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MEETING SUMMARY

The following pages provide a summary of the second in-person meeting of the Great Northern Landscape Conservation Cooperative (GNLCC) Steering Committee (SC). The meeting was held October 21-22, 2010 in Boise ID at the offices of the BLM.

This summary is broken into sections tracking with the meeting agenda (Appendix A) as developed by the GNLCC Advisory Team (AT). The summary is built on running meeting notes (Appendix D) from Susan Filkin and the flip chart notes of the facilitator. Action items are denoted by a “** action—“ and are summarized in a single table in a later section.

The AT came to the meeting seeking guidance and/or SC direction on five decision topics (briefing papers in Appendix B). During the meeting a sixth decision topic was added.

A listing of SC attendees to this meeting can be found in Appendix C. All presentation materials, as well as the meeting packet, background materials, spreadsheets showing SC, AT, staff, and proxy participants, and more can be found at the GNLCC interim website (www.nrmc.usgs.gov/gnlcc).

Informational Presentations: Part 1

Following opening introductions by all and welcoming statements from Steve Steve Guertin, John Wessels, and Cal Groen, the meeting moved to informational / background presentations. Highlights from these presentations follow.

GARY TABOR

Gary provided an overview on trends in large landscape conservation. He noted that the US is losing 2 M acres of natural land per year according to a NRCS-NRI and USFS 2006 report. Gary described why large landscapes are the proper geographic scale to concentrate on for landscape conservations given that they encompass such items as

• Biodiversity
• Weather mass disruptions
• Evolutionary processes
• Connectivity

Gary noted that ecological processes—for example natural disturbance regimes, migration, dispersal, and more—operate over large areas. Thus large areas are important to build and maintain ecosystem processes and resilience. Key points of focus for the LCC programs (and others), then, are:

• Conserving processes like migration
• Enhancing connectivity
• Removing or minimize existing stressors
• Protecting a representative array of ecosystems with redundancy
• Improving conservation outside protected areas

Gary described how climate change exacerbates habitat fragmentation, a key ecosystem stressor, and has the potential to drive species north or otherwise away from current habitat. He noted that increasing connectivity should be a core goal of landscape conservation policy, and provided examples of on-going efforts.

Gary closed by citing a number of federal large landscape initiatives that are on-going, and then by providing encouragement that the GNLCC can serve as proof of concept for collaborative, large landscape conservation.

GREGG SERVHEEN

Gregg used slides developed by Charles Baxter (deceased), a previous Advisor to the US FWS Director. Gregg talked about issues today that are providing challenges to conservation, for example population growth, energy development, water shortages, and climate change. He stated that trends transforming conservation include:

• The emergence of Conservation Science as the 21st Century conservation paradigm
• The changing conservation workforce
• Escalating expectations regarding public sector performance
• The increasing complexity of conservation issues

Gregg described that we are in a transition in conservation ethics, having moved from Romantic-Transcendental Conservation ethic (man/nature relationship seen in a spiritual context); to a Resource Conservation ethic (an/nature relationship seen in a utilitarian, wise use context); to what is emerging today: an Evolutionary-Ecological Land ethic (defined by the theoretical thinking of Conservation Biology, Landscape Ecology, Ecosystem Management).

Under this final emerging ethic, Gregg used a quote from hockey player Wayne Gretsky to explain what the goal should be for the GNLCC: “I skate to where the puck is going to be, not where it has been.”

RICK SOJDA

Rick spoke about state wildlife action plans (SWAPs) and GNLCC/USFWS common species as a first step toward integrating landscape efforts. He noted the following observations:

• Identifying species commonalities are a first step and not a final step. These are part of a foundation for discussing the future evaluation of our success at landscape conservation.

Rick described the process that the GNLCC AT used to determine initial species and habitat analysis. This resulted in 27 common species living in six key habitat types. Of the habitat types the

• Wetland/Riparian (greatest # of species)
• Cool/Cold streams
• Grassland/Sage/Steppe
• Montane Forest
• Alpine
• Open Forest

Rick recommended three areas to focus adaptive management discussions on for protecting priority species:

• ensuring the complete suite of management alternatives is identified and then selecting those to evaluate
• developing conceptual models to be used for empirical evaluation
• developing the monitoring effort to be used for evaluation of whether objectives have been achieved

DAVID NAUGLE

David focused his talk on four areas:

• Outcome-based science to manage adaptively
• Large-scale planning; aka conservation triage
• Using focal species to represent ecosystem dynamics
• LCC partnership with USDA Sage-Grouse Initiative

He noted that a new model is emerging for conservation delivery that is collaborative, strategic, science-driven and planning-intensive; where management actions are based on predicted population benefits; and where monitoring and research are indispensable. This contrasts greatly with past efforts that were agency specific, opportunity driven, and planning averse.

David noted that we need to identify and articulate a shared vision that engages the public. For example, we are not promoting grizzly bears, but instead sustainable ranching and rural life.

David discussed the USDA Sage-Grouse initiative covering 11 western states, slated at protecting sage grouse while ensuring sustainability of working ranches in the West. He pointed out the program represents a new way of doing business for USDA, essentially saying, “What’s good for sage-grouse is good for ranching.”

Decision I—GNLCC Strategic Framework

TOM OLLIFF
Tom presented the AT’s vision for the strategic framework for the GNLCC for 2011 and asked the SC for direction on the following decision:

**Decision 1:** Does the SC agree to adopt the proposed framework to guide LCC priorities and metrics in the short- and long-term? Does the SC agree to move forward with defining flagship priorities within this framework?

Tom provided detail and then led discussion on the AT’s recommended strategic framework for the GNLCC for 2011. The goal is to create the framework from which the long-term strategy will be derived. For the strategic framework, the AT recommends:

- A staged approach driven by different efforts:
  - Immediate term: use the Interim GNLCC Plan
  - Short-Term: use analyses and priorities from State Wildlife Action Plans and on-going Landscape Initiatives. There are 24 landscape initiatives already identified within GNLCC—most newly getting underway—19 with stated priorities. The priority categories are species, ecological communities, landscape issues, ecological processes, and cultural heritage.
  - Long-term: develop full GNLCC strategy based on short term themes and resources, other ecosystem services and conservation values, and input from eco forums and other partners.
  - Considers priorities on broad suite of Ecosystem Services, Conservation Values, and Cultural Heritage, as well as input from partners.
- The strategy will be built on a framework that includes Flagship Priorities, Conservation Goals and Measures, Operations Plan, Science Strategy, Communications and Coordination Strategy.
- The Strategy will eventually guide annual workplans and reporting. Processes driven by the strategic framework, even without the full strategy elucidated, should begin in 2011.

Guidance, questions, and comments from the SC to the AT’s strategic framework included the following:

- **Action 1**—Data integration should be shown explicitly as part of the strategic framework and long-term strategy.
- For conservation goals and measures—may want to have a phased approach in synch with long-term strategy.
- The SC stated that human factors (including cultural heritage) appears to be missing from the strategic framework; that some input from social scientists is needed.
- Some discussion centered on fact that social sciences can be brought in through GNLCC communication and education efforts.
- The Umatilla tribe has a cultural heritage program called First Foods that ties all work of management decisions back to a landscape perspective.
- A member of the AT compared the strategic framework to a business plan that the AT needed a go or no-go decision on. The comparison to a business plan resonated with the SC.
- Some SC conversation and debate surrounded the need, under the guise of social sciences/cultural heritage, to reach out to private landowners. This work, per the AT, has not been done to date but is planned for the future targeting the public and NGO’s. The SC asked several key questions: 1) Can we answer “what this means for the public out there?” 2) What is the human component? 3) What are the linkages between the people and the landscape?
- A suggestion was provided to use the NOAA model for engaging the public (ref: DeWayne Cecil).
- The SC recognized that with possible changes at election time, the GNLCC need an action plan that anticipates and endures potential political shifts. But there was also recognition that the LCC concept is a big idea that should transcend politics—it will be a greater than two year effort. The USFWS is committed long term to the LCC program. Some discussion centered on the question: how do we institutionalize GNLCC and move forward to make action happen?
• The SC stated that projects have three parts: ends (goal), ways (methods), and means (resources). The SC recommended that the AT focus on the third of these items, and also that the GNLCC needs to have an outline that describes its sequence of steps over time.

• Further discussion centered on the question of how the GNLCC can show relevancy. Comments from the LLC included for Partners; Partner response, particularly from the states included 1) putting data into a geospatial reference; 2) getting technical support in reference to connectivity; 3) Fish and Game agencies need examples/less ESA species and no or little litigation; 4) help with data integration, 5) help with climate change modeling for future predictions; 6) help with actionable information regarding habitat connectivity; 7) real data; 8) guidance on what science is needed; 9) consolidating all data in a single location; 10) most important is providing capacity.

• The SC requested information on who is doing what? How do we define and work together? We are trying to actually to improve, or purchase for protection connectivity.

• Y. Converse—we aren’t spending a lot of time to discuss the projects we put money into/synthesis project (who is doing what) just haven’t been able to talk about at this meeting. We have so much going on, place or issue based. We will work on presenting this info to the SC and greater GNLCC participants.

