

**North Atlantic LCC Steering Committee Meeting
October 26-27, 2015
Portsmouth, New Hampshire**

Minutes

Action Items

Committee and Partner Action Items

- Please contact Ken Elowe or Andrew Milliken to set up specific science delivery opportunities for your agency, organization or partnership
- Ask any of your staff that are starting to use LCC information and tools to provide feedback on what is useful; what would make these tools more useful; and what LCC information and tools are resulting in actions and share this feedback to Andrew Milliken
- Review and provide feedback on state fact sheets (in your meeting folders or [on the website](#)) and on product website to Bridget Macdonald (she will share link when ready)
- Contact Andrew Milliken to volunteer or identify staff to help scope out specific additional strategic plan components (see list in [Handout 19](#)); LCC staff will work with these teams and bring back results to Steering Committee
- Bill Hyatt will coordinate with non-federal employees about communicating with their elected officials to let them know their support for LCCs prior to the December 11 appropriations deadline

Staff Action Items

- LCC staff will post upcoming science delivery events on LCC website and calendar, including forthcoming RFP
- Invite technical team members and other key partners to participate in Regional Conservation Opportunity Areas including review of the scientific elements used in design
- Document comparisons of approaches used in the North Atlantic LCC to other conservation design approaches, including the assessment of alternatives by the RCOA team, and provide that to the Steering Committee
- Monitor feedback from the implementation of the Connecticut River Watershed Landscape Conservation Design Pilot (“Connect the Connecticut”)
- Work with WMI to notify successful P.I.s for floodplain and rare plant proposals and develop agreements that reflect review team recommendations
- Follow-up with Sharri Venno and other tribal contacts to enhance tribal science delivery opportunities
- Work with Maryland DNR, state and other partners to gauge interest in a Symposium or Workshop focused on LCC products at the NEAFWA Conference in April

Monday, October 26

Welcome & Introductions - Ken Elowe (FWS)

Attendees in person and on the phone introduced themselves. There were 42 attendees in person or on the phone representing 27 steering committee agencies and organizations and representing a quorum. Fullttendee list is at the end of the minutes.

Ken Elowe: In April, we heard the message that you wanted us to focus more on “Products” not “Projects”, and that you wanted more in terms of communications. You wanted to know how we get a hold of the information, and we wanted feedback on utility.

We have been in meetings with state agencies to learn: What do you need to do your job better? Does it need to be something else completely? The trajectory of this LCC was set on a certain path from the Albany 2 conference, but it is all just conceptual until you have something in hand. Now we do, so it’s useful for you to provide feedback on tangible products. We’d like to hear from you more during this meeting, and in the coming months and year.

Ken asked for a motion to approve minutes. Cathy Sparks (RI) motioned to approve minutes, and Chris Hilke (NWF) seconded.

Action Items from June Steering Committee Call and Actions Taken - Andrew Milliken (LCC)

Walk through action items that came out of the June 2015 call - referenced in the minutes you approved - and the actions that have been taken in response:

- Projects - You approved two categories of projects, direct and sole source:
 1. Extension of aquatic mapping into Canada
 2. Extension of aquatic connectivity work by adding a tidal-culvert component.

The proposals and contracts are in place, and projects should be underway shortly.

The other area was Science Delivery, which includes some RFP work that has not been issued, but we will talk that through tomorrow.

We are moving forward with large amount of Science Delivery, meeting with partners across the region. The short version is that we have done extensive visits with partners, and have heard a lot of good feedback that we will share.

- Strategic Plan Matrix - We are keeping that up to date, and it is available on the website.
- Moving forward with Strategic Plan - We came up with a set of topics that are important to address. You ask that we winnow those down, and I provided some criteria for doing that, which we will go over tomorrow.

- Feedback on CT River Watershed LCD implementation - We will report on Core Team meeting in October, and share voices of our partners.
- Steering Committee need for Science Delivery - What do you want us to focus on? How can we help each other?
- Articulating next steps for regional LCD - We met with Northeast states last week, and have a clear path forward that we will share.

Highlights and Discussion on Science Projects and Resulting Products – Scott Schwenk (LCC), Megan Tyrrell (LCC), Peter Murdoch (USGS)

Products, Tools, and Uses of LCC - Scott Schwenk

I am excited to report out that over the past six months, we have had significant milestones. This is a culmination of three or four years of work. In [Handout 5](#) you will find a little more detail than is in the slides.

In Albany, we agreed to adaptive management framework focused on translating results of assessments into work that can be used by partners, and delivering it. More and more, the line between science projects and delivery is blurring.

Our projects fall into three categories:

1. Foundational information
2. Assessments of condition
3. Decision-support tools

Most products and tools are developed at a regional basis, allowing integration by different partners in different places. The goal is a portfolio of projects and products that fit together.

Highlights:

- Northeast Terrestrial Habitat Map - Initially sponsored by Northeast states to come up with consistent classification, now extends into Canada

Karel Allard (Canadian Wildlife Service): This is a great example we can use to show how the LCC is supportive of projects that are meaningful for us. It creates foundational habitat layer that support conservation for our region. It's a real contribution.

- Northeast Lakes and Ponds Classification - Provides ability to look across the region at these water bodies for the first time
- Migratory Landbird Stopover Sites - Fills in a hole in assessments, which until now have focused primarily on breeding habitat and we want to try and make this into a useful tool for state and local players.

- Maps of Occurrence for Marine Birds - First time this many marine bird species have been mapped over such a large range. Can look at by annual occurrence or occurrence by month.
- Regional Vernal Pool Data - Putting disparate data together in one place, from state, academia, and smaller projects, as well as developing methods for using remote sensing to identify vernal pool sites.
- Just underway: Extension of Northeast Aquatic Classification into Canada – Similar to the Northeast Terrestrial Habitat project.
- Designing Sustainable Landscapes - Connect the Connecticut, Habitat Models for Terrestrial Species, Index of Ecological Integrity
- Fish Habitat Tool - Focus on brook trout, river herring, and winter flounder, through visualization, ranking, and futuring tools.
- Interactive Catchment Explorer – Impact on stream temperature based on different climate change scenarios

Coastal Resiliency Projects – Megan Tyrrell

- Increasing Aquatic Connectivity – North Atlantic Aquatic Connectivity Collaborative. There is work going on in at least 12 states, and one of the initial products is a prioritization tool to show where assessments and restoration work should take place.

