

**Strategic Habitat Conservation Workshop
Gulf Coast Plains & Ozarks
Landscape Conservation Geography**

RAW RECORDED NOTES

Tuesday, March 16, 2010

Jean Brennen – *Science Based Management Challenges in Contemporary Conservation*

- Discussion of the 6th Extinction
- Drivers of change – Converging Technology, Energy, \$/Economy, Governance, Demographics
- Currently 75% of fishable waters are either over fished or fully exploited
- Impacts of Induced givens
 1. Continuance of climate Change
 2. Effort to limit GW to 2 degrees C
 3. 3-4 degree change will result in little species adaptability
 4. Extreme weather events increase with climate change
 5. Biome shifts toward north as climate increases in temp
 6. Zonal shifts / species movement - non “analog”
 7. Ecosystems disrupted

- Uncertainty of climate change causes paralysis
- Working towards “1km” models – current +/- 5km
- Better modeling will result in requests for more specific models – more accurate info
- Move toward “Act and Study” mentality – treat research more as hypothesis
- Categories of Adaptation measures:
 1. Sustained Response
 2. Active Adaptation

- New Paradigm should be focus on composition, structure and function
- Discussion of pro’s and con’s of assisted migration
- Process of accretion – LA used as example

Bill Uihlein – A Way of Working Challenge

Discussion of:

- Current and future housing densities on species – use of public doctrine
- 21st Century challenges – both formidable and complex
- Conservation and Transition – US moving toward 3rd ERA
- Comparison of Resource Management and Conservation Science
- Government performance viewed poorly considering current challenges
- Way of working challenges – Mississippi Alluvial used as example – discussion of alternative visions and the increasing use of “industrial” visions which “sound good” to the public
- Need to work areas as a system to achieve system level impacts, recognize function interdependence, and strive for functional connectivity, recognizing “niches” and support
- Coming to terms with the term “SHC” – Taking “habitat” out of SHC – offers some relief to a few but doesn’t change the need to accept the “new” science, scalability and interdependence SHC will req.

Mike Millard – SHC-The Framework and Practical Application

- SHC= Science based, Approach-planning, Design, Delivery monitoring, and Research
- Why SHC now? – recognition of Increased public awareness, and need for more science intensity, increased accountability;
- New Strategic and Specific Approach – SHC’s goal is population based and driven vs. acres/miles recovered.
- SHC’s Basic framework = an adaptive process (5 elements):
 1. Biological Planning
 2. Conservation Design,
 3. Conservation Delivery
 4. Outcome Monitoring
 5. Assumption based research
- Strategic spending of funds to equal greatest increase in population.

Discussion on:

- Usefulness of modeling to achieve population increase
- Challenges of new strategic approach – Fostering new SHC culture, Monitoring capacity, easing employee uncertainty, Leading and managing the change.
- Example of working SHC approach –Red knot pop’ns
- Challenge for SHC practitioner – creation of cohesive partnerships and expending effort to achieve targets rather than being opportunity based.

- How to implement SHC – understand the process, base decisions on SHC framework and work towards change to SHC
- Common perception - LCC's are being morphed into SHC's – LCC are in fact a component of SHC

Question and Answer period

Q. Why take the “H” out of SHC if it is in fact Habitat Conservation

A. Lose less people on topic, have to move away from traditional thinking and being so protective of current way of doing business – goal still has to be population growth not habitat restored.

Q. – We are still performance based on acres and miles so how can we move “forward” to new system?

A – Cindy – We are working on a new performance system to reflect new system, pilot program started in Chesapeake Bay.

Comment – These “new” approaches are in fact not new – “acres and miles” is a measurable standard that’s why we use it – some species are too difficult to accurately census. And what’s the cost going to be to implement this new system and where does \$\$ come from?

Cindy – goal is to use as many partnerships as possible to possibly split cost based on need – **undetermined** – bottom line is that SHC will be our new business model

Comment – Don’t get caught up in language used – principles have to driving force

Comment – SHC “name” will not be changed

Q: How does an LCC differ from JV?

