

Meeting Notes
Tahoe Science Advisory Council

Friday November 18, 2016

10AM – 2:00 PM

Tahoe Center for Environmental Sciences, first floor Rm 119
291 Country Club Drive Incline Village, NV 89451

Conference phone: 712-775-7000; access code: 214924#

Participants: Alan Heyvaert (DRI), Mark Pitchford (DRI), Sudeep Chandra (UNR), Steve Tyler (UNR), Geoff Schladow (UCD), Steve Sadro (UCD), John Melack (UCSB), Pat Manley (PSW), Ramon Naranjo (USGS), Todd Ferrara (CNRA), Jim Lawrence (NDCNR) Zach Hymanson (CNRA), Jennifer Carr subbing for My-Linh Nguyen (NDEP), Julie Reagan (TRPA), Patrick Wright (CTC), Shane Romsos (SIG), Matt Busse (PSW)

1. Welcome and Recap

Bi-State executive committee meeting recap - Road map for funding thru 2018, expect to have another one around federal event in August 2017.

2. Update on Council funding, contracting, and work plan

July 2017 new funds 150k, just a singular funding source

1st subcontract between UCD and TRPA to fund administration, communications, and website development. Contract at UCD for review.

Next group of contracts allow for substantive work of group. Dan sent out a model of TRPA has used for consultant contract for work. Gets two entities in agreement and then work orders are developed that specify the work being done.

Dan explains that TRPA has consulted with legal teams, done two rounds with UNR, has a model that works well with DRI, recirculate old language with UCD, and getting close with USGS. Intellectual property and how it's handled, brought up in contract talk. TRPA does not have a stance as the contracting agency. SOP is universities have unfettered access to data as does whoever is funding the project. Standard clause, 30 days' notice that information is being used.

John on the phone, asks: two issues with contract insurance stuff, identification so that everything lands on the shoulders of UCSB. Dan explains standard two party contract language from TRPA. Geoff sponsored people have accepted it, suggest having UCSB sponsored person talk to UCD sponsored person.

Dan working with all respective agencies to come up with a contract everyone agrees with. Thank you to Dan for coming up with that model and pursuing it.

Looking to have it set by the 1st of the year which would be a great accomplishment.

Indirect cost rate discussion from bi-state committee. Zach has some latitudes to get the indirect cost rate with some help with the co-chairs. Currently 25% from the state of California with it changing to 35% NEXT YEAR. In discussion with DRI to negotiate rate. He is expecting to have an answer by the end of November. USGS is roughly 81% that is the rate and there is no negotiation.

Any questions? No.

Zach sent out travel reimbursement forms. Straight forward, but if there are any questions contact Zach or use the provided contact information. TRPA prefers electronic payments, requiring routing number.

There is still one member council position available (UC position). Scott Stevens, a fire ecologist at UC Berkeley declined the offer to join. Suggestions: Max Morris, UC Extension program also a Fire ecologist is now at UCSB. Examining the backgrounds the Science council is lacking would be a good way of searching for the right person. Forest background, landscape, forest management, forest ecology, forest soil and water, an ecological statistician, someone who helps thinking about monitoring in the long run. Technical expertise, knowledgeable, but a good contributor at meeting says Todd.

USFS can always reach out internally to statisticians. Goals are to be able to reach into internally for all organizations and utilize expertise within organizations says Mark. Matt says not to focus on covering all disciplines, between the council they will always have a resource to cover something. ACTION: John Melack to look at contacts in the UC System outside of UC Davis who can contribute social science/economics/ sociology.

3. Schedule for 2017 Council meetings

MOU says meeting 4 times a year. Zach initially suggests quarterly meeting schedule and a specific day of the month. Once things get going, meetings may be longer as projects pick up. Alan wonders if every third month is enough in the formative stage, perhaps every other month would be a more proactive schedule. Sudeep wonders if it's possible to set up video conferencing abilities. Weather might necessitate video conferencing, but Alan wants a larger screen for everyone to check out. Consider investing in a conference speaker system, conferencing software, laptop, projector, etc.

It's difficult when people don't know their teaching schedule, but people may only know the next schedule, sooner decided the better.

Council decides on every 3rd Thursday starting the 19th of January, every other month through July.