When asked if they agreed to the framework proposed by the AT to help guide GNLCC work, the SC agreed to the idea of having a framework but requested more information to define flagship priorities. The SC said it was not ready to give the go ahead to the framework as presented. Instead they asked for further development, as reflected in these actions items:

• **action2**—In development of the strategic framework, the SC recommended that the AT focus on a) resources and capacity; b) climate change and relevant modeling to support states; c) social sciences and creating a more inclusive tent.

• **action3**—The SC requested a white paper or similar providing more detailed strategic framework bullets. The SC recommended a bulleted approach with respect to process with a description of how to achieve each step (e.g., capacity, messaging/goal for workable lands, how to measure, stakeholder involvement, accountability). The AT is requested to return a new framework proposal to the SC for approval that includes greater detail. The SC specifically requested that topics of a) selection of GNLCC priorities, and b) GNLCC relevancy be addressed.

• **action4**—The AT requested, and was not dissuaded from, hiring a consultant who specializes in the generation of organizational strategic documents.

## Decision 2—Eco Forums

**Yvette Converse**

Yvette presented the AT’s vision for the Eco Forum concept previously developed, asking the SC for guidance on the following decision:

**Decision 2:** Does the SC support the proposed outline below for convening Eco Forums?

• Recommend 45 day review period
• Recommend initiating Eco Forums in FY 11
• Recommend funding support to start up Eco Forums in FY11

Yvette noted that the purpose of the Eco Forums is to engage “…conservation practitioners and partnerships that share conservation challenges in an eco-geographic context to identify specific conservation needs for the GNLCC priorities.”

She showed overlays of the great number of current conservation partnerships within the GNLCC. She also defined what the AT meant in dividing the GNLCC into three eco-types; an eco-type as employed by the AT is not a discrete geographic area but rather areas that have common conservation needs. For the GNLCC the
three eco forums selected are Rocky Mountain, Columbia Basin, and Sage-Steppe.

The Eco Form process, as envisioned by the AT, includes:

- Series of interactive webinars
- Creation of a leadership team
- Gap analysis
- Identify specific needs
- Develop into a long-term strategy

Yvette further mentioned that AT envisions that Eco forums will be self-governed at appropriate scale and formality and that the GNLCC will provide support to initiate and convene the groups, plus guidance for information and process.

The SC discussed the Eco forum presentation, and decision #2 with the following comments:

- The SC largely stated that the process set out is an excellent idea recognizing that the sooner the AT is able to step this down to some of our field folks the sooner you will get some work done. Also, it was noted that a model for webinars exists: the National Draught Information Center that regularly holds 30-40 people webinars for citizen engagement.
- Some discussion and direction from the SC came around the question of whether it would be productive or not to engage the public before the directions of the eco forums were set. Strong sentiments were expressed in each way. One related suggestion that received some discussion was the idea of moving communication out of the strategic framework.
- The SC asked where will the $s come from for the creation of the eco forums and their leadership teams. Yes, there should be help from GNLCC staff but the AT expects that a few key people from outside the GNLCC staff will have to step up, as well. NGOs were suggested as a convener of the eco forums. It was also noted that there are landowner organizations that will be interested in being on the team.

- The SC suggested that in convening the eco forums some leg work needed to be done to find out what information each partner group could provide and needed.
- The SC suggested that the AT 1) stay focused on the outcomes desired from the eco forums first, and then design the processes for engagement with partners; 2) start with some of these well-established landscape initiative groups; and 3) engage the people that are already doing the work to assure success; 4) consider the idea of having two-level eco forums: experts and public, each meeting having different goals; 5) first engagement should be with existing landscape initiatives.

**action5**—SC requests that the AT “flesh out” the idea based on today’s comments, return the proposal to the SC for a 30 day comments period. Included should be a funding request, including explicitly if there are any resource requests from the states. By Thanksgiving.

**action6**—The SC recommends that the AT create a pilot eco forum project in the next 6 months to “test drive” how they are to be developed (goals, governance, etc). The target group should be an existing landscape initiative.

### Decision 6 (added during this meeting)—Pilot Project

**DAVID WOOD**

This item was initially slated for discussion only. Following David’s presentation and subsequent discussion, however, it became apparent that there was a request on the floor from the AT to the SC as follows:

**Decision 6:** Will the SC support creating a pilot project through the LCC in the Middle Rockies to integrate decisions and data sharing for on-going landscape assessments?

<< The discussion began on Oct 21 and was held over for the start of the meeting on Oct 22. The report that follows presents key points from the discussion in a single narrative. >>
David began by asking, how can LCC partners work together on landscape scale assessments? David described numerous federal initiatives slated at fostering cross-agency cooperation, and likewise how states cooperate through the SWAP program as well as the Western Governors’ Association. He quoted from a climate adaptation scoping report that said:

A successful adaptive management strategy requires coordinated effort among federal entities, state agencies, and engages tribes and local jurisdictions. By working together, Western states can identify collective priority resource areas and information needs, and ensure that new federal ‘climate services’ are responsive to on-the-ground needs.

From a Progress report of the Interagency Climate Change Adaptation Task Force, David added:

Harmonizing efforts at the regional scale benefits both decision makers and information providers by avoiding duplication of efforts and leveraging existing capabilities. Regional coordination will foster collaboration on the many science and service activities emerging across Federal agencies. Furthermore, a regional emphasis will create opportunities for improving the accessibility of existing science as well as responding to evolving information needs.

With this background, David described the opportunity for the GNLCC to support the creation of a short term demonstration project that would facilitate and accomplish trans-boundary, cross-agency natural resource management.

He stated that the LCC could add value by helping establish interagency cooperation on landscape scale adaptive management to assure efficient use of resources, decreased time demands, and increased effectiveness and utility of outcomes, data, tools, and science products. Such cooperation would address the following issues:

- We have similar strategies for managing large scale pressures on ecological values, but are implementing these separately
- Coordination and integration of these strategies is most effective at the regional scale
- Leveraging existing capacity is more efficient and facilitates partnership approach widely recognized as needed in the new paradigm of conservation
- Do we have the capacity and funding to fully implement these separately?

The explicit proposal from the AT to the SC was as follows: Will the SC support creating a pilot project in the Middle Rockies to integrate decisions and data sharing for on-going landscape assessments? Such a project would better align

- project schedules
- calls for and uses of data
- management questions and terminology including overall assessment approach, and respective project outcomes and deliverables

To accomplish this effort, the AT needs

- Immediate staff attention (ad hoc committee) from F&W State Agencies, BLM, and USFS
- Investment in initial coordination for long term efficiencies
- Management decisions on recommendations

David’s proposal on behalf of the AT sparked much discussion within the SC, as highlighted below:

- Some of the SC expressed great enthusiasm saying we have nothing in a concerted way that we can trace the efforts on the landscape. To understand climate and ecological change we need better data. We need the observation data to know when the species are changing. The LCCs can tell us when we put the observations in place are we putting them in the right place? In terms of working together, NOAA wanted to step up to the plate. We are trying to better coordinate
with all LCCs. We don’t want to duplicate but use other LCCs for information.

- Some on the SC stated confusion over why are we trying to do what is already being done; why not use the info already being collected? The response is that the pilot provides for the integration of the three projects, not just one. The project connects BLM Regional Ecological Assessment (REA) with similar assessments being done by the USFS WVA pilots and WGA pilots.
- The SC noted that one key is to understand what each group means by assessment. AT response is essentially that this is the goal of the pilot project, to see if goals can be aligned thereby saving time and resources. A recent USGS-led assessment of trout was cited as an example of successful cross-agency collaboration.
- SC stated that climate information is important, but need to recognize that vulnerability assessments can vary based on the question being asked. Thus LCCs can be the clearing house for the shared questions all groups want to ask.
- Some of the SC expressed that such a pilot project would require some capacity to pull it off. A response from the AT came that yes that was correct in the short term, but expected not to be true once integration was well under way due to improved efficiencies and elimination of redundant efforts.
- Some on the SC recognized that this is a unique opportunity and only short lived as the BLM needs to get started with its Regional Ecological Assessment (REA) in the next few weeks. The REA assessment and WGA assessment and USFS
- SC member noted that upper agency efforts in Washington DC are focusing on addressing capacity needs and that DOI/BLM are trying to coordinate REAs nationally with states, including a tentative workshop on this issue at the WGA meeting in December and also a national workshop charged with looking into cross agency collaboration in two weeks.
- David clarified that 1) this would be a 6 month project with a report back to the SC at that time (next SC meeting); 2) the request was for an ad hoc committee to begin working on the pilot project.

**action7**—On a call of the question, the SC gave unanimous “thumbs up” and/or “no objection” vote to going forward with a 6-month pilot project that reflected AT request and discussions presented herein. No budget was discussed for the project. The SC requested a work plan for the project be presented.

**action8**—Use the GNLCC as a coordinating mechanism for states w/r to climate change information; thus add climate change coordination to the strategic framework (note: the discussion closed here without full clarity in this direction regarding the roles of the GNLCC vs the role of the USGS Climate Science Centers)

### Decision 3—Governance Charter

#### Y. CONVERSE

**Decision 3**: Does the SC support the Governance Charter as final?

- Recommend 45 day final comment period after which Governance Charter is final.