Pete Murdoch: What does the red indicate [in the survey prioritization tool]?

Megan: Those are areas of high priority for future road stream crossing assessments.

Pete: So it's places where we think the culverts are vulnerable?

Megan: This is based on survey results where fish habitat values outweighed infrastructure considerations but they are all included as criteria. One can change the weights of the criteria to change the output of where high priority survey areas appear- could weigh all towards where we expect culverts might fail.

As Andrew mentioned, there is interest in moving this protocol forward to make it applicable to tidally influenced crossings. We have drafted an agreement with Scott Jackson at UMass to do a literature review and synthesis of issues related to tidal culverts, identifying specific challenges and key species. We had a workshop in September bringing together managers who are interested in this topic, and we expect to have draft protocol and scoring system by July 2017.

- Multi-LCC Aquatic Connectivity Efforts – Collaboration with Great Lakes and Upper Midwest LCCs, upcoming workshop will share approaches to prioritization and optimization.

- Support for Coastal Resiliency - Hired a post-doc Emily Powell to do delivery of coastally relevant information to partners and decision makers. She was tasked with developing a workgroup, and has enlisted representatives from all six coastal LCCs, so we already have a lot of engagement and feel it will continue. Other components of her work will be communicating to communities the natural resource benefits of living shoreline versus hardened approach.

Megan: Before I move onto tidal marshes, I meant to ask Anne to speak about aquatic connectivity work she has been involved with in Rhode Island.

Anne Kuhn (EPA): We are using the NAACC databases – Critical Linkages and Stream Continuity, focusing on stream-culvert assessments. Critical Linkages is actually a model-based estimate incorporating IEI, looking at a number of parameters to make predictions about the importance of each road-crossing in enhancing and restoring aquatic connectivity. If you put them together, you can start to prioritize. We have done so in the Taunton watershed in Rhode Island, and we are now expanding to Narragansett watershed. It allows us to ask: Where are most important crossings? What's the condition? So we can prioritize for upgrades, but also for maintenance. The third is where do we need to do more assessments. We are working in these watersheds – first in Taunton through the Resilient Taunton Watershed Network - doing workshops, bringing in DOTs and DPWS, and all are agreeing on prioritizations. We are also working with NGOs who want to take on the voluntary monitoring.

Megan: Jed, did you want to mention something about work in Maine?

Jed Wright (FWS): I'd like to add that this summer we continued with this work, and have 3,000 new structures surveyed – I wish I could say replaced! We have iPads in the field for e-data collection, and are working with Maine Audubon on outreach. It's a really great outlet for delivering the message.

Megan: Thank you. Okay back Hurricane Sandy Projects.

Increasing resilience of tidal marshes:

- Saltmarsh Habitat and Avian Response Program – Assessing wildlife and bird use in marshes, with pre- and post-Sandy data. Also developing and refining marsh equilibrium model to show impacts of sea level rise and storms.
- Working with NROC and MARCO on delivery of products to practitioners in the region.

Increasing resilience of beach habitat:

- iPlover – Smartphone app to collect geomorphic data on piping plover nesting sites that feeds into predictive models to show how sea-level rise might affect these and other species.
- Inventory of Beaches and Tidal Inlets – Using aerial photography before, right after, and three years after Hurricane Sandy.

DOI Metrics – Pete Murdoch (USGS)

Pete: DOI formed a metrics expert group - a team of scientists and economists to provide insight on the success or failure of Hurricane Sandy projects. We have produced version one of a report, but as part of our deliberations, we decided we didn't understand socio-economics metrics well enough yet, so we contracted a consulting firm to do a study of potential metrics. Within the month we should have the final report, which will transition into another RFP and a testing of those metrics. The idea is eventually to link socio-economic metrics with environmental metrics in one report, which will be a recommendations report, not a report saying what groups should or should not be doing.

There is an effort underway to identify focal areas to use remaining resources to fill science and data gaps. One of problems for detecting resilience is we don't know the baseline conditions. Approaches like thin-layer deposition can take a few years to show the hoped-for results. So the remaining funding will help us look at efficacy. We are also putting out an RFP for contractor to oversee the DOI assessment of the Sandy projects, asking what worked, what didn't, how we measure resilience-change effectively, and how we might create best practices.

Ken Elowe: That was a large volume of information. It's not meant to be absorbed, but more to provide an overview. Three pots of dollars have gone into this work: Hurricane Sandy was a Congressional appropriation not just for rebuilding, but for looking at what might make things more resilient down the line. Some projects are also shared between LCCs, funded by national LCC dollars for big things that cannot be done in a single geography. The rest were done with NALCC dollars in hand.

What you have seen here is in response to what you have told you wanted done. If you remember, we have technical committees with 50 different people from your organizations. The question is: Do the results look useful to you? This can be tweaked into a lot of different formats, different forms, combined into a lot of different tools that might be more useful to you. With this volume of science coming out, you told us to make it available and useful. That's a message we are taking seriously, but we want to revisit.

Chris Hilke (NWF): Coastal Resilience work is really important to us, given the number of projects going on at local and state levels. Particularly the metrics, so decision-support tools that can inform implementation is key area on that front. I'm not sure if Roselle Henn (US ACE) is on the phone, but there is interest in SAGE partnership in collaborating with coastal LCCs. There are a lot of points of connection, so I want to voice my support.

Ken: Those who work on the ground. If there is anything we can do to enhance your ability, we see that as productive.

