North Atlantic Landscape Conservation Cooperative
Conference Call
August 5, 2010
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 noon

Action Items

Andrew Milliken and Ken Elowe will communicate with states about how to ensure representation of diverse resource issues in each state (such as marine resource issues) within the representation opportunities provided to states on the North Atlantic LCC Steering Committee. Andrew will make minor edits to the Structure and Governance document, as discussed, to reflect that each state partner will represent the natural resources within its jurisdiction, as appropriate and relevant to the mission and purposes of the North Atlantic LCC.

Andrew Milliken will draft up an outline of a request for science needs and provide to the steering committee for review and then send out a request to existing partnerships.

Andrew will communicate with neighboring LCCs about potential boundary changes and bring them to the steering committee for consideration.

Steering Committee members and partners will provide Andrew recommendations of partnerships that can support the LCC by serving the LCC mission and needs in their current form, that could be built upon through the LCC, and that should be included to provide technical input to the LCC.

Megan Nagel will develop draft *.org* website and project sharing websites. She will ensure that updates requests from these websites are organized as weekly or less frequent requests. She and Andrew will work on preparing a standard North Atlantic LCC PowerPoint presentation to be available on the site for partners to use.

Andrew will send out and post minutes for review to participants on the call and to the broader partnership contact list, make corrections based on input received and then post the revised minutes.

Andrew will send out a request for availability for an October conference call and send out additional details and a preliminary RSVP for the November in-person meeting in New Hampshire.

Agenda Item 1: Introduction and Review Agenda

Andrew Milliken (USFWS North Atlantic Landscape Conservation Cooperative) opened the call by indicating how excited he was to work with partners to develop a truly collaborative North Atlantic Conservation Cooperative (North Atlantic LCC); thanked everyone for participating and introduced Ken Elowe, the new Assistant Regional Director for Science Applications in the Northeast Region of the Fish and Wildlife Service to facilitate the call.

Ken reviewed how we are going to run the meeting and noted the materials available on the Web (http://www.fws.gov/northeast/science/meetings.html). Ken noted that we have not been in close communication as an LCC group since last winter when we were working on the development of the governance document that was provided for review, but now that staff has been hired, we will begin communicating more frequently. Ken and Andrew have just started in their positions and will build on the work that has been completed to date. On the call, he asked that participants consider where are we now, what have we covered so far, what are the possibilities and where/how would we like to move forward? Although we will not resolve these issues during the call, we would like to keep these organizing concepts in mind and pose some options and possibilities for next steps.

Partners on the call introduced themselves. A total of 41 participants were on the call. A full attendee list is provided at the end of these minutes.

Ken then introduced Tony Leger, Acting Northeast Regional Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Tony Leger welcomed the participants on behalf of Regional Director Marvin Moriarty and Deputy Regional Director Wendi Weber. Tony indicated that he is acting for them throughout the summer. He indicated that the Northeast Region is invested in working harder and smarter with our partners for landscape-scale conservation. The commitment of a broad range of partners is vital. He extended his thanks to the meeting participants for being on the call and their commitment to the partnership.

Ken Elowe provided some context for the development of the Landscape Conservation Cooperative (LCC). One of the things that we must do as a partnership moving forward is establish what an LCC is so that we as partners can clearly articulate the mission of the North Atlantic LCC. He noted the following major themes.

1. Our agencies and organizations exist because the public expects an outcome of the conservation of fish and wildlife into the future.
2. We need to translate those expectations into conservation actions.
3. We need to create conservation designs for sustainable landscapes that incorporate those conservation actions and take care of all components of the landscape: land, water, wildlife, and cultural resources.
4. We need to identify science needs and implement science projects that increase our effectiveness in achieving goals related to sustaining land, water, wildlife and cultural resources and that take into account uncertainties, including climate change, and their impact on future landscapes.
5. We need to develop tools based on this science that are useful to managers and decision-makers by guiding decisions on implementation of conservation actions at multiple spatial scales.

6. We need to have a feedback loop to monitor effectiveness of conservation actions and of the LCC process.

All of these opportunities relate to the science foundation of the LCC. LCCs provide us with nothing less than the opportunity to change the way we do conservation in this country and around the world – and the North Atlantic LCC has the opportunity to lead the way.

