***DRAFT* AGENDA | Stakeholder Science Committee Webinar**

**Lake Tahoe West Restoration Partnership**

Tuesday, May 2, 2017, 9 am to 12 pm

**Webinar link:**  <http://nationalforestfoundation.adobeconnect.com/laketahoewest/>

* *Please log on to the webinar* ***a few minutes early*** *so we can troubleshoot as needed.*
* *Please* ***call this conference line separately****: 888-346-3950, access code 65306600#*

**Contact information**: Dorian Fougères, Lake Tahoe West Program Manager, (530) 902-8281

**Meeting Goals**

1. Recommend boundary for the initiative.
2. Advance development of, and if possible recommend, the Essential Management Questions.
3. Advance development of the Landscape Resilience Assessment indicators.
4. Review the second draft planning scenarios.

| **TIME** | **AGENDA ITEM** | **PRESENTER(S)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 9:00 am | **Welcome and Agenda Review****Webinar Ground Rules, and Stakeholder Science Committee (SSC) and Interagency Design Team (IADT) member introductions****Interested Party Comment Period #1**At this time any interested party may request consideration to place a new item on a future agenda. Individuals will be limited to a three-minute presentation. No action will be taken today as a result of any item presented at this time. | **Mike Vollmer,** Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and IADT Lead**Dorian Fougères**, Facilitator |
| 9:15 | **Lake Tahoe West Boundary*** Review of analysis area and planning area

*Objective: Recommend boundary for the initiative.* | **Dorian****All SSC and IADT members** |
| 9:30 | **Essential Management Questions*** Review of revisions per SSC April 4 suggestions

*Objectives: Make any final revisions to the questions. If possible, recommend the questions.* | **Mike****All SSC and IADT members** |
| 10:00 | **Landscape Resilience Assessment (LRA)*** Properties of resilient systems (see reference papers listed below in Webinar Materials)
* Draft indicators for primary disturbances
* Next steps for LRA

*Objectives: Review key properties of resilient systems. Review proposed indicators for each primary disturbance, and suggested secondary disturbances.* | **Mike****All SSC and IADT members** |
| 11:00 | ***Break*** |  |
| 11:15 | **Planning Scenarios*** Climate and management assumptions
* Re-structured narratives

*Objective: Provide feedback on revised draft scenario descriptions.* | **Randy Striplin,** LTBMU and IADT**All SSC and IADT members** |
| 11:45 | **Action Items and Next Steps*** Adoption of April 4 meeting summary
* Charter signatures and Process Committee
* High-level monitoring inventory and project inventory
* Review of upcoming meeting dates

**Interested Party Comment Period #2**Per description above.**Closing Remarks** | **Dorian****Mike** |
| 12:00 pm | ***Adjourn*** |  |

**Upcoming Meeting Dates and Main Topics**

* June 6, 1 to 5 pm - **Stakeholder Science Committee** meeting, *Location TBD (likely the west shore)*
* June 7, 8 am to 4 pm – **Stakeholder Science and Community Committee field trip** – *west shore locations TBD*
* Thursday, July 6 (special date), suggested revised times (original request was 10-3) to allow for SSC to hear SCC feedback before (if possible) recommending Landscape Resilience Assessment
	+ *9:30 am to 12 pm – Stakeholder Community Committee*
	+ *1 pm to 5 pm – Stakeholder Science Committee*

**Webinar Ground Rules**

1. **Please mute yourself when not talking** - this helps us avoid background noise and makes it easier for us to hear
2. **Please do not put us on hold** – music often starts to play and we have to reset the call
3. **Please speak up** or click on the “raise hand” webinar button if you want to speak – the facilitator will put you in the queue
4. **Honor time** – we need to spend some time with each topic on the agenda, please adhere to the guidance provided
5. **Humor is welcome** – it just should not be at someone else’s expense
6. **Common conversational courtesy** – do not interrupt others, use profanity, or make it hard to hear by having third-party conversations at the table
7. **All ideas and points of view have value** – you do not have to agree with your neighbor; if you do not agree with something, propose an alternative that could meet everyone’s interests
8. **Treat each other with respect** – everyone cares about the work, and brings unique backgrounds, expertise, and insight to the conversation
9. **Avoid editorials** – avoid judging other people’s motives or the value of their actions; instead explain what you need for your interests to be met and our work to be a success

**Webinar Materials**

1. Agenda
2. Project boundary map (the same as in the revised Project Description, 03-14-17)
3. Draft Essential Management Questions **List** – 04-24-17
4. Draft Essential Management Questions **Spreadsheet** **(shows all the sub-questions)** – 04-24-17
5. Landscape Resilience Assessment Disturbance-Indicators – 04-28-17
6. Revised Draft Planning Scenarios – 04-28-17
7. Draft April 4 meeting summary
8. *Resilience Reference Paper A: Scan of seven pages of the book only – we apologize, we do not have a clean PDF copy:* Biggs et al 2015, Principles for Building Resilience: Sustaining Ecosystem Services in Social-Ecological Systems.
9. *Resilience Reference Paper B:* Nemec et al 2014, “Assessing Resilience in Stressed Watersheds”
10. *Resilience Reference Paper C:* Seidl et al 2016, “Searching for resilience: addressing the impacts of changing disturbance regimes on forest ecosystem services”
11. *Resilience Reference Paper D:* Timpane-Padgham et al 2017, “A systematic review of ecological attributes that confer resilience to climate change in environmental restoration”
12. *Resilience Reference Paper E:* Anthony et al 2015, “Operationalizing resilience for adaptive coral reef management under global environmental change”
13. *Resilience Reference Paper F:* Walker et al 2012, “Drivers, ‘Slow’ Variables, ‘Fast’ Variables, Shocks, and Resilience”

**Context for Revised Draft Planning Scenarios**

The goal of revisions is to clarify assumptions and the overall structure of the scenarios, including ensuring:

1. There are no topical gaps
2. Each scenario is internally consistent
3. There is enough distinction between scenarios