The following report presents a summary of a two-day meeting of the Steering Committee for the Great Northern Landscape Conservation Cooperative (GNLCC) held 15-16 May September 2012 at the Coast Hotel and Conference Centre in Kamloops British Columbia. The report, presented by the meeting facilitator Scott Bischke of MountainWorks Incorporated, is built from full set of meeting notes taken by Danielle Cuthbertson, and from meeting flip charts.

**Key Meeting Outcomes**
- Steering Committee Decisions/Guidance
- Plans for Next Meetings

**Action Items Developed in this Meeting**

**Meeting Summary (Day 1, May 15th)**
- Opening Welcomes
- BC Perspective on LCC Engagement
- Steering Committee Business Activities
- Landscape Conservation Cooperatives—A Brief History and Opportunities for Partnership
- LCC Engagement in Canada
- Climate Change Initiatives and Research in BC

**Meeting Summary (Day 2, May 16th)**
- Opening Remarks
- Transboundary Research
- Update on Partner Forums (Yvette Converse)
- Alignment with regional/national landscape programs—(Tom Olliff)
- FY12 funding recommendations (Sean Finn)

**FY12 GNLCC Funding Recommendations**

**Appendix A — Meeting Agenda**
- Tuesday, May 15th
- Wednesday, May 16th

**Appendix B — Optional Field Trip**

**Appendix C — Meeting Attendees**
** Key Meeting Outcomes **

The Steering Committee (SC) was—

- briefed on and reviewed the 1st Draft of GNLCC Strategic Framework;
- updated on the National LCC program;
- updated on engagement of Canadian Partners in the GNLCC;
- updated on the Flathead MOU; and
- updated on trans-boundary research.

** Steering Committee Decisions/Guidance **

The SC made the following decisions and/or provided the following guidance to GNLCC staff:

- The SC approved the finalized GNLCC Governance Charter as presented to them. Additionally, the SC provided guidance on developing a new criteria section to the Charter to address new membership to the SC.
- The SC provisionally selected the GNLCC Vision Statement, a part of the GNLCC Strategic Framework, pending post-meeting agreement of BC contingent.
- The SC reviewed FY12 funding and set itself a process for OK-ing the funding recommendations post-meeting.

** Plans for Next Meetings **

One or two SC telecons are expected—dates to be determined—over the coming summer.

Selection of location and date of the next SC meeting will be spearheaded by GNLCC staff (**action item 1**). The location is most likely to be somewhere in Wyoming, as the SC seeks to continue meeting around the GNLCC. The date will be in the fall of 2012, as proposed by GNLCC staff. A likely time would be end of September or beginning of October.
## Action Items Developed in this Meeting

Table 1 provides a compilation of meeting **action items**, noted in bold in body of the report.

### Table 1.—Action items identified during this meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>What</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GNLCC staff</td>
<td>1) Determine/proposal location of Fall2012 SC meeting</td>
<td>By July 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) Create Doodle poll to determine date of Fall 2012 SC meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>GNLCC staff</td>
<td>Editorial items (many) associated with the Charter; SC vote to accept the GNLCC Governance Charter as final—see that section of the report.</td>
<td>Before next SC telecon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yvette Converse</td>
<td>The SC requested that the Y2Y letter be forwarded to them as well as any information that could be provided on Y2Y’s mission statement, guiding principles etc.</td>
<td>Before next SC telecon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GNLCC staff AT Plus</td>
<td>Four actions associated with the process of partner’s petitioning to be part of the SC (see that section of the report).</td>
<td>Before next SC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>GNLCC staff</td>
<td>On page 15 (next steps) of the Strategic Framework, the third bullet (getting into actual strategies) needs to mention gap analysis and science needs.</td>
<td>By next SC telecon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>GNLCC SC members GNLCC staff</td>
<td>A five-step process was agreed upon (see that section of the report) by the SC for moving forward with the Draft Strategic Conservation Framework.</td>
<td>By next SC telecon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Madeline Maley for BC</td>
<td>Determine BC concurrence of accepting vision statement.</td>
<td>By next SC telecon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>GNLCC staff</td>
<td>Totals in spreadsheet for requested and funded erroneously show the same number. Need to correct—replace 3600.5 with 985.</td>
<td>By next SC telecon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>GNLCC SC members GNLCC staff</td>
<td>The SC then set a multi-step process for deciding on approval of the 2012 funding recommendations (see text).</td>
<td>Decision needed by early June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>GNLCC staff</td>
<td>The SC asked GNLCC staff to assure that the criteria used for future funding decisions be consistent with the tenets of the new Strategic Conservation Framework. Also, the SC requested that GNLCC staff consider how a social science component could be added to the grading criteria.</td>
<td>Before next SC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>GNLCC Staff</td>
<td>The SC expressed some disappointment that the group did not make it to the funding decision until meeting end when the SC no longer had a quorum. They asked that funding (and all) SC decisions be moved to earlier in the meeting.</td>
<td>Before next SC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>GNLCC Staff</td>
<td>The SC asked GNLCC staff to consider calls for proposal in January to better fit with Canadian fiscal year.</td>
<td>Before next SC meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following pages provide a summary of a two-day meeting of the Steering Committee (SC) for the Great Northern Landscape Conservation Cooperative (GNLCC). Presentations made at the meeting are available at the GNLCC website (http://greatnorthernlcc.org/event/215). Note that not all speakers used presentation slides.

Appendices provide the meeting agenda (A), a short report on an optional field trip offered (B), and an attendee list (C).

**Meeting Summary (Day 1, May 15th)**

**Opening Welcomes**

The meeting began with short welcoming statements from Canadian leads. Mark Zacharias, Assistant Deputy Minister for the British Columbia (BC) Ministry of Environment, noted that BC is an environmental leader, including in such areas as imposing a carbon tax. Steve Torbit, Science Applications Assistant Regional Director for US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Region 6 (for RD Steve Guertin) stated the importance of the cross boundary collaboration.

**BC Perspective on LCC Engagement**

(Madeline Maley)

Madeline thanked the assembled group for traveling to Kamloops, and added her best wishes for a productive meeting. She noted—

- BC is part of three LCCs—the Great Northern, the North Pacific, and Northwestern Interior Forests—and open to LCC engagement;
- that BC is ~94% publicly owned, mostly by the Province; and
- the Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations (FLNRO) was created to deliver integrated land-management services across BC during an era of climate change, plus increasing recreational activity and demands on natural resources. Both environmental sustainability and economic prosperity are key FLNRO goals.

**Steering Committee Business Activities**

**National LCC Update (Tom Olliff)**

*see http://greatnorthernlcc.org/event/215 for talk*

Tom noted that all 22 LCCs are now underway. While the USFWS is involved in all of the LCCs, leads or co-leads vary by location (may be BOR, BLM, USFS, NPS).

Tom noted that a national LCC council and executive committee have been seated; that a national LCC coordinator is in place; that an LCC coordinator network has been formed to identify high priority issues and share information; and that standard guidelines (not finalized) are in various stages of development focused on such areas as conservation targets and data management. The national program formalized its charter last year and is developing a 10-year strategic plan. Goals include trans-boundary issues. The national program established four priorities for FY12.

Tom noted that requirements for communications have increased with increasing maturity of the national LCC network (e.g., bi-weekly calls, bi-annual meetings, monthly updates, and annual reports). He described a National LCC workshop that took place in Denver in late March, with roughly 400 participants. The workshop included plenary speakers; a focus on LCC tools, approaches, and challenges; and...
discussions on such items as LCC logos and branding.