Ken posed a few questions to the partners on the call and asked that they ponder answers to these questions from their organization's perspective as we establish the North Atlantic LCC over the next few months.

1. What's your agency/organization's biggest challenge to achieving landscape scale conservation?
2. What does your agency/organization need from an LCC to meet those challenges?
3. What opportunities do you see with the LCC to overcome those challenges?
4. What can your agency/organization bring to the LCC?

We are striving to build a long-term relationship based on mutual commitment. How we respond to these questions can help establish and sustain a stronger partnership.

Ken noted that we hope to have a few more conference calls in the coming months leading up to a face to face meeting in November in New Hampshire before the Northeast Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, Directors Meeting.

Agenda Item 2: Updates on LCC Staffing

USFWS: Ken Elowe indicated that in addition to hiring the North Atlantic LCC Coordinator (Andrew Milliken), the Communications Specialist (Megan Nagel) and his Science Applications Assistant Regional Director's position, the USFWS will be hiring an Appalachians LCC Coordinator very soon. Rick Bennett noted that the Appalachians LCC coordinator will be located in Blacksburg, Virginia at Virginia Tech. Ken Elowe mentioned a science coordinator position in the North Atlantic LCC has been brought up in previous discussions. At some point, USFWS may fill that position but will first identify what capacities are missing in the partnership and what additional staff can best help facilitate the partnership.

USGS: Bill Lellis (USGS, Leetown Science Center) indicated USGS received funding of about $300,000 for research support of the LCC at the Leetown Science Center (including the Conte Fish Laboratory). USGS will put it toward two positions: one permanent research population modeler and one student eco-hydrology from the University of Massachusetts (UMass) Environmental Engineering department.

Rachel Muir (USGS) added that USGS will be establishing the Northeast Wildlife and Climate Change Center in 2012. There will be a strong relationship between this center and the LCC. The RFP for this center will go out next year.

NPS: Rick Bennett (USFWS) indicated that the National Park Service will be hiring a liaison for their Cooperative Ecosystem Studies Unit (CESU) to work with the NALCC. Rick Harris (NPS/Northeast) noted that each NPS region is developing its own position description for an LCC liaison position. The Northeast Region (NPS) will be advertising its LCC liaison position at the end of the month. This position is multi-disciplinary, including expertise ranging from natural to cultural resources. It will be housed at

the University of Rhode Island-Narragansett CESU. NPS plans to seek candidates with strong coastal resource background, because this is a big component of this CESU. NPS hopes to have these hired by October/November 2010.

Diane Pavek (NPS/National Capital Region) said that they are hiring an Urban Landscape Ecologist at a GS 13/14 level to be located in DC at the Center for Urban Ecology in support of all urban areas in LCCs. They are close to advertising that position.

EPA: Rick Bennett (USFWS) noted that the Environmental Protection Agency EPA is working with FWS to develop a detail from EPA to the North Atlantic LCC. Tom DeMoss (EPA) indicated that the detail was Deputy Director of ES in Region 3, located in Philadelphia. This position will interface landscape and water quality with the NALCC and Appalachians LCC.

David Whitehurst (Virginia) asked how the USFWS is looking at strategic placement of resources to operate at a landscape level.

Ken Elowe (USFWS) answered that USGS has pondered where to place positions and we need to consider it as we move forward and look at what capabilities we need.

Andrew Milliken (USFWS) added that we will assess the capacity we have and need and how we topically and geographically place capacity to ensure all parts of the region are well served. The same issue has come up with projects relative to working with Coop. Units. Andrew also noted that Ken McDermond from the South Atlantic LCC (South Atlantic LCC) was on the call and that it is critical that there is a strong relationship between the North and South Atlantic LCCs, so that all Atlantic coast-wide issues are addressed consistently and we build off and work with each other to not duplicate efforts.

Patricia Riexinger (New York) noted that the Coop. Unit in New York is filling positions with researchers who can respond and work on climate change and landscape level planning. Ken Elowe (USFWS) noted that in Maine that was also an important consideration for filling vacant positions in the Coop. Unit.