Yvette provided a summary of the AT’s recommendation for the GNLCC SC Governance Charter, built on the deliberations of the April 2010 SC meeting and subsequent teleconferences. She noted that to SC had agreed to the following goal for the GNLCC:

*Coordinate, facilitate, promote, and add value to large landscape conservation to build resource resilience in the face of climate change and other landscape-level stressors through the following:*

- Support Science Development
- Effect Coordination
- Inform Conservation Action
- Monitor and Evaluate
- Communicate and Educate

Yvette reviewed the draft governance plan that the SC had for review pre-meeting, as well as in their meeting packet. The plan describes—both
via narrative and schematic—the GNLCC operations charter, including guiding principles, long-term strategy, partnership community (Eco Forums), and annual work plan development.

The SC provided the following feedback:

- The SC stated relative agreement with the Governance charter given the provision that all groups recognize the charter may be adapted and modified in the future as the need arises.
- **action9**—The SC requested that interim reporting for active projects be required (page 19 of meeting packet).
- **action10**—The SC requested that a vice chair be called out in the governance charter. That person would convene meeting is the absence of the chair, and also be expected to be the chair for the following term.
- Much discussion centered around the adding a component of social science (possibly through NRCS, USFS, NPS, or USGS Climate Science Centers?) and/or assuring that cultural heritage (do all groups mean the same thing by that?) is part of the governance charter. Yvette made slight changes to the charter real-time on the screen under “B. Purpose and Goals—Describe cultural heritage, working landscape values” with some quick group editing, that received general acceptance and will be part of the reissue of the governance charter (see action11 below).

Upon a call of the question for Decision 3, the SC provided unanimous thumbs up to the Governance charter as described, with the two requested changes completed. Also, the SC reserves the right to consider the charter as provisional and modifiable as needs may arise.

**action11**—After the AT makes the changes and adds paragraph about diverse lands; forwards the revised governance charter, the SC will have 30 days to review the changes for comment. The SC will convene for a yes/no vote.

---

**Decision 4—FY11 Themes**

---

**T. OLLIFF/Y. CONVERSE**

**Decision 4:** Does the SC agree to the proposed themes and process to guide funding and work plan decisions for FY11? (Note: this will be the last year under interim operations until the GNLCC develops a Long-term Strategy to guide annual workplans).

Tom and Yvette first reviewed the SC’s 2010 priority themes for GNLCC funding:

- Habitat Connectivity
- Water Resources Vulnerability
- Data Integration

For 2011 the AT recommended the following priority themes for GNLCC funding:

- Habitat Connectivity
- Aquatic Integrity
- >> Data Integration
- Climate Change
- Partnerships
- Communication, Education, and Outreach

The data integration item was not part of the AT recommendations but was added to their day 2 presentation after strong SC guidance on day 1 during the Strategic Framework discussion.

Tom and Yvette noted that the GNLCC is both funding and finding science. As such, the AT recommended the following step-wise process for sponsoring GNLCC projects:

1. To develop the overall pool of projects to consider for potential funding--
   a. Consider carry-over projects
   b. Canvas partnerships for existing projects matching 2011 GNLCC themes
   c. If insufficient projects from a & b, develop and circulate GNLCC project RFP

2. Apply SC ranking criteria to the pool of projects under consideration from #1 to create ranking and funding recommendation. The AT recommends the following method of ranking:
   i. Climate change or other landscape drivers (25%)
ii. Focal resources, species and/or habitats (15%)
iii. Effects on – the - ground conservation delivery (25%)
iv. Geographic scope of project (10%)
v. Partner engagement (15%)
vi. Ability to show "success" in FY2010 (10%)

3. Based on the outcome of the ranking, the AT submits projects recommended for GNLCC funding to SC for approval

Based on this presentation, the SC provided the following feedback:

• A member of the SC wondered if the GNLCC is can expect sufficient funding to support all themes. Steve Guertin responded that $1 million was available for each LCC to fund projects. He said that the challenge is to get OMB to approve and buy off on our projects (funding).

• Many SC comments led to open discussion but not clear answers. Among them: How can we relate the Eco forms to the themes? Can we make sure that the strategic framework is reflected in the themes? Can the AT provide clarification on pooling of funding criteria?

• **action12**—The SC requested that clear guidelines be developed for GNLCC project funding process to help grant seekers. In particular a desire was stated that the guidelines be objectives based, and not simply select projects based upon their existence already.

• The SC stated that data integration and monitoring are critical parts of the GNLCC’s work. They also asked the AT to differentiate between partnership themes vs common themes.

• The SC asked how it can prioritize social and human aspects, in particular to issues of climate change? Much discussion followed including that it will come in through the communication and outreach portion of the GNLCC goals.

The facilitator requested a call to the question of whether the six themes be accepted. The SC provided unanimous agreement given that action12 be taken.

### Decision 5—Capacity and support

**S. Guertin**

**Decision 5:** Does the SC support the proposed options for providing support to GNLCC partners?

- Data or other Technical support staff at WGA
- Range-rider Liaison staff at WGA or WAFWA
- FY 11 funding to States to offset costs of participation
- Development of a Capacity Grant Program that can support other partners

Steve provided a summary of capacity and funding available to the GNLCC for 2011, as follows:

- **Coordinator & Staff (funding source)**
  - Coordinator–US FWS (GNLCC $)
  - Co-Coordinator–NPS (NPS $)
  - Science Coord.–US FWS (GNLCC $)
  - Science Coord.–USGS (GS NoRock $)
  - Landscape Ecologist–USGS (GS $)
  - Outreach ¾ FTE–USGS (GS NoRock $)
  - GIS ¼ FTE–USGS (GS NoRock & Snake River $)
  - NPS internship (NPS $)

- **Advisory Team**
  - GNLCC Coordinator and Staff
  - Colateral support from partner agency staff
  - Represent regional collaborative body
  - Membership flexible and responsive

- **Support to Partners**
  - States
    - Long-term—State support positions:
      - Technical support FTE for pilots (WGA)
      - ‘Range-rider’ FTE for multiple states (WAFWA or WGA)
    - B. Short-term—FY11 allocation: $50k to each State to offset costs of participation
  - Others—Capacity Grant Program
**Informational presentations: Part 2**

S. Gray

- Modeled after IWJV Capacity Grant Program
- Annual or Bi-annual term-grant program
- Available to non-Federal partners
- ‘Need’ and ‘Effectiveness’ criteria
- Opportunity for Tribes, Provinces and NGOs

Steve asked for a short turnaround decision from the states (MT, WY, ID) on whether they would accept one time, short term, $50k funding offered.

**action13**—States of MT, ID, WY to respond to Steve Guertin by Nov 10 to the USFWS offer of $50k for each state to fund a GIS project position in each state (or other need).

**action14**—Steve to get back to full SC on the decisions of the states presented to him under action13.

Steve’s presentation led to a short conversation by the SC members, with key points as follow:

- The SC asked if the GNLCC would recognize that NGOs needed funding. Steve said yes, capacity grants will take care of that need.
- The SC requested that WA and OR be involved in the long-term funding discussions and decisions.
- State members on the SC stated their desire to have someone who can dedicate their time to LCC. SG noted that USFWS has $100K for a state coordinator that could handle coordination for all three states. He asked the states to try to come to some consensus on the a long term structure they could support.
- **action15**—MT, WY, ID, OR, WA (also provinces, tribes?) come to consensus on acceptable long term support structure for GNLCC

On a call to the question for Decision 5, the SC gave unanimous thumbs up.

Steve Gray spoke about climate change and its impacts and opportunities in the GNLCC. He noted that some projections show a ~3.5 F increase by 2050 with a strong likelihood of drier summers and wetter winters for North America. For the Western US, Steve said the continued temperature increases are highly likely, but that there is low confidence in what trends precipitation will follow with climate change.

Steve’s two key issues in the face of climate change are:

- Current knowledge of temperature change and its ecological impacts gives us a solid foundation for planning, monitoring and adaptation efforts; and
- myriad opportunities exist for local, state and federal partnerships to address knowledge gaps and improve adaptive capacity

Steve suggested, and provided evidence, that we should expect more hot days, fewer cold days, more heat waves, and fewer cold outbreaks. He noted that high elevations are warming faster than low-elevations.

Steve showed modeling efforts that showed that small increases in temperature lead to increased evaporation in the western US, and decreased water yield to streams. Droughts intensified with high prob. of extreme drought

Steve stated that climate is the backdrop for all other types of change and that we need to recognize that climate can promote, pace, amplify, or dampen the impact of other drivers (e.g., river flow, fire regimes, invasives spread). While climate change will have many implications for the GNLCC, Steve noted that we will have to deal with drought, flooding, severe winters, etc. no matter what climate change brings.

Steve closed with a positive message—that we know enough to start acting today. His suggestions:

- Pressing need for research and monitoring that links key aspects of climate variability and change to ecosystem impacts
• Smart, sustainable monitoring
• Characterization of natural climate variability and recent climate change (whatever the cause)
• Construction of high-quality, QC/QA’d baseline climate data
• Improved access to data
• Use “Scenario Planning” and other techniques to assess vulnerabilities under a wide range of potential futures

N. Lee

Nancy Lee talked about the current status of the USGS Northwest Climate Science Center (CSC). The selection of university hosts for two centers—southeast and NW regions—occurred September 23, 2010. For the NW a consortium of universities (OSU, UW, UI) was selected and given a budget of $3.5M over five years. Each university will focus on different aspects of climate science; each will host graduate student projects.