During a question and answer period, numerous thoughts were put forward related to the National LCC program:

- Nancy Lee—similarly the North West Climate Science Center (NWCSC) is working on a 5-year science plan.
- Rick Sojda—the North Central Climate Science Center is taking cues from the LCC program on where to make priorities.
- Madeline Maley—While BC happily sits at multiple LCC tables, the province has concerns about maintaining its sovereignty over policy and legislation. BC thus appreciates that the LCCs act as independent bodies.
- Robyn Thorson—The link between Climate Science Centers and LCC’s is important. Priorities need to be robust and ensure that we keep these relationships tight so that priority items are moved forward. We need good relationships and good science.
- Bryant Farley—A North Pacific agreement that included a focus on jobs was signed by Premier Clark and the governor of Washington. While on its face this was an agreement on jobs, it was also a message from the leaders to develop a clean economy that includes clean transportation and energy efficiency. Also notable, some of the impetus for the agreement was to deal with threats to jobs resulting from climate change and extreme weather.

This discussion also included an update from North Pacific LCC (NPLCC) coordinator John Mankowski by phone. John made, among many, these points:

- The NPLCC is making great progress.
- They adopted their charter ~6 months ago.
- They are currently developing a 10-year Strategic Plan and a 5-year Science Plan.
- The NPLCC contains the entire north Pacific Coast of the USA and Canada and includes multiple biomes and cultures.
- The NPLCC has a goal to develop and share science and traditional knowledge across cultures.
- The NPLCC is focused on many transboundary issues; it acknowledges the leadership of BC and Madeline in particular for her participation and help.
- The NPLCC has already seen and is expecting many more impacts from climate change.

GNLCC GOVERNANCE CHARTER (YVETTE CONVERSE)
See http://greatnorthernlcc.org/business for latest version of the Governance Charter

Decision: The SC is being asked to finalize the Governance Charter.

Background: The GNLCC Governance Charter was accepted as final in FY11. With the addition of new members, the Charter was circulated for revisions to reflect international participation and to clarify membership and process for decision making. The current draft reflects comments of the SC and AT from review of drafts since fall 2011.

Yvette provided a short history of the development of the Governance Charter, then asked for SC comments and review. Key comments and directions from the SC included:

These items reflected as **action item 2**

- Formatting issues in the document need to be fixed before it is finalized. For example, there is a formatting issue on page 7 under bullet number 7
- Ian Dyson—(1) 94% Crown land figure is for BC not Alberta; we can provide that numbers. Charter should call out both BC and Alberta. (2) The list of representation shown in the Charter reflects 2010 information and needs to be updated, in particular to show new Alberta and possibly BC participants.
- Verify editorial changes have been made at next SC telecon.
- Mary Sexton—Suggest moving the list of SC participants to an appendix of the document as they will be continually changing.
• See also Charter action items in the Y2Y section of this report.

Comments, discussion

• Dave Brittell—I move to adopt the Governance Charter as presented assuming a window for editorial comments until next conference call
• Robyn Thorson—Second the motion. This document is a remarkable and will serve as a great guiding point for other LCCs.
• Request by facilitator for any objections. No objections stated; thus motion to accept the GNLCC Charter as finalized is adopted.
• Question—Given the acceptance of the document, are we now fully operational, including such items as possible rotation of the chair. Answer = yes; this group can now decide if someone new is ready to take this role.

Request for participation from Yellowstone to Yukon (Y2Y) Initiative

[A letter from Y2Y to the SC was included in the meeting packet, which can be found at http://greatnorthernlcc.org/event/215.]

Discussion: The SC is being asked to consider formal participation by Y2Y based on their written request.

Background: The current Governance Charter describes how an organization can request to be a formal participant on the GNLCC Steering Committee. Y2Y has submitted a request to the US and BC chairs for consideration. The Y2Y letter provides information about how Y2Y meets GNLCC criteria for (1) capacity, (2) alignment, and (3) adherence to GNLCC values and principles. The SC is being asked to consider this request in preparation for a later decision via conference call. This is the first formal request for an organization to join the GNLCC under the guidelines from the new governance charter.

The GNLCC staff, per the background above, requested input and feedback on how the SC views the petition from Y2Y. Key discussion and Q&A items from between the SC and GNLCC staff, or among the SC members, follow:

Y2Y specific comments

• The SC requested that the Y2Y letter be forwarded to them as well as any information that could be provided on Y2Y’s mission statement, guiding principles etc. Yvette committed to getting that information to the SC (**action item 3**).
• I like the idea of non-profits being involved with us. We need a robust mechanism for including these groups. But we do need to keep in mind that one thumb down can have a large influence on what this group does.
• We need to be careful of talking about the perception of different NGO communities. Likewise, some government agencies are held in low esteem by some communities. Y2Y seems like a good fit, even acknowledging the perception issues of some.

Should NGOs be allowed on the SC?

• Q—How were the first NGO’s included? A—They were asked to participate. LCCs were not envisioned as government only group.
• Q—Would the ability to petition to be part of the SC extend to industry advocacy groups? A—that is up to this SC itself to decide.
• We could consider having a representative of a sector—for example NGOs—coordinate and represent that sector.
• I see a lot of value in a bigger tent with more voices in it. It is important for the SC and the GNLCC to have diverse set of voices discussing such large issues.
• I see value and uniqueness in the SC staying largely governmental since it is above all governments, First Nations, and Tribes with both an interest in the landscape and legal and constitutional rights and obligations to the land. And recall that many efforts, negotiations, and interactions will occur across jurisdictional boundaries. Given those facts, it seems appropriate that the NGOs are engaged in the GNLCC via the Partner Forums or on the Advisory Team. We will lose some value if open the SC membership up too large.
• We get great value here from understanding our differences over time. There seems to be a
clear dividing line between NGOs that bring resources to the table versus groups that are almost purely advocates for some position.
• If we are talking about who is missing at the SC table, then I would suggest that local government is the most obvious missing.
• I think there is some acknowledgement from the group here that we want to be inclusive, but don’t want to get too big. As such, we need to communicate that there are other means to participate in the GNLCC beyond the SC (e.g., in the Partner Forums).

**Directions from the SC**

As the discussion concluded, the SC provided four directives (**action item 4**):

1) GNLCC staff should develop an education plan for reaching out to partners and telling them how they can become involved in the GNLCC.
2) The AT should develop a set of criteria for new members petitioning to join the SC. These criteria would be added, possibly as an appendix, to the GNLCC Governance Charter.
3) GNLCC staff should (a) revise the Governance Charter to define SC membership positions by function and not by specific agency or entity name, and (b) consider moving this section to an appendix.
4) In communicating back to Y2Y about the SC discussions regarding their letter of petition, GNLCC staff should underscore how pleased the SC is for Y2Y interest in the GNLCC.

With respect to the Y2Y petition, the SC tabled that decision pending completion of the four items listed above. No vote was taken on the petition as it was apparent from discussion that it would not pass the SC’s “no objection” criteria.

[Facilitator’s note: The SC also provided a great deal of guidance on this topic during its Sep2011 meeting in Whitefish. A summary of that guidance is provided in the meeting report, at http://greatnorthernlcc.org/event/59.]