4. Council review of threshold assessment

Shane was the former science monitoring person at TRPA. Zach explains TRPA evaluates threshold standards every 4-5 years. ~170 standards, these evaluations have happened since the late 80s. Recently there have been changes to the evaluation process. These thresholds are deficient in many ways, have come across many difficulties when meeting

goals, and they need rethinking. Idea is that staff would begin on assessment process and work/operate over the next 5 years. Efforts made to identify what needs to be done, to create an effective evaluation. TRPA goes along and the plan came out, changed from 4 to 5 years. Underwent peer-review, lots of problems with standards, do a wholesale assessment. TRPA developed an initial approach for an assessment methodology, seven issues overall. Science council has a draft that everyone has reviewed; an assessment process and an update process. Look at the entire threshold system: standards, monitoring, examine it critically and make changes. Dan says to update the threshold, one small part in a longer process to do so, put off updating threshold until the Science Council makes an assessment. Relook at the system of standards. Comments from peer review are on the website. Technical expertise is also provided.

Stakeholder content; according to Dan there is broad support from TRPA that the science council should look at standards again. Find deficiencies in the standards and determine where we focus our energies. There is recognition that there could be a stronger nexus rooted in science. Revisiting the thresholds has always been a dicey endeavor says Mark F. Now is the time for a united spirit of collaboration and care, a time where different constituents can offer different viewpoints and come to a common point. In the 70s when these standards were put together it was superb but current conditions are different and we want to ensure we're tracking the correct things. Can't do everything, must be focused, to help things get funded.

Wait and see how the regional plan does, says Mark F. Watch them monitoring the threshold to see that regional plan does what promised. Need to make sure we are monitoring and evaluating the right thing to track the TRPA.

Last threshold evaluation cost 1 million. The work that the council will not fund the entire assessment. Methodology and testing is what the science council is shooting for. A methodology that has been put to some use and exercise, that reveal changes that need to be made, produce products that are usable for groups to change, give Science council and TRPA and idea of what the costs will be for a full update.

Geoff: the goal should be to provide a product that is meeting the needs of agencies. Only to be told that this is how much money that we want to spend. So that information is needed at the start. There's a balance between the committee serving the needs of agencies, justifiable, cost-effect. Do the agencies have an idea or preconceived notion as to costs or spending available?

Sudeep seconds idea, given finite resources available now, focus on one thing. What do the agencies want, get it out on the table, and work it out from there.

Alan says TRPA has gone thru what they have spending for monitoring and Science council can look thru that as a general idea of what usually gets spent.

Marc, says offer something that is attractive enough that people will want to fund and figure out funds when they see it. Extend time period or search for the funding. Write a plan or process that comes in at the budget number, be sure the plan is cognizant of funding but try to do it the right way and then explain the need for additional funding. Monitoring happen all

the time and budgets are tight on that. Don't want to feel financial strains if it means not doing a complete and thorough job.

Alan agrees funding shouldn't constrain plan. But knowing the council needs to be aware of how much we're working with and what the reality is. Multiple agencies are engaged and so funding possibilities are different, other opportunities could be available.

Marc: Come up with a well-reasoned list of needs as well as costs. Prioritize list of activities.

Jim: There will be greater success of obtaining funding with specific ideas, i.e. of everything we looked at, these are the items that we think needs to be done, how we strategically chose these items, and how this meets the needs at Tahoe specifically. From a state department point of view we need specifics. Zach clarifies that state would be able to provide starting point, how much money is being spent now.

Mark F: Let the decision makers make the decisions, we are providing them with choices.

Assessment process, review the timeline associated with that.

Dan says TRPA released draft at the end of September and had it open to the public for review. Report officially released at the December 14th governing board meeting. Everything in the report that has been reviewed has been included but not the assessment by the science council. Set of standards written some time ago, the science of setting standards has changed, smart criteria and categorization process. Factors have been identified that relate to good standards. Go thru 178 standards and say are they specific, is it measurable, is it attributable to the agency. After this Common data base, putting context around what the assessment needs, common info base to talk about this. Relative importance based on stakeholder interests

Todd: putting context around relationship, in terms of importance

The second task of the science council is to create a matrix for each of the current threshold standards. Should we have a place to show what level of effort or results from current efforts or efforts over the years to put it in perspective? Todd thinks this is important for entities to understand how much money has already gone in and putting a lot of money into something irrelevant is useful to know.

Marc: Assessment includes fundamental look from a basic policy point of view. When making decisions about priority it is important to know what has been done and what can be done.

Alan: This is our goal, to help the TRPA capture methodology that is robust, and accomplish this before March.

