

**Landscape Conservation Cooperative National Council Meeting
Tuesday, February 4, 2014**

Council Participants

Buck Sutter, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
Dan Ashe, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
David Whitehurst, Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries
Ed Roberson, Bureau of Land Management
Eric Schroff, Department of Ecology, Yukon Government
Gary Tabor, Center for Large Landscape Conservation
Herbert Frost, National Park Service
Jad Daley, The Trust for Public Lands
Jeff Raasch, Bird Habitat Joint Venture Partnership
Ken McDermond, South Atlantic LCC
Laurie McGilvray, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
Leslie Honey, NatureServe
Lynn Scarlett, The Nature Conservancy
Madeline Maley, Ministry of Forests Lands and Natural Resource Operations, BC Provincial Government
Mallory Martin, North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission
Marc Miller, Illinois Department of Natural Resources
Martin Lowenfish, USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service
Mary Wagner, U.S. Forest Service
Michael Andrews, National Fish Habitat Board
Michael Weiss, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
Rachel Jacobson, Department of the Interior
Stephen Guertin, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Terry Williams, Tulalip Tribes
Ulalia Woodside, Kamehameha Schools

National Landscape Conservation Cooperative Staff and Facilitation Team

Elsa Haubold, National Landscape Conservation Cooperative Coordinator
Ben Thatcher, Assistant National Landscape Conservation Cooperative Coordinator
Megan Cook, National Landscape Conservation Cooperative Science Coordination Specialist
Ann Froschauer, National Landscape Conservation Cooperative Communications Coordinator
Maggie McCaffrey, U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution
Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues
Aoife Blake, EnviroIssues

Audience

Amanda Reed, The Nature Conservancy
Cindi Jacobson, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Doug Austen, American Fisheries Society
Doug Beard, U.S. Geological Survey
Doug Parsons, National Park Service
Jean Brennan, Appalachian LCC
John Mankowski, North Pacific LCC
Karen Blakney, Bureau of Land Management
Kit Muller, Bureau of Land Management
Laurie McGilvray, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
Mark Humpert, Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies
Monica Tomosy, U.S. Forest Service
Robin O'Malley, U.S. Geological Survey
Seth Mott, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Suzanne Orenstein, Udall Foundation
Tim Breault, Peninsular Florida LCC
Todd Hopkins, Great Basin LCC

Welcome and introductions

Penny Mabie welcomed Council members to the first Landscape Conservation Cooperative (LCC) National Council meeting and provided a brief overview of the two-day meeting agenda and associated materials. Penny noted that Council meetings are open to the public and asked the audience members to introduce themselves to the Council.

Penny asked the Council members to introduce themselves and share their vision for the Council, reasons for participating, desired outcomes or their vision of success, and key factors for success. Council members largely shared their desire for the Council to support the LCCs, enhance coordination and facilitate the work they do to support a sustainable network. They identified the need for two-way communication with the LCC Network to understand the issues facing the LCCs and how the Council can help with those issues. They also shared a desire for the Council to advocate for the LCCs, attract new resources and address policy issues to support the future growth of the LCC Network.

Overview and history of the Landscape Conservation Cooperatives

Elsa Haubold, National LCC Coordinator, thanked everyone for attending the meeting and sharing their vision and goals for the Council. Elsa introduced a short video from Secretary Jewel, U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI), who welcomed Council members, talked about the importance of landscape conservation and how the LCCs are enhancing conservation efforts across jurisdictions and international boundaries.

Elsa gave an overview of the LCC Network noting that they fill a critical need by providing a forum for connecting the entire conservation community within a defined geography and focusing conservation investments and actions on shared priorities. Elsa reiterated the vision of the LCCs was to have a – “landscape capable of sustaining natural and cultural resources for current and future generations.”

Elsa described the extent of the LCC Network, from Puerto Rico to Hawaii and Micronesia. She explained that LCCs are relatively new institutions, but over the last four years remarkable progress has been made with the establishment of 22 individual LCCs. Elsa explained that the 22 LCCs are designed to be a seamless national network capable of supporting site-specific protection, restoration and management efforts to help natural systems across the continent. She further described LCCs as conveners that bring together partners to provide a shared place for collaboration, identify issues and means for collective action, facilitate exchange of applied science, monitor and evaluate LCC progress and ensure science and research tools developed are available, accessible and usable by partners.