The NW CSC will cover three LCCs: the North Pacific, the Great Northern, and the Great Basin.

Nancy noted that the CSCs have several charges, including to:

• integrate physical climate models with ecological, habitat, and population response models;
• develop models and forecast fish and wildlife population and habitat changes;
• develop methods and assess vulnerability of species and habitats; and
• develop standardized approaches to modeling and monitoring

The USGS is currently recruiting a Center Director. The NW CSC will convene Science Advisory Committee and a Science Implementation Panel, and will develop a science plan to establish science priorities by June 2011.

Spring 2011: To be held at the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, Wednesday/Thursday April 13/14, 2011 from noon to noon in Umatilla OR. Hosted by the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (Carl Scheeler contact).

Fall 2012: To be held in late September or early October, to be determined. Some synergy may be possible with other landscape level meetings/events being held in that time period (ref: Gary Tabor). To be held at or near Glacier National Park and hosted by the National Park Service (John Wessel contact).

SC Telecons

The AT requested that the Steering Committee begin to meet by phone regularly to better handle required decisions and guidance. The SC agreed to meet by phone the first Tuesday of the month, every two months, beginning in December 2010, all calls at 10 AM Mountain time.

• Thus the next SC telecom is Tuesday Dec 7, 2010, 10 am Mountain Time (one hour call). Meeting agenda will include action items identified in this meeting. The AT will be responsible for convening the call.
• Future meetings for the rest of 2011 would then Tuesdays, 10 AM Mountain time on Feb 1, Apr 5, Jun 7, Aug 2, Oct 4, Dec 6.
• The AT recognized that given a goal to provide useful preparation materials to the SC for the April meeting in Umatilla, that another SC phone call would be of use. The SC agreed to set aside time for a telecon Mar 29, 2011 at 10 am Mountain time.

Future Meeting Scheduling

SC face-to-face meetings
**Action Items Identified During this Meeting**

The following table provides a summary of the action items developed during this two day meeting. Completion dates were not explicitly stated in all cases. Thus the dates shown are in some cases suggested by the facilitator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>What</th>
<th>By when</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td><strong>Action1</strong>—Data integration should be shown explicitly as part of the strategic framework and long-term strategy</td>
<td>Provided in advance of next SC phone call, Dec 7, to give sufficient time for SC review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Action2</strong>—In development of the strategic framework, the SC recommended that the AT focus on a) resources and capacity; b) climate change modeling to support states; c) social sciences and creating a more inclusive tent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td><strong>Action3</strong>—The SC requested a white paper or similar providing more detailed strategic framework bullets. The SC recommended a bulleted approach with respect to process with a description of how to achieve each step (e.g., capacity, messaging/goal for workable lands, how to measure, stakeholder involvement, accountability). The AT is requested to return a new framework proposal to the SC for approval that includes greater detail. The SC specifically requested that topics of a) selection of GNLCC priorities, and b) GNLCC relevancy be addressed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td><strong>Action4</strong>—The AT requested, and was not dissuaded from, hiring a consultant who specializes in the generation of organizational strategic documents.</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td><strong>Action5</strong>—SC requests that the AT “flesh out” the idea based on today’s comments, return the proposal to the SC for a 30 day comments period. Included should be a funding request, including explicitly if there are any resource requests from the states.</td>
<td>By Thanksgiving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td><strong>Action6</strong>—The SC recommends that the AT create a pilot eco forum project in the next 6 months to “test drive” how they are to be developed (goals, governance, etc). The target group should be an existing landscape initiative.</td>
<td>May 1, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Decision 6: Will the SC support creating a pilot project in the Middle Rockies to integrate decisions and data sharing for on-going landscape assessments?</td>
<td>Workplan provided before Dec 7 SC phone call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>David W, AT</td>
<td><strong>Action7</strong>—On a call of the question, the SC gave unanimous “thumbs up” and/or “no objection” vote to going forward with a 6-month pilot project that reflected AT request and discussions presented herein. No budget was discussed for the project. The SC requested a workplan for the project be presented.</td>
<td>In 6 months, report to SC at April SC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>What</td>
<td>By when</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td><strong>action8</strong>—Use the GNLCC as a coordinating mechanism for states w/r to climate change information; thus add climate change coordination to the strategic framework (note: the discussion closed here without full clarity in this direction regarding the roles of the GNLCC vs the role of the USGS Climate Science Centers)</td>
<td>Incorporate into actions 1, 2, 3, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td><strong>action9</strong>—The SC requested that interim reporting for active projects be required (page 19 of meeting packet).</td>
<td>To be added to the Governance charter before sending out (action 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td><strong>action10</strong>—The SC requested that a vice chair be called out in the governance charter. That person would convene meeting in the absence of the chair, and also be expected to be the chair for the following term.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>AT, SC</td>
<td><strong>action11</strong>—After the AT makes the changes and forwards the revised governance charter, the SC will have 30 days to review the changes for comment. The SC will convene for a yes/no vote.</td>
<td>AT send out by Nov 15; SC response, if any, by Dec 15, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td><strong>action12</strong>—The SC requested that clear guidelines be developed for GNLCC project funding process to help grant seekers. In particular a desire was stated that the guidelines be objectives based, and not simply select projects based upon their existence already.</td>
<td>Provided in advance of next SC phone call, Dec 7, to give sufficient time for SC review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>MT, ID, WY</td>
<td><strong>action13</strong>—States of MT, ID, WY to respond to Steve Guertin by Nov 10 to the USFWS offer of $50k for each state to fund a GIS project position in each state.</td>
<td>Nov 10, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Steve G.</td>
<td><strong>action14</strong>—Steve to get back to full SC on the decisions of the states presented to him under action13.</td>
<td>Nov 11, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>MT, ID, WY, OR, WA</td>
<td><strong>action15</strong>—MT, WY, ID, OR, WA (also provinces, tribes?) come to consensus on acceptable long term support structure for GNLCC</td>
<td>for next SC phone call, Dec 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A: MEETING AGENDA

DECISION ITEMS FOR THE MEETING (see related briefings on following pages)
1) GNLCC Strategic Framework
2) Process to establish Eco-Forums
3) Finalize governance
4) FY11 Themes, workplan, and funding process
5) Capacity to support States and other partners

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 21, BEGIN AT 12PM

12 noon—Introductions and Welcome (30 min)

12:30 PM—THE FRAMEWORK
1. Landscape Conservation: A perspective on the Great Northern (G. Tabor) (20 m)
2. The Need: A Shifting Paradigm (20 m)
3. State Wildlife Action Plans and the GNLCC (R. Sojda) (20 m)

<< Mini Break (10 min) >>
5. The GNLCC Strategic Framework (T. Olliff, Discussion & Decision 1) (1 h)

<< BREAK @ 3:15p (15 min) >>

3:30 PM—MAKING IT WORK
6. Proposal for Initiating GNLCC Eco Forums (Y. Converse) (45 m) (Disc & Decision 2)
7. How LCCs can facilitate REAs, WGA & other initiatives (D. Wood) (45 m) (Discussion)

5:30 PM—ADJOURN / MEET FOR DINNER at 6:30pm (details to be provided)

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 22, BEGIN AT 8 AM

8 AM—BUSINESS and OPERATIONS
1. Finalize Governance Charter (Converse) (30 m) (Decision 3)
2. FY11 Themes, Annual Workplan, Funding Process (1 h) (Converse/Olliff) (Decision 4)
3. Capacity & Support to State Agencies and others (S. Guertin) (45 m) (Decision 5)

<< BREAK 10:15a (15 min) >>

10:30 AM—CLIMATE CHANGE
4. Climate Change and Landscape Conservation (S. Gray) (30 m) (Information)
5. USGS Northwest Climate Science Center (N. Lee) (30 m) (Information)
6. Schedule future meetings and calls (dates/times/locations) (Bischke) (15 m) (Business)
7. Wrap-up of Meeting and Final Comments (15 m) (GNLCC Chairs)

12 noon—ADJOURN
APPENDIX B: BRIEFING PAPERS FOR GNLCC DECISION POINTS

The following briefing sheets were presented to the SC to support their decision making during the course of the meeting. The full meeting packet, which included these as well as other support documents, can be found at the GNLCC interim website (http://www.nrmcs.usgs.gov/gnlcc).

DECISION 1. Great Northern LCC Strategic Framework Decision Briefing

Decision 1: Does the Steering Committee (SC) agree to adopt the proposed framework to guide LCC priorities and metrics in the short- and long-term? Does the SC agree to move forward with defining flagship priorities within this framework?

Background

1. Interim Operations Plan - In 2009, the Great Northern LCC (GNLCC) developed an Interim Operations Plan in response to a request from US FWS. However, there was minimal partner input during this time. Therefore subsequent steps were taken to integrate priorities from partner agencies, starting with State wildlife agencies.

2. Goals and Priorities for FY10 - In 2010, the GNLCC focused on setting a goal, developing a governance structure, and funding science under three priority themes: a) Habitat Connectivity; b) Water Resources Vulnerability; and c) Data Integration.