A. **No definitive answer given** – Jv’s are bird focused – giant leap to LCC’s not probable, although some could create LCC’s fairly quickly

Comment – with use of LCC’s and more accurate modeling we can determine who would be able to do the most good. Also priority species will have to travel across map lines.

Q. How do we determine priority species with other agencies with so many being “priority”?

A. “Priority” for who and for what first has to be asked, then using the “umbrella” concept, applying filters and then determining what society will stand for, will ultimately determine actual priority species.

Media presentation will play a big part and there must be a priority to have public understand new “systems” concept.

Bill Uihlein, Mike Millard and Greg Wathen – Background, Status Report and Development of GCPO LCC

- Overview Discussion on background – climate change impact
- 2010 funding for LCC's and the stand up of 9 LCC's in FY 2010
- Quick overview of the 9 LCC's

Q: What about governance for new LCC's?

A. Broad guidance is coming – Steering committees will make final decisions (as of now)

Also, JV model works well for LCC's – being considered

- GCPO LCC implementation reactions and attitudes from briefed personnel – various camps – few in the “I'm in” camp
- Forming the LLC – approach should be horizontal based across agencies and sections not added on to any one agency.

Gregg Wathen – TWRA – speech on his mentors, state business models vs. federal, benefits of an LCC for states (mainly funding), forming their LLC and challenges associated.

Allison Shipp and Sonja Jones – USGS – discussion on climate change impacts for USGS, new wildlife science centers, South Regional Assessment Project, SERAP, data models that can be shared between agencies such as climate land changes, water tables, occupancy models and various other support tools.

Question and Answer period

Q: How would new LCC's have changed the outcome of previous fights between agencies?

A: Unknown; General feeling is that LCC's will lessen arguments possibly with “common” species priorities.

Q: Will NGO's be allowed on steering committees?

A: Cindy – (at this time) any entity will be able to sit on the committee. However it's officially undetermined – Feeling is yes they will be

Comment – there are hundreds of NGO's.....

Q: What will the Involvement of Tribes be?

A: Cindy - They will be able to participate to the extent they want.

Q: How will LCC's integrate with the new USGS science centers?

A: **No specifics given**; Feeling is that they will work together to create usable products for both. Steering committees will determine.

Q: How do LCC's and SHC overall fit in with fisheries?

A: **Asked to hold question till day 2** – after classes – info will given

Q: How does a JV run?

A: Staff and processes are designed around partnerships; Goal is to maintain long term partnerships

Q: What about disagreements?

A: They are resolved using a democratic process.

END

Wednesday, March 17, 2010

HAPPY ST. PATRICK'S DAY

CALL TO ORDER 8 AM

8 AM Dean Demarest opened the floor for questions

8:05 AM Dean introduced Cyndi Dohner

Recognition of workshop organizers

We need engagement from project leaders – there is funding, we need your input to ensure it is spent in the most effective way *in partnership*. Nothing is set in stone. Question about priorities – need to integrate SHC into day-to-day activities and work with supervisors to prioritize tasks

8:13 Dean introduced Steve Reagan

Overview of breakout exercise: exploring SHC for one species – planning, design, delivery, monitoring, and research elements and what they would entail

Numerous questions arose – legal mandates, where to enter the adaptive cycle and does it matter, how to explain SHC consistently and appropriateness of existing definitions, how to handle conflicts in priorities among partners, scale of planning and planning and how to connect, blurring of elements – is it okay for design to bleed into delivery

Topic for discussion – scale and what scale is appropriate for implementing SHC

Every scale

Organizational: Scale of partnerships – don't forget local partners

Spatial: All problems are scale-dependent, but can a field station "do" SHC

Taxonomic: can we do SHC on a single species or is it a community-wide effort

Delivery will happen at a smaller scale

Monitoring at broader scales to provide bigger picture of how we're succeeding

Planning drives scale –conflicts with CCP for single refuge vs. refuge complex

-Who coordinates the vision at broader scale (e.g., Delmarva fox squirrel)?

Product vs. process in consideration of scale

Topic for discussion – blurring elements of SHC. Do you have to follow circle and how does it affect your ability to come full circle?