Andrew Milliken also noted that Kevin Whalen from USGS is on the call and thanked him for identifying interests and specialties of Coop. Units from around the region to address LCC needs.

Agenda Item 3: Update on USFWS North Atlantic LCC FY2010 Funded Science Projects

Ken Elowe (USFWS) said over the past year, there have been a number of discussions about how to best use science funding through the USFWS for the North Atlantic LCC in Fiscal Year 2010 and show progress on major items. There were some very high priority needs that came out of NEAFWA Regional Conservation Needs, Atlantic Coast Joint Venture, and other partnerships that could be funded with this year's project money.

Andrew Milliken (USFWS) discussed the details of the process and projects funded in FY 2010, totaling about $925,000. There are additional funds for capacity building through staff and projects that will be spent on projects this fiscal year or early in the next fiscal year. Although the funding for science needs through the USFWS is important, Andrew noted the success of the LCC depends on a broad range of funding sources to support the many science needs in the North Atlantic. Andrew also noted that we need to avoid the perception that the LCC is going to be just a Request for Proposals process.

This past year, staff from the USFWS Northeast Region compiled a list of project needs from existing programs and partnerships. This list was prioritized by a multidisciplinary Strategic Habitat Conservation team, and recommendations on projects to fund were reviewed and approved by the USFWS Regional Directorate Team to identify the most foundational landscape conservation projects. There are fact sheets on each of the selected projects on the meeting website with more details on each of the projects. All of the projects are done or almost done with the contracting phase.

There were four projects funded in FY2010:

1) Regional vulnerability assessments that build on Northeast states' vulnerability assessment projects. The funding will go to the Wildlife Management Institute and will be added to the pooled State Wildlife Grant funds in support of a project to be selected for the identified Regional Conservation Need on climate change vulnerability. $100,000

2) Work on "Designing Sustainable Landscapes". This project started with the Atlantic Coast Joint Venture with the goal of developing a consistent approach for conservation design to assess existing and future habitat capabilities for sustaining wildlife, how these capabilities are going to change due to climate change, urban growth and other major drivers, and how conservation actions can be targeted based on this information through decision support tools. The Designing Sustainable Landscapes project principal investigators are at University of Massachusetts Amherst and University of Vermont. The project will also involve The Nature Conservancy, states, U.S. Forest Service, USGS, Atlantic Coast Joint Venture and the investigators from the first phase of the project in the South Atlantic at (North Carolina State University). These two phases together will develop a consistent conservation design for the entire Atlantic Coast. $405,000

> David Whitehurst (Virginia) asked if there are connections between the vulnerability assessment project and this project. Andrew said these projects are complementary ways to assess vulnerability and strategies to increase resilience. The regional vulnerability assessments will primarily utilize expert panels to identify vulnerable species and habitats and to build a model based on this input. The Designing Sustainable Landscapes project is a data-driven modeling approach to understanding changes to landscapes, habitats, and their relationship to wildlife populations that will inform vulnerability assessments and conservation planning.
>
> Rachel Muir (USGS) made the point that we need to have some expertise on the hydrologic components in the LCC and indicated that USGS is developing an eco-hydrology workshop or working group to contribute to LCC projects.

3) Forecasting Stream Flow project, an aquatic-focused effort with a similar overall goal to the Designing Sustainable Landscapes project. In this project, predicted changes to streams will be used to assess impacts to a representative species – the Eastern brook trout. Decision support tools to guide conservation actions will be then be developed. The project is being led by the University of Massachusetts, USGS, U.S. Forest Service and USFWS and is a priority of the Brook Trout Joint Venture. $420,000

> Bill Hyatt (Connecticut) noted the project fact sheet says that this project will look specifically at brook trout but later says salmonids. Was that intentional? Will the project address larger

populations of cold water species? Andrew Milliken said, this project will start with brook trout, and later expand to other cold water fish and invertebrates.

Patricia Riexinger (New York) expressed her concern that we are focusing on fish when in fact we should be looking at aquatic ecosystem design. Andrew noted that this project was envisioned as expanding to incorporate all aquatic organisms.