3. State Wildlife Action Plans – In response to a request from State agencies to consider SWAPs, the GNLCC analyzed State Wildlife Action Plans from Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington for commonalities in ecological communities and species. This analysis can serve as a foundation for priority species and ecological communities for the GNLCC as one step towards identifying flagship priorities.

4. Preliminary Landscape Initiatives Analysis—As suggested at the SWAP Coordinator’s Workshop, the Advisory Team also conducted a preliminary analysis of Landscape Initiatives within the GNLCC, combining priorities across five resource areas: a) Landscape Issues/Threats; b) Ecological Communities; c) Species; d) Ecological Processes; and e) Cultural Heritage. This analysis is preliminary and needs to be expanded but provides an excellent start at identifying common regional natural resource priorities.

5. Long-term Strategy — In order to develop annual needs within a larger strategic framework that incorporates priorities and values from all partners, the Advisory Team recommends that the GNLCC use the proposed framework to develop a Long-term Strategy. This Strategy would be informed by the above analyses (SWAP & Landscape Initiative Analysis) as well as other landscape scaled assessments and input from Eco-Forums.
   0 Once developed, the GNLCC Strategy guides annual workplans.
The Advisory Team recommends development of the Strategy is an FY11 priority project.

### Decision 2. Convening Eco Forum Briefing

**Decision 2:** Does the SC support the proposed outline below for convening Eco Forums?

1. Recommend 45 day review period

2. Recommend initiating Eco Forums in FY 11

3. Recommend funding support to start up Eco Forums in FY11

**Background**

1. There are numerous existing and functioning landscape-scaled partnerships within the Great Northern Area

2. A wealth of scientific and technical expertise exists within the Great Northern Area

3. The GNLCC wants to take advantage of existing efforts and expertise in developing a collaborative, regional response to landscape change.

4. Eco Forums provide a means for existing expertise and experience to play a driving role in development of conservation information and needs by building on existing teams, committees and effort.

5. Eco Forums provide an interface for ground-level and local management and scientists to interface, inform, and provide feedback into the GNLCC.

### Decision 3. Governance Charter Briefing

**Decision 3:** Does the SC support the Governance Charter as final?

1. Recommend 45 day final comment period after which Governance Charter is final.

**Background**

1. In April 2010, the Advisory Team drafted a governance charter to reflect discussion at the April 2010 Steering Committee meeting

2. Governance Charter includes:
Need
Purpose and Goals
Organization
Operations
Communication and Information Exchange

3. There have been two review periods for additional comments (three drafts).

4. Changes have been made to reflect comments and add clarity in roles, responsibilities and communication flow.

**Decision 4. FY11 Themes and Funding Process Briefing**

**Decision 4**: Does the SC agree to the proposed themes and process to guide funding and work plan decisions for FY11? (Note: this will be the last year under interim operations until the GNLCC develops a Long-term Strategy to guide annual workplans).

**Background**

1. In 2010, the Great Northern LCC funded science projects under three priority themes. After reviewing the SWAPs and after a preliminary Landscape Initiative Analysis, the AT recommends that GNLCC focus on five priority themes in FY11 as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY THEMES FOR GNLCC FUNDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Habitat Connectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Water Resources Vulnerability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Data Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Process for soliciting proposals:
   - Similar to FY10, existing landscape partnerships will be canvassed to identify priority science/information needs within these themes.
   - For Projects that are on-going within a partnerships— fund existing projects
   - For Projects identified as a new need— potential Request for Proposals unless sole source is evident for jurisdictional or proprietary reasons.

2. Process for Selecting Proposals to Recommend to SC for Approval
   - Similar to FY10, use (or modify) criteria and process for ranking proposals.
3. Recommend continuing funding for Priority FY10 GNLCC Science Projects that meet FY11 Themes

4. Recommend operational funding support for Long-Term Strategy and Eco-Forum development

DECISION 5. Supporting Partners Capacity Briefing

Decision 5: Does the SC support the proposed options for providing support to GNLCC partners?

1. Data or other Technical support staff at WGA

2. Range-rider Liaison staff at WGA or WAFWA

3. FY 11 funding to States to offset costs of participation

4. Development of a Capacity Grant Program that can support other partners

Background:

1. In 2010, States and other partners voiced concern about lack of capacity to participate in GNLCC meetings, activities, and coordination

2. Technical capacity that can provide coordination among ongoing and complementary data and decision-support system integration efforts is needed

3. A shared, multi-state LCC liaison may provide additional support to States for participating, coordinating, and responding to LCCs

4. Other agencies such as Tribes, Provinces, and First Nations as well as some non-government conservation organizations may also have needs for capacity to provide meaningful participation in the GNLCC or GNLCC efforts.

5. A grant program could be developed that would allow non-federal partners to apply for funds to support their capacity needs
### APPENDIX C: ATTENDEES