**COMMUNICATIONS AND OUTREACH FRAMEWORK (YVETTE CONVERSE)**

Yvette presented the SC a first look at the GNLCC Communications and Outreach Strategy 2012-2014 and asked for comments and feedback, (though not endorsement which is expected during a future SC call). The document, which can be found at http://greatnorthernlcc.org/business, was developed with the help of information specialist Mary McFadzen.

Yvette noted that the communication strategy includes discussions on primary audiences, objectives, tactics and tools, and assessment measures. At the core of the strategy are four main goals:
1) Build and foster engagement in the GNLCC by increasing awareness and understanding of the role and value to collaborative landscape conservation.

2) Improve the exchange of knowledge and dissemination of science-based information, tools, and products to advance collaborative landscape conservation.

3) Increase opportunities to leverage funding and align existing programs and initiatives to enhance collaborative landscape conservation.

4) Build and foster engagement with Tribes and First Nations in collaborative landscape conservation.

SC feedback included enthusiastic statements about this effort being a great start. SC members noted that they liked how the strategy calls out the need to foster dialogue with researchers and scientists. The SC asked two questions: (1) Are there some tactics and tools to better solicit information from the managers on their science needs? (2) Could we run this strategy by some communication specialists, possibly even within our own agencies, and get their feedback?

**GNLCC Strategic Framework, including Vision Statement (Tom Olliff)**

See [http://greatnorthernlcc.org/event/215 for talk](http://greatnorthernlcc.org/event/215)

Tom provided a short progress report on milestones in the development of the GNLCCC to date, leading up to the draft Strategic Conservation Framework released this month. He noted that the purpose of a Strategic Conservation Framework is to (a) clearly focus and prioritize efforts, and (b) harness the efforts of partners to achieve more meaningful conservation at the landscape scale.

The SC asked Tom to define “ecological integrity”, which he did as the ability of an ecological system to support community that has species composition, diversity, and functional organization comparable to those of natural habitats.

Tom noted that GNLCC goals and conservation targets, as developed by the contracting team of Nina Chambers and Gary Tabor and further modified by the Advisory Team Plus, are hierarchically scaled to achieve integrity across the GNLCC Landscape. Four goals are put forward, with central topics being maintaining, conserving, or improving—

- terrestrial integrity,
- aquatic integrity,
- connectivity, and
- ecological processes and disturbance.

Tom further talked about a proposed conservation target tier system for considering species, as follows:

- **Tier 1.**—Umbral species whose function and outcomes represent many other species
- **Tier 2.**—Ecological process indicator species that have direct ties to critical ecological processes which can indicate change or threshold effects
- **Tier 3.**—Species of iconic or social importance which serves as a flagship for landscape effects

SC feedback included statements of support for the use of targets as themes. A request was made that on page 15 (next steps) of the Strategic Framework, that the third bullet regarding strategies be modified to mention gap analysis and science needs (**action item 5**).
Graphical representation of proposed GNLCC conservation targets resulting from the four overarching GNLCC goals.

Tom defined next steps in finalizing the Strategic Conservation Framework as:

- Building organizational capacity by supporting the Partner Forums
- Aligning and sharing existing information and conducting a gap analysis to determine how and where GNLCC efforts can add value to existing efforts
- Developing a science strategy based on the gap analysis
- Partnering with inventory and monitoring programs to collect and share information across agencies and organizations
- Identifying resource managers’ needs for information and developing tools to disseminate information
- Creating a communications strategy to keep the GNLCC network of partners engaged and informed
- Identifying opportunities to focus and leverage resources on priority issues
- Linking conservation to sustainable communities through socioeconomic analysis

A process was agreed upon by the SC for moving forward with the Draft Strategic Conservation Framework (**action item 6**):

1) Review the vision statement
2) Set telecon date
3) SC to review the Draft Strategic Conservation Framework and send comments to GNLCC staff 1 week before telecon
4) Staff to incorporate edits before the telecon
5) During telecon, SC to vote on accepting the modified Draft Strategic Conservation Framework. If yes = adopted; if no = return to step 1.

**Vision Statement discussion**

**Decision:** The SC is being asked to discuss and decide on final vision statement to include in the Framework.

**Background:** Three potential vision statements were drafted as part of the Advisory Team Strategic Framework workshop and subsequent Framework review. Each is consistent with GNLCC purpose, goal, and value statements. We are asking SC members to consider finalizing one of the three options below.

**Draft Vision Statements**

1) **Natural ecosystems of the Great Northern landscape are connected and sustained for future generations through collaborative science, conservation, and land management.**

2) **A landscape that sustains its diverse natural systems including land, water, plants, fish and wildlife, and its people into the future. The people embrace this vision through collaborative science, conservation, and management.**

3) **A landscape that sustains its diverse natural systems to support healthy and connected populations of fish, wildlife, and plants; sustains traditional land uses and cultural history; and supports robust communities.**

Three potential vision statements—see directly above—were drafted as part of the Advisory Team Plus workshop in April 2012. Each is consistent with GNLCC purpose, goal, and value statements. GNLCC staff asked the SC members to consider finalizing one of the three options.

After a short discussion, the SC group moved and seconded to a vote on accepting the
third vision statement. There were no objections to the proposed adoption of the third vision statement. However, BC representative Mark Zacharias said that BC could not agree without concurrence of their partners (e.g., Executive Branch, First Nations). Thus the acceptance of vision statement 3 was declared provisional pending BC agreement (**action item 7**).

Yvette noted a simple caveat that received no disagreement from the SC: that this vision statement could be used to guide USA-based work until BC has made their decision.

**Landscape Conservation Cooperatives—A Brief History and Opportunities for Partnership**

Yvette Converse provided an overview on the history of LCCs. She noted that Secretary of the US Department of Interior Order 3289 (14 Sep 2009) started the LCC program. The reasoning for LCCs is stated clearly in a 2010 Lincoln institute report, which said “...there is a gap in governance and a corresponding need to create informal and formal ways to work more effectively across boundaries.” Yvette’s talk, including a hyperlink to the Lincoln Institute report, can be found at http://greatnorthernlcc.org/event/215.

**LCC Engagement in Canada**

**CANADA FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE (BLAIR HAMMOND)**

*see http://greatnorthernlcc.org/event/215 for talk*

Blair discussed Canadian Wildlife Service conservation initiatives underway within the GNLCC. These include:

- Migratory Bird Conservation Initiatives
  - NAWMP & CIJV
  - Waterfowl decision support
  - Wetland Trends project
  - Breeding Bird Atlas
- Species at Risk Conservation Initiatives
  - Recovery planning
  - Habitat Stewardship
- Dry Interior Conservation Plan
- National Conservation Plan

**PARKS CANADA (DAVE McDONOUGH)**

Dave discussed Parks Canada engagement with the GNLCC. His did not have any slides.

Dave noted that Parks Canada is involved in three partnerships: The Crown Managers’ Partnership, the BC Rail Partnership (addressing grizzly mortality), and a partnership to reintroduce mountain caribou to Banff and Jasper National Parks (a cooperative project with BC). He stated his belief that the GNLCC provides a great avenue for building relationships.

**ALBERTA (IAN DYSON AND BILL DOLAN)**

Ian and Bill discussed Alberta’s engagement with the GNLCC. Their talk was not accompanied by any slides.