Not rushing revisions. Issue report with draft assessment (Dec 14 2016) and work in next 2-3 months and bring revised in February from the Science Council. Feb 23 presented, drafts Feb 15th to be finalized. Advisory planning commission, come back to the APC whether or not to issue the report. All planning matters will go thru APC.

Create a memo that goes to the board that we have reviewed the revise report and what the next steps are.

Alan: Work on creating a process to work for Dan and Science Council. Issue a memo by the end of Jan. Begin discussion assessment chapter of peer-review. Suggestions compiled as part of this meeting, so that Dan can get going on some of his revisions now.

Where can Dan Start? Review the peer reviews again. Compile comments from group and send to Dan as a second set of suggestions to reform his revision of assessment approach. That would be the preliminary memo to Dan from this group in early Dec. Revise assessment and incorporate our suggestions, things that are important from the initial peer review. Dan will give us a revised chapter back to science council. Then Jan 19th we would discuss that revised chapter and then submit a second memo, this meets criteria that we suggested for assessment chapter, memo to governing board.

Doing the matrix happens later.

How we develop information is what is being determined. Dan suggests that this is the revised version of the columns is this something we want to go forward with.

Geoff says that the whole system needs to be predicated by conceptual models. Unless you have a conceptual model how can you model? What is the point? How do you come up with conclusions? How can you tell it provides value?

Insert question as part of assessment, is this supported by a reports chain or conceptual model? Science Council could easily say all standards should be supported by some sort of conceptual model according to Dan. Which is appropriate? Are there redundancies in existing questions?

Sudeep is just trying to think of a work flow, to get this information. Call for building conceptual models doesn't mean that we need to build them. This is all process-based information that can be considered as guidance provided from this science council.

Where do standards fit in a conceptual model?

Patrick – reduce 171 to a manageable level, drive agency investments. Currently agency investments are not driven by thresholds, EIP performance level as standards. Group needs to recognize to help get going, point out areas where concept mod would be necessary. Threshold are guides to investment, lay out a ten year road map, estimates what it would take (finances resources), actually going to affect investments and regional plan. Make that clear from the beginning.

Marc says that someone will have to define what people's tasks are. Someone will find an expert for each of those standards/thresholds and will be tasked to come up with a concept mod. Find a place for each threshold, and those don't need to exist can be get rid of and Matrix needed, conceptual is second.

Sudeep says set realistic timeline and realize that just bringing people up to speed will take time and procedurally, bringing people up to speed is very important. Prefers to not have a point person but to have more common meetings.

The thresholds need to be relevant to every other issue in the basin says Geoff.

Alan says form subcommittee for assessment memo. Keep longer term goals in mind that can be built into the assessment. This needs to be a collective effort, other people with more time to move this memo forward. Help TRPA come up with methodology for thresholds that will be relevant to other stakeholders in the basin. We want to create something that serves the current collective purpose but could be used but potentially easily modified over the years. While the Science Council continues to comment, give Dan some prioritization for how to start working on it and where to focus his time initially.

Zach – the highest priority is determining what the assessment will do, but not describe how it will be done. Who will do that assessment and how will it be used? Who's going to populate the matrix? Who's going to process this data into usable info to make decision? This needs to be written up for agencies, stakeholders, and the general public. Communicating about the overall approach will encourage greater support.

How do we do it? Is it one person, is it a subcommittee, is it consensus, divvy up by expertise or background? Dan thinks this would be helpful. When it goes to board, it can't just be an assessment; it has to be a full proposal. Delve more about how it will be used. Make it a public process where everyone can weigh in on the threshold assessment. TRPA has had thoughts about who will do it and if this were an internal assessment it will not be seen as credible. Dan envisions different people will be in the room, interested in guidance, working with subcommittee, whose opinions needs, may not be the same people depending on the standards.

Divide standards and find the appropriately knowledgeable people to deal with the standards. Diagrams of how things fit together with background information, what is the knowledge base that supports this model. Organizing them this way will enable us to see the interconnectedness (Marc). Things can easily relate back to scenic, forest, air quality, etc.

Sustainable recreation touches everything, the web will be tremendous says Jennifer

Geoff - Rather than sending it out and lumping it all together, keep the science community separate from public idea and a lot could be learn about that. What agencies want may be different from science and public. Keep result separate, as to the rankings (123 level of importance) or the yes/no. Is this measurable?