The spreadsheet that follows lists the members of the Steering Committee and their proxies. Those who attended the Boise meeting are shown in **bold text**. The full SC membership spreadsheet is available at the GNLCC interim website ([http://www.nrmsc.usgs.gov/gnlcc](http://www.nrmsc.usgs.gov/gnlcc)). In addition to the SC members, ~20 people were also in attendance each day, made up principally of Advisory Team members as well as agency staff and visitors. A scanned signup sheet for all attendees is available from the facilitator. Note that a number of individuals called in for a telecon and webinar of the meeting, but their names were inadvertently not recorded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18</th>
<th>AGENCY / ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>GNLCC Position</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alberta Sustainable Resource Development</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>Bjorge</td>
<td>Director of Wildlife</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Ron.Bjorge@gov.ab.ca">Ron.Bjorge@gov.ab.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bureau of Land Management</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Ditton</td>
<td>Idaho Acting State Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Peter_Ditton@blm.gov">Peter_Ditton@blm.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bureau of Land Management</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>Lemm</td>
<td>Montana State Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MT_SO_Information@blm.gov">MT_SO_Information@blm.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bureau of Land Management</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Simpson</td>
<td>Wyoming State Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Don_Simpson@blm.gov">Don_Simpson@blm.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bureau of Land Management</td>
<td>Admin for BLM MT</td>
<td>Barb</td>
<td>Riveland</td>
<td>State Director's Staff Assistant</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Barbara_Riveland@blm.gov">Barbara_Riveland@blm.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bureau of Land Management</td>
<td>2nd Proxy</td>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>Foster</td>
<td>Chief, Idaho Resources and Science</td>
<td>Jonathon Foster/ISO/ID/BLM/DOI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bureau of Land Management</td>
<td>1st Proxy</td>
<td>Tyler</td>
<td>Abbott</td>
<td>Wildlife Biologist and Ecoregional Assessment Lead</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tyler_Abbott@blm.gov">Tyler_Abbott@blm.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bureau of Land Management</td>
<td>1st Proxy</td>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Foss</td>
<td>Idaho Deputy State Director for Resources and Minerals</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jeff_Foss@blm.gov">Jeff_Foss@blm.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bureau of Land Management</td>
<td>1st Proxy</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Pellant</td>
<td>Great Basin LCC Coordinator</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mike_pellant@fws.gov">mike_pellant@fws.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Columbia Basin Federal Caucus</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>Mogren</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Rick.Mogren@noaa.gov">Rick.Mogren@noaa.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Confederated Salish-Kootenai Tribes</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>Ernest 'Bud'</td>
<td>Moran</td>
<td>Chairman Tribal Council</td>
<td><a href="mailto:budm@cskt.org">budm@cskt.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Confederated Salish-Kootenai Tribes</td>
<td>1st Proxy</td>
<td>Dale</td>
<td>Becker</td>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td><a href="mailto:daleb@cskt.org">daleb@cskt.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Confederated Tribes of the Salish-Kootenai</td>
<td>Admin for CTSK</td>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Silberman</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sharons@cskt.org">sharons@cskt.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>Scheeler</td>
<td>Wildlife Program Manager</td>
<td><a href="mailto:carlscheeler@ctuir.com">carlscheeler@ctuir.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EPA Region 10</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Ecologist</td>
<td><a href="mailto:martin.don@epa.gov">martin.don@epa.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EPA Region 10</td>
<td>1st Proxy</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Duncan</td>
<td>Climate Change Science Advisor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:duncan.bruc@epa.gov">duncan.bruc@epa.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EPA Region 8</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Farris</td>
<td>Climate Coordinator</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Farris.Laura@epamail.epa.gov">Farris.Laura@epamail.epa.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region/Agency</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Chair/Representative</td>
<td>NEPA Coordinator</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA Region 8</td>
<td>Proxy</td>
<td>Stephen Potts</td>
<td>NEPA Coordinator</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Potts.Stephen@epamail.epa.gov">Potts.Stephen@epamail.epa.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Plains Region Bureau of Reclamation</td>
<td>1st Proxy</td>
<td>Gary Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:JGDavis@usbr.epa.gov">JGDavis@usbr.epa.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart of the Rockies Initiative</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>Michael Whitfield</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hotrmike@silverstar.com">hotrmike@silverstar.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Fish and Game</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>Cal Groen</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cgroen@idfg.idaho.gov">cgroen@idfg.idaho.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Fish and Game</td>
<td>1st Proxy</td>
<td>Sharon Kiefer</td>
<td>Assistant Director - Policy</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sharon.kiefer@idfg.idaho.gov">sharon.kiefer@idfg.idaho.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Environment</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>Kaaren Lewis</td>
<td>Director of Ecosystems Branch</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kaaren.Lewis@gov.bc.ca">Kaaren.Lewis@gov.bc.ca</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>Joe Maurier</td>
<td>FWP Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmaurier@mt.gov">jmaurier@mt.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks</td>
<td>1st Proxy</td>
<td>Dave Risley</td>
<td>FWS Deputy Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:drisley@mt.gov">drisley@mt.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Park Service</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>John Wessels</td>
<td>Regional Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Rory_Wessels@nps.gov">Rory_Wessels@nps.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Park Service</td>
<td>Admin for NPS Intermountain</td>
<td>Donna Emmons</td>
<td>Administrative Executive</td>
<td>Donna Emmons/DENVER/NPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Park Service</td>
<td>1st Proxy</td>
<td>Ray Sauvajot</td>
<td>Chief of Natural Resource Programs</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Ray_Sauvajot@nps.gov">Ray_Sauvajot@nps.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Park Service</td>
<td>1st Proxy</td>
<td>Laura Joss</td>
<td>Deputy Regional Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Laura_Joss@nps.gov">Laura_Joss@nps.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nez Perce Tribe</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>Aaron Miles</td>
<td>Manager, Department of Natural Resources</td>
<td><a href="mailto:2moon@nezperce.org">2moon@nezperce.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOAA</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>Alexander MacDonald</td>
<td>Deputy Assistant Administrator, NOAA Research</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Alexander.E.MacDonald@noaa.gov">Alexander.E.MacDonald@noaa.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOAA</td>
<td>1st Proxy</td>
<td>Andrea Ray</td>
<td>Climate Researcher</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Andrea.Ray@noaa.gov">Andrea.Ray@noaa.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRCS</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>Joyce Swartzendruber</td>
<td>Montana State Conservationist</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Joyce_Swartzendruber@mt.usda.gov">Joyce_Swartzendruber@mt.usda.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRCS</td>
<td>1st Proxy</td>
<td>Charles Gordon</td>
<td>Montana State Conservationist</td>
<td><a href="mailto:charles.gordon@mt.usda.gov">charles.gordon@mt.usda.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>Roy Elicker</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:roy.eicker@state.or.us">roy.eicker@state.or.us</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife</td>
<td>1st Proxy</td>
<td>Holly Michael</td>
<td>Conservation Policy Coordinator</td>
<td><a href="mailto:holly.b.michael@state.or.us">holly.b.michael@state.or.us</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific NW Region Bureau of Reclamation</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>Bryan Horsburgh</td>
<td>Deputy Manager of Resources and Technical Services</td>
<td><a href="mailto:BHorsburgh@usbr.gov">BHorsburgh@usbr.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mtn Elk Foundation</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>Blake Henning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>Steve Guertin</td>
<td>Mountain-Prairie Reg. Dir.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Stephen_Guertin@fws.gov">Stephen_Guertin@fws.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>Carol Schuler</td>
<td>Science Applications ARD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Carol_Schuler@fws.gov">Carol_Schuler@fws.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Proxy</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Noreen Walsh</td>
<td>Mountain-Prairie Deputy RD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Noreen_Walsh@fws.gov">Noreen_Walsh@fws.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proxy</td>
<td>Robyn Thorson</td>
<td>Pacific Regional Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Robyn_Thorson@fws.gov">Robyn_Thorson@fws.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Admin for USFS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paula J Bailey</td>
<td>Intermountain Executive Assistant</td>
<td><a href="mailto:piballey@fs.fed.us">piballey@fs.fed.us</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Forest Service</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Mary Erickson</td>
<td>Superintendent - Gallatin NF R1</td>
<td><a href="mailto:merickson@fs.fed.us">merickson@fs.fed.us</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st Proxy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jane Cottrell</td>
<td>Northern Region Deputy Regional Forester</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jcottrell@fs.fed.us">jcottrell@fs.fed.us</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st Proxy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lee Jacobson</td>
<td>Intermountain T&amp;E Species Program Manager</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ljacobson@fs.fed.us">ljacobson@fs.fed.us</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st Proxy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eric Johnston</td>
<td>Deputy Staff Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ejohnston@fs.fed.us">ejohnston@fs.fed.us</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Geological Survey</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leslie Weldon</td>
<td>Northern Region Regional Forester</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lweldon@fs.fed.us">lweldon@fs.fed.us</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Admin for USGS Central</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tammy Sharp</td>
<td>Secretary to the Regional Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tksharp@usgs.gov">tksharp@usgs.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Admin for NW RE USGS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Angel E Freeman</td>
<td>Administrative Executive</td>
<td>Angela E Freeman/BRD/USGS/DOI@USGS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Geological Survey</td>
<td>1st Proxy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nancy Lee</td>
<td>Northwest Area Deputy Regional Executive</td>
<td>Nancy K Lee/BRD/USGS/DOI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phil Anderson</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:director@dfw.wa.gov">director@dfw.wa.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st Proxy for WA and IGBC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dave Brittell</td>
<td>Assistant Director of Wildlife</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Dave.Brittell@dfw.wa.gov">Dave.Brittell@dfw.wa.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>1st Proxy for IWJV</td>
<td>Larry Kruckenburg</td>
<td>Scientist</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mcross@wcs.org">mcross@wcs.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyoming Game and Fish</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steve Ferrell</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:steve.ferrell@wgf.state.wy.us">steve.ferrell@wgf.state.wy.us</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Admin for WY</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sheridan Voycheske</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sheridan.voycheske@wgf.state.wy.us">sheridan.voycheske@wgf.state.wy.us</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming Game and Fish</td>
<td>1st Proxy</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Emmerich</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:John.Emmerich@wgf.state.wy.us">John.Emmerich@wgf.state.wy.us</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowstone Indian Nation</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phil Rigdon</td>
<td>Natural Resource Manager</td>
<td><a href="mailto:prigdon@yakama.com">prigdon@yakama.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D: RUNNING NOTES

The following pages provide running notes of the meeting from Susan Filkin. The facilitator cross-referenced the notes with meeting flip chart notes to help in development of the meeting summary presented earlier in this document. Due to time constraints, however, no effort was made to synthesize the notes into a cohesive narrative.

21 October 2010

Goals for meeting: 5 key decisions for this meeting
Welcome-Steve Gurtin, John Wessels, Cal Groen
Introductions of steering committee and others

GARY TABOR-POWERPOINT

Fragmentation Pace 6,000 acres a year
What scale can ecological processes be maintained?
Pattern to process
In the next 25 yrs, over 44 million acres of private forests will be converted to developed uses-usgs
Climate Change exacerbates habitat fragmentation
Poleward, upward to drier aspect
Species “going transboundary” b/c of Climate change
Corridors, connectivity

GREG SERVEEN-POWERPOINT

Trends transforming Conservation
Resource conservation vs. Conservation Science
Conservation Paradigm shift/GNLCC Themes
  Connectivity
  Aquatic Integrity
  Partnerships

Communication and Education
Climate Change

RICK SOJDA-POWERPOINT

State wildlife action plans and priority species and their habitats
Ecological Integrity: species composition, diversity, and functional organization
5 State Wildlife Action Plans (SWAP) species lists
Key Habitats for 27 GNLCC priority Species
  Wetland/Riparian (Greatest # of species)
  Cool/Cold streams
  Grassland/Sage/Steppe
  Montane Forest
  Alpine
  Open Forest

Discussion-species centric? Will meet GNLCC objects? May miss some species? It’s about populations and not just species.

DAVID NAUGLE-POWERPOINT

Large-scale planning; conservation triage
Collaborative is new business model/science driven
Outcome-based management objective/measureable yielding accountability
Identify and articulate a shared objective
‘Prioritize relentlessly’ to identify where largest populations benefit
Figure out where are largest populations are and manage for them

TOM OLLIFF-POWERPOINT

GNLCC Strategic Framework
Landscape Initiative Analysis currently 24 Landscape initiatives Identified within GNLCC; 19 w/stated priorities
State Wildlife Action Plans (SWAP)
Landscape issues: Connectivity, Aquatic Integrity (Invasion), Climate Change, Partnerships, Communication Education and Outreach

Framework:
Strategy includes:
- Flagship Priorities
- Conservation Goals and Measures
- Operations Plan
- Science Strategy
- Communications and Coordination Strategy

Should begin Process in FY11?