Elsa illustrated the integration and collaboration of the LCCs by highlighting the range of partners involved in the Great Northern LCC Steering Committee. Across the network over 250 agencies and organizations participate, including: all 50 state natural resource agencies, all major federal resource management and conservation agencies, over 20 individual tribes and consolidated tribal groups and over 40 non-governmental organizations (NGO).

Elsa demonstrated the collaborative work carried out by a range of LCCs to combat regional issues using examples from across the LCC Network. Elsa highlighted some of the accomplishments of the LCC Network to date - the creation of a forum for broad based partnerships to establish common conservation goals across broad geographies and to develop tools and applied science which translate that knowledge to managers on the ground. Elsa saw the next step for the LCC Network as the convening of the LCC Council, who will help the 22 self-directed LCCs form a seamless network that achieves the vision of “landscapes capable of sustaining natural and cultural resources for current and future generations.”

Overview of LCC Council convening

Department of the Interior and National Partners LCC National Council Assessment – Key findings and recommendations

Maggie McCaffrey, U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (U.S. Institute), provided an overview of the third party neutral assessment, conducted by EnviroIssues and the U.S. Institute, of the DOI and national LCC partners to gauge potential support, concerns, and recommendations for convening a LCC Council. Maggie highlighted the role of the U.S. Institute, the purpose of the assessment, and the methods used to conduct the assessment. Findings indicated that there were national-level needs that could not be met through the existing LCC enterprise, but were critical to the long-term viability of the LCC network.

Maggie highlighted that through the assessment, some conflicting or divergent views emerged. For example, there was broad awareness of the LCC effort and widespread support for a national body, but this was qualified by a general lack of clarity regarding the LCCs and uncertainty about the expected outcomes of the LCCs and of a national body. Maggie also highlighted that the findings showed diverging perspectives on the role of a national body. Some felt a national body should set national priorities and goals to add consistency, commonality, and a national voice for conservation. However, others felt that

a national body should not set national priorities and goals as it could result in dictating priorities or management decisions, which should emerge from the LCCs.

Maggie noted that common perspectives were shared about the need for coordination and communication to support a cohesive purpose, support collaboration across geographies, advocate for the LCCs and share success stories and outcomes. During the assessment, Maggie noted some potential barriers to long-term success were identified, such as top-down management, lack of commonality and consistency across the LCC Network, lack of inclusion (a perception that DOI or particular bureau was driving agendas or the priorities of the LCCs) and funding (competition for resources). Maggie said the U.S. Institute's recommendation to the DOI was to convene a strategy team representing all the key partners to develop a straw charter that addresses the size, representation, authority and the mission, goals and roles of a national council.

Maggie noted that because there was strong support and interest by all parties in establishing a strategy team, the U.S. Institute convened a broadly representative group to develop the purpose and goals for a national body as well as a straw charter.

National LCC Strategy Team – Establishing a National Council

Mallory Martin, North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission, provided an overview of the strategy team's process to establish a National Council. Mallory noted current Council members who also served on the strategy team, such as Jad Daley, Leslie Honey, Ken McDermond and Ulalia Woodside. Mallory noted that the strategy team worked for two years on developing a charter for the Council and recruiting members. The strategy team's charge was first to determine how the team itself would operate. Then they clarified the need for a Council, and agreed on the Council's authority, purpose, goals and roles in order to draft the charter. Mallory noted that the strategy team chose to operate by consensus to ensure all partners have equal weight in the decision-making process. The strategy team examined if there were needs from the LCCs that were not currently being met and the level of these needs; for example, national level or LCC Network-wide needs versus needs that are beyond the scope of an LCC Council. Mallory stated the strategy team had a list of 11 unmet needs that they deemed rose to the level of needing national attention, as they weren't being addressed fully in any other forum, and if met, would provide support to the LCC Network. These needs are associated with coordination, integration, support for and engagement in the LCCs. The list was agreed on by consensus of all the members of the strategy team and served as the basis of the purpose and needs section in the LCC Council Charter.

Mallory stated that the strategy team identified a number of needs that were to be considered beyond the scope of the LCC Council, but would be appropriate for the Council to elevate to federal leadership or Congress. The strategy team worked on developing a white paper to address these needs, but, Mallory explained, it was tabled as a lower priority than establishing the Council. Mallory highlighted the discussion around Council authority and explained that the intent was not for the Council to be an advisory committee but rather, to be a partnership of partnerships, a collaboration that would support

the LCC Network. As a partnership organization, all entities in the landscape scale conservation effort would be equal partners in the Council. The strategy team also determined the Council's purpose, organizational framework and developed the rest of the draft charter that laid out structure, roles, responsibilities and membership of the Council. The strategy team sought agency/organizational approval and solicited feedback on the charter from the conservation community. Mallory noted that most of the comments received related to membership composition, which resulted in adjustments being made to tribal, indigenous and international seats.