Jad Daly (Trust for Public Land) asked about the involvement of Trout Unlimited (TU) as a partner and David Whitehurst agreed that it is important that these projects are connected with existing projects. Rick Bennett (USFWS) noted that we already have an Eastern Brook Trout Joint Venture (EBTJV) letter of support for this project, including TU and indicating TU's support.

Andrew Milliken (USFWS) noted it would be great to have TU on the committee overseeing the project and noted that in general we should have projects overseen by a committee to ensure that the research projects meet implementation needs. He also emphasized that each funded project is based on priorities from existing partnerships: the vulnerability assessments are based on the states' Regional Conservation Needs program, the Designing Sustainable Landscapes project on the ACJV and South Atlantic LCC project, and the Forecasting Stream flow on EBTJV/fish habitat work.

Rick Harris (NPS/Northeast) asked how the LCC will operate as a governing body in the future and for selecting projects. Andrew noted this would be covered later in the agenda.

4) Andrew noted that the fourth project would test the assumption that using representative species in conservation planning leads us to actions that adequately address the needs of a larger suite of species. This UMass project will look at the assumptions that go into selecting those species and how the results compare to other approaches of conservation planning, including coarse filter ecological integrity approaches. This analysis will help us understand how we can complement species-habitat based approaches with ecosystem based approaches. This funding came from USFWS LCC funds that were not used for staffing this year. $120,000

Patricia Riexinger (New York) noted that Angela Fuller at Cornell Coop. Unit did some work like this in Maine working with TNC; she recommend that getting Angela involved in this project. Andrew agreed and will work with UMass to make sure that happens.

Andrew then noted additional funding may become available for projects, depending on what happens with USFWS hiring this year. If funding becomes available, USFWS will work with partners to decide how to select those additional projects.

Agenda Item 4: Update on USGS North Atlantic LCC FY2010 Funded Science Projects and Climate Science Center Funds

Bill Lellis (USGS) noted that USGS will add two components to the Forecasting Stream Flow project. The first is adding to the project a component on freshwater mussels -especially the dwarf wedge mussel, identified in the North Atlantic LCC Operations Plan as a priority species. The project will then focus on both a fin fish and benthic organism using the same stream habitat. USGS has also added a population genetics component to the project to determine whether genomic tools can be used to predict species'

population potential to adapt to climate change. These projects were chosen based on existing strengths at Leetown Science Center and the needs of the North Atlantic LCC. USGS Leetown Science Center has an existing, strong eco-hydrology program looking at flow for freshwater mussels, and the process of developing the study plans is still underway.

Andrew Milliken (USFWS) noted that the USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center is assigned to work with the South Atlantic LCC and has particular expertise in terrestrial wildlife. Ideally, both Patuxent and Leetown can support both the North Atlantic LCC and South Atlantic LCC as well as the Appalachians. The idea is to make the best use of their respective expertise. Rachel Muir (USGS) agreed and noted it is the role of the regional office to identify the needs and then USGS will tap the centers to assist the LCCs as those needs are identified. Graham Smith (USGS Patuxent WRC) noted that Patuxent Wildlife Research Center has a wide interest and expertise to bring to the LCC efforts.

Agenda Item 5: Key Points From Previous Discussions: Framing Next Steps

Ken Elowe (USFWS) led this discussion, noting that we need to think about the North Atlantic LCC's mission, products, and governance. Rick Bennett (USFWS) noted the need to continue to work toward resolving how the North Atlantic LCC will communicate and operate. Although partners are conceptually on board, it is necessary to facilitate North Atlantic LCC decisions and communications in light of everyone's workload. Conference calls and linking with other meetings are starting points to figuring out how to best do this. We also need a sound decision-making process based on a framework in a structure and governance document. We will want to consider a number of questions, including how do we maintain and enhance communication for those not on the Steering Committee? Rick said he has also heard concerns about how we move together into the future and identify challenges and needs for landscape scale conservation? Rick said we need to identify our collective capacities beyond the $1 million from the USFWS—this is a cooperative, so how can we pool our resources to be most useful and effective? His experience to date has shown these to be big broad areas that we need to address in the next evolution of the partnership.

Ken Elowe (USFWS) indicated some of the conversations he has had with state directors have been focused on: 1) What is an LCC, and what is it relative to other partnerships that are going on, such as joint ventueres, fish habitat partnerships and what does an LCC bring above and beyond that?; 2) What makes it worth my time to be engaged-what do I bring home; and 3) how do I run this from a logistical standpoint?

A lot of these questions have been discussed through existing efforts such as the RCN program, joint ventures, fish habitat partnerships, and the Regional Plan Association initiative. Also, the New England Governors have gotten together and said they want landscape conservation to happen in a coordinated way and suggested that the LCC could serve as the umbrella for these tasks. A significant challenge articulated has been that people can't go to 4-5 partnership meetings that overlap 80% in purpose. It will be important, therefore, that the LCC play a complementary and additive role to existing partnerships and that parallel landscape conservation efforts converge under the LCC umbrella.

Andrew Milliken (USFWS) noted that the ACJV has had discussions about these same issues in its last three meetings. A key question being asked is how the ACJV relates to LCCs. At its December meeting, the ACJV decided that one of its approaches is to make sure ACJV board members are actively involved in the LCCs. Andrew noted that a number of ACJV board members were on this call. Another key

question asked by the board was how the science needs of the LCC relate to the ACJV. The ACJV decided to provide a prioritized list of science needs to the LCCs in its boundary. A number of these needs are being funded through the North or South Atlantic LCCs this fiscal year. The final issue discussed was how to most effectively build on existing structures rather than duplicate them. The ACJV and the LCCs need to work closely, and they may have joint meetings whenever it makes sense to do so. A significant amount of discussion around coordination and logistical issues occurred at the last ACJV meeting in July. Andrew quoted Cal Dubrock from the last ACJV board meeting by saying that this [need for coordination to ensure landscape conservation for all taxonomic groups] is a "great problem" to have because it's something we all believe we need – we just have to make the logistics work. The ACJV board agreed that it can serve an important role in tying the multiple LCC efforts together in the flyway, representing science and technical needs for birds in Atlantic coast LCCs and in linking LCC science to management on-the-ground by JV partners.

Wayne MacCallum (Massachusetts) asked when in the LCC process will we address the finalization of LCC boundaries. He feels Vermont should not be divided into two LCCs or have the Hudson River separated out. Andrew said the Department of the Interior has said LCC boundary issues will be addressed in 2011. In the meantime, we need to work with neighboring LCCs to propose any necessary and mutually agreeable boundary change.

Patricia Riexinger (New York) noted that because the resource issues we are working with will not always adhere to rigid boundaries, it is important to recognize that LCC boundaries aren't rigid boundaries but fuzzy ones - this is really important.

Andrew Milliken indicated that he will make an action item to work with other LCC coordinators on LCC boundary change proposals. He also agreed that these are fuzzy boundaries, but he recognizes the need for defined boundaries logistical reasons.

Agenda Items 6, 7, 8: Draft Structure and Governance, Interim Steering Committee, Opportunities for building on existing partnerships

Ken Elowe (USFWS) started this discussion by raising the draft Structure and Governance document prepared for the North Atlantic LCC, based on the November partner meeting conversation and the work of a small representative group of partners who worked on it over the past winter. It mirrors the joint venture and other existing partnership frameworks.

Recognizing the short time allotted in this call for discussion, Ken asked the participants on the call for their thoughts about the document. He asked what kind of process do we need to move forward. How does it interact with existing partnerships? He said we want to build a complementary structure that is not duplicative and that allows for evolution and flexibility over time. Ken asked for some group direction on how to move forward with the draft Structure and Governance document.

Comments generated included:

- Ken Elowe (USFWS) said he thought the steering committee representatives need the authority to commit funds and staff time but need to be supported by scientific information, staff and technical committees or work groups.

- Rick Harris (NPS) said the proposed steering Committee is really land-centric, and we need to engage more marine and coastal partners. More NGOs maybe, need to reach out to those folks.
- Bill Hyatt (Connecticut) asked how many state fish and wildlife agencies include marine interests? Ken Elowe said about half of those in the NALCC. Ken noted he has heard from partners that [marine resources] are an under-represented aspect of the partnership.
- Patricia Riexinger (New York) pointed out this is the "North Atlantic" LCC. Have we reached out to the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC)? Rick Bennett (USFWS) said that the ASMFC has an aquatic habitat committee so there is a nexus for the North Atlantic LCC and the ASMFC.
- Rick has heard in discussions about how the marine environment tied in to coastal LCCs extend out to the EEZ, but really, they can go out as far as necessary.
- Leroy Young (Pennsylvania) was at the ASMFC meeting this week, where there was a workshop on ecological modeling. He noted ASMFC is moving into this area on a broader scale.
- Rachel Muir (USGS) also noted the Northeast Regional Oceans Council-encompasses all three of the region's LCCs. Emily Greene, coordinator for Atlantic Coast Fish Habitat Partnership may be NALCC liaison, but we should stay in close communication with the JV in the other LCCs.
- Ken Elowe agreed on the need for marine and coastal representation but noted that each state will need to decide how to most efficiently provide representation from their state.
- Gwen Brewer (Maryland) also noted the need to include plants and plant communities.
- Leroy Young noted that Pennsylvania has three different natural resource agencies that need to be represented at the LCC, how do they organize participation?
- Ken Elowe asked how states would like to ensure their multiple resource issues are represented; how would they want to retain enough energy and level of agreement to make the process useful?
- Patricia Riexinger asked if we could we include Nature Serve, which coordinates the state Natural Heritage Programs and plant conservation?
- Rachel Muir noted that [Nature Serve] is very plant-centric, which is good, and it has regional representatives who could help transform the concerns of individuals.
- Cal Dubrock (Pennsylvania) noted that Nature Serve does not have statutory responsibilities or jurisdiction, so the states will need to decide how best to incorporate such concerns.
- David Whitehurst (Virginia) agrees with Cal about the need to have a very clear understanding of the purpose of the LCC with regard to the interests and stakeholders that need to be represented.
- Scot Williamson (WMI) noted that the Canadians are vital to the partnership and also members of NEAFWA. It may be one way to crack the nut of that partnership to get them involved in the RCN program with an emphasis on climate change so that the committee doesn't get overly complicated.
- Rick Bennett (USFWS) noted that a few months ago at the Trilateral Committee for Wildlife and Ecosystem Conservation and Management meeting was in Halifax the Canadian representatives seemed to have an extreme interest in getting engaged in LCCs. They just don't know how yet.
- Ken agreed that is good to point out they are a part of NEAFWA-maybe we can make it a little easier for them to provide input.
- Andrew agreed to make a modification to the draft Structure and Governance document to reflect that states will determine how best to represent their own diverse array of relevant natural resources issues through their representative on the Steering Committee.
- Ken asked – are there any other changes or can we go with this as a flexible interim structure to make decisions?

- Jad Daly (TPL) commended the team on the document, and said it is tremendous and captures the right body of work . Jad thought it a great starting point, and he recommended we can move forward.
- Rachel Muir (USGS) agrees we can begin to move on to the specific governance structure, such as the technical committees. She feels we can start thinking about those committees and what they can bring to the LCC.
- Ken Elowe noted that they don't have to be created new-they can be a part of committees that already exist, like the RCN and JV technical committees. In trying to prevent redundancy, we can build on those existing structures. We want to build as much efficiency in as possible.
- Dan Sealy (NPS/National Capital Region) asked about how FACA (Federal Advisory Committee Act) applies to LCCs? Rick Bennett noted that we are waiting for guidance from Washington regarding this matter.
- Ken Elowe (USFWS) asked for any other issues for discussion, and if there were none, if we can go forward with the current draft Structure and Governance document (with minor changes based on this discussion).
- Patty Riexinger (New York) suggested that we just use it-if we find bumps-we'll address them then.
- Paul Peditto (Maryland) agreed but asked where we left the marine representation issue? Ken Elowe replied that we will put the invitation out to the marine agencies and the states will have to decide within themselves how to decide on representation.
- Cal Dubrock (Pennsylvania) asked for clarification - a solicitation would go to a state to be on the steering committee, anybody can show up, but each state will have one seat? Ken replied that his suggestion would be that each state has a vote, and each state can decide among their representation how to use that votes, and they should include their marine input and representation. He will call each state and see what the best way to extend the invitation and bring the right partners to the table.
- Leroy Young (Pennsylvania) asked are the other LCCs producing the same type of structure or are they similar? Ken Elowe replies that they are similar and Andrew confirmed that LCCs are all learning from each other and existing partnerships. He said all LCCs will have a steering committee/board that will be supported by staff and informed by technical committees.
- Ken Elowe confirmed that we will start by using the existing document and thanked the group for input. He and Andrew will be in touch with states with multiple agencies and issuing invitations.

Andrew continued the discussion on building on partnerships to provide technical input. His goal is to really understand what partnerships already exist that we can build off of to provide technical input to the NALCC. We probably don't need a bird committee because we have one with the ACJV and similarly, we can build on the Atlantic Coast Fish Habitat Partnership, Eastern Brook Trout JV, and Partners in Amphibian and Reptile Conservation. There are also groups that have already integrated among taxa like the Northeast Wildlife Diversity Technical Committee and Habitat Committee. We should form task groups as we need them, but we should use existing groups to the extent we can. He asked that steering committee members let him know via email or phone about the committees that exist and if you have specific ideas. The Northeast Regional Oceans Cooperative was also suggested.

Agenda Item 9: Process for input on science needs and projects building on existing partnerships: Progress and next steps

Ken Elowe (USFWS) noted that in the evolution of RCN development, the identification of science needs was relative to a big picture. It is important that we establish the larger context for LCC science needs.

What would be counter-productive is for the NALCC to be viewed as an RFP/funding source, rather than an intentional and holistic landscape scale conservation approach that builds capability to effectively meet challenges to fish and wildlife populations and habitats in the landscape.

Andrew Milliken said in order to support that process, we need to deliver that message to technical groups and begin to specify parameters of a request for science needs. He offered to draft up what it is that we are looking for in terms of science needs and have the steering committee react to it. Rather than a general request, we need to clearly articulate what we are looking for and why. Once he gets that feedback, the partnership can establish a process for review and prioritization of those needs and for specific projects in FY 2011. There may also be a shorter-term need to prioritize projects for additional FY 2010 funds.

Scot Williamson (WMI) discussed the RCN process. The topic areas developed by the Northeast Wildlife Diversity Technical Committee results in an RFP for needs. There is still an evolution in our thought process that some of the topics need to be very specific with specific requests. Some projects are time-sensitive. Some are holistic enough they need to be fuzzy. There is a move toward being more specific with the recognition that the process should adapt to new ideas and thinking.

Agenda Item 10: Proposed Communications Tools for Project Sharing: Next steps

Ken Elowe (USFWS) asked if we should schedule more conference calls between now and a face-to-face meeting planned for November, in order to follow-up on action items and build the agenda for November? There are decisions that have to be made on projects for FY2011 by this winter.

Ken said there is an advantage to holding the LCC and the November NEAFWA Director's meetings back-to–back, because it will help create synergy and make travel more efficient. Ken said he was willing to do whatever the group thought necessary. Andrew Milliken (USFWS) noted that in early October we can provide an update on input regarding science needs from the other venues.

Rachel Muir (USGS) thought that approach sounded reasonable. She felt it was unlikely we would have a federal budget by November; we will be probably be on a continuing resolution. We should plan with that in mind.

Scot Williamson (WMI) and Andrew agreed that they should use the NEAFWA Wildlife Diversity Technical Committee (in September) to coordinate RCN and LCC needs and discuss them.

Ken Elowe agreed that we would like to build on those partnerships and bring them under the LCC umbrella.

Ken suggested we discuss how to articulate our mission and purpose so that it is consistent and effectively communicates the purpose and intent of the LCC to all relevant audiences. To that end, Ken introduced Megan Nagel, USFWS public affairs specialist working in the Region 5 Science Applications office, who would explain our options for communication.

Megan noted that we have two communications challenges with the partnership: 1. How we communicate publicly 2. How we communicate amongst ourselves and share information and documents. She asked of the group of participants, would you prefer a *.org* or *.gov* Website? And do

we need a place to share documents, data, and projects? (Refer to Handout 7 for a detailed list of needs and challenges)

Patricia Riexinger (New York) asked that emails related to documents being posted be organized as regular, weekly (or less frequent) updates, as opposed to more frequent updates or an expectation members of teams will remember to check the site on their own. Megan Nagel agreed that is a good idea and will make sure that happens.

Rachel Muir (USGS) noted that a *.org* may not be the most preferable because it may be hard to find on a search. Andrew Milliken (USFWS) noted that the web presence should be the partnership's face, not the USFWS, which is why he thinks a *.org* is preferable.

Rachel Muir asked that we make a standard PowerPoint presentation – brief and up-to-date – for any of us to use when talking about the North Atlantic LCC, with general bullets and topics in the notes section? Andrew and Megan agreed to make one available.

Ken Elowe said there seemed to be agreement on moving forward with establishing a North Atlantic LCC website and a site where we can manage projects and share information. Megan will work on getting those established.

Ken asked in closing that we continue to exchange ideas on the challenges we face and the opportunities that we have as we move forward.

Ken McDermond (USFWS, South Atlantic LCC) noted that the Gulf Coast Plains and Ozarks have a meeting in the fall, and they will soon be hosting a call. David Whitehurst noted that the Appalachian JV and EBTJV are having a joint meeting in October.

Andrew Milliken mentioned in closing that he was thrilled to be in this position working with the partners in the North Atlantic. He asked that partners call or email him at anytime.

Ken reminded the partners of the questions he asked them to ponder. From your organization's perspective:

1. What's the biggest challenge to landscape scale conservation?
2. What do you need from an LCC to meet those challenges?
3. What opportunities do you see with the LCC to overcome those challenges?
4. What can your organization bring to the LCC-take home and bring because this is a partnership/cooperative?

Ken said he was excited to be a part of this, it is a huge opportunity to change the way we do conservation in this region and this country. He thanked everyone for participating.

The next call will be scheduled for early October and the next in-person meeting is scheduled for November 17 in conjunction with the NEAFWA Directors meeting in New Castle, New Hampshire.

Call was adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Conference Call Attendees and Organization

Ken Elowe	USFWS
Andrew Milliken	USFWS, North Atlantic Landscape Cooperative
Rick Bennett	USFWS
Tony Leger	USFWS
Edith Thompson	USFWS
Megan Nagel	USFWS
Bill Lellis	USGS Leetown Science Center
Marci Caplis	USFWS
Shaun Erying	NPS Northeast
Hector Galbraith	Manomet
Patricia Riexinger	New York State DEC
Bill Hyatt	Connecticut DEP
Diane Pavek	NPS National Capital Region
Dan Campbell	NPS National Capital Region
Pat Sealy	NPS National Capital Region
John Schmidt	NPS National Capital Region
Cal Dubrock	Pennsylvania Game Commission
Leroy Young-PA	Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission
Lise Hanners	The Nature Conservancy
Tom Dubois	EPA Region 3
Christina Stringer	Bureau of Indian Affairs
Larry Herrighty	New Jersey Division of Fish and Wildlife
George Gay	National Wildlife Federation
Danielle Swallow	NOAA
Bob Lent	USGS
Mike Slattery	USFWS Chesapeake Bay
Graham Smith	USGS Patuxent Science Center
Rachel Muir	USGS Northeast Region
Ken McDermond	USFWS, South Atlantic Landscape Cooperative
Kevin Whalen	USGS
Scot Williamson	Wildlife Management Institute
David Whitehurst	Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries
Wayne MacCallum	Massachusetts Division of Fisheries and Wildlife
John O'Leary	Massachusetts Division of Fisheries and Wildlife
Paul Lund	USGS
Tom Oppenheimer	Mass Audubon
Gwen Brewer	Maryland DNR
Paul Peditto	Maryland DNR
Rick Harris	National Park Service
Tom DeMoss	Environmental Protection Agency
Jad Daley	Trust for Public Land
Bill Uihlien	USFWS Lower Mississippi Valley Joint Venture