Discussion-
C. Groen-wants data integration? Where is it in framework?
T. Olliff-high need, will be looking a continuing funding for projects already going on
R. Sojda-project can be for certain base layers, question of incorporation in each projects or overall
J. Emmerick -capture in part of strategy
C. Groen-where is the modeling going with adaptability? A major driver bring in social scientetists input
C. Groen-obvious lack of interest of social scientetists
S. Zylstra-some modeling going one in climate change and water
Y. Converse-hard to pay for some of these things, communication and education how do we reflect that we are able to talk to each other
C. Groen-tried to incorporate cultural heritage into the map
C. Scheeler-our director has incorporated cultural heritage into our management activities/priorities (Tribal). Communication and education are going to be critical.
R. Mogren-Is there a white paper or have you developed the Strategy Framework bullets?
Y. Converse-we didn’t want to get too far before we all talked about the strategy framework. Always a lot of new people it’s difficult to keep committee updated.
G. Tabor-Need to build a business plan=strategy plan
J. Emmerick-Has there been an outreach to the private landowner?
Y.Converse-no at this time but we want to in the future to reach to NGO’s and public
R. Sojah-we see the need to build on public and NGO’s
J. Emmerick-local people want to be a part of this type of work
J. Wessels-Business plan analogy, need to hook into AGO/we need to have a good plan of action with culture prioriteties/do we have congressional support
M. Whitfield-process is important
F. D’Erchia-Can build on existing work-look at those plans (WLCI)
C. Groen-concern is in a staged approached it’s going to take some time, vision to carry on to sustain this group? GNLCC? How do we institutionalize GNLCC? It’s going to take a long time to achieve our goals. Huge time effort, how do we carry forward to make action happen?
S. Guertin-Parks service is committed to GNLCC/ we have congressional support/will this out live the current administrating?
L. Weldon-is this sustainable? Is this something that is taking away from the human connection? Partnerships? People? Who beyond the agencies? Can we answer “what this means for the public out there?” What is the human component? Define the linkages between the people and the landscape?

R. Mogren-Ends ways and means? Are we clear/agree on these? We don’t want to fail we need to make an outline and have sequence over time? We have about a 2 yr window to get some of this done?

J. Wessels-we need an umbrella of relevance/ how do we figure out the relevancy is? How do we make this relevant to our NGOs?

D. Naugle-Follow up science, targeting enough conservation to places.

D. Cecil-we have gone to local users of climate info and asked them would they use this information?

J. Wessels-MT-WY members what does relevancy look like to you?

J. Emmerick -WY, we are fully engaged to put info into geospatial reference. There has been a big need, enhancements are monitored to follow up research

Need technical ability, need tech support in reference to connectivity

C. Groen-ID-workable lands, Fish and Game agencies need examples/less ESA species and no or little litigation.

J. Maurier-MT-working on a lot of these things, connectivity. We are already doing in partnerships. Wants data integration, climate change, future predictions, habitat something that I can use and put on the ground not just some exercise? Real data, what science is needed.

Who is doing what? How do we define and work together? We are trying to actually to improve, or purchase for protection connectivity.

Y. Converse-we aren’t spending a lot of time to discuss the projects we put money into/synthesis project (who is doing what) just haven’t been able to talk about her at this meeting. We have so much going on, place or issue based.

T. Olliff-is this the right decision to go forward?

J. Emmerick-what is it you want a decision on today. Identify flagship priorities?

T. Olliff-to have those strategies identified

C. Scheeler-failing to address the social sciences will affect the species and habitat affected/we may make investments in habitat that is not important to the public

Y. Converse-recap/ are we headed in the right direction? We need a strategy to help guide us

M. Whitfield-process we use to get there/how engaged are all of the elements of the community out there? A lot of folks are wondering what is the LCC all about how do they engage. Are we sustainable long-term?

J. Emmerick -We need a bullet process

S. Bischke-recap from briefing paper in packet

R. Sojda-To show success, show workable lands

L. Weldon- Paradigm conversion towards landscapes can we convert?

G. Tabor-WGA consul

J. Maurier-It took a 1 to 1 ½ years once we were on the WGA council to figure out what we wanted to do

T. Olliff-Yes to idea to having the framework but need more information to define flagship priorities. Bring something back to get approval to move forward and flush things out with more detail.

S. Keefer-I would like conservation and goals to take somewhat of a phased approach/are out targets become actual targets
T. Ollif-we are going to stay at the themed level for at least a year

**Yvette Converse-Powerpoint**

Eco Forums

Eco Forms are an engagement of GNLCC conservation ...

Eco Form Process

- Series of Interactive Webinars
- Leadership Team
- Gap Analysis
- Identify Specific Needs
- Develop into A long-term Strategy

Discussion-

D. Cecil-great idea, we can work together and work together successfully

S. Keefer-what is your timeframe

Y. Converse-great idea, speaks to maybe value of breakup on the communication strategy bringing in a professional to help with communication and outreach

R. Mogren-what did you have in mind about the resource team

Y. Converse-We wanted to build on excising efforts, know leaders in the science field to pull in this body of information together. Separate the funding.

R. Mogren-a person who can convene the meetings, set the agenda

T. Ollif-certainly there will be some support from GNLCC staff to make it work but we’ll need others to help

L. Weldon-this concept is a good idea, the sooner you are able to step this down to some of our field folks the sooner you will get some work done

J. Foster-this helps to bring together some of the other LCCs to help improve the coordination b/w other LCCs

Y. Converse-David what is your opinion?

D. Naugle-Don’t call a public meeting until you know what you want from them. Once you decide where the LCC wants to hitch to and then get partners around the table. Friends write letters/partners write checks. You can’t fund everyone be selective when you invite the public.

Y. Converse-How do we be inclusive but control the discussion?

M. Cross-How do you go from a pool of ideas to priorities’? Separate out your groups, filter some of the public. Flush out/be real good and detailing your targets

F. D’Erichia-webinars may not be the answer, it takes time

L. Weldon-stay really focus on what the outcome is that we are designing for it/l thing we will achieve the results but we need to stay focus.

J. Emmerick -Start with some of these well established LCC groups

Y. Converse-we need to start with other LCC groups. What about Dr. Kersner

Kersner-the more you engage the people are already doing the work you will be more successful

G. Tabor-I think you will find you will have enough support

R. Mogren-page 9 is what you are asking the steering committee to review

Y. Converse- yes

R. Mogren-I think 45 days will be enough time

C. Groen-I would like to have it flushed out a little bit more before we vote on it, try 30 days
and I would want to review before I commit to this
Kersner-it might be you try one and see how it goes then bring it back for review?
Y. Converse-Is there one of the three forms that you favor we look at?
Y. Converse-resource managers, communication need, this was more towards dealing with science
J. Wessels-I like going slow and starting with one and flushing out what we need
C. Scheeler-I don’t want to recreate the wheel I would encourage us to get off the mark and get going. WE have some pretty tight timelines and need to get going
Y. Converse-hopefully the NGOs and others will help and get things moving
M. Whitfield- These are landowner organizations that will be interested in being on the team
J. Emmerick-We should target those initiatives?
R. Hannon-Do you see these forms as a onetime event?
Y. Converse-No
R. Hannon-the challenge is to get them to come in the door the 2nd, 3rd time not just the first.
Y. Converse-Part of the leadership team role is to solve this problem. We don’t want the LCC to be the power. Talk of how you fund this
S. Bischke advisory team needs to flush out before funding
Yes or no to the group....
Y. Converse-we can come back after the review
S. Bischke-before Thanksgiving?
J. Emmerick-clarify implementing
S. Bischke-by Thanksgiving it will be flushed out

DAVID WOOD-POWERPOINT
Facilitate transboundary natural resource management
Page 11 of agenda
Adaptive Management Framework
Partnerships
Assessment Issues
How can the LCC “add value?”

Discussion-
D. Cecil-LCCs can help all of us. We have nothing in a concerted way that we can trace the efforts on the landscape.
Y. Converse-are you talking about climate change?
D. Cecil-Yes! Ecological change, we need better data. We need the observation data to know when the species are changing. The LCCs can tell us when we put the observations in place are we putting them in the right place? In terms of working together, NOAA wanted to step up to the plate. We are trying to better coordinate with all LCCs. We don’t want to duplicate but use other LCCs for information.

22 October 2010

CONTINUED WITH DAVID WOOD
How LCCs and facilitate REAs, WGA & other initiatives?
Do we have the funding to support LCC?
Proposal: Pilot project in the Middle Rockies to integrate ongoing decisions

Discussion-
L. Weldon-? About #3 (management questions and terminology including)
D. Wood-Yes
Y. Converse-Doug can you talk about this
Doug A-encourages, ensures to keep the connection and build up the needs right now
J. Maurier-I’m confused why are we trying to do what is already being done why not use the info already being collected

Y. Converse-the pilot is the integration of the Divide project and Middle Rockies/it’s the integration of the three not just one.

J. Emmerick-public and only deal with so many agencies at one time, it’s going to require some capacity to pull it off

D. Wood-yes, coordination means to get data without duplicating

Y. Converse-finding the overlap/using dialog to outline for us to build some efficiencies

R. Mogren-I’m glad you are clarifying, I was quite confused when we adjourned yesterday/No objection

R. Sojda-

J. Emmerick Why didn’t you consider the BLM REAs?

D. Wood-we did, explains...

S. Bischke-what is the timeframe?

D. Wood-6 month window

J. Emmerick- pls. re-state the request, you’re looking for

D. Wood-Yes, asking for an ad hoc committee to look at

Y. Converse-we really can’t not try to do this, everyone wants their own projects to be successful/we need to integrate now to make everyone’s projects better

L. Weldon-It’s a good idea, what kind of support to have everyone participate?

G. Tabor-Yes the private sector would be willing to help and be a part of it

M. Whitfield- Yes, we would like to be a part of it and participate

S. Guertin-If we don’t participate then BLM will just go it on their own; this is a unique opportunity to synergize our efforts

R. Hannon-How much will it cost?

S. Kleeser-deliverables, we as managers have to weigh our decisions carefully. I don’t know what questions the BLM is trying to answer with the REA? We need to think how we can make it work.