Mallory gave a high level overview of the recruitment process for each participant category. Applications were solicited broadly for these participants. Reviewers were also solicited from outside the strategy team for tribal, indigenous and international review panels. The strategy team affirmed Council membership and contributed to the agenda and material development for the Council meeting.

Discussion

A Council member asked about the use of the word "National" in the name of the Council, how was that name decided upon and if others had thoughts on it given that the Council goes beyond international boundaries. Penny clarified that there was quite a bit discussion on the use of the word "National" in naming the Council. She explained that the strategy team talked about using other terms like "international", "continental", "network-wide" but none of them seemed quite appropriate. A Council member added that this term is problematic from a tribal perspective and others echoed concern by having a term that is associated with geography. Some new names were suggested, including "LCC Council", "LCC Coordinating Council", "LCC Strategic Council", "LCC Strategic Council for Conservation and Cooperation." The Council name decision was tabled until later in the meeting.

A Council member asked if there were issues for the Council to be aware of that the strategy team did not address. Mallory explained that there were some needs identified that were beyond the scope of the Council. While the strategy team attempted to provide a white paper on these issues, the development of a charter and convening the Council was the priority of the strategy team. A former strategy team member from the audience, Kit Muller (BLM), gave an overview of the white paper issues. While it was determined by the strategy team that these issues were beyond the scope of the Council, there was a recognized need for greater coordination across landscape conservation efforts, including discussion about how the initiatives relate to each other and how LCCs fit into the process.

Monica Tomosy (U.S. Forest Service), also a former strategy team member, mentioned that the feedback to the strategy team from the conservation community was crucial to the development of the charter and the success of the Council. They reiterated that the convening of the Council has taken two years and the LCC Network has evolved over that time. Some issues that were identified may be resolved and some may still exist. LCCs should identify issues for the Council to discuss, including if there is a need for cross agency coordination.

Penny gave a brief recap of the morning session and added that she heard general agreement from Council members on their thoughts about a shared purpose. Penny asked the Council members if the purpose stated in the Charter captured what was shared in the earlier discussion. A Council member reiterated concern on the use of “National” in the Council name. Another Council member emphasized the importance of stressing the bottom up, self-directed nature of the LCCs. The Council members discussed the purpose and role of the Council in supporting the LCCs and respecting their self-directed nature. Opportunities were identified for the Council to have a role in advocating for the LCCs, providing leadership action, enhancing coordination among the LCCs, and developing relationships with other conservation efforts. A Council member did caution against revisiting areas which the strategy team had examined in the convening of the Council and suggested looking forward. A work group was formed to examine the Council’s purpose statement and present it to the Council for further discussion at the next meeting.

Action: Work group, including: Gary Tabor, Madeline Maley, Mallory Martin, Mary Wagner, Jeff Raasch, David Whitehead, and Ulalia Woodside, will work on refining the purpose statement in the charter.

Issues/Topics for Council consideration

An Emerging Cohesive Strategy for the LCC Network

Ken McDermond, South Atlantic LCC, presented issues identified by the LCC Network. He emphasized the challenge to the LCC Network is its collective nature, and how the LCC Network fits together. Ken presented the concept of a cohesive strategy for the LCC Network that allows each LCC to contribute in a meaningful way to fulfill the expectation for an interconnected network. Ken pointed to a number of sources that identify the LCC Network as a forum for the National Fish, Wildlife, and Plants Climate Adaptation Strategy, action plans such as State Wildlife Action Plans, mitigation plans, etc. Ken highlighted that there are shared objectives across multiple organizations that can be achieved by collective action and identified that the LCCs could be the mechanism for implementation. Ken stated this would be different from past efforts due to its scope and scale, and could help inform decision-making, conservation investments, guide infrastructure development, inform national policy and respond to major disasters. He added that a cohesive strategy could be a framework for the LCC Network to inform and facilitate those decisions.

A Council member asked how a cohesive strategy would fit into what LCCs are currently doing. Ken clarified that 14 LCCs are currently looking at strategic planning and this strategy could be an added value to what currently exists. A Council member pointed out that there could be varying applicability of a strategy to the different LCCs and identified that the Council could help provide linkages and facilitate information exchange to a number of LCCs. It was acknowledged that a cohesive strategy could integrate science in a way that helps inform decision-making, but the success of a cohesive strategy would depend on a number of factors, including maturity and readiness.