Marc – Look at a broad slice of different stakeholders. Use public outreach to populate the matrix additionally with a list of technical expertise and policies. If with three set of answers there is a broad consensus, that's good. Alternatively if with three set of answers there is a widely varied preference, that is also worth noting. Sudeep says this is a good reasoning to integrate a social scientist into the council.

Matrix questions

Specific? Differing opinions potentially that could be garnered in a survey. What is important is that we engage in a broader community and utilize in our assessment. Document that this is part of our process in order to build confidence and support of this process.

Dan would like guidance when does that outreach occur? Is that part of the assessment? Who decides what is relevant? Allocate those 100 coins to choose what standards are relevant. Read thru the document and then read the peer review separately, so reviews were positive, negative, and someone he relates to.

Reviewer 3 gave the best ideas; we should just go forth with what he proposes. – Marc.

There are some common themes that can be pulled out of reviews. For Dan's purposes it would be great if we could capture ones that important for Dan to deal with initially – Alan.

Work on creating preliminary conceptual models, broader community interaction, and building some of the suggestions in. – Alan

Geoff suggests an alternative to the 100 coins, give them a dollar and distribute anything they wanted. Good exercise for the science council.

Populate the matrix and build the models happens first, look for common – Mark F

What is the purpose of the thresholds to begin with? Protect parts of the basin that people like. Do you then need to ask people what they care about in form of survey?

Dan – take note of the relevance to policy makers and public. Are these relevant to policy makers, public, reviewer, concept model? Relevance to stakeholders, to investors, to policy makers, relevance to concept model should be the same as policy maker. Science-based model or non. Policy maker needs to make decision may impact all quality life in basin and needs a model. Not sure if there is one answer for relevance. You may have standard that is a water quality standard but not pertinent and could be captured more effectively with a different matrix.

Choose one set of threshold or standards and we try it. Issues and ambiguity will come out. Rather do it all. Take that approach to start in on the actual assessment. SMARTER framework, add that other R. Achievable, Realistic, Relevant, Matrix, Specific, etc.

Priorities of the funding: biodiversity, resiliency, how are the thresholds relevant if it's supposed to be so interdisciplinary. How do the thresholds evolve parallel to that? – Patrick
Examine how standards and the thresholds are moving forwards? Can't be too narrow, it's not as effective as it can be. Look at the standards as they exist today.

Important funding mechanisms, 30 years from now, how to revisit that? Has the TRPA thought of that? One goal... is it forest management or clarity? Biodiversity, carbon management, forest fuels, what are the priorities? – Sudeep

Post-lunch recap

Alison to compile notes to be distributed, dive a little deeper into the peer reviews and notes, email back to everyone with further comments. Send it back to Dan by early December up to mid-December is optimistic. Don't want to spend too much time capturing our vision

Issued as a draft in Dec, have proposal ready to go to APC and governing board in February.

Hard date for 1st draft memo soliciting feedback on – 16th Dec Friday, Dan ideally wants a bullet points on what is going to inform the memo. Editorial board, address issues 1, 3, and 4. Address issue x and ignore everything else. Memo will explain why those suggestions were made. Flush out who is doing the assessment, talk about more about how it will used once it's completed. Substantive changes, any heads up would be appreciated.

Notes to be distributed by Dec 1st

Take some time to compile comments and suggestions. Reference those suggestions in the final memo. We have reviewed this chapter it is likely to meet the needs of the... Memo in Dec to Dan will cover that. The bullet points should already be there, Dan should just go forward based on what is in his head.

Dan needs to address:

The brainstorm ideas that came out of this meeting.

Don't have to deal with the matrix, but think more about the process.

Conceptual model will be part of the process of doing the assessment.

Memo needed:

How should we actually assess piece

Background info after is a latter step

Populating this matrix

Other part has to do with concept models

Making priorities

Final matrix will be down the road

Conceptual model will be part of this assessment

Conceptual model would be done before matrix

Start populating matrix that doesn't require a conceptual model

Conceptual models are all in place already, are these models still in place still relevant

Chapter 13 the review and how ideas are being presented

Dan says limit focus to is this entire chapter relevant? Is this appropriate and is it meaningful to future revision? Invest in concept models that will help to evaluate future chapters.

Yes this is good, but adding conceptual models to the assessment process. When you do the assessment, construct the concept model. Concept model has to happen before assessment.