Ian noted that Alberta is a strong supporter of the GNLCC, and that the GNLCC goals align well with those of Alberta. As long as its sovereignty is protected, Alberta is open to cross-boundary discussions and programs. In an era of rapid energy development, Alberta is acting with great seriousness regarding “getting it right” regarding land use. They have programs in place to begin dealing with climate change, including (a) a regulated market on carbon, (b) allocating $2B for carbon sequestration efforts, and (c) scenario planning for climate change. Ian noted that Alberta recently went through elections. The new provincial government, which has combined environment and natural resource protection under one ministry, is focused on three core issues: families, jobs, and getting real about the environment.

Bill noted that the Weed Act in Alberta has caused a great focus on terrestrial invasives. Work on aquatic invasives, however, is lagging and he noted Alberta appreciation for work in that arena being led by the Crown Managers’ Partnership (CMP). Along with the CMP, Bill said that Alberta’s Prairie Conservation Plan links well with the Plains and Prairie Potholes LCC, and the Water for Life Program likewise has links to the GNLCC Strategic Conservation Framework.

Ian and Bill concluded their talk with an invitation to host a future GNLCC SC meeting in Alberta.
**BRITISH COLUMBIA (MADELINE MALEY)**

Madeline discussed BC’s engagement with the GNLCC. She noted that we are more alike than different and that together the Partners in the GNLCC have a tremendous amount of wisdom and Experience.

Madeline’s talk was not accompanied by any slides.

Round table discussions brought out many valuable points, plus allowed interactions between people from across the GNLCC.

**ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION #1**

Following the discussion of Canadian engagement with the GNLCC, the SC broke for round table discussions where they were asked to (a) brainstorm opportunities, challenges, and possible partnerships for cooperative, large landscape conservation, and (b) briefly present their brainstorming to the group. A compilation of unique ideas developed from the multiple break out tables, organized into like areas, follows.

**Opportunities for cooperative, large landscape conservation**

- **Partnering opportunities**
  - First Nations
  - Involve/engage resource based industries and land based user groups (e.g., agriculture, forestry). Show commonalities.
  - Work at watershed level.
  - Involve local governments.
  - Work with National Conservation Plan.

- **Opportunities of scale and focus**
  - Get the scale right; find where GNLCC uniquely fits.
  - Create work groups based on 3 themes—invasives, climate change, development.
  - Seek to pool efforts under large objectives.
  - Explore existing agreements regardless of LCC boundaries. Discover gaps and overlaps.
  - Cumulative Effects Framework—under development. Common values across ecoregions that could provide a set of consistent indicators throughout the LCC
  - Focus on communication and to complement research happening across jurisdictions.
  - Fund priority objectives with coordination of players to inform/work with them on prioritizing conservation efforts.

- **Opportunities with academia and researchers**
  - Coordinate research and make the results freely available.
  - BC government is very open with data (e.g., GeoBC spatial datasets for natural resources)
  - Link academic research with operational needs and research (happening in US) in partnerships with LCCs.
  - Create more strategic and thought out research networks.
  - Capitalize on academic arguments more in convincing funders and regulators to make research a priority.
  - Improve linkages among unique science communities.

**Challenges for cooperative, large landscape conservation**

- **Challenges of capacity**
  - LCC Partners limited on time, $s, human power.
  - Major cuts in research funding by BC and Canadian governments, as well as by forest and industry.
  - Funding for implementation.
Challenges of approach and communication
- With BC model of including stakeholders in simultaneous setting of objectives with zoning effort.
- Semantics in the language we use (e.g., “conservation” means something different in BC than Alberta than USA). Need common, unifying language that avoids polarizing rhetoric.
- LCCs focus on the right science and scale good for informing but not for delivering conservation.
- Concerns over individual groups maintaining their sovereignty.
- Lack of political stability.
- Long time frames make it difficult to “sell” ideas to the public and bureaucrats. Need to engage common citizens with idea that landscape conservation is relevant to an urban society.
- Communication between researchers and managers and regulators (two ways—getting the questions right and sharing the answers).
- Need a common GIS platform to share info.

Challenges with existing situation
- Difficulty overcoming institutional cultures of participating organizations.
- Difficulty in creating a balanced SC.
- Working in the era of fast, furious, and intense development.
- Working with Land Use Plans—many are 10-15 years old and may not still be relevant.
- Difficulty in application of research at decision making level for land use decisions.
- How do we factor in social science? This is especially important for conservation implementation.
- Lack of harvesting of beetle killed tress in USA.
- Working with First Nations—especially issues of capacity and cultural differences.

Possible partnerships for cooperative, large landscape conservation
- Improve partnering with Tribes and First Nations, particularly in areas of education and traditional knowledge.

ABM
- Watershed groups, including work around aquatic invasives.
- Local governments (be inclusive and balanced)
- Industrial stakeholders (e.g., forestry, agriculture, oil & gas, fisheries, range). Capitalize, for example, on fact that conservation and industrial interests have common science and modeling needs (e.g., sea level change associated with climate change).
- With Ag community change the nomenclature from an environmental to an agricultural context when talking about conservation. Consider working with ranchers’ associations.

Climate Change Initiatives and Research in BC

Climate Action Secretariat (Thomas White)
see http://greatnorthernlcc.org/event/215 for talk

Thomas described BC’s framework for climate change adaptation efforts as a three-pronged effort:
- Developing a strong foundation of knowledge and tools.
- Considering climate change impacts in planning and decision making across government.
- Assessing risks and implement priority adaptation actions in key climate sensitive sectors.

Thomas noted that BC has made investment in climate change science with a regional focus, including funding a research endowment to develop solutions (Pacific Institute for Climate Solutions) and inform decisions (Pacific Climate Impacts Consortium—research on historic and future climate).

Thomas also noted these additional BC priorities:
- Engage Natural Resource sector professional and industry associations
- Maintain and enhance regional climate science
- Improve availability and access to highest quality terrain mapping
- Evaluate opportunities for market based approaches (PES)
• Encourage integrated assessments that consider multiple risks and domains

**Forest Stewardship Action Plan for Climate Change Adaptation (Kathy Hopkins)**

see http://greatnorthernlcc.org/event/215 for talk

Kathy noted the Action Plan, which builds on BC’s Climate Change Adaptation Strategy, is driven by the Province’s desire to improve the sustainability of BC forest communities and industries. The Province recognizes that disturbance and other change brought on by climate change pose risks to these entities.

The vision for the Action Plan is that BC’s forests provide a broad suite of goods and services that benefit society now and in a changing climate. The Action Plan, which applies to 24 Mha of BC’s timber harvest land base, has three goals:

- to foster resilient forests;
- to maintain future options and benefits; and
- to build adaptive capacity.

The timing for the plan includes (a) setting an agenda now for managing for resilient forests, and (b) phasing in the Action Plan over 5-20 years. By 2017, BC’s forest management policy framework seeks to fully account for a changing climate.

**Climate Change Research (Caren Dy mond)**

see http://greatnorthernlcc.org/event/215 for talk

Caren provided an overview of climate change research going on in BC, including:

- Climate change projections
- Modeling of expected forest change associated with climate change, including species dislocation and changing forest disturbances (e.g., fire, pathogen outbreaks)
- Modeling of the interactions between stand dynamics and disturbance

She also talked about how BC is seeking to use such models to integrate carbon management decisions into management of its

- forests and grasslands;
- fisheries and watershed processes; and
- wildlife and biodiversity.

Finally, Caren noted that BC is employing climate change research in planning for and decisions on natural resource economics and rural community resilience and sustainability.