Science and science delivery

Jad Daley, The Trust for Public Lands, presented to the Council issues surrounding science and science delivery that were identified when examining the national level needs of the LCCs. He emphasized that some LCCs are going beyond science delivery and towards implementation. Jad noted a trend towards science delivery and linking projects to decisions and seeing progress on the ground. Jad referred to work of the North Atlantic LCC who has a standing Science Delivery Committee and Request For Proposals process. Jad saw an opportunity for evolution and development of the LCCs that is looking toward science effectiveness on the ground. Jad asked what the Council's capacity is for championing LCC accomplishments. It was proposed that the Council could have a best practices approach to help advance the LCC Network. Jad highlighted the LCCs as educators and suggested that this role be reflected in the Council's messaging.

The Council discussed what role the Council can have in facilitating science sharing across relevant LCC partners. Council members further discussed its role in providing guidance to the LCC Network and that the Council should be aware of best practices and opportunities to help LCCs with their challenges. An opportunity for the Council to provide over-arching coordination was identified in relation to issues which span across multiple LCCs (e.g., greater sage grouse). A Council member suggested there could be a number of benefits from a synthesis of shared direction. He added the Council could increase the relevancy of the LCC Network to decision-makers, by being informed from the ground up. It was added that the Council could have a role in promoting the work of the LCCs to the wider conservation audience.

Council members also discussed the diverse range of LCCs across the Network, some more progressive than others. A Council member noted the need for a framework/strategy that provides guidance for LCCs and identified a role for the Council. The Council debated the need for a guiding strategy and how to balance it with the self-directed nature of LCCs. The Council also discussed how to communicate the outcomes of the LCCs and how to demonstrate the success. The Council agreed that there is a place for guidance to ensure consistency and coordination across the LCC Network while respecting the self-directed nature of the LCCs. A Council member identified that a guiding framework can allow for self-directedness while providing incentives for action.

Council discussions

Penny asked the Council members to identify issues the Council might address in order to develop initial areas of focus for the Council. She noted the Council heard some issues identified by the strategy team, which would be discussed in greater detail on Wednesday.

The Council developed the following list of high-level issues for the Council to consider:

- Identify and understand current commonalities among LCCs
- Listen to LCCs to understand the challenges
- Determine how the Council will work with the LCCs. How will the Council and the LCCs work together? How will the framework be developed?
- Identify and share best practices, tools and processes that might have utility across the LCCs

- Create a framework for sustainability for the network
- Model what a group of collaborators could look like. Develop a framework of a successful LCC partnership
- Encourage setting more socio-economic objectives (help to understand motivations)
- Exercise our power of convening
- Provide some assessment of the relationship of the LCC enterprise to other large landscape-scale efforts and help identify potential synergies (critical element is to be aware of and get educated on these other efforts and initiatives; are they congruent or non-congruent with the LCC mission?)
- Cheerleading role: pitch LCCs “back home”
- Understand LCC resource and capacity limitations and explore how to overcome them
- Look at staffing needs for the LCC Network and the Council (look broadly for funding support)
- Work with LCCs to identify emerging trends (forward looking)
- Provide strategic thinking and innovation to the network (look for and identify gaps)
- Seek federal agency consistency and flexibility; look beyond individual agency mandates
- Develop a communications plan for communicating with the LCC network and with external audiences (seek message consistency)
- Draw distinctions in messaging depending on the target audience

Penny asked the Council to identify from this list which of these issues is key. A Council member suggested categorizing the issues raised into the following themes:

1. Taking actions to understand LCCs (listening, working together)
2. Assisting in performance management (framework/best practices)
3. Foster relationships
4. Adding value to the LCC Network (forward looking, funding)
5. Communication

At the end of the day, Penny asked if any members of the audience had comments for the Council:

- Jean Brennan, Appalachian LCC Coordinator, asked the Council to discuss the possibility of having a Council award for an integrated and innovative approach. She thought this would bring the Council’s presence to the field.
- John Mankowski, North Pacific LCC Coordinator, suggested that the Council should help build long term political support. The LCC Network would benefit strongly by having Council member organizations participating in local LCCs.
- Doug Austen, American Fisheries Society, acknowledged the great work put into convening the Council from Council members, LCC staff and facilitators. He suggested the Council use the LCC Network to talk about how the LCCs can add value to existing conservation efforts.
- Todd Hopkins, Great Basin LCC Science Coordinator, stated the LCC Network does not yet have a strategic plan. He encouraged the Council to look forward to the years ahead and what the LCCs should be doing. He also encouraged the Council to set the bar high.