This chapter is an appropriate approach based on what was given to us. Yes, with the caveats of reviews and our ideas. We agree with some of the reviews in the area of conceptual models, but there are some other suggestions. We also might suggest something different in 3 months, potentially...

Concern about timing

Flow chart is needed to explain process to Dan

Beyond this assessment, whether that's the starting point and what's in it.

1st step, concept models for everything? – Dan

Looking at each standard and referring back to concept model and seeing if that model works or is there something better for the assessment

Approve matrix and then come back to conceptual model... or give them the hint that the assessment is incomplete until the concept model is complete

Help prioritize comments in reviews that address the process for review. Make sure that the main comments in these reviews are incorporated in the process represented in this chapter. We find this chapter now suitable after Dan revised.

Is an assessment of this nature the appropriate first step? Yes or no. Start with something else and that something else looks like x.

Either you need to prioritize conceptual model or you need new models.

Could be potentially useful to add another column into the matrix as to whether or not the current model is still viable. Is it working? If yes, then write yes in the model. If no, then it is addressed later.

Dan needs in the memo:

Conceptual development as a model for the future as a whole list of ideas that are going to come up. In the process somewhere there will be development of concept models.

Standardized questions for each threshold where all boxes must be checked to be useful. Is this something we address question by question or reviewer comment by comment?

Alan - Dan does a few bullets about what's important to him for what is available for him to review. Give brief first memo with the understanding.

Things we think should be in the chapter:

An assessment of the measurement system from there we can hopefully suggest a new measurement system.

Three step process:

- 1) Assessment, matrix to answer questions
- 2) Develop of concept models if necessary, justify existing concept models

3) Using outcome of assessment and concept model to investigate a measurement system

Linking outcomes into manageable policies, i.e. air quality affects invasives which affects recreation, etc. how that model will be changed. Can we see how what's happening here affects the forest?

Out of 54, 45 have no determining process. Run them thru SMART based assessment and see why they aren't working. Once you get through those questions, then you can figure out where it fits and where to go from there

Standards are different from policy questions. What – pushing everything thru assessment process, and then how do we move forward?

How to push ~178 things an assessment while at the same time encouraging broader thinking by assessors? Here's what we think we should be working on with you...

Memo is trivial part of the process but it needs to be right to guide our steps forward.

Actionably work products deliverable i.e. we went through a process and went through a streamlined process. Some things like the development of conceptual models are a bigger task that will take greater time.

A lot of this silo'd based on what the compact says. If there is going to be an RPA on top of state legislature that is tracking the thresholds and report on it.

Tracking method needs to be cleaned up. Make this system and make it applicable to larger systems. Make it consistent, but it won't be the driver for priorities. Immediate things that need to be addressed how we take that and make it something more valuable. - Jim

Immediate results from assessment that will give you strong indications. Prioritize based on assessment would be helpful.

Look at policies and look at goals. Is this redundant with another part with the system? Where issues live in the system and are there solutions? Is it fixing the standard or is there something completely different?

Geoff proposes drafting a memo to send to Dan at TRPA before January 13th. This can be completed with a little back and forth with Dan (ACTION). Who does this? Alan, Pat Manly, Mark F, and Sudeep will be the subcommittee. Alan will be the lead of this group as the point of contact. Please contact Zach if any help is necessary.

Memo will explain how they think the standards can be accomplished, concept models already exist. Looking at the concept models could be helpful to give an idea as to what direction the memo is heading. Threshold evaluation reports on website, Dan to send link to Zach (ACTION).

Steve suggests allowing everyone to comment one week/couple of days before it is due.

Eventually we will set up a dropbox to have all this information distribute.

Sudeep wants to populate a document like a google document.

SMART – Timebound wasn't there for most of them. Marc would like that time be kept as part of the matrix to make sure that there is that in the evaluation because keeping time is important. Timing for when a threshold should be met is important. Over what period of time do we want to achieve this threshold? If there's no time, do we not have to worry about it? It's a deficiency that should be included. This is our goal for 20 years or risk of being non-attainment. Should this time element live in standard or is it targets for restoration. You have minimum targets, set targets that are tied to things like election.

Is there value in writing timing into the standard? It helps with expectations. Not every standard should have timing tied in, but if it has it in the column is it a yes or no, can it be a yes? This would be information, not a mandate.

Interaction among different standards/thresholds, with the thinking that if certain changes occur even when a goal is 20 years out, you can be fairly sure you don't need it. Directions of the conditions can be indicative of this. There are often indirect time standards based on interactions in the thresholds themselves.