**Round Table Discussion #2**

Following the discussion of Canadian climate change initiatives and research, the SC broke for round table discussions where they were asked to (a) brainstorm opportunities, challenges, and possible partnerships associated with cooperative work on climate change initiatives and research across the GNLCC to support large landscape conservation, and (b) briefly present their brainstorming to the group. A compilation of unique ideas developed from the multiple break out tables, organized into like areas, follows.

**Opportunities for cooperative climate change initiatives and research**

- **GNLCC could foster**
  - A willingness to learn and connect between all parties.
  - Public awareness and engagement to make people care about climate change; to make it relevant politically to get broader support for both research and mitigation of impacts.
  - An approach that downplays the climate change prediction accuracy and instead fosters a goal of learning to understand the uncertainties and develop adaptive management systems to assist.
  - A focus on issues that have less uncertainty in the climate change realm—e.g., fisheries, stream temperatures.
- **Programmatic planning and on-the-ground implementation**
  - Adaptation planning and implementation
  - Updating landscape planning with new information
  - Develop pathways, connections to take predictions to the next step of changing land management practices
  - Provide information on movement of tree species (e.g., possibly northward or upslope) due to climate change.
Prioritize research and/or actions on an international basis & rationalize resource use

Convene scientists and managers across the region to say, “Even given the uncertainties, there may be actions that we can take—what are they?” Bringing people together to discuss and share ideas helps everyone have a better sense of options (scenario planning).

- **Opportunities with researchers, data**
  - Determine cumulative impacts and how they affect different jurisdictions and industries
  - Shared research w/ Climate Science Centers
  - Data integration (perhaps GNLCC could take the lead?). Perhaps create GNLCC-wide relational database.
  - Reapplying Prism data
  - Compile climate change data and research across GNLCC like Caren did in talk here
  - Working GNLCC-wide is attractive because it is more compatible with scale of climate data
  - Need to look at vulnerability of species across their whole range

**Challenges for cooperative climate change initiatives and research**

- **Challenges of capacity**
  - Procuring research resources ($s, human), including bringing data sources up to date.

- **Challenges of approach and communication**
  - Attitudes around who benefits from conservation work. Is it for the US benefit?
  - Who suffers as a result of conservation work? Can we understand and explain the economic impacts of conservation work associated with climate change?
  - Need to expand the focus beyond temperature change to include consequences (e.g., extreme weather).
  - Need to link climate change mitigation to jobs! (e.g., infrastructure changes)

- **Challenges with information, research**
  - Sharing information on what’s being done. Hard at times to simply marshal the needed info to tap into. Even more complex in considering integrating transboundary data sets (ownership, access, expense).
  - Need better assessment of what has already been done—say over last 15 years—
  - Including measuring results vs modeling.
  - Keeping databases updated. Many inventories are out of date or simply non-existent (e.g., for many wildlife species).
  - Large scientific and information complexity
  - Need better understanding of ecological processes—how they will be impacted and how we can maintain them in the face of CC.
  - Understanding the strengths and weaknesses of various downscale models. Similarly, (a) how do we match climate change model output to decisions on a local scale? and (b) how do we manage entities developing different, competing models to get outcomes that we can use?

- **Challenges with transboundary situation**
  - Dealing with cross-border travel—e.g., customs restrictions, hindrance of travel.
  - Impacts of CC on species migration.

**Possible partnerships for cooperative climate change initiatives and research**

- Existing regional groups (e.g., Columbia Basin Trust) or treaty groups/commissions (e.g., IJC)
- Universities and research entities
- Industry?
- Link to US CSCs and Canadian equivalent
- Citizen scientists can collect data if we get then invested in the topic and process.

---

**Meeting Summary (Day 2, May 16th)**

**Opening Remarks**

Doug Konkin, Deputy Minister for MFLNRO, noted that a big development push is underway and that we thus need a new way to accomplish stewardship. He stated his absolute support for the GNLCC, saying that with new relationships come new possibilities.

Lori Faeth, Special Asst. Sec. of Policy Management and Budget (US DOI), noted that the LCC program is a big deal to DOI, including for transboundary work. LCCs serve as a new approach to conservation collaboration; the “stove pipe” approach does not work. She noted that $s can accomplish much, but relationships and face-to-face collaboration so much more.
**Transboundary Research**

**Erin Sexton – Transboundary Flathead MOU**

*see http://greatnorthernlcc.org/event/215 for talk*

Erin talked about workplan implementation for the BC-Montana Memorandum of Understanding and Cooperation on Environmental Protection, Climate Action, and Energy. The MOU—

- will sustain the environmental values in the Flathead River Basin in a manner consistent with current forestry, recreation, guide outfitting and trapping uses;
- will identify permissible land uses and establish new collaborative approaches to transboundary issues;
- will not allow mining, oil and gas development, and coalbed gas extraction to be permitted in BC’s Flathead Valley;
- provides a framework for environmental protection, climate action, and renewable energy; and
- provides a demonstration project for the GNLCC.

For 2011/12, Erin noted that under the MOU an inter-jurisdictional fisheries team has been convened to develop a collaborative 5-year workplan for the North Fork Flathead River Basin Demonstration Project. The workplan includes provisions for cooperation on fish and wildlife management, facilitation of climate change adaptation, and pro-active information sharing.

**Fine Scale Linkages and Conservation Delivery for Grizzly Bears in the Northern Rockies of Canada and the USA (Michael Proctor)**

*See http://greatnorthernlcc.org/event/215 for talk*

Michael Proctor spoke about his work on the Trans-border Grizzly Bear Project (see http://transbordergrizzlybearproject.ca/). Michael provided his talk via phone but did not provide slides to the facilitator.

The goal of the project is to use science to understand conservation challenges and implement researched solutions for grizzly bears in the Trans-border southern Selkirk and Purcell Mountains of BC, Northwest Montana, and North Idaho. To accomplish this goal the project

- applies relevant local scientific research on grizzly bear biology as it relates to management and conservation;
- translates research results into workable management actions;
- integrates the ideas of local people; and
- stimulates implementation of productive management plans.

**State of Washington Transboundary Connectivity Work (Bill Gains)**

*See http://greatnorthernlcc.org/event/215 for talk*

Bill Gains spoke about the work of the Washington Wildlife Habitat Connectivity Working Group (WHCWG). The mission of this group is to promote “…the long-term viability of wildlife populations in Washington State through a science-based, collaborative approach that identifies opportunities and priorities to conserve and restore habitat connectivity.”

Bill highlighted the WHCWG’s completed work on the American Black Bear, which included such analyses as linkage zones, landscape integrity, and climate gradient corridors. He also described on-going work in the group’s Columbia Plateau Ecoregional Assessment effort and Transboundary Habitat Connectivity Proposal.