There is no issue in blurring

Lines are clouded by existing programs and affects where you enter wheel

TIRPAK NOTE: SHC PROVIDES FRAMEWORK TO CONNECT VARIOUS PROGRAMS UNDER A UNIFIED OBJECTIVE. BLURRING IS BENEFICIAL – THERE NEEDS TO BE A CONNECTION AMONG PLANNING, DESIGN, DELIVERY, MONITORING, AND RESEARCH.

"Are we doing SHC " is not the question. Are we doing it well?

Static objectives or a cemented framework for achieving our goals is not SHC

Understanding objectives clearly and realistically is critical

Need to have common objectives with our partners for what is realistic (beaches)

Ecosystems are the key – species are windows into ecosystem function, benchmarks of our success, and tools to use to prioritize our efforts.

Understanding species-habitat relationships provides insights into conservation that are not necessarily self-evident (coastal restoration and benefits to our trust species)

Topic for discussion – what is the 30 second elevator ride description of SHC; 4th grade level

A new way of doing business; businesses that fail are those that don't adapt

Increasing the effectiveness of creating sustainable landscapes through increased collaboration and a strong scientific foundation

It is not redundant

What is the end vision and who sets it? The LCC can not establish these independently, otherwise it is not an LCC.

TIRPAK NOTE: SHC IS THE DRUMBEAT THAT GETS EVERYONE ROWING TOGETHER

NOT A ROMAN SLAVE SHIP, BUT RATHER A GOLD MEDAL CREW TEAM WITH EVERYONE TAKING A TURN AT COXSWAIN

LCC IS THE BOAT

WE STILL NEED TO KNOW WHERE WE'RE GOING...WATCH OUT FOR THE WATERFALL

SENRLG – becoming engaged in LCC

NOAA has a similar mission as LCCs in coastal zones

Role of education and outreach – we need to change people’s behaviors and values or we will never win

Communication message should focus on what you’re doing and why you need their help

Tailor your message and its delivery mechanism to the audience; empowers people to understand where they fit in the bigger picture

“Way of Working Challenge” PowerPoint is an effective communication tool. Can this be shared?

Get Jean Brennan’s definition of SHC:

She broke SHC down into three components for her definition:

strategic – a way of improving our science and science-based management

habitat – to achieve on the ground conservation of the natural world

conservation – to enhance the quality of life for our generation and for future generations

Get Dennis Figg’s definition of SHC:

“We don’t have enough money and manpower to save the world. Strategic habitat conservation is a way to direct our limited dollars and manpower to conserve as much fish and wildlife as we can in a rapidly changing world.”

So, putting it all together, strategic habitat conservation is a way of improving our science and science-based management, to achieve on the ground conservation of the natural world, to enhance the quality of life for our generation and for future generations.

Additional summary of Tuesday afternoon breakout discussions:

1) Issues of scale –

geographic scale
organizational scale
temporal scale
"taxonomic" scale

- Scales of activities must relate to the function of the activity
- for example, Delivery will continue to occur at local scales
 - but Planning or Design may occur at broader scales
- local implementation in the context of landscape sustainability

Think of SHC in terms of Products and Process

- developing and refining the process of "doing" SHC in other areas and solving other conservation problems can be as important as the actual products that are developed that represent those solutions

How do Policies that are in place relate to the scale at which we "do" SHC?

- for ex. HCPs and CCPs done at scales that may not relate well to the scale at which "strategic habitat conservation" would best be accomplished
- do these policies really "prevent" thinking about planning in the context of the bigger landscape
- CCP and other planning may not relate to a scale that is relevant for population regulation and sustainability for priority taxa (e.g., DelMarva Fox Squirrel comment)

2) Blurring the lines of the SHC Functional Elements

Is it important to know which Element of SHC you are doing as opposed to where in the process you are working and what the purpose of a given activity is?

"Blurring" is not a hindrance . . . so it may not be necessary to identify a given activity as being Planning vs Design vs Monitoring, etc

Understand the systematic, deliberate process that you are undertaking to facilitate effective delivery . . . we don't necessarily need to understand whether we are "in" Planning vs Design, etc.