- Tim Breault, Peninsular Florida LCC Coordinator, reassured the Council that while initially they may struggle with their identity and what issues to work on, there will be clarity as the Council gets established. He encouraged all Council members to stick with it.
- Amanda Reed, The Nature Conservancy (TNC), informed the Council that TNC is actively engaged in 15 LCCs and their staff has looked at a lot of commonalities and differences across those LCCs. She emphasized that listening to the needs of the LCCs is very important and advocacy will establish itself as the Council grows. She encouraged the Council to think about what should be involved in the programs.
- Monica Tomosy, U.S. Forest Service, asked the Council to talk more about executive leadership and less about staff work. She identified the need to leverage resources at the national level and align programs and resources.

Penny provided a brief overview of logistics and agenda topics for Wednesday's meeting.

Landscape Conservation Cooperative National Council

Wednesday, February 5, 2014

Penny welcomed the Council members and audience to the second day of the LCC National Council meeting and asked Council members to share key takeaways from the previous day's meeting. Council members identified the strong engagement and commitment by members; willingness to understand the LCCs and respect their self-directed nature; recognition of complex governance and the willingness to find a way to work together; and recognition that some key constituents are missing from the Council.

Penny reminded the Council they would be making their leadership selection later in the morning. A Council member suggested an alternative chair structure of two co-chairs, instead of the Chair and Vice-chair structure called for in the Council Charter. Council members generally supported this suggestion as it was seen to be more reflective of the LCCs partnership and would add greater thought to work load and agenda setting.

Council relationship with other national conservation efforts

U.S. Geological Survey's Advisory Committee on Climate Change and Natural Resource Science

Robin O'Malley, U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), briefed the Council on the Advisory Committee on Climate Change and Natural Resource Science (ACCCNRS) and how it relates to the LCC National Council. Robin explained that the ACCCNRS is a formal Federal Advisory Committee (FAC) that advises the DOI Secretary on the establishment and operations of the USGS National Climate Change and Wildlife Science Center (NCCWSC) and the DOI Climate Science Centers (CSCs).

Robin explained that the initial focus of the advisory committee was to ensure CSCs are more sensitive to the needs of their stakeholders. However, the ACCCNRS is looking at not just how well the CSCs

meet the needs of their stakeholders but also what is the content and the overall quality of the products.

Robin identified the relationship between the LCCs and CSCs, as LCCs serve an important function by bringing together key stakeholder interests. However, it was identified that some states feel they have science needs that may not be effectively communicated through the LCCs. Robin identified this as a critical issue and emphasized the need for the LCCs to develop direct relationships with the states in order to hear all stakeholders' key interests.

Robin noted that Herbert Frost (National Park Service), Council member, is also involved in the advisory committee. The committee is made up of federal, state, local, tribal, academia, NGO and private sector participants. Robin clarified that the advisory committee advises at the national level, not at the individual CSC level.

Robin highlighted that the advisory committee is working on defining "actionable science" and developing best practices; looking at an evaluation scheme; looking to improve relationships with tribes and indigenous peoples and looking at the committee's relationship with other groups (including the LCC Council). Robin emphasized common ground between the advisory committee and the Council in relation to improving communications, enhancing data coordination, coordinating science processes, focusing on decision-making and problem solving and working together with tribes in a way that is effective, but not burdensome.

The Council discussed the lack of involvement from western state agencies in the Council and talked about seeking participation from other state agencies like Department of Natural Resources. A Council member proposed that the Council send a message to all partners that the LCCs are aiming to meet their needs. He emphasized the need for good collaborative relationships with the CSCs to make sure the enterprises stay integrated. It was proposed that the Council look at the science investment of the CSCs and LCCs and analyze how they may be more integrated, in a process way. It was suggested that a sub-group examine the relationship between CSCs and LCCs to see how they are coordinating and what can be improved.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Regional Integrated Science Assessments

Adam Parris, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), presented to the Council on NOAA's Regional Integrated Science Assessments (RISAs), why there are not enough regional programs and suggested some areas for coordination. He acknowledged that RISAs are just one of many landscape conservation programs and acknowledged that we cannot respond to global climate change in isolation. He pointed to the National Climate Assessment illustrating interagency efforts to work together on climate change. Adam identified the need to integrate systems where communities become stewards of the resources they manage.

Adam explained there are 11 RISAs with stakeholder advisory committees and they are primary mechanisms to ensure science is connected to management decisions. Adam identified there is some coordination across the CSCs and RISAs as both entities have some overlapping membership but RISAs have more participation from state and local governments.

Adam proposed a need for regional programs which are place-based and problem-focused. He discussed that through engagement, people understand the context and the risks the region faces and can then understand how to address those risks. Adam identified a need to learn how to structure science to be more useful for decision-making so it can be adapted to climate change and adaptation strategies. Adam acknowledged that while risk changes over time and place, the one thing that stays the same is the people doing the work. People in the regions are coordinating because it makes a difference to the place they value.

A Council member noted that the LCCs are the only conservation entity that bridges implementation systems and useable understanding. He suggested this should be talked about when defining the role of LCCs. Another Council member identified an opportunity for the LCCs to learn what has been helpful for RISAs. Adam mentioned the National Research Council Report (Informing Decisions in A Changing Climate, 2009) identified learning as a key component of decision-making. Each RISA has funded an external evaluator to carry out annual evaluations, which are used to capture lessons learned and to design systems for experimentation and innovation.

U.S. Department of Agriculture Regional Hubs - Aligning Programs and Services for Risk-Based Adaptation

Dave Cleaves, U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service, provided a quick overview of the USDAs Regional Hubs, a new institutional mechanism which will provide productive partners with landscape conservation resources on the ground. Dave explained that the Council of Environmental Quality (CEQ) called for greater coordination across agencies, which galvanized the USDA to examine how to better coordinate across its own agency. The USDA examined user needs and learned about the demand for adaptation practices on the land. This resulted in USDA forming the Hubs. There will be seven Hubs across the country which will coordinate the USDA programs (including the science/research centers) oriented to provide better risk management information, as part of the climate change adaptation policy for USDA.

Dave described one selection criterion used to determine the location of each Hub was its potential to facilitate coordination and collaboration with other landscape conservation mechanisms such as LCCs, CSCs, and RISAs. Hubs involve working with communities who work on the landscape and implement adaptation practices. He identified some of the Hub activities to include technical support, assessments and forecasts, and outreach and education. Dave emphasized that USDA is using the existing structure to deliver adaptation strategies on the ground and bring the working landscape into the conservation efforts.

A Council member asked about science delivery in relation to Hubs. Dave acknowledged the need to organize the delivery of science into action. Over time, the different roles for different mechanisms will be worked out so different users will know where to go for information.

Council members discussed the need to identify and map the relationship of LCCs to other conservation programs and make linkages to these programs. They saw a need for an analytical view of the relationship between all the conservation programs to find synergies and be effective. However, they also noted the relationship between landscape conservation efforts needs to build in flexibility to enable decision-making. The Council discussed the LCCs as the interface for science and management and that the LCCs are the mechanism to distill shared needs across a region and enhance them.

An audience member suggested conservation programs should look at how they can all work well together rather than distinguishing themselves. Another audience member differentiated that USDA Hubs have production-orientated stakeholders, while LCCs are more conservation-orientated. She also emphasized the relationships between LCCs and USDA research stations which she stated need to be maintained as these may not be reached through the Hubs.

Council communications, coordination and support for the LCC enterprise

Penny directed Council members to the “Council communications, coordination and support for the LCC enterprise” issues paper. Penny asked the Council members to read through the issues that are highlighted in the paper and think about how the Council may want to address these issues relating to communications.

Elsa Haubold described the existing communication mechanisms used by the LCC Network. She talked about the LCC Coordinators Team who works on aspects of LCC network operations, the LCC Science Coordinator’s Team who communicate and collaborate on technical and scientific matters among the LCCs, and between the LCC Network and other science partners. Elsa noted that Google Docs is the main platform for file sharing and added that the LCC Network is also exploring options for a file sharing platform for all across the Network. Elsa introduced Ann Froschauer, Communications Coordinator for the LCC Network, who manages communications through email, newsletter and LCC Network website. The LCC Network is working on establishing a social media presence through Twitter and Facebook. Elsa noted that many of the individual LCCs also adopt these forms of communication within their network.

A Council member recalled the establishment of the LCCs, which he felt was not very well communicated. He encouraged Council members to think about what this Council is doing, what value it is adding is and to be mindful to ask LCCs. He emphasized the need for a clear purpose to aid understanding of the Council’s work. A Council member asked what the message is about LCCs in the context of the science delivery system. She stressed the importance of outcomes-based messaging and effectively communicating those to the LCC Network and partners.

A Council member acknowledged the range of good tools that are currently being used and suggested that communications also needs to involve dialogue. She emphasized the need for the Council to hear more about the needs of the LCC Network in order to know what direction to take. She suggested a sub-group of the Council join the LCT calls periodically to get a sense of the issues discussed. Other Council members echoed this and added the Council should build a relationship with the LCT and find ways to have conversations about issues facing the LCCs.

A Council member specified the importance of the LCC Network having access to the work of the Council. Key pieces, meeting notes and action items should be communicated to the LCC Network after each meeting. She added that feedback to the Council should come through existing mechanisms - LCT and LSCT. Each Council member has their own “constituency” and has multiple ways to bring issues to the Council and share information.

Another Council member suggested the Council reach out to constituents to ask how the LCC Network is doing and to determine if there are success stories or issues/problems that need to be addressed. She referred to the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (AFWA) and suggested that the Council communicate to constituents about the role of the LCCs and create a mechanism to gain feedback from constituents.

A Council member suggested establishing a policy that the Council will take input on the development of meeting agendas, have open attendance at meetings and circulate meeting notes after each meeting. He advised the Council make this commitment in order to develop relationships so people feel empowered to bring issues to the Council. A Council member suggested that staff develop a draft Communications Plan for the next Council meeting.

Action: A Communications Work Group including: Dave Whitehurst, Marc Miller and Terry Williams, will develop a draft Communications Plan for Council review.

Leadership selection

Penny reminded Council members that the charter calls for the Council to select a Chair and Vice-chair. She pointed to the part of the charter which lays out leadership roles and responsibilities. The Council members discussed the proposal of having two co-chairs, rather than a Chair and Vice-chair leadership structure and agreed to move forward with co-chairs. Nominations were accepted and two rounds of voting were conducted. Council members agreed by consensus on Marc Miller, Illinois Department of Natural Resources, and Lynn Scarlett, The Nature Conservancy, as the Council co-chairs.

Charter, draft operational guidelines and Council membership

Penny directed the Council member to the “Charter, draft operational guidelines and Council membership” issue paper. Penny provided some context about membership and composition of the Council and noted that the strategy team chose not to fill the two “at-large” seats during recruitment.

However, during the recruitment process, the strategy team did receive suggestions about some types of organizations that could fill those seats.

The strategy team recommended to the Council for consideration for one of the “at-large” seats the Wilburforce Foundation/Consultative Group on Biological Diversity. This organization applied for an NGO seat, but the review panel and the strategy team felt that this organization would be more suited to an “at-large” seat. Penny also noted that during the recruitment period interest to participate on the Council was expressed by the National Association of Counties, Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board and a private sector applicant.

Penny highlighted that there are currently four vacancies on the Council: One state vacancy, one international vacancy and two tribal vacancies. Penny gave a brief overview of the selection process outlined in the charter for the State participants. Penny noted that the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA) chose not to fill their seat during recruitment. A Council member expressed concern about only seeking participants through AWFA. The Council discussed the state vacancy and whether or not to broaden recruitment to include more than AFWA. After much discussion of different approaches the Council agreed to connect with WAFWA again to see if they are interested in participating. If they decline, the Council will then discuss other methods of filling the vacant state seat.

Penny reviewed other vacancies that exist on the Council in the tribal category and international category. Penny explained that during tribal recruitment, the strategy team received five applications, largely concentrated in the Pacific Northwest. The strategy team selected two tribal participants and recommended that the Council carry out greater outreach for tribal participants to ensure diverse geographic representation for the third tribal participant. Penny noted that since naming the Council one tribal participant withdrew. The strategy team also recommended that all original tribal applicants be considered during the next recruitment period. Penny noted that the charter calls for one international seat to be reserved for a Mexico participant and no applications were received from Mexico during recruitment. The strategy team recommended the Council conduct greater outreach to fill this seat.

Penny concluded this conversation and proposed the Council delay validating the Council membership structure until the Council has time to discuss it further. The Council directed staff to conduct outreach, recruitment and a review process for tribal and international participants. The Council agreed to discuss further the other Council vacancies, decide what sectors they would like to participate on the Council and agree on a process for recruitment. Penny asked Council members to send any contacts that may be able assist with outreach to the Mexico or tribal participant categories to Elsa.

Operational guidelines

Maggie provided a brief overview of the U.S. Institute and EnviroIssues’ role in the convening process and informed the Council the current contract for neutral facilitation support will expire by the end of

February. The Council decided that the Co-chairs will work with Elsa to make a determination on how they want to proceed with facilitation, internal communication, and documentation.

Action: Co-chairs will meet with Elsa to determine facilitation, internal communication and documentation needs and bring a recommendation back to the Council.

Path forward

Penny suggested that the Council table endorsing the charter until they have further discussions. Gary Tabor, Madeline Maley, Mallory Martin, Mary Wagner, Jeff Raasch, David Whitehurst, and Ulalia Woodside volunteered to be on the charter working group to look at possible areas for change in the charter and bring it to the next Council meeting for discussion.

Action: Charter work group will develop proposed charter changes and bring back to the Council for discussion.

Penny reminded the Council of discussions they had about taking action to understand LCCs. A Council member suggested they be included in the development of the LCC Network Strategic Plan. He added it is important that the Council contribute to the development of a strategy by the LCC Coordinators, in terms of providing input on issues. He suggested a sub-group be established to work with the LCC Network to develop the strategic plan. This approach was supported by Council members and Eric Schroff, Jeff Raasch, Leslie Honey, Madeline Maley and Terry Williams volunteered for the Strategic Plan work group.

Action: Strategic plan work group will work with the LCC Network to collaborate on development of a Network Strategic Plan and fold in Council strategic direction.

A Council member added that there is a need to establish a mechanism so that priority issues are elevated to the Council. The Council members discussed the LCT's role in providing a list of short term issues for immediate consideration. He acknowledged that a key message from the meeting is that the Council wants to know what is happening now that the LCCs need help with, as well as assisting in developing a long term strategy for the LCC Network.

The Council addressed the issue of the Council name. Consensus was reached that the name should be changed to be the LCC Council, to demonstrate the intended inclusivity of the Council.

The Council briefly highlighted some potential agenda topics for the next Council meeting:

- Report from the LCT/hear short presentations from select LCCs
- Report from the three working groups (communications, charter, strategic plan)
- Further discuss the purpose of the Council
- Discuss filling "at-large" seats
- Develop high-level outcomes to communicate to the LCC Network

Schedule of meetings

- Conference call in April to check in on the progress of action items and review agenda for the next in-person meeting.
- An in-person meeting to be scheduled in early June (location TBD)
- The Council has tentatively planned to meet again in the fall (location TBD)

A Council member identified that one of the challenges with in-person meetings is travel funding. A Council member said that the Fish and Wildlife Service will brief Council leadership and staff on a possible solution to help alleviate this issue.

Council action items

Penny reviewed the action items from the meeting:

- Three **working groups** have been established to work on the charter, a communications plan and a strategic plan.
- **Council members** will send contacts to Elsa to assist staff with outreach and recruitment for tribal and international (Mexico) participants
- **Council Co-chairs** will reach out to WAFWA to measure interest in participating in the Council
- **Staff** will send out a Doodle poll to schedule an April conference call.
- **Envirolssues** will send expressions of interest in the Council received to staff.
- **Envirolssues** will post the meeting materials on www.lccnetwork.org/council.

In closing, the Council agreed to summarize key messages and outcomes from the meeting to support Council members sharing the meeting results with their organizations. It was suggested and agreed this should be a standing action at the end of each Council meeting.

Key messages

- The LCC Council enthusiastically affirmed their role to support the LCCs and facilitate the work they do to support a sustainable network.
- The LCC Council has a shared commitment to landscape scale conservation and the unique contribution of the LCCs selected leadership.
- The Council members discussed the new name for the Council and agreed the Council should move forward as the LCC Council. The Council felt that this name recognizes the desire for inclusivity across the LCC Network.

Meeting Outcomes:

- The LCC Council developed a broad framework for actions to support the LCCs
- The LCC Council selected leadership (two co-chairs):
 - Marc Miller, Director, Illinois Department of Natural Resources
 - Lynn Scarlett, Managing Director, Public Policy, The Nature Conservancy
- Seeking to clarify its role, the LCC Council established three working groups:

- Communications
- Strategic Planning (jointly with the LCC Network)
- Charter refining
- The LCC Council started to develop a better understanding of the relationship of LCCs to other landscape conservation efforts/initiatives
- The LCC Council will reach out to LCCs to understand barriers to success, help address these barriers and to celebrate successes

The Council will meet again in spring and summer 2014 to continue their work in supporting the LCC Network.