Bill provided examples of how WHCWG connectivity products are being used, a sampling of which follow:

- Statewide Analysis Products
  - Forest Service—land management plans for Okanogan-Wenatchee, Colville National Forests
  - WA Department of Transportation—information for local biologists and planners to consider in transportation planning
- Climate Connectivity Products
  - Environment Canada—climate impacts on ecosystems
  - US Environmental Protection Agency—information used in project reviews such as transportation projects
- Columbia Plateau Analysis Products
Arid Lands Initiative—select areas to implement conservation strategies
• Connectivity Analysis Tools (Linkage Mapper)
  o The Nature Conservancy—three large landscape planning efforts in US
  o Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife—Western gray squirrel reintroduction in Thurston County

**Update on Partner Forums (Yvette Converse)**

See http://greatnorthernlcc.org/event/215 for talk

Yvette noted that the Partner Forums are “an engagement of GNLCC conservation practitioners and partnerships that share conservation challenges in an eco-geographic context to identify specific conservation needs for GNLCC priorities”. She defined the eco-typic regions that the Forums operate as

- Ecologically relevant geography
- Similar ecological process or systems
- Related landscape issues
- Not a discrete geographic area; but rather having common conservation needs

Three Partner Forums—Rocky Mountain, Columbia Basin, and Sage-steppe—are in various stages of formation. Yvette noted that the Partner Forums are largely following the same development process, with major steps including:

- Identifying leadership team
- Discussion and information sharing through webinars and meetings
- Gap analysis to identify needs
- Situation assessment
- Forum recommendations leading to a workplan

Yvette shared that GNLCC staff had recently received a proposal for the creation of a fourth “Cascadia” forum. Yvette noted that SS and RM Partner Forum Leadership Teams have met by phone twice and are determining next steps for appropriate gap analysis and engagement.

**Alignment with regional/national landscape programs—(Tom Olliff)**

Tom talked about recent GNLCC efforts and accomplishments in science program alignment, specifically citing four areas:

- National Fish and Wildlife Foundation
  o Migration Corridors of the Great Northern LS
  o target specific geographies, species, and identify explicit strategies for investment
- Sage Grouse
  o Multiple LCCs coordinating information
  o BLM, USFS, NRCS, States
- US Forest Service Collaborative Forest Land Restoration Program
  o Southern Crown
  o Tapash
  o Clearwater
- Headwaters Economics
  o Online tools for GNLCC economic profiles
  o Leveraging foundation grants on climate change

**FY12 funding recommendations (Sean Finn)**

Sean presented the FY12 GNLCC funding recommendations, as can be seen in the table on the following pages.

**Decision:** The SC is being asked to review and either approve—or provide a timeline for approval before June 1—of the FY12 Funding Recommendations (see table at the end of this section).

**Background:** $1 million has been made available in FY12 to support shared GNLCC science and information needs as per the FY12 Funding Guidance. 63 proposals were received of which 35 met general criteria for ranking. A review team of 8 from 7 organizations reviewed and ranked the 35 proposals and developed a funding recommendation for SC consideration. The process for review as well as the attached summary of the FY12 Funding Recommendation will be discussed during this meeting.
Sean described that this is the third year for a GNLCC science solicitation. The group had $US1M a year to allocate. This year the GNLCC received 63 proposals totaling $US59M in requests. Twelve of the proposals were from projects the GNLCC had funded in the past; 49 were new proposals.

All proposals were graded against six relevance criteria previously mandated by the SC. Eight people served on the review panel, all anonymously. The 12 past projects (i.e., already funded by the GNLCC at least once) were automatically passed to round 2 for further consideration. The rest went through a rigorous first round of evaluation before moving into the second round. As a result of the 2-part review process, 15 projects are being put forward as recommendations (table next page).

Yvette noted that with the departure of a number of members of the SC, the group no longer had a quorum. Thus, the remaining SC members decided to discuss the funding proposal but hold a vote online following the meeting. Points brought forth in the SC funding discussion included:

- The SC provided feedback that the review process appeared thorough and fair and that fact gave them confidence in the selection process.
- For greater clarity in the selection process, SC members can talk with their own representative on the Advisory Team (AT).
- Not all projects were funded to the requested level. If only partial funding was offered, the selection committee first talked with the requester to assure partial funding still helped (i.e., that the project needs did not dictate all-or-nothing funding to be of use).
- SC asked if socio-economics were a criterion considered. Answer = no.
- A note—totals in spreadsheet for requested and funded erroneously show the same number. Need to correct—cross out 3600.5 and replace with 985 (**action item 8**).
- SC asked if requesters will be told how they were ranked, best to worst. Answer = GNLCC staff can provide requesters feedback on reasons for being funded or not, but would like to avoid ordinal ranking discussions.
- The SC members present (again, a quorum was not present) decided to take a strawman vote:
  - When asked if there were any objections to the FY12 funding recommendations as presented, none were recorded.
  - Nancy Lee asked to defer her vote pending discussion with her colleagues at the NWSCC.
  - When the facilitator asked to make a recording of those SC members still present, the group declined to do so.
- The SC then set for itself the following process for decision (**action item 9**):
  1. Yvette emails an update on these deliberations as well as the funding recommendations to the SC.
  2. SC votes online to accept recommendations. Per Governance Charter, an SC quorum requires more than 16 with consensus and no objections. If this requirement met, funding recommendations are accepted.
  3. If vote is no, then SC will meet by telecon to discuss and approve recommendations (no time was set for this potential telecon).
  
  GNLCC staff stressed that the work needs to be completed by early June to successfully move the dollars into the requesting projects (paperwork needs to be in by Jun30, funds obligated by Sep30)
- (**action item 10**) The SC asked GNLCC staff to assure that the criteria used for future funding decisions be consistent with the tenets of the new Strategic Conservation Framework. Also, the SC requested that GNLCC staff consider how a social science component could be added to the grading criteria.
- (**action item 11**) The SC expressed some disappointment that the group did not make it to the funding decision until meeting end when the SC no longer had a quorum. They asked that funding (and all) SC decisions be moved to earlier in the meeting.
- (**action item 12**) The SC asked GNLCC staff to consider calls for proposal in January to better fit with Canadian fiscal year.
Within the funding, GNLCC staff pointed out that $80k had been set aside for state capacity grants, $50k for the demo project, and $50k for tribal capacity. Several SC representatives from the States pointed out just how important those funds were to them to assure their ability to participate in SC meetings.
## FY12 GNLCC Funding Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Title</th>
<th>Sponsoring Organization</th>
<th>PI or Project Coordinator</th>
<th>Request ($Ks)</th>
<th>Recm ($Ks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Regional Stream Temperature Model for Mapping Thermal Habitats and Vulnerability of Aquatic Species to Climate Change</td>
<td>USFS Rocky Mountain Research Station Aquatics Lab</td>
<td>Isaak</td>
<td>116.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Connected Landscapes: Validating Connectivity Models, Informing Conservation Decisions in the Columbia Plateau</td>
<td>Washington Wildlife Habitat Connectivity Group; WA Dept. of Fish and Wildlife</td>
<td>Schuett-Hames</td>
<td>166.0</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicting effects of climate change on aquatic ecosystems in the Crown of the Continent</td>
<td>USGS Northern Rocky Mountain Science Center</td>
<td>Muhlfeld</td>
<td>195.0</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Fine Scale Linkage Areas and Conservation Delivery in the Northern Rockies of US and Canada</td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>ServheenC</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing high resolution connectivity maps for greater sage-grouse in the Great Northern Landscape using genomics</td>
<td>University of Montana</td>
<td>CrossT</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species Adaptations to Climate Change: Grassland, Sagebrush, and Riparian-associated Landbirds in Bird Conservation Region 10</td>
<td>Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks</td>
<td>Wightman</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown of the Continent Landscape Analysis/Ecological Indicators Project</td>
<td>Flathead Lake Biological Station, University of Montana</td>
<td>Sexton</td>
<td>139.0</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on next page
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Title</th>
<th>Sponsoring Organization</th>
<th>PI or Project Coordinator</th>
<th>Request ($Ks)</th>
<th>Recm ($Ks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington Connected Landscapes: Transboundary Collaborative Connectivity Analysis with British Columbia</td>
<td>Washington Wildlife Habitat Connectivity Group; WA Dept Fish Wildlife</td>
<td>Schuett-Hames</td>
<td>179.0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing aquatic monitoring programs for large-scale restoration projects: building understanding for watershed conservation</td>
<td>The Wilderness Society</td>
<td>Carlson</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating climate change adaptation planning and implementation through the GNLCC Rocky Mountain Partner Forum</td>
<td>Wildlife Conservation Society</td>
<td>CrossM</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape-level assessment of ESA-listed spring-chinook distribution in Upper Columbia Basin watersheds using environmental DNA</td>
<td>US Geological Survey Forest and Rangeland Ecosystem Science Center</td>
<td>Pilliod</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piloting a Strategic Approach to Conservation Planning and Design for the National Wildlife Refuge System in the Columbia Plateau</td>
<td>US FWS National Wildlife Refuge System, Region 1</td>
<td>Miewald</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okanagan Basin Biodiversity Conservation Strategy and Transboundary Connectivity Analysis with Washington State</td>
<td>South Okanagan Similkameen Conservation Program, Province of British Columbia</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Wyoming Geospatial Data Management, Information Sharing and Preparation for DSS Development - Migration Corridors</td>
<td>Wyoming Game &amp; Fish Department</td>
<td>Nordyke</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the Conservation Registry as a visualization tool for the Great Northern Landscape Conservation Cooperative</td>
<td>Defenders of Wildlife</td>
<td>Vickerman</td>
<td>111.0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Continued from previous page**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Title</th>
<th>Sponsoring Organization</th>
<th>PI or Project Coordinator</th>
<th>Request ($Ks)</th>
<th>Recm ($Ks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3600.5</td>
<td>3600.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX A — MEETING AGENDA