Jed: Megan caught me off guard before, but I want to add that the NAACC is multi-faceted effort. It's collaborative, looking for partners, building tools, building capacity, building a framework is really important, and it is having a real influence on the region. We appreciate it.

Ken: And we're not the ones doing it. We're just convening those who have the expertise, wherever that is.

Scot Williamson: I was really impressed with Handout 12. The number of meetings held from June to October, that's a lot of work, but what did you hear?

Andrew: The quick version is: People are impressed with the breadth and depth of what we are doing, but they are overwhelmed by it as well, and so they appreciate the opportunity to get training. That's where it begins to become hands-on rather than theoretical. Another key point is that a lot of the work seems to be focused on helping partners prioritize work for land protection. An overall theme we are hearing is a desire to give equal weight to restoration and management. Another might be that partners are interested in conservation designs bringing common goals together, but maybe just as important, they want to set their own weights, think about their own prioritizations, and make their own decisions. We have also heard that staff members aren't using the tools because they need more support. So we are clearly just starting in doing the Science Delivery that we need to.

Ken: That complexity takes a lot of diving into, and organizations have lots of different types of staff that need different resolutions of training on different products, so we need to get the right training to the right people. We are also hearing that there are no solutions being produced here: It's information you can use or not. It's not meant to supplant anything else. We've had to compile information across a region. So you may have higher resolution data where you work. It's the question of: Is it bad to have additional information on the table? Is this helpful as an addition?

Sharri Venno (Houlton Band of Maliseets): It looks to me like the maps and tools are at a point where it might be helpful to take them to the tribes, not so they will use them necessarily, but just as a way to get a clearer way of understanding how the NALCC tools might affect them where they sit. I think it might be a good time to reach out. I'm also wondering: In terms of planned boundary efforts: At what point can you use decisional tools based on how much you've done with the Maritimes? We've got the Terrestrial Habitat Map, and the Aquatic one is coming. Will we need more mapping still once that occurs?

Ken: TNC projects are designed to cross border.

Scott: We need to decide if we want IEI and Habitat models to cross boundaries.

Sharri: So that's still a long time coming.

Andrew: But you can already use the Terrestrial Habitat Map to make decisions. What we have also tried to do is bring in existing cross-border work that can be used in conjunction, like Two Countries, One Forest. That's one of the Strategic Plan objectives: To think through cross-border work.

Gwen Brewer (MD): Are they static? Can we put them together yet?

Ken: We've never had the capability to do this kind of work before. Now we are starting to get results, but as an LCC community, we are not sure what to do with them yet. The LCD concept combines approaches to make a single product, and gives the ability to refine things that are important to you.

Jed: A great example is the Interactive Catchment Explorer. Everyone around the region is updating information, which updates the models. It's interesting example of constant refinement.

Chris: That's a unique example. But what is the extent to which you can bridge that gap, with regional tools fed by local data.

Andrew: I would like to say that all things we do are dynamic and kept up to date because they become obsolete so quickly but not all of them are. It is an important aspect of how we work, predicting the future, and providing better information into the future.

Bill Hyatt (CT): What I think I'm hearing is that you've provided a broad sweep, understanding that a lot of folks have not dug in yet. It sounds like an "ask" to have people take a look in order to have more detailed feedback than we can provide in a meeting like this.

Ken: We are not looking for a reaction now; it's more of an invitation to start the conversations. I want to emphasize the word "start".

Jack Buckley (MA): To Scot's question, in response to the science delivery visits, I can only conclude Massachusetts was a rare outlier. We were quite skeptical of the value and the use of all of this to us. Maybe we are just outliers, and we represent an extreme view.

Ken: And the feedback you gave about us on not "selling", but "listening", was very useful. You have been using the same researchers and resources we have, so some of this was not new. But as a regional approach, it is. I expect frank feedback because it's the only way we can be responsive. That's why we want to sit down with you. I don't take it the wrong way at all.

Jack: My point is: The results are presented quite rosily. The day I spent with you was not rosy. Just wanted to get that on the table.

Ken: What's rosy is we've come a long way. What's challenging: How do we make this more useful to conservation?

Update on Landscape Conservation Design - Steve Fuller (LCC), Scott Schwenk (LCC), Bridget Macdonald (LCC)

- a) Updates on and lessons learned from the Connecticut River Watershed Landscape Conservation Design Pilot;
- b) Regional Conservation Opportunity Areas: approach and recommendations – outcome of NEFWDTTC meeting and next steps
- c) Next steps across the region
- d) Steering Committee questions & discussion

Andrew: It is key to think about these as learning, iterative processes that we hope to get feedback on. What does it mean to do this kind of conservation design work on the regional scale? The RCOAs team has engaged some of the same resources as Connect the Connecticut team, and brought attention to Regional Species of Greatest Conservation Need. That approach was just approved by the Northeast Fish and Wildlife Diversity Technical Committee with a clear understanding that this is a learning process. We are ready to produce draft products and

learn from them. That was last Wednesday, which brings us to today, and I think the conversation that would be helpful for us as a staff: What does this Steering Committee think is the most important thing moving forward? Is this the right set of tools? What could make it more useful?

Our first recommendation is to keep supporting that learning in the Connecticut River watershed. Does that sound right to agencies who have been involved?

At the RCOA scale, we have had a team working on that with Steve Fuller and others, made up primarily of state GIS folks, and we would like to bring in other partners moving forward as we do this at a regional scale. Our second recommendation is to move forward and do a version 1.0 with additional partners involved in the process. One thought is going back to technical teams and asking for their involvement, but we also want to run it by you to ask, if we need a broader conservation design team informing this effort, how do we do that.

Another thing our partners have mentioned during our visits is that having draft products to react to is actually pretty important. So we need to try things out and provide some results.

The final thing is to think about something at the regional scale could be stepped down to different scales, like a watershed. This version 1.0 effort would inform additional science needs.

Kim Royar (VT): I think the fact that you have gotten so far is impressive. And you are the entity to be doing so. A lot of us are doing this kind of work in state or with partners, but this is bigger. I think it's great to get feedback from the end users. It might also be good to do a peer review with technical people and academicians to stand back and take one more look at the process.

Andrew: Eric Sorenson (VT) is talking about going a step forward and doing a formal peer review. An important step in learning is being comfortable with tools and models. Is now the right time?

Kim R.: It could be done while rolling out to the final product to end users.

Scott: We have thought a lot about that and are taking steps with individual products. We met with Black Duck Joint Venture to get feedback on the black duck model. There are complexities and challenges, and the RCOA Core Team has taken months to work through them, so how long does it take to bring an outside team up to speed?

Kim Lutz (TNC): I was wondering if I could get clarification. When you described how the data in the RCOAs project "matched"...what did it match? It made me think: Could we do that kind of on-the-ground testing with Connect the Connecticut. It would be great to do.

Steve Fuller: I was checking that forest condition data matched land management projects. The other was that states asked us to develop a more objective way of ranking species, so we used data for each species that occur, processed patterns of status rankings, and the results matched the arduous species-by-species projects. Where there were discrepancies, it made sense.

Kim: It may make sense to do that with Connect the CT. Also, in terms of getting feedback on the products, it might be nice to have a set of questions to frame that feedback. It might help

evaluators to understand what it is you are looking for. Also, I appreciate the clarity about these two products, but I am confused about when you would use one or the other. I would add that as a step: When use LCD, and when use RCOA?

Andrew: I would think about the two projects as piloting a very similar approach at two different scales. The underlying data and tools, particularly in terms of core areas and connectivity, are very similar. The RSGCN component in RCOAs is specific to the states. So it's not different processes, but two different scales, and learning from each other. So you don't choose one or the other, but you will ultimately have a suite of regional tools, and you will learn what you can do at watershed scale.

Steve: You had another point on guiding input regarding key decisions that need to be made to move forward. We will do that. We want general input, but there are general areas where we already know we need more input. For example: We have not had enough aquatic and coastal input. If you know or can delegate anybody, we'd really appreciate it.

Andrew: Our technical teams can help, but we want to know if you think it's a good role for them to shift to focusing on the LCD, rather than broader science needs. Are there others who might be more appropriate?

Ken: What's exciting to me is that the two efforts are converging. One started in 2010 with request from states to make habitats comparable across the region. There have been two components: RCOAs, and the lexicon project, a database that catalogues species and habitat needs for the region. That has been percolating for a long time with a lot of input as well as challenges. In the meantime, we have been working on products that come together for conservation design. A lot of the things that were piloted in the Connect the Connecticut prove useful in RCOA discussion as well, with additional considerations. Two processes are converging. That's what we should keep in mind. Is it useful for the LCC? The vision was to conserve a landscape that will allow a future for key resources 100 years from now. So the RSGCN component is just another. To Kim's point: This is a unifying factor, not two separate things.

We've also got tomorrow morning, so we don't need answer right now. Just start thinking about what you need for the future, and what we can provide.

Andrew: From my perspective, we need to hear that this general approach to utilize our resources and technical committee to learn and move forward, and produce things for people to react to, makes sense. If not, we need to know.

Bill Hyatt: My impression is that this is a logical extension of what we have been moving towards. The difficult thing for this group is that there is too much complexity to have a discussion beyond the 10,000-foot level in terms of being able to say: Yes, this is the next step. We need to build in ground-truthing. What further input could I possibly have into this effort? I don't think the lack of discussion represents a lack of endorsement: Just challenge of grappling with details behind it.

Jack: The question seems rhetorical. Are there alternatives? It just seems logical that we move forward, unless you have alternatives to present. That's all.

Ken: Scott showed the LCD map. This was an approach that we started in 2011 based on a more scientific look at climate change and habitat capability models for a different set of species. We tried to take a more comprehensive look. This is the road we started on, but it's not an inevitable one. It is rhetorical until we get people looking at this on the ground. I guess we need to get things into your staffs' hands to see if it's worth doing it, or if we should consider something else.

Jack: It's the "something else" that's missing.

Ken: Would it be helpful to see other approaches to compare?

Kim L.: One of the things we've talked about for Connect the CT is to show the various tools that people are using, and how they are complementary - when you would use one or the other. Many of the user groups you have identified need to have a menu of what it took to get to that point. In general that would be helpful.

Jack: It might also be helpful to know the added value in the context of a decision. Theoretically, the outcome is some practical action. How much more information do you need to make a decision? Are you building toward some metaphysical perfect outcome?

Curt Griffin (UMass/NECSC): My perspective: Until you can do this, you cannot make a decision. There are other approaches out there, but they are nowhere near where we are. Given the hundreds of thousands of dollars spent already, it is worth the investment to see it through. We looked at Biomap for comparison, and this seemed like the obvious next step. We could go back and make those comparisons again, but not sure that's worth it.

Kim L: I admit I didn't attend every meeting, but I never heard about that, and that would be helpful.

Curt: That meeting was done years ago. I'm sure Kevin can provide the comparison.

Jack: I would like to see that.

Curt: Biomap was designed for different objectives, so it's not a perfect comparison, but it exists.

Chris: What I'm struggling with...the point of these tools is to provide regional context for finer scale decision. So what I wonder is...obviously the finer scale local information is more valuable to states. Where is the threshold at which putting effort into regional context provides enough value? What is the value threshold? It's great to have holistic picture, but what point to we have enough context?

Ken: The question is how much effort do you spend, and to what end: What do you want it to do? If the idea is to provide regional context to decision making so our collective efforts add up to something bigger, that's the end game. Given large-scale stressors like climate change, have we built in the best framework to address that kind of issue? But you don't want to be perfect to be the enemy of the good. Those are good return on investments questions that we need to consider.

Jack: The question you asked is based on us having honest context. Without that, what are we supposed to say? We have no alternative to consider? I guess keep going.

Ken: I understand, it's a timing thing. We have a certain suite of information in hand. We also have request from states to keep going with RCOAs to build into SWAPs. But before the next meeting, we need to provide that.

Jack: Who from the states is asking those questions? It's a lifestyle question.

Ken: It came out of Albany, where all the states were present.

Jed: What do you mean by "lifestyle"?

Jack: I mean when you become so involved in something, it becomes more of a lifestyle than a choice.

Bill: How far do you go in refining this tool to the regional level? To me, this is that step. Prior to this, we didn't have a tool that provides regional context. This is the first step that tees up the question.

Ellen Mecray (NOAA): We are beating a dead horse. You want an answer, but the question is not clear, and we need to know the alternatives. So maybe we proceed until you provide us with more information.

Ken: So we need to provide more information to you to help you provide an answer, but it is not a rhetorical question. We also want to move forward for the SWAPs sake. The question of budget and investment is an important one. How do you want to spend dollars over the next year? Part of the question is: Should we finish the process we started? We have already paid for 99 percent. One of the things we should have done is to present specific decisions we need made right now.

Gwen: We also didn't address your questions about technical teams.

Review of project budgets and contracts – Scot Williamson (WMI)

Review of projects selected and RFP results – Scott Schwenk

Handouts 11a and 11b – Results of Science Needs Process

We held a workshop with the Technical Committee and Science Delivery committee, and went through process to identify needs in both areas. I'm here to talk about the Science Needs results.

Four topics were brought forth in our call last June. We worked with WMI in putting together RFP package for two of those.

1. River corridors and floodplains assessments – We've done a lot of work on upstream and downstream connections, but they are dynamic, and we need to accommodate future

changes. So we want an assessment of ecological context of rivers. We also added a consideration of cultural resources, specifically national historic sites that occur in floodplains.

2. Prioritization of rare plants – Wanted to tap into latest information from natural heritage program on status of rare plants across the region.

River corridors and floodplains assessments - The recommendation was to proceed with a proposal from Christine Hatch at UMass Amherst, which has established a River Smart Task Force already focusing on these issues.

Jed: We had three great proposals, but UMass stood out for doing an assessment of needs.

Amanda Babson (NPS): All the proposals were strong, but in terms of cultural resources, only UMass really thought through how to incorporate the necessary expertise to address that component.

Prioritization of rare plants - The recommendation was to proceed with a proposal by Nature Serve, which has already been doing this kind of work, has data in hand across the region, and is committed to updating global ranks for species that occur in this region.

Sharri: Was there any tribal element in the floodplain project?

Jed: They said they would engage tribal members on the Steering Committee, but that's all I remember.

Scott: Is that something you would recommend?

Sharri: Yes, tribal historic preservation officers should be reached.

Scott: Let's follow up with you to be sure we frame that request correctly.

Gwen: For the river proposal, it sounded like UMass's proposal was for a more limited area. Is it realistic that they can expand to the region?

Amanda: Their current partnership focuses on New England states, but they want to do the 13 North Atlantic states, so we asked for more information on how they intend to do so.

Jed: The question is: What do the end users need? UMass wants to broaden the approach across the region. They are looking at 10 different protocols - from detailed fieldwork to remote sensing - and it seemed like they were stepping way back to ask: How are we going to do this? At this point, it is less about the final product, but about figuring out what is needed in order to do creative river management. In the RFP, creating a regional dataset was "if you can", but not the primary focus.

Scott: You can do a purely remote sensing, or you can do some field-based complement. So there are trade offs. The product may not immediately cover the entire geography, but ultimately would be more meaningful to do it this way.

Ken: We need a motion to approve these recommendations.

Cathy: I move to approve both

Kim R.: Second.

Curt: I just want to mention that the Northeast Climate Science Center produced a report outlining guidance for states on incorporating climate science into their State Wildlife Action Plans. I have put copies of the Executive Summary out on the table, but you can also access the report online (<http://necsc.umass.edu/projects/integrating-climate-change-state-wildlife-action-plans>).

Tuesday, October 27

Meeting opening and agenda review- Ken Elowe

Ken: Everyone was invited to share thoughts on yesterday's discussion. Agenda items 9 and 10 will be reversed.

Progress on science delivery- Steve Fuller

Update on 2014 grants: Highstead completed 4 workshops across region, targeted toward regional conservation workshops. Envision the Susquehanna has been initiated by the Chesapeake Conservancy. Wildlife Conservation Society is prioritizing municipalities based on the town's standing zoning regulations to implement land conservation. Open Space Institute is developing guidance documents for incorporating climate change adaptation for land trusts.

Update on spring allocation: Some funds were obligated for Improvements to Data Basin to insure interoperability w. Landscape America for data archiving tools. Funds have been obligated for staff capacity to achieve Initial Knowledge Transfer, including staff support time, Bridget, Stephanie and Steve's time. We will get out to more partners, finding their needs beforehand and coming in with a more customized approach. Funds not yet obligated for Focused Science Applications or for Technical Assistance Provider Grants- held out on spending after feedback from users.

What we are hearing from science delivery workshops and training –

- Folks want face to face engagement in addition to slide shows, Data Basin a useful resource b/c people can navigate in it. State F&W staff in some cases don't know about our products. RCOA products will be helping with increasing exposure and familiarity. Brook Trout assessment tool and aquatic connectivity tools are well received.
- Conservation design tools are useful to look beyond state boundaries to find out an organism's status beyond the state. These tools also help partners rally around common objectives
- RCOA process has been well received from collaborative perspective, folks want to see the results before ready to roll out final products.

- Representative species models should be a useful complementary approach to habitats for planning but people want additional experts to review them more before embracing them.

Ken: States have primary authority from F&W management. Ken has sat down w. each state to hear their response to our products and process. Every state has different needs and have different requirements that they want for their staff to learn about our products

Becky Gwynn: Had 3 LCC's visit, lots of the staff weren't aware of the tools but really appreciated the face to face training. Lots of conservation partners were trained at the same time. Resulted in state level coordination for using the tools in Virginia.

John Wright: NFWF- meeting and training with LCC Coordinator was helpful - tools will be very useful to them as they move to a more regional planning strategy in Northeast and elsewhere. Northeast Forests and Rivers fund will use the tools to figure out where priorities are, how to find match. They don't do this kind of stuff (landscape-scale planning) at NFWF. They liked it to visualize where they are going to go, still absorbing it. The Connecticut River pilot approach is a good match for how they will do similar conservation.

Andrew: We are in a learning stage on how to do delivery effectively and probably need for follow ups after each broader training (also become additional science delivery). One new component, on-line training modules is now being developed collaboratively with the Appalachian LCC and NCTC.

Pete: has anyone made a decision w our information yet? Not expecting because we are still in the training mode, but is there a tracking method to find out if a decision made with LCC info was a good one?

Jed: Participated in Highstead training with a diverse group of participants. Someone has to be avail to be there in person, providing tech assistance is necessary to insure these tools are used in local settings.

Steve: Yes. Lots of preparation and in-person training is needed.

BJ Richardson: Reagarding Pete's comment- Bridget has been collecting that type of info through interviews. People can download without us knowing how they use the data. At in person trainings in Maine a partner said they protected a 3000 acre tract using one of our tools.

Pete: You are formalizing that is great to get additional feedback. Tracking whether the decision was successful gets into the metrics from DOI Hurricane Sandy projects.

Roger: Are we posting on the LCC website, upcoming trainings? Future calendars? Advertising on upcoming activity?

Steve: Started to talk about scheduling a year out, because busy for next two months, haven't been able to transition to proactive planning.

Roger: Still value in using a calendar to letting us know when we are going to be in an area to allow folks to show up when we are nearby.

Ellen: Are you wondering why NOAA is here? Because regional climate directors are involved with LCCs. This is also the kind of science delivery that NOAA does. Three years ago Lafayette discussed NOAA's role in science delivery. Commented in Newport in April- having conversation about NOAA tools would be helpful. Would like to have a discussion on tools with other federal agencies (e.g., EPA, USGS) at a future meeting.

Chris: They use a ton of NOAA tools, would like to hear more about them. Regarding science delivery- still a challenge- a lot of information to comprehend and understand. It is still challenging to understand ins and outs of Designing Sustainable Landscapes.

Ken: A lot of the feedback that we need is along those lines. This is similar to Beginning w. Habitat program in Maine 15 years ago; the end users are on a continuum. Some people want to get behind the scenes and understand the detail. Other users want the analysis translated to make conservation decisions- want the quick and dirty. We have lots of scientific credibility behind our work but it isn't in a format that you need it most. Users wanted to know what a conservation pattern looks like that incorporated these data. Not everyone needs to know the under the hood details. We have to satisfy all types of users on the continuum.

Chris: For those who are interested in getting into the weeds, want to know the methodology of how the data was crunched. Being able to articulate the machinery of data analysis is important.

Ken: We have lots of documentation of what went into the analyses. Maybe it isn't clear enough for some technical people.

Pete: This is the scariest moment- Donald Rumsfeld moment- we don't know what we don't know. Its not an either or. We can't split them. Complex ecosystems- scientists handing off to managers and then scientists walk away. We need decision support tools *and relationships*. Like cooperative extension agents- the back and forth between scientists and manager gives us the answer. Wants to have a scientist at the table when the models are being interpreted. Further refinement of tools may not fix the problem that a scientist needs to be there when the tools are being used.

Steve: You have asked us to better document the models and tools and we have been working with principal investigators to do that. Still have work to do to make it accessible to all audiences.

Bill: In Rhinebeck we had this discussion. Does this effort need to be paired w. co-op extension model? What needs to be in place long term, for what the LCC needs to be doing?

Curt: Regarding training- I am the lead for landscape scale conservation course at NCTC, introduction to landscape conservation including Designing Sustainable Landscapes, aquatic connectivity, etc. DOI employees get this exposure. This might be a good place to try Connect the Connecticut as a case study- train the trainer and see how the attendees absorb it.

Steve: At the next NEAFWA meeting, we propose to have a session to provide an opportunity to get hands-on with some of the science.

Communications update- Bridget

Connect the Connecticut: focusing on implementers and stakeholders that will not use the tools, (e.g. Congress, etc.) but need to know the tools exist. Different ways to get the word out about LCC science.

- Spreading the word- taking advantage of more outlets to reach different audiences. Tell them what the LCC offers that is distinct. Launch of North Atlantic Aquatic Connectivity Collaborative- in June. AP picked up the story and it went to 70 news outlets. Great to get these topics in front of more people.
- New science for Brook Trout conservation-newsletter story, blog post, re-posted on LCC network site, was one of the most viewed blog posts.
- 3rd anniversary Hurricane Sandy- two posts.
- Implementation- involves developing content, strategy and coordinating publicity, increasing access to these tools. Overview of science products fact sheet. Tailored to each state –there is a copy in each folder. We need follow-ups to in-person visits to see how much people are using the tools, do they need more help? If decisions are being made and how have the tools helped? Also is coordinating publicity with TNC around their terrestrial habitat work.
- Products page- oriented toward different kinds of users relative to conservation actions they are trying to take (land protection, restoration, etc.)
- Responding to needs- continuing to seek feedback. Please provide Bridget with communications feedback.
- RCOA workshop interviews on a video.
- Products webpage- will have live link in a few weeks.

Andrew: Timing with NEAFAWA to work with Maryland DNR to put together special session on LCC tools, and information. Linked to a hands on workshop. Is there feedback on that idea or should we get just get presentations on our tools embedded into the existing sessions at NEAFAWA?

Jed: Wants to know how we are serving the information, maybe a decision tree for new users to guide them through our products.

Sharri: Training of people around the tools, lots of tribes have a training from USGS, tech assistance from NRCS, team approach to doing this kind of work rather than the science behind the scenes. Likes to do the training in the context of conservation on the ground- when its less abstract, theoretical not helpful. They want to bring people to them, working with their dataset.

Ken: Science Applications is few people is by design. Face-to-face interaction is exceeding our staff capacity. For example, we went to Nulhegan to do training in aquatic connectivity for USFWS staff, Andrew went as tech assistance. Ken wants to hear how we can stretch our

staffing capabilities to be more responsive to your needs. Regarding Ellen's experience with data dissemination – maybe we should partner up.

Ellen: Delivering science is very hard, especially with limited staff. Working together- bringing Renee to a couple of states was helpful. Each state has different partner federal agencies. Federal roundtables – allow learning about tools developed in different disciplines can be helpful and efficient. This gets at Sharri's comments as well regarding the tribes needs.

Steve: Next Steps- strategic planning sessions over the summer, will capture them to the LCC strategic plan. We are seeking input to improved Data Basin interface. Contracts to support workshop staffing. Staff and partners need to accomplish initial knowledge transfer- this is a constant effort for us. Developing training course material including on-line training courses. Focused Science Applications- Release RFPs for tech assistance and partnership coordination grants.

Gwen: If we can partner in advance of tool development it will insure that someone can take it forward so we don't have to. Make it part of the RFP for tool development so they have to do it and we don't have to. LCC staff and steering committee- learn about states where strong watershed efforts become automatic partners. Partners around the table can contribute that knowledge and assist with that workload.

Ken: Aquatics define the Northeast region, this is the skeleton of our landscape. There are lots of watershed groups – is that the extra capacity that we are talking about? Chesapeake Conservancy wants to take on that role in the Susquehanna. We don't need to build something new, if we can connect with them.

Sharri: Working with TNC on prioritizing culvert restoration, lots of folks that can help, not just federal agencies.

Technical committees, Science Needs process and Science Delivery process for 2016-
Andrew, Steve, Scott

Andrew: Usually there is an annual process for technical committees related to science needs. Recommending that technical committee charge this year rather than general science needs process is to become a sounding board and to come together with RCOA team to form a conservation design team to support RCOA efforts, review what we've got, assess alternatives, identify key steps to validate the information and tools, Are there additional investments needs to make RCOA effective and to deliver it across the region? Allows the focus for next year's project funding to complete on-going work towards a regional conservation design and to continue investments in science delivery and apply learning from these to the strategic plan.

Ken: What are your thoughts? Formulation of tools gets a lot of interest, when we get to the point where we need to do something with it, we get cautious, want to validate more. We may want to have our technical committees dive into this and would like to dive in.

Kim Lutz: The technical experts will give us feedback on pieces. But getting it to people to use is a different set of people to ask. State what our intended outcomes are- state we want this tool

to be used for X purposes. What are our alternatives? Other conservation design efforts vs. what we've created here, tech committee could help there. For science delivery- is there a different mechanism than our alternatives?

Jack: Puzzled about Andrews' 2 slides (review vs pause).

Ken: We are 99% of the way towards the regional conservation design that the Steering Committee has asked us to do over the last 5 years. What is left, is figuring out the applications and delivery of it.

Kim Royar: Before we apply the Connecticut River pilot are we are going to complete the draft and do a concurrent assessment of alternatives?

Ken: Assessment of alternatives being undertaken by RCOA Team. LCC has a responsibility to provide information to people across the region and the need to have a first iteration of a regional conservation design to evaluate.

Bill: From a regional perspective, do we apply what we learned from Connecticut River to the region and go the same deep detail for the whole region or forgo the more detailed approach to try to create a regional product?

Chris: Thought we were going to take regional transferability from Connecticut River pilot and transfer to a regional conservation design. Some elements had regional transferability from the project area. Makes sense to him to view the product since we are almost there.

Amanda: As a coastal technical committee member, only a subset of us are involved in regional conservation design, if additional expertise is needed we might need a new committee. Are we talking about a pause and looking at the Pilot. The RCOA is already at a regional scale right?

Ellen: Technical expert group is primed for looking at alternatives for RCOA effort. Second prong is looking at the extension approach- Sea Grant, forest extension, agricultural extension. All have same problems- capacity, need for a scientist in the room.

Andrew: This is becoming intertwined with science delivery. We may need extension agents for the science delivery discussions.

Ken: Is this a good way forward?

Amanda: Does this emphasis on conservation design and delivery means not looking at science needs this year?

Ken: - Yesterday's conversation indicated it doesn't make sense to spend additional dollars on science projects. It may require additional funding to engage extension agents.

Cathy: Yes. This brings us full circle to the discussion in April, makes sense.

Ken: We may not need a formal vote- this gives the LCC staff a way to move forward for the next year based on yesterday's discussion.

Pete: Agrees with what was just decided. We've done great work on communication. Is there a next step with that that parallels science delivery? Like getting state, NOAA, communications people together to find synergies for when we post on the website so that it gets read. States have their own communications methods as well.

Steve: There was a request at the RCOA meeting, to keep thinking about communications process.

Ken: There is lots of space with what Steve Fuller and Bridget MacDonald presented for more on science delivery. Who needs to know what?

Pete: Can we tap into SWAPs communication networks in the states?

Steve: Yes.

Ken: SWAPs are a subset of what state's do. If communications meld, they need to be responsive to each states needs. NOAA climate services has a communications component.

Anne: If we come up with a Regional Conservation Design, work on trying to implement it and sell it to those who would fund implementation. We need to show the economic benefits of these designs.

Ken: Coming up with the models is 2% of conservation. The rest of it is how do you work with it on the ground which takes decades. Can we think in a similar direction to make our efforts stitch up? What are your challenges for getting things on the ground that our collaborative could facilitate in getting things done? Tools, targeted funding?

Kim VT: Economics of gun ownership in VT is a good example.

Ken: Conservation that ties to communities is the best bet.

Pete: There are seven major committees that tie to ecosystem benefits....

Jed: We appreciate the 2% insight, business plans could be second step for LCC to get to implementation on regional designs.

Ken: Delaware developed database of species that occur across the region and some potential management actions that states can update. The LCC might be a natural place for that to live. Another opportunity is a federal lawsuit (multi-district litigation) that resulted in need to look at 70 species across the region. LCC could help organize the information. State and federal status assessment of these species could be coordinated through the LCC.

John: With respect to their grantees- they find that they are not connected to networks and how what they are proposing fits into a larger scale plan. They do this on occasion to help them find sources of information, but LCCs could also fulfill this role.

Ken: There are so many RFPs and competitive funding out there, if you'd like them to be guided by certain kinds of information we could steer them towards these types of things- if useful to help your programs, e.g., waterways mitigation funding.

LCC Network updates and budget- Ken

Network of LCCs needs to work together seamlessly to accomplish our goals.

Andrew: There is a new LCC Network Council. David Whitehurst our Northeast representative to the council, Jad Daley also a member. Also, National Academy of Science review due in late November. John O'Leary is on that panel.

Cathy: Is network a new name?

Ken: They are trying to communicate that they need to be a network to be seamless and that it is beyond national. Our boundary bisects a lot of states. We've tried to work seamlessly across the Northeast region so we don't confine our work across the region, not just according to our boundary that bisects states.

President's 2016 budget included increase for LCCs to help LCC's all get to a minimal level with core staff and some project funding. In the past few years, the House had been zeroing out LCC budgets but Senate has restored them. This year during house markup they reduced LCC funding by half and with turnover in Senate, they didn't restore it as they have done in the past. A 50% reduction to the network would take us to some major impacts. We are on a continuing resolution until December 11. They will either will have a continuing resolution to extend the dates further or do an omnibus budget if they can't pass a budget. Our budget is uncertain.

Roger: Last night, the House, Senate and White House came to agreement on omnibus that will be voted on by Wednesday. 80 billion increase between defense and non-defense spending.

Bill: Executive branch employees can inform people of the facts on the budget but not advocate for funding. If there is opportunity over the next month or two for those that can communicate with elected officials please do so. FWS staff can't do this. Bill would be willing to talk to legislative folks in the states to see how many would be interested in participating? It would be in November and early December.

Chris: On behalf of NWF, we interested in doing this. LCCs need this kind of advocacy moving forward. It might work into lobbying, fly in efforts.

Kim Lutz: TNC has a fly in date where every single board goes to DC. But it's passed for this year. If they know about this in the future, they can assist.

Bill: This could be a two step process- anyone think this a bad idea?

Sharri: Tribes are on the list of folks that Congress sees a lack of coordination from LCCs.... Where does that come from? Is there tribal engagement on the National Network? She is one band of a large North American nation, with a homeland in a trans-boundary watershed. Trying to work collaboratively to develop a watershed management plan which -given the resource

constraints- is impossible. Pleased to see the restoration piece/principles brought into the conservation design because it puts the tribes on the map. Beginning to see the LCC as potential for them being able to address their huge needs. She has connections with Congress. She sees value from this LCC continuing from her perspective. They don't lobby generally. They have conversations with staff people. She is beginning to see real value and wants to share it.

Bill: Expect some communication on updates of omnibus efforts, a reach out for folks to get a message out, package materials out and getting them to folks for their use. Follow ups as well. All of this will come from Bill not from FWS staff.

Ken: A 50% cut is a national cut, it might not translate evenly across the nation. Don't know the impact to our LCC at this point.

Bill: Is there any indication within the Service of where this cut might go? (re: LCC's).

Ken: No, because it was such a wild card scenario at this point.

Amanda: If there are major cuts, are there ways to get input from the steering committee on the way forward?

Ken: Yes, if a major cut happens and there are things to convey and decide, he will set up a call or other communication going.

Andrew: If we find out there are major cuts it might be necessary to re-think what we just decided for the next year.

Discussion on LCC Strategic Direction-Andrew

Andrew: Strategic planning on handout 19. What process do we want to go through to assess the directions for this LCC going forward? He has a recommended approach that is revised from past meetings' input to make sure feedback happens first. Have some specific modifications to our strategic approach and will work with staff to do this. Keep focus on conservation design and science delivery. We have had learning about what our partners need, what our partners don't need. Suggest we slow down our strategic process to get some time to get through feedback on initial regional design process and science delivery. We should also try to synchronize our strategic direction with state wildlife action plan updates which were due Oct 1. Approval process for those plans will happen in June and therefore the state's efforts to take the updates to the SWAPs is a little delayed from where we thought we would be for LCC strategic planning. Propose a conservation workshop in Northeast in June 2017 to allow time to absorb SWAP updates and see where they are going with regional plans (this stems from a conversation with Northeast Fish and Wildlife Diversity Technical Committee but he wants to hear from Steering Committee what they think. Our strategic plan is a science strategy, it does not currently include all components of our work. Science Delivery and Communications need to be integrated from their separate documents where they sit now. It would be helpful to have your organization's communications staff to communicate with ours.

There are a number of components that have not had enough attention regarding proposed modifications. All are important and also urgent? How do we sort through this set of things to go

forward, which do we need to work more on? Want to hear from partners that have a particular interest on this list to insure we know what is encompassed in each suggestion- if we can't get participation on this then we may not be able to work further on those suggestions where no one steps up. Andrew drafted criteria for additions to strategic plan. If we are not doing something that is identified in SIAS plan how can we do it?

Is the LCC the most important place to address these additional components?

Roger: Is excited about what is proposed. We must slow down in order to accomplish what is already proposed? How will we get folks to answer the invitation to participate? Thinking about the potential larger role for LCC, maybe this Steