDIS-II model, so we can do this dynamic modeling. We can assess the effects of fire regimes for one ecotype to another. It's not a static model. We have talked about modeling treatments in given cell provided its past condition, and providing us with its probable future position.

Disturbances and Indicators

Mr. Fougères asked SSC members to review ecosystem categories and what disturbances and indicators may be for each one. He emphasized the importance of keeping categories consistent across products. The IADT is hoping to end up with perhaps 12 to 20 indicators to keep the work manageable overall.

Discussions followed:

- Is the change in regime and drought relating to the amount of rain and snow?
 - Mr. Fougères: It came from heavy rain events, drives erosion, and could also affect snowpack.
- None of the disturbances reflect the implicit impact of warming temperatures. Terrestrial disturbances need to reflect warming in both day and night temperatures. We should split temperatures to illustrate day and night temperatures.
 - Air and stream temperatures should also be differentiated.
 - Mr. Fougères: We will add change in temperature to the “change in precipitation” disturbance.
- Should air pollution disturbance, ozone damage, and invasive species be added as disturbances?
 - Mr. Fougères: We struggled with invasive species being a response or a disturbance itself.

- Invasive species are not just a response, and should be included as a disturbance in terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems.

Mr. Fougères explained the difference between primary and opportunity indicators and why they are separated. The former speaks to conditions once seeks to restore or maintain. The latter to opportunities to create additional benefits from restoration opportunities – LTW’s organizing principle is first and foremost restoration.

- We may want to tier the indicators. Some of these can be rolled up to give a sense as to why they are important.
 - Mr. Fougères: We hope to end up with a dozen fine scale indicators. These may roll up into larger topics, but the point is to have indicators that can be discretely measured.
- What is the purpose of this document and where does it fit in relation to the process?
 - Mr. Fougères: The document’s purpose is to clarify the indicators that we will use in steps 1 and 2 of the LRA. These indicators will be used to develop the desired resilient conditions that are used to evaluate the landscape.
- Time scales vary between types of disturbance.
 - Mr. Fougères: There is a temporal element that is not spelled out, but we agree that the timeframe will be important during evaluation of the indicators.
- Why is the mountain brush community ecosystem not included in the list of terrestrial ecosystems? It is unique and different from other forest ecosystems.
 - Mr. Fougères: We will add mountain brush to ecosystems in the landscape resilience assessment.

Mr. Fougères noted that the IADT will work on the assessment units and add clarity to the draft matrix.

Standardized assumptions

Mr. Vollmer reviewed the work that had been done to clarify management and climate assumptions for the scenarios.

Ms. McCarthy elaborated on the climate assumptions for the scenario plans. Climate assumptions show that average precipitation does not change, but the variability of precipitation changes substantially. This means that disturbances may potentially include more high precipitation events. She emphasized that people need to not just look at these numbers for the average, but for the increased variability and extremes.

Discussion followed:

- We should also take note of the differences in day and night temperatures.
 - Ms. McCarthy: We will try to tease out temperatures for night and day as well as seasonal precipitation changes.
- Soil moisture is also important to examine, since vegetation depends on available water.
 - Ms. McCarthy: We will try to extract that data as well.

Mr. Fougères noted that after the IADT had complete climate and management assumptions that they would revise the scenario narratives per the structure suggested on March 7 (assumptions, hypothesis, resulting conditions).

ACTION ITEM: **Interagency Design Team** to revise landscape resilience assessment materials and planning scenario assumptions.

ACTION ITEM: **Maureen McCarthy, Randy Striplin, and Pat Manley** to gather some additional information and share planning scenario climate assumptions with LTW Science Team.

5. Closing Remarks – SSC

There were no interested party comments.

AGREEMENT: The SSC adopted the February 7 and March 7 meeting summaries.

Mr. Jeff Brown and Ms. Mollie Hurt volunteered to serve on the Process Committee.

Mr. Vollmer thanked participants for attending. He noted that the current work was expanding and exploring many possibilities, but that the IADT was beginning to narrow options with the help of the SSC.

STAKEHOLDER COMMUNITY COMMITTEE (SCC) MEETING

6. Welcome and Opening Remarks – SCC

Mr. Fougères welcomed all of the SCC members. Mr. Vollmer also welcomed the group. He acknowledged that the project has been moving at a fast pace, that there have been a lot of different products, and that those involved have been working diligently.

There were no interested party comments.

7. Foundational Documents – SCC

Mr. Fougères referred SCC members to the revision extracts handout, and reviewed each of the revisions. Mr. Fougères stated upon approval a hard copy will then be printed and passed to the ET for signatures. Once signed the final draft will be distributed and posted on the website for public comment. There were no questions or comments.

- **AGREEMENT:** The SCC adopted the Agency and Stakeholder Charter.
 - Members present: see Attendees section below.

Mr. Fougères reviewed the Draft Communication and Education Plan (CEP), including the addition of new public contacts and events, and additional complex scientific topics to communicate carefully during outreach.

Discussions followed:

- What is the process and who will be involved for setting up tables at events?
 - Mr. Fougères: This is going to depend on the organization. Operations will at least involve staff that represent the agencies, and it would be great if the SCC could help introduce or arrange events with the organizations they represent or work with.
- **AGREEMENT:** The SCC adopted the Communication and Education Plan.
 - Members present: see Attendees section below.

Mr. Fougères briefed SCC members on the Stakeholder Assessment Final Findings and Recommendations. He explained that the public can be involved in the LTW process through the SSC, SCC, and implementing the Communication and Education Plan. There were no questions or comments.

- **AGREEMENT:** The SCC adopted the Stakeholder Assessment Final Findings and Recommendations.
 - Members present: see Attendees section below.

8. Essential Management Questions – SCC

Mr. Vollmer used slides to orient SCC members to the Essential Management Questions (EMQs). He stated that these questions are intended to address Executive Team priorities such as landscape planning with multiple benefits over piecemeal planning, and careful deliberation of trade-offs. He acknowledged that the design criteria focus on biology and ecology, but that the IADT realizes some vegetation treatments have socio-economic impacts. He led the group through all of the management questions and allowed for discussions throughout the exercise.

Discussion followed:

- It's important that prescribed fire safety is addressed on the west shore.
 - Mr. Fougères: The Public Health and Safety category includes this.
- Does it make sense for fire to be considered as a primary aquatic ecosystem disturbance?
- Are we considering that no action has a positive management action?
 - Mr. Fougères: Modeling will include baseline conditions against which one can compare the outcomes of different management strategies. State Parks acknowledge that some ecosystems are being managed without intervention in the vegetation or the fire regime.
- Does the term treatments imply “fuel treatments”?
 - Mr. Fougères: Treatments are not limited to fuels, and may include thinning vegetation for heterogeneity, etc.

- We need to be more specific in some of our questions. For example, maybe we should capture that by saying minimizing short-term impacts while maximizing benefits.
 - Mr. Fougères: In some questions there is a temporal aspect to specify short and long term impacts or benefits. This will be clarified in a revised version.
- What is the trade-off between short-term and long-term projects? A species may not make it through the short-term to experience benefits of long term impacts.
 - Mr. Fougères: Again, a revised spreadsheet will highlight these distinctions as appropriate.

Mr. Fougères explained that there are two parts to recreation: high impacts due to high use causing erosion from a trail (which might be a primary indicator), and how one can benefit recreation by doing restoration (opportunity indicators). Discussion followed.

- Restoration doesn't necessarily conflict with recreation in a landscape approach. Language should be revised to avoid assuming this.
- This question assumes restoration could negatively impact recreation, when often there is a synergy.
- "Recreational stewardship" isn't a different type of stewardship, but rather shows that recreationists are stewards by emphasizing who is doing it.
 - Mr. Vollmer: We will need to see how recreation can be incorporated into management activities.
 - Mr. Fougères: We need to do a better job at incorporating recreation from the beginning and showing what the recreation opportunities might be before the end of the process.
- Did we consider economic impact as part of the design criteria?
 - Mr. Fougères: We're hoping to work with Kim Rollins of the University Nevada at Reno to examine economic benefits, impacts, and tradeoffs. We did not address this in the EMQs.
- It would be helpful and simple to include some reference to economics in the EMQs.

9. Landscape Resilience Assessment – SCC

Mr. Vollmer noted that the Landscape Resilience Assessment (LRA) will determine what conditions would be resilient to future disturbances, and what parts of the landscape are more or less resilient today. He continued to brief the SCC on the process the IADT went underwent to develop the assessment units and disturbance indicators. He explained these indicators will aid the IADT and SSC in comparing the same ecosystems and their resilience to disturbances. He reminded the group that LTW is in Phase 1, which focuses on the LRA and aims to be finished July 31, 2017.

Discussions followed:

- Would we talk about recreation as a disturbance?
 - Mr. Fougères: We did talk some about human disturbances.
- Management is also a disturbance.

- Mr. Vollmer: This is something that I have been working on. The human element is unavoidable.
- Mr. Fougères: We need to think about resilient forests that include communities and high amounts of human use.
- Why are insects and disease combined?
 - Mr. Vollmer: As managers, we often consider those disturbances as similar agents that create tree mortality.