### Tuesday, May 15th

#### STEERING COMMITTEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30 AM</td>
<td>Registration opens</td>
<td>Coffee/tea/light snacks available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>Scott Bischke&lt;br&gt;Meeting facilitator&lt;br&gt;Welcome!</td>
<td>• Greetings from the Co-Chairs&lt;br&gt;• Self-introductions, all present&lt;br&gt;• Agenda overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Madeline Maley&lt;br&gt;BC Perspective on LCC Engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15</td>
<td>Yvette Converse&lt;br&gt;Tom Olliff&lt;br&gt;Steering Committee Business</td>
<td>• National LCC update (TO)&lt;br&gt;• GNLCC Governance Charter (YC)&lt;br&gt;• Communications and Outreach Framework (YC)&lt;br&gt;• GNLCC Strategic Framework, including vision statement (TO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45</td>
<td>Lunch on your own&lt;br&gt;We recommend eating at the hotel given time constraints (discount)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### STEERING COMMITTEE AND GUESTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:30 PM</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>Coffee/tea/light snacks available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>Scott Bischke&lt;br&gt;Madeline Maley&lt;br&gt;Welcome Guests!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>Yvette Converse&lt;br&gt;Tom Olliff&lt;br&gt;Landscape Conservation Cooperatives (LCCs)—A Brief history and Opportunities for Partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45</td>
<td>Various presenters</td>
<td>LCC Engagement in Canada&lt;br&gt;• Canada&lt;br&gt;• Alberta&lt;br&gt;• British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td>All&lt;br&gt;Round Table Discussions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>Break&lt;br&gt;Coffee available (number of people going to Milestones?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15</td>
<td>a) Thomas White&lt;br&gt;b) Kathy Hopkins&lt;br&gt;c) Caren Dymond&lt;br&gt;Climate Change Initiatives/Research in BC</td>
<td>a) Climate Action Secretariat&lt;br&gt;b) Forest Stewardship Action Plan for Climate Change Adaptation&lt;br&gt;c) Climate Change Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15</td>
<td>All&lt;br&gt;Round Table Discussions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45</td>
<td>Mark Zacharias&lt;br&gt;Steve Guertin&lt;br&gt;Wrap-Up</td>
<td>• Agenda Day 2&lt;br&gt;• Feedback – Day 1&lt;br&gt;• Dinner planning/ideas&lt;br&gt;• Field trip check in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GNLCC Steering Committee Meeting * 15-16 May 2012 * see [http://greatnorthernlcc.org/event/215](http://greatnorthernlcc.org/event/215) **
**DRAFT: Not for release until OK’d by Yvette Converse or Tom Olliff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5:00</td>
<td>Adjourn</td>
<td>Dinner &amp; evening on your own (530 dinner for those going to Milestones)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wednesday, May 16th**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:30 AM</td>
<td>Arrival</td>
<td>Coffee/tea/light snacks available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>Scott Bischke</td>
<td>Welcome Back—Call to Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Introduction of any new attendees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Agenda overview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:05</td>
<td>Doug Konkin, Lori Faeth</td>
<td>Deputy’s Perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Yvette Converse</td>
<td>Tranboundary Flathead MOU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45</td>
<td>Bill Gaines, Michael Proctor</td>
<td>Transboundary Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) State of Washington transboundary connectivity work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Fine scale linkages and conservation delivery for grizzly bears in the Northern Rockies of Canada and the USA (by phone)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Coffee available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15</td>
<td>Sean Finn, Yvette Converse, Tom Olliff</td>
<td>Steering Committee discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* FY12 funding recommendations (SF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Alignment of regional/national landscape/science programs—opportunities and next steps (YC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Update on Partner Forums (YC, TO)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Mark Zacharias, Steve Guertin, Madeline Maley</td>
<td>Wrap-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Feedback – Day 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Closing Remarks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Next steps / action items</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 noon</td>
<td>Adjourn (travel safely!)</td>
<td>Lunch on your own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 - 4 PM</td>
<td>OPTIONAL Field Trip</td>
<td>Exploring the Ecological Variety in the Kamloops Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B — OPTIONAL FIELD TRIP

As a follow on to the meeting close May 16th, staff from the Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations made available a field trip to explore the ecological variety in the Kamloops area. The tour covered the geologic history of the area; soils and soil profiles; descriptions of flora and fauna and drivers such as climate change and forest pathogens that are modifying those communities; cultural and social uses of the land including for ranching, mining, and timbering operations; and more.

Roughly 20 people took part in the tour. All were appreciative of the chance to see a portion of the GNLCC surrounding Kamloops, and much appreciative of the efforts put forth by the tour guide team.

The arm provides a handy tool for visualizing the period of human history in relation to geologic time!

Great day to be outside, including discussions of variations in flora and fauna, geology and soil types around Kamloops.

Super guides from BC’s Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations. From left to right: Michael Ryan (Research Ecologist), Chuck Bulmer (Research Soil Scientist; with the vest), Ken Soneff (Research Manager), Brent Olsen (Stewardship Officer), Jim Fox (Compliance and Enforcement Manager). Michael, Chuck, and Ken are from the Region; Brent is from the District Office; and Jim works for a Victoria Branch.
A list of meeting attendees, including affiliations and contact information when available, is presented below in alphabetical order. The list reflects the organizers best effort to capture all those in attendance, though we recognize that some folks may have come and gone without having RSVP’d their plan to attend, or recording their presence on the sign in sheet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last, first name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annett, Rory</td>
<td>Executive Director, Coastal Projects</td>
<td>Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scott@emountainworks.com">scott@emountainworks.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bischke, Scott</td>
<td>BC Coordinator of Conservation Projects</td>
<td>MountainWorks, Inc.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:katie.blake@natureconservancy.ca">katie.blake@natureconservancy.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake, Katie</td>
<td>BC Coordinator of Conservation Projects</td>
<td>Nature Conservancy of Canada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brittell, Dave</td>
<td>Assistant Director of Wildlife</td>
<td>Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Dave.Brittell@dfw.wa.gov">Dave.Brittell@dfw.wa.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connell, Jamie</td>
<td>State Director, Montanan-Dakota Office</td>
<td>Bureau of Land Management</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jamie_Connell@blm.gov">Jamie_Connell@blm.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converse, Yvette Cross, Molly Cuthbertson, Danielle</td>
<td>Coordinator, Great Northern LCC Scientist Executive Coordinator</td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service, Wildlife Conservation Society, Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Yvette_Converse@fws.gov">Yvette_Converse@fws.gov</a>, <a href="mailto:mcross@wcs.org">mcross@wcs.org</a>, <a href="mailto:danielle.cuthbertson@gov.bc.ca">danielle.cuthbertson@gov.bc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickenson, Kevin Dolan, Bill</td>
<td>Regional Executive Director Land and Resource Management Coordinator</td>
<td>Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations, Alberta Tourism, Parks, and Recreation</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kevin.dickenson@gov.bc.ca">kevin.dickenson@gov.bc.ca</a>, <a href="mailto:bill.dolan@gov.ab.ca">bill.dolan@gov.ab.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dymond, Caren</td>
<td>Research Scientist</td>
<td>Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Caren.Dymond@gov.bc.ca">Caren.Dymond@gov.bc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyson, Ian Emmerich, John</td>
<td>Head, Cumulative Effects Strategy Development Deputy Director</td>
<td>Alberta Environment, Wyoming Game and Fish</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lan.Dyson@gov.ab.ca">lan.Dyson@gov.ab.ca</a>, <a href="mailto:John.Emmerich@wgf.state.wy.us">John.Emmerich@wgf.state.wy.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faeth, Lori</td>
<td>Special Asst to Assistant Sec of Policy Management and Budget Executive Director, US Relations and Partnerships</td>
<td>US Department of the Interior, BC Intergovernmental Relations, Office of the Premier</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bryant.fairley@gov.bc.ca">bryant.fairley@gov.bc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairley, Bryant</td>
<td>Science Coordinator, Great Northern LCC</td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sean_finn@fws.gov">sean_finn@fws.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gains, Bill</td>
<td>Manager, Ecosystem Conservation</td>
<td>Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Canadian Wildlife Service, Environment Canada, Canadian Mountain Joint Venture</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Blair.Hammond@ec.gc.ca">Blair.Hammond@ec.gc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammond, Blair</td>
<td>BC Regional Vice President</td>
<td>Nature Conservancy of Canada</td>
<td><a href="mailto:linda.hannah@natureconservancy.ca">linda.hannah@natureconservancy.ca</a></td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins, Kathy</td>
<td>Technical Advisor for Climate Change</td>
<td>BC Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kathy.hopkins@gov.bc.ca">kathy.hopkins@gov.bc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karakatsoulis, John</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Natural Resource Sciences</td>
<td>Thompson Rivers University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ikarakatsoulis@tru.ca">ikarakatsoulis@tru.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konkin, Doug</td>
<td>Deputy Minister</td>
<td>BC Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Nancy</td>
<td>Northwest Area Deputy Regional Executive</td>
<td>US Geological Survey</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nlee@usgs.gov">nlee@usgs.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maley, Madeline</td>
<td>Acting, Regional Executive Director</td>
<td>Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations</td>
<td><a href="mailto:madeline.maley@gov.bc.ca">madeline.maley@gov.bc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McBeth, Dave</td>
<td>Forests Practices Specialist</td>
<td>Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dave.mcbeth@gov.bc.ca">dave.mcbeth@gov.bc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonough, Dave</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>Waterton Lakes NP, Parks Canada</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dave.mcdonough@pc.gc.ca">dave.mcdonough@pc.gc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nash, Laurel</td>
<td>Executive Lead</td>
<td>Ministry of Energy and Mines</td>
<td><a href="mailto:laurel.nash@gov.bc.ca">laurel.nash@gov.bc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhouse, Nancy</td>
<td>Program Manager, Canadian Rocky Mountains Program, BC Region</td>
<td>Nature Conservancy of Canada</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nancy.newhouse@natureconservancy.ca">nancy.newhouse@natureconservancy.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olliff, Tom</td>
<td>Coordinator, Great Northern LCC</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tom_Olliff@nps.gov">Tom_Olliff@nps.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterson, Dan</td>
<td>Director, Resource Management</td>
<td>Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dan.peterson@gov.bc.ca">dan.peterson@gov.bc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sargent, Sasha</td>
<td>Coordinator, Canadian Intermountain Joint Venture and Pacific Coast Joint Venture</td>
<td>Canadian Wildlife Service, Environment Canada</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tasha.sargent@ec.gc.ca">tasha.sargent@ec.gc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexton, Erin</td>
<td>Research Scientist; representing Crown Managers Partnership</td>
<td>Flathead Lake Biological Station</td>
<td><a href="mailto:erin.sexton@flbs.umt.edu">erin.sexton@flbs.umt.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexton, Mary</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Department of Natural Resources and Conservation, State of MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Chris</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wildlife Management Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soneff, Ken</td>
<td>Forest Science Officer</td>
<td>Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ken.soneff@gov.bc.ca">ken.soneff@gov.bc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas, Ifan</td>
<td>Field Unit Superintendent</td>
<td>Waterton Lakes National Park</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ifan.thomas@pc.gc.ca">ifan.thomas@pc.gc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorson, Robyn</td>
<td>Pacific Regional Director</td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Robyn_Thorson@fws.gov">Robyn_Thorson@fws.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torbitt, Steven</td>
<td>Science Applications Asst Regional Director</td>
<td>USFWS R6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunnoch, Chris</td>
<td>Manager, Strategic Operations</td>
<td>Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chris.tunnoch@gov.bc.ca">chris.tunnoch@gov.bc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson, Greg</td>
<td>US FWS Chief of Office of Landscape Conservation - Mountain Prairie Region (Denver)</td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Greg_Watson@fws.gov">Greg_Watson@fws.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Thomas</td>
<td>Manager, Climate Change Adaptation</td>
<td>Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations</td>
<td><a href="mailto:thomas.white@gov.bc.ca">thomas.white@gov.bc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>Whitfield, Michael</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Heart of the Rockies Initiative</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hotmike@silverstar.com">hotmike@silverstar.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittington, Tammy</td>
<td>Associate Regional Director, Resources and Science Advisor, Intermountain Region</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zacharias, Mark</td>
<td>Assistant Deputy Minister</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mark.zacharias@gov.bc.ca">mark.zacharias@gov.bc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zylstra, Stephen</td>
<td>Science Applications Asst. Regional Director - Pacific Region</td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Stephen_Zylstra@fws.gov">Stephen_Zylstra@fws.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attending at least in part by phone: John Hayward, Rick Sojda, John Mankowski, Claire Sherry, Tom Schmidt, Carl Scheeler.

1 scott@emountainworks.com; www.emountainworks.com