S. Bischke-can we move to vote? Knowing there are limits and caveat to what we can do and deliver in 6 months

Yes, no objection

Y. Converse-powerpoint

Governance Charter

45 day open comment period

J. Emmerick-one suggestion on page 19-I think we ought to require an interim report

S. Keesler-we’re good with this as provisional recognize it may be adapted and modified as we review and come back.

Y. Converse-Yes, I would agree that this should be something we can change over time

R. Mogren-Yes, I agree, maybe keep it as a year and then revisit

C. Scheeler-I think a year is too long but there are ways to go about it without slowing up the process

Y. Converse-Yes, within the next 6 months to 1 year we can have a more of active tracking reporting system. We will try and use the reporting in our active contracts

J. Maurier-vise chair issue/if chair doesn’t make a meeting are you going to have a individual to fill in

Y. Converse-yes, we should have a vise chair would John Wessels like to be vise chair
R. Mogren-just a clarification, usually a vise chair takes the chairs position the following year after the chair steps down

Y. Converse-John should know that it may be a longer commitment then he thinks

J. Wessels-We are (Park Service), I am committed to GNLCC

Y. Converse-if we are all in agreement that it is a vise chair and a “bump” position for next year

J. Wessels-we keep the concept of culture heritance as a part of the governance and we don’t drift towards a species only

Y. Converse-is there a specific direction/wording that we should use/suggest

D. Cecil-we should add a social scientist to the committee

L. Weldon-acknowledgment of cultural heritage is important/what do we mean by cultural heritage it could mean several things.

Y. Converse-we can try and go back and revise and accept this document and know it is working draft

N. Lee-we are going to have a position to support the social science

Y. Converse-refer to PowerPoint changes on governance and operational charter under B. Purpose and Goals “Describe cultural heritage, working landscape values”

S. Bischke-review/sums up the changes: cultural heritage wording, adding vise chair, and

J. Emmerick-add cultural heritage to list of Steering committee originating members

F. D’Erchia -NRCS might be the person to ask for cultural heritage person

C. Scheeler-discussion w/Converse on where to add social sciences

R. Mogren-how about we call it “Social and natural sciences” we need a “up or down” vote and then work with the document

Y. Converse-ok, everyone clear with these changes and can vote on governance?

S. Bischke-does the steering comm. support the governance charter? Recap of changes discussed today, with today’s changes there will be a “yes/no/vote?”

Yes, thumbs up by all

T. Olliff/Y. CONVERSE-POWERPOINT
FY11 Themes

As an advisory team we are recommending changes (refer to ppt.)

Process to solicit proposals (themes)

- Consider FY10 carry-over projects
- Canvas existing landscape partnerships

Rank and Recommend for $ based criteria

Discussion-

S. Zylstra-can you relate the Eco forms to the themes?

T. Olliff-yes, discussion w/Y. Converse

S. Guertin-The challenge is to get OMB to approve and get them to buy off on our projects (funding). OMB is looking at LCCs and the type of funding

C. Scheeler-How do we meet social aspects prioritization, human aspects?

Y. Converse-common strategy will show and also capacity talk

R. Mogren-are you all anticipating to get sufficient funding to support the 5 themes?

Y. Converse-yes, can Rick can speak

S. Guertin-1 million $ per each LCC to fund each and projects plan and bank on this same amount

D. Cecil-We’re not adding work add/climate and weather information to terminology
N. Lee-we should come up with guidelines to what we are funding as far as projects/If data integration should be the “carrot” to get the approach to get the funding.

Concerned about monitoring funding and we don’t know what kind of data we are getting?

F. D’Erchia-we need to show the progress to get funding

S. Bischke-recap/page 7 what steering committee voting on/is this theme set acceptable to you?

Accept or reject?

C. Scheeler-where is the social science in the themes?

Y. Converse-in communication/tell us what you want to incorporate

L. Weldon-strategic framework needs to reflect in the themes

R. Mogren-what happened to the flagship priories from yesterday?

Y. Converse-discussion

G. Emmerick-social science will be address in tools

C. Scheeler-Social response to climate change will have a huge response and where are the real risks/I want to add the social component to climate change

S. Bischke-vote on the six themes?

Yes, All thumbs up/ exception from R. Mogren about adding social theme consideration

R. Mogren now agrees to six themes as is now and wants social theme

N. Lee-What is it we want to accomplish and where we want our money to go/criteria

Y. Converse-Yes, we will get the criteria up shortly and send on/we don’t have the framework on the objectivity to get to the criteria

N. Lee-worried that the partners will get funded but is it really what or criteria is/partners will get rewarded

Y. Converse-We don’t have the framework yet to tell us what we are missing with respect to pritories

N. Lee-I just want to make sure we get the most bang for our buck! Partnership theme vs. common theme

T. Olliff-putting our objectives up front is a good idea and we will work on it

M. Cross-need some clarification on pooling of criteria

Y. Converse-Yes, solicit then ranking on proposals/we will work on refining the themes

G. Tabot-Strategically present proposals to get people will see you just as money and not an identity to get data/information

Process vote:

S. Bischke-recap steering comm. would like details, process step by step/timeline

M. Cross-would like Guidance document

L. Weldon-yes, need guidance document

Discussion: Yes, thumbs up

5. Guertin-Powerpoint

Capacity and support

7 or 8 funded positions

Capacity Grant Program

NGOs, Tribes, Provinces, etc.

Discussion-

how to fund; WAFWA/WGA

B. Henning-want to make sure NGOs get recognized and needing funds
S. Guertin-Yes, capacity grants will take care of that/We are asking for steering committee to advise on funded position or allocation?

S. Bischke-asking steering committee for direction of funding for position/capacity

S. Guertin-One-time $50K (GIS project) for coordination and funding to ID, WY, MT

G. Emmerick-We want someone who can dedicate their time to LCC

S. Guertin-asking for 30 day turnaround/we have 100K for a state coordinator

We are trying to set up a long term structure to get the pilot project

S. Bischke-want to make sure we know that we know what we are voting on/process was already voted yes, on the three states need to go back and discuss about 50K

S. Keesler-can we set a specific date rather than just saying a month?

S. Guertin-Nov. 10, 2010

S. Bischke-Clear on what is wanted...recap

Short-term-Letter to comeback from ID, WY, MT yes/no (stipend to states)

Long-term-WA, and OR will want make sure they are involved and not over look them

S. Guertin-Will get back to whole steering comm. (to let them know what the decisions are) via electronic notification

Capacity Grant Program-yes or no voting

Thumbs up-Yes, vote.

S. GRAY-POWERPOINT

Climate Predictions for North America

Address knowledge gaps

2050-roughly 3.5 degree temp. increase

High elevations warming faster than low-elevations

Droughts intensified with high prob. of extreme drought

Climate is the backdrop for all other types of change

Climate can promote, pace, amplify or dampen the impact of other drivers

You will have to deal with drought, flooding, severe winters, etc. no matter what climate change brings

Discussion-

S. Guertin-a lot of this work is underway, once we have this climate information we will start having requests for information from LCC

S. Gray-we need to have a good sense of what has happen with climate change in the past to get a better idea of what may happen in the future/Also there is a lot of climate “stuff” that is bad data you need to be careful on the data gathered.

L. Weldon-what are those guiding themes for adaption to organisms/do you see a trend in data leading to better management decisions?

S. Gray-there is a tremendous amount of work being done. The data helps in making decisions if connections are made into decision making process from what could happen with the warmer trends, like should we try and save a stream if it is going to dry up or be too warm to support fish?

How much energy and where should we put our priorities will be answered if we connect the data to the projects.

N. LEE-POWERPOINT

Northwest climate change center

Consortium of Northwest universities (OSU, UW, UI)
3.5 million
Research to be done by grad students
USGS will recruit Center Director

Discussion-
C. Groen—will there be outreach?
N. Lee—Yes, want to get others input. We want to overlap with other LCCs
We’re looking to have an LCC coordinator to be the liaison
J. Maurier—I would encourage you to work with Canadian counterparts they are willing to be partners
N. Lee—Thank you, I will pursue

Future Meeting Scheduling
S. Bischke—Venue for next meeting.
J. Wessels—offers Glacier National Park
C. Scheeler—offers Umatilla tribal facilities
Y. Converse—weather wise Umatilla better in Spring/Glacier in fall

VENUE:
Spring—Tribal facilities/Umatilla, OR (Carl Scheeler)
Fall—(Late September/early October?) Glacier National Park, MT (John Wessels)
Two day meeting in April 13 and 14, 2011
S. Bischke—Steering Committee will meet by phone? Before the holidays?
Y. Converse—Beginning of Dec?
S. Bischke—Tuesday Dec. 7, 2010, 10 am Mountain Time (one hour call)
Steering committee will meet every two months, first Tuesday in month.
Feb, 1, 2011, 10am Mountain Time
C. Olliff—I think we need a meeting in March.
S. Bischke—March 29, 2011 at 10 am Mountain Time
**** End day 2 and of meeting-SAF