Mr. Fougères explained that these documents are still in draft forms. He also noted the importance of discussing more about how and to what extent disturbances affect public health and recreation. The primary indicators tell the IADT and ST about disturbances and thresholds, whereas opportunity indicators show that there are other values on the west shore that stakeholders may wish to evaluate and enhance.

Discussion followed:

- Are we capturing the interconnectedness of disturbances?
 - Mr. Fougères: We are trying to do a snapshot in time and not necessarily think about how disturbances evolve with the landscape over time. The models will analyze trade-offs between management approaches based on desired outcomes and the ecosystems in question.
- Did you find that you missed any indicators?
 - Mr. Fougères: We haven't considered this yet but that will be part of the exercise. We might start with 25-30 indicators and eventually get to 15. They need to be scientifically rigorous.
- Economics should be applied into the disturbance and indicators document.

Mr. Fougères review the final worksheet showing ecosystem types. The IADT wants to compare these ecosystem types across the LTW planning area to determine which examples of each ecosystem are more resilient, and then assign a composite value for comparison between watersheds.

Discussion followed:

- Areas should be weighted relative to others in order to show prioritization and importance for restoration planning.
 - Mr. Fougères: We discussed if steps 3 and 4 are necessary in the SSC meeting. These may be removed if we find that steps 1 and 2 provide sufficient information; we don't know if putting in a sub-watershed will help us define our goals.
- Even if we don't analyze steps 3 and 4 we can still look at the overall watershed health to analyze what regions may be more or less resilient based on ecosystems.
- Mr. Fougères described the EcObject tool developed by Scott Conway. Small polygons with 25 metrics each were pulled from Landsat and LiDAR datasets specifically for the LTW planning area.

- How do we track the actions being made on the ground instead of just the indicators?
 - Mr. Fougères: The calendar of activities notes the importance of not just monitoring but performance measures.

10. Planning Scenarios – SCC

Mr. Fougères reviewed the planning scenario exercise undertaken at the February 7 meetings. The SCC reviewed the scenarios during a March 7 meeting and suggested to clarify the climate and disturbance assumptions and management assumptions, and re-structure the narrative. The IADT is working to clarify the climate and management assumptions, most notably the variance in temperatures and types of precipitation. The IADT will also add variances in night and day temperatures as well as soil moisture information to inform the scenario narratives.

Discussion followed:

- Are there appropriate datasets for air temperatures vs water temperatures?
 - Mr. Fougères: We will look into datasets for aquatic systems before sending out the next iteration of the planning scenarios.

11. Closing Remarks – SCC

AGREEMENT: The SCC adopted the February 7 and March 7 meeting summaries.

Mr. Fougères asked for input regarding the time allotted for SCC members to participate in the LTW process. Discussion followed:

- As we identify specific areas of interest, how do we engage more? I would like more input regarding invasive species but don't necessarily want more involvement.
 - Mr. Fougères: We're trying to get documents in front of SCC at least twice before we move on with a product. Aside from joining the Stakeholder Science Committee, if you feel you need more engagement on a particular issue please contact me and we will do our best to provide you with any additional information available and address your questions and concerns.

Mr. Fougères reminded the SCC that the next meeting will be field visit on Wednesday, June 7, with another potential webinar in May if the SCC wanted a status update beforehand. Mr. Vollmer thanked the SCC members for their different perspectives that they brought to the table, which complement those of the Stakeholder Science Committee.

12. 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. Ann Hobbs
2. Brett Storey
3. Bruce Springsteen
4. Harold Singer
5. Jeff Brown
6. Jennifer Quashnick
7. Matt Freitas
8. Maureen McCarthy
9. Mollie Hurt
10. Patricia Maloney
11. Roland Shaw
12. Sue Britting

Stakeholder Community Committee Members

13. Amy Berry
14. Ben Fish
15. Beth Kenna
16. Carl Hasty
17. Casey Blann
18. David Reichel
19. Doug Barr
20. Rob Weston
21. Zack Bradford

Staff

22. Brian Garrett, USFS
23. Dan Shaw, State Parks
24. Dorian Fougères, NFF
25. Jen Greenberg, CTC
26. Marilyn Linkem, State Parks
27. Mike Vollmer, TRPA
28. Patricia Manley, USFS
29. Stephanie Coppeto, USFS
30. Tamara Sasaki, State Parks
31. Teresa McClung, USFS

Interested Parties from the Public

32. Danielle Hughes
33. Nanette Hansel
34. Stephanie Wilson