Goals and objectives of the threshold systems or for TRPA.

Issue specific – are there overarching goals and objectives for water quality? Desired conditions, vision, etc. Is this something that needs to be updated or revisited?

Regional plan is designed to achieve the standards. TRPA has updated the desired conditions.

Threshold standards aren't well-connect to the regional plan. EIP drives where money goes. The way to unite those are common goals and objectives. Zach wants to do this early one. Get a common goals and objectives. Is the standard relevant? We can state up front what we think the goals are or should be...

Community vision, in context of plan, several years ago. Julie has not seen a lot of changes in the last 7 years. Pull together key documents in order to provide some context.

Subcommittee to look at all materials to be addressed: Mark F, Steve, Alan, Pat, Sudeep. Goals are to have a draft memo by Jan 9th circulated before the 9th into the Science Council. Science Council provide feedback and finalized by 13th (ACTION)

We will have at least a draft of the notes from Alison and Zach by the 1st of Dec. (ACTION)

Threshold should be moved up in priority? That is part of the next questions. Do we ask this team to look at relevancy?

Anything that we haven't discussed that is relevant can be discussed after the notes are distributed.

5. Council member updates on Tahoe Basin science projects

Tahoe West project- Pat: Relevance to council. Collaborative effort interest and jurisdiction over west side of the basin. From Emerald bay to Tahoe City a landscape wide planning for restoration effort to the forest ecosystems. Executive team, core team, science team that PSW is coordinating. That science side: it's a collective as opportunities have come along it helps that regional institutions work together. Support a variety of interactive modules i.e. climate change (Geoff), DRI, UNR, Portland State, etc. contributing to this interactive modeling effort to see forest management treatment effect on wildlife, water quality, and air quality. For science management meetings have shown interest in coming up with a revised rendition of management issues of long time ago. What was the original intent here? What does watershed restoration mean? All sciences come into play. Lots of discussion about meadow restoration, hydrology of streams, riparian restoration, how does that affect water quality? Funding depended growth aspects of project. What could be developed as a result of this? SNPLMA funding, building capacity, and how to apply this approach across the basin. Potential to connect with nearshore research with science collaboration at the land-water interface. Well-supported and could get a lot of traction if approached correctly. For more information contact Pat.

Patrick - Monitoring, how about we get together and get a coordinated monitoring plan. One reason it hasn't happened is because the TRPA discussion has dominated the conversation. Do we wait for the thresholds and standards to coordinate monitoring? This process for TRPA can really provide framework for driving a lot. Monitoring the basin and regional change is an opportunity to really help drive things happening in the basin. Make what's happening now relevant, find the relationship between thresholds and EIP with monitoring. Make the outcomes relevant and something that we ourselves would use in the future.

Extreme climate project - Geoff

SNPLMA funds – Alan - email sent out, allocation of SNPLMA funds. Has been reconstituted, have been funds from previous projects that has be returned. 8 million in funds returned. A set of funds are only for fire-related projects capital. Other priorities weren't ready to go forward, and for many different reasons these projects never happened. Projects are on the list that proposes the project and provides background information. Categories for science but no associated proposal. Can science develop a proposal and add to the list? Yes. Is the committee interested? Continuing science interaction, it's collaborative it's integrated. They don't want a big science proposal it's already earmarked for several projects. Wrote up a proposal and had it in the list, we would get some funding for it. Get ahold of Jeff at USFS and get the timeline, what needs to be in the proposal, and what's likely to be approved. It has been amended to provide for the last Tahoe restoration act. 10 percent to go to science projects. Secretary signs off on specific projects. Time has gone by and priorities may or may not have changed. Is there any money coming back from

science projects? More than likely no. Alan will attend meeting and bring back a report to the Science Council and see where to proceed once he hears back.

SNPLMA doesn't like indeterminate things, modeling. Something more focused, meaning an applied research project or develop a system. Like building conceptual models.

Jennifer – who's doing what? How do we share information? A clearinghouse of some sort of what's going on? Who's done what? Enforcement action with NDOT industry monitoring in Incline monitoring. How does the Science Council attack that idea of what's happening. Science updates ideally would be something like that would be on a website.

Science Council is not the control situation.

Nearshore resource allocation plan- Alan

Lakes of the west science initiative- Sudeep

Geoff adjourns meeting 2:15 p.m.