Understanding Conservation Design as distinct from Biological Planning may relate to increasing levels of spatially defined information and direction as we move from Planning to Design.

3) When are we "doing" SHC?

Phrased more appropriately, we might ask instead, when are we conducting our activities effectively in the context of SHC?

Maybe what we're doing now "is" SHC, but we're just in the first iterations of it. We acknowledge room for improvement to be more effective, but does that mean we're not trying to be strategic at the moment.

- What information and capacity do we need to move us thru a more refined iteration of SHC

If we don't have clear, common objectives . . . can we really say we're doing things (SHC) most effectively?

- Goal isn't to be doing SHC per se, so much as to be using SHC to help us be more effective at conservation

- Having clear objectives may help synch up a lot of good ongoing work

10:00 AM BREAK

10:30 AM Reconvene – Dean introduced late morning program and partner perspectives

10:35 AM Joe DeVivo – NPS presentation

NPS big picture
Park Science – I&M program focuses solely on surveillance monitoring NOT management effects monitoring; **CESU?**
Planning Process – integrating across programs by having resource adaptation strategy: impact of cultural resources on wildlife resources
Conservation Challenge – conflict between cultural vs. natural resources and design and implementation must encompass full range with a human dimensions perspective
Role in LCCs and CSCs – hiring scenario planners; integrating with FWS I&M; nothing for GCPO

10:55 AM Dennis Figg – MDC and state wildlife action plan perspective

SHC may help us view sustainability at larger scale than our boundaries....perhaps SWWA is not highest priority in Missouri (relative to TX or AL), but does everyone recognize that.

The collaboration that helps you define your conservation vision at a broad scale is not the collaboration that helps you deliver that vision.

LCC provides information to help assess local scale projects in a larger perspective and help define role in conservation estate

SWAPs provide info on abundance and distribution of priority wildlife

Base habitat associations and list of focal species

SWAPs identify habitats and priority locations

SWAPs propose actions for conservation to help priority species

SWAPs don't connect but do compartmentalize the LCC effort; connected to LCC planning and modeling efforts will free up resources to do more on-the-ground conservation

11:20 AM Esther Stroh – USGS and Ozark Partnership

Organizational challenges –multiple partners with multiple regions and boundaries that are different

Look for overlap among partners – Ozark Summit 2008

ozarks.cr.usgs.gov

Additional summits held in 2009 and planned for 2010

Have not expanded forum to include stakeholders from private sector, cultural resources

Contributions: a venue for collaboration, website, all elements of SHC

Benefits: Development of science plan, structure under which to operate, buy-in and cover from respective agencies, additional dollars

There are lots of effective components of the conservation community that act fairly independently. Is there a way to bring them under a common umbrella without undermining their autonomy and

11:40 AM Ron Seiss – MDWFP

Cautiously optimistic and opportunistic; state and LCC priorities are not always the same...right now funding is critical

Involvement allows influence; bird conservation is not job 1 but provides mechanism for habitat conservation

LCC is natural progression with bigger picture habitat focus. It's happening fast

Benefit is collaboration on opportunities at larger scales; communication and time commitments of multiple staff; cost-sharing of staff

It all hinges on delivering on the ground – EX: BLH DFCs

11:50 AM Curtis Hopkins – Ducks Unlimited

NGO perspective that believes in partnerships and supports concept of LCCs

Science-based landscape approach to conservation is needed

Recognizes devil in the details

LCC is being developed top-down rather than bottom-up

Where is broader partnership participation?

Will all these pieces come together? LCCs vs. CSCs

Fear is this is moving too fast...caution needed to ensure broad participation.

Complexity is increasing taxonomically and geographically.

Social aspects must be addressed – policy involvement

11:57 AM Scott Robinson – SE Aquatic Resources Partnership

Big partnerships are difficult...we support it but we don't know how it will work

Landscape scale adaptive habitat conservation is the right approach

SARP already bringing together the network and the data to support hydrologic planning, design, and delivery in aquatic systems

Dennis Figg – excitement over LCC approach (compared to ecosystem approach) is due to restructuring role of science in management rather than just restructuring organization

Speed: is it too fast? How do we alter that perception?

Slow down as you engage external partners.

Figg – take advantage of existing partnerships; wind some down, step some up

Many resources available....need to capitalize on existing capacity

How do PLs stay engaged?

Many strategies – teamwork on technical teams

1:12 PM Dixie Birch kicks off the afternoon session of FWS program perspectives

1:13 PM Keith Weaver - NWRS

NWRS administered via organic legislation and establishing authorities that are manifest in refuge purposes

Refuge manager “psyche” – my piece of turf

Cooperative or Control

Will they take action?

Level of bureaucracy? Subservient? CCP vs. LCC? Priorities – spatial, taxonomic? Funding? Opportunities for input?

Benefits to LCC– study areas, funding, expertise

Benefits to NWRS-research, planning documents, Monitoring, implementing adaptive management

LCC should be a tool that the NWRS can use to improve its management efficiency

1:32 PM Randy Wilson – Migratory Birds

Migratory bird program fulfills needs for birds relative to LCC...who will do the other planning?

We are kidding ourselves if we think LCC staff will make up this difference!

Challenges-large landscapes, id of JV, coordination, building a cooperative

Benefits-increased capacity, increased delivery partnership

Concerns-long-term money, NAWCA competition, erosion of base funding, data calls, audience for LCC products

1:48 PM Bill Wayman-Fisheries

Survey of 5 Project Leaders – broad range of responses from little understanding of role or relationship of fisheries to LCC all the way to clear expectations of both LCC and fisheries role in broader conservation enterprise

Capabilities and capacity

LCC connections – fit very well in all aspects of SHC except design

2:00 PM Charlie Scott – ES

ES has primary role for risk assessment and risk abatement and PFW

What could we use to do conservation more effectively? How can we better share collection of information?

- Enhanced capabilities and access to expertise

- Enhanced monitoring design and analysis

- Enhanced decision making capabilities (SDM and DSTs)

- Habitat and population restoration techniques

What is role of LCC and how does it fit with ES?

- Focus on science delivery

- Commonalities of science needs and capacity

- Link key parts of different plan

- Integration of priorities

- Connect partners and conservation

Change Cycle

2:18 PM Panel Q&A

How do we prevent ESA from devouring LCC's time?

Partnership is the key. The partnership forum is not meant to absorb the individual tasks of the partners, but rather provide additional insight and coordination among partners to help them achieve their goals.

Joe DeVivo cautions against being too species-specific. Build into governance document some safeguards to focus on systems.

LCC must serve the needs of the partners, not the partners serving the LCC

Personnel hires are critical...need the right individuals in the right roles.

- Need to generate synergy, not be a drain on resources.

Developing an advisory committee

Checks and balances in NPS I&M program

- Limits on overhead

- Washington office cost code

- Organizational charters

LCC is a partnership, which is voluntary. Nothing is going to be mandated.

3 PM BREAK

Breakouts will return to discuss what does this mean for me as an employee.

Thursday, March 18, 2010

Housekeeping and Wednesday Recap

Concerns or challenges that came out during the discussions...

Did not anticipate any grand conclusions. It's more of a process of discussing ideas and getting different thoughts about SHC and LCCs.

Setup for discussion on small group activities

Steve Reagan – Discussions from breakout sessions

What are the roles within the proper SHC elements?

Started off pretty tame and got into some big issues

Start off slow and get into some of the individual roles that people described including partners.

No one has a good idea of what the LCC will be yet.

What are the individual roles and contribution of staff?

Individual Responses for roles

A lot of people had no idea of how to participate.

Will depend on LCC and what they step down to the field

Many people saw themselves in a role as technical experts

Conducting outreach going out and spreading the word

Providing delivery data and design

Peer review for plans

We don't want the LCC to be a group that sends out plans and tells us how it's done

Providing office space, equipment, support staff

Downscaling info from LCC to field and how it might work on the ground

Communication tools

A lot of unique expertise in the field – identify resources

I

Information and outreach

LCC role

Should be providing us with the big picture across the landscape

Identifying important partnerships direct outreach

Organize network and step down info

Funding

Collect, analyze data, and publish results

Specific roles/job titles

Should add expertise and expand focus of existing efforts instead of creating something new.
Help with existing projects and programs.

How will they know where to go to for a certain task?

Bill – how do we connect among all our expertise?

Working with USGS in Lafayette, LA developing a web based system so that individuals can identify their expertise by LCC . System would be setup where you can log in and register name and species or technical expertise and what you would be interested in, for example, modeling. What type of commitment you are willing to make ...Capacity assessment speaks to what's available... the system is in development and may be obsolete once the community gets started.

Comment: Employee wide assessment in Region 5. Mike Mallard?? in Region 5 has already developed a tool to evaluate resources and expertise and went to each field station gathering that info. Helped identify gaps.

Bill: that would be a data call and we are looking more for folks that want to make the effort or have the time

Kelly Purkey: Do we really have time? Can we integrate into what we are already doing?

Bill: the opportunity is there decline or participate, it's your choice. In the JV world the management board identified who was going to participate and gave them authority to work on DFCs. For LCCs that doesn't exist right now so how do you do that? How do we connect ourselves?

George: the way we've done it in the past is with a working group that you are familiar with and that person goes to who their aware of that's qualified then asks them

David Viker: good point we will always do that. We don't have to adjust our priorities, we just need to know what's out there.

Dean: What is the capacity it's nice to know what's out there and have the opportunity to participate?

Bob: this isn't open ended

There hasn't been a grassroots buy in. The partners have not been involved yet. They need to identify what the needs are and what is needed. No one asked the partners yet so they don't know what is needed. They are concerned.

What is the next step? We haven't been told? What's the next step as a group?

Impetus behind the tool...it is finding what's available and gives the expectation for participants

Prior to the meeting we didn't know who was who and the meeting has allowed them to meet and see what they have to offer, for example...Who is Randy Wilson, now I know and he has experience with modeling, now I will call him when I need help with modeling.

NEXT STEP...Organizational plan...we need to comment

If you have ideas and solutions please provide them

Randy Cook: No solution, but just a comment after working with the JV for 20 years we are not just interested in Delivery we want to be involved in design too. We need to be involved in the entire process. Everyone in the room is partners and we all need to have a say... the good products come about with involvement at all levels to get a good product with buy-in..We don't want top down we want to generate needs at the local level so that what is needed gets pushed up and included because it directly impacts what we do at the ground level

Dean: It's difficult for us to see how to get involved at one time. We need to get involved, but we also need to plan and let some other people plan and think about it and show us how to get involved. The natural tendency is for us to respond, not to develop. It's like, you gave me something to think about and now I want to get involved.

Kelly: I think the idea is good but I think it's early. Partners if you send them an email and say tell me how you can participate they will not jump in. You need to take the time to bring them on board first and get them involved before asking what you can do for me.

Bill: Agencies have same concerns that we have. We need a means in which we can communicate and collect that information. This format gives you the opportunity to allow people to participate without requiring it.

Comment: Need an LCC road show similar to the Nutria Road Show in the Delmarva Peninsula

Bill: Talked about interagency team to do that

Bob: I agree with the idea that it is too early. I like the tool but maybe we just need a checklist without names or time commitment, like we need a hydrologist do you have anything that you may be able to contribute

Dean: We need to be careful of what we are asking. We don't want to be a separate entity that is going to extract resources from already strapped folks

Barry: (on the database) we are not expecting to launch anytime soon this is a long term tool to be used by the coordinator

Keith: Will the LCC serve the programs or will the programs serve the LCC...fear is that we are now serving the beast. We need to get out of the weeds. It's too early

Randy Wilson: Form follows function until we have defined the LCC we can't do anything else and we don't know what we are selling or even asking for

Steve: We need buy-in but we don't have a message. Where does that leave us?

Don Voros: After 2 days ...the genesis of the LCCs is global climate change, am I wrong. We have not even talked about that. You are building a potential empire but we haven't addressed climate change

Jeff Fleming: There is still a little room between the lip and the cup. We don't know what it will look like. It's a big fat science partnership. As these LCCs get developed the partners and field folks are going to feed it, then the LCCs are going to provide Decision Support tools. We have to have some idea of what we are communicating

Don: Climate Change Centers what is their role in the LCC

Comment: They are providing expertise to feed to the LCCs. I don't think the LCC is that fuzzy of a creature. You have to start with a concept to get the idea out there to get buy in. If we want their buy in we have to bring them in now. There is something we will have to offer to people on the ground to help do things better. It's an integration making our work more effective and more cohesive.

Dean: there is a construct to the concept if we develop a road show that will force people to further consider the concept and help it grow and become more refined

We do know what LCCs are. Wwe add up all the issues including climate change. It's politically volatile...What if money goes away?

In many ways there are so many changes to land use. In many ways that is a funding opportunity to look at: Changing land use, irrespective of climate change and whether it is accepted by the public or not. LCCs and funding may go away with a new administration.

We need to be careful that we don't tie it so close to climate that we lose focus of the other stressors associated

Jeff: Climate is part of the mix but it is just one of the stressors that the LCCs will use to adjust management tools. There will be hurdles, but that is part of evolving conservation and there are opportunities

Top down vs. bottom up: We don't have enough money to do our jobs. Asked \$60 million to address scientific support, and OMB said no during change of administration. What we got back was \$10 million to support LCCs and \$10 million to get them going. The department asked us to model ours against the NPS. They got \$100 million and they've been doing it for 10 years. If we hang back and wait for all the answers we are going to miss the train. There's a lot of recognition at all levels that the FWS doesn't have the money to do what we need to do.

Bob: LCCs have to deal with all stressors including climate change and the climate change centers are still being built.

Comment: We are working to improve climate change models for years and are continuously narrowing it down. The political process is not going to stop the impacts of climate change. With declining budgets no one can stop this on their own. We will have to address it collectively if we want to make a difference.

LCCs would have come about without Climate Change. LCCs are an evolution from the JV embracing all birds and then black bears taking steps forward. Climate money and attention helped LCCs move forward quickly but independently at the same time

Partners are about other stressors not just climate change they want to address local issues like urban growth.

Bernie: Going out on a limb... We have heard this week that this is a partnership and the partners say they are not involved and that it is just big federal movement. Why aren't they involved in organization now, instead of telling them how it will be and how they can be involved? We need to have them sitting at the table with us right now. They will only be there if the money is there and we can show them what's in it for them.

Bill: You're 100% right. I was reluctant and resistant to holding this meeting. It's a communication thing. We are not making decisions here. We are working to understand what the cooperative is. There are steps being taken to get there. Each one of us touches partners every day. We should assure them that we want them involved and get to where we can have a common understanding in here to where we can convey to them that we are not creating the cooperative except stepwise. We haven't yet crossed that threshold that pulls us all together.

We have the community here, but how are we supposed to bring them all together without stepping on toes. We all need to communicate to our partners that we are not leaving them out.

The RO and guiding coalition has struggled with who to invite, how many partners and how to get them involved. How do we involve them without stepping over them? If you have an idea let someone know.

In the South Atlantic they are approaching it differently.

Why don't we have a meeting and invite partners? We want to talk to them and have them put something together and invite who they want.

Look at formative stages of the JV and use that model on a larger scale. They are all the same thing except on a larger scale with more species focus.

What's the point? The end game is not a partnership. We want to have an adaptation strategy. How do we tackle urban growth? The JV establishment was a nightmare and you already had everything established with flyways, councils, etc. It has to have value and be something that is producing enough that has the community wanting to keep it going.

Jim Boggs: I want to state the obvious. When congress allocates you 20 million you have to initiate something. It has to be top down at this point.

Bill: Everything is top down. It's a playground term. The top down is where we need to head. The bottom down is how we get there.

Comment: It's hard to get our heads around climate change with various policy choices. What we can all agree with is that this country is moving on with energy efficiency and alternative energy sources despite what it means for climate change.

Comment: I know very little about JV. When you go to talk to partners at meetings like the North American make sure you still aren't leaving out someone like OK. Maybe we should get a stadium and invite everybody.

Bill: We will make sure to give them the opportunity to include who they want to be there. This is not a giant science cooperative it's a giant science management cooperative. We want to know how to respond to urban growth and climate change. It's about thinking hard about how to approach these at all levels.

Deisha: They (Partners) don't want our workshops. Give them an opportunity to meet prior so that they can work together. We can initiate but allow them to talk among themselves and form their own opinions prior to throwing them in with our people.

We need to get beyond this room real quick and create the need and the demand and let them work on their own.

Individuals from each state have been involved but not to the extent that it should be.

Take the operational plan and send it out to us and allow us to review and send to our partners. Who knows what is going to happen. We need to hurry or we will miss an opportunity.

The Secretary views this geography as a high priority region because of the capacity that is there and the advances that we have made in the past. The RD is getting higher ups that want to come and see what is going on and why everyone wants to be involved. We are highly visible because of the potential.

America's Great Outdoors/Treasured Landscapes... Sec. of Interior wants to use that to jumpstart LCC geographies across the country. They want to start here because of the potential.

Bill: I'm crazy enough to think that if we get with Ricky Campbell and look at his alligator gar stuff and tie it into LA black bear and mig birds and all along that spectrum and paint a picture of what that system needs to look like, we could really have something.

Question: How do we talk to partners that don't know or may not have a clue about LCCs? Don't hesitate to talk to anyone especially if they don't know. Several agencies (federal and state) already have dialogue. We can't over communicate.

Comment: There are opportunities for funding from other LCCs through RFP's.

Question: Are there going to be talking points that people can take out and meet with their partners? Yes, those types of resources are available. Some were available on the table outside and others are available on the website. Not necessarily something you would hand out, but would be something to help frame your discussion.

Question: How do we keep our identity (Programs) throughout this process? Is there still concern? I don't see anything that will change anytime soon without some mass reorg of the FWS. It all depends on where the limited dollars are going and what does that mean for my program. Also what are the burdens that my station or program may endure? The LCC has to serve all needs not just FWS but also the partners.

What are the steps of the operational plan? What can we do with it? Do whatever you want with it. It is simply a means by which LCCs are built around and thinking about what is going on. It was a requirement and was written to be apologetic because everyone couldn't get involved. There are no decisions in there.

Take home message: What about that plan? It happened quickly we had a deadline and we wanted to demonstrate where we could go and not what will be done. It was the guiding document to get us in the cue and is only useful when we decide to build on it or revamp it. It was only a starting place to see how we wanted to participate and how to make it better.

Bill: Networking opportunity...NING technology creates networks. By invitation only, but when you are invited you can invite who you want. A way to share info, documents, comments, etc. We have to figure out a process to determine science needs that we have and our partners have and how to access those needs. Integrated science team will help determine science needs, synthesize them, and push them through to the steering committee. Everyone will have the opportunity to contribute to and participate with those needs.

This isn't a start over thing. People have been doing this already. It may be a fresh look but we will gather what's already been done.

What is planned what are the next steps?

Finding a way to communicate and connect everybody. You will get an email to join a NING network. We will try it and see if it works. It should work because it is not hosted by any one agency. You can interact, create groups and has the potential for public interaction if wanted. Not blocked by active directory, for now.

Members of LMVJV board got together and had a leadership summit and will be planning a meeting not hosted by the Service. It will be facilitated. May be in conjunction with SEAFWA

Creating a Science summit. Don't know what that means right now but it will bring together needs and prioritization. Lots of voices but we need processes to have them all heard. No date set yet.

Opportunity to weigh in on what would be useful or would be needed to make available for the info from the meeting would be useful.

- 1.) Fill out the feedback forms.
- 2.) Raw notes available from the week.
- 3.) Provide list of attendees

Concluding Thoughts – David Viker

Presentation of Talking points

Top 10 Quotes of the Week

Summarize key points

Definition of SHC

We don't have enough money or man power to save the world

Strategic

A way of improving our science

Why SHC?

Why strategic where's the landscape stuff?

Conservation actions instead of Conservation delivery

Boundaries are not meant to be barriers

"All models are wrong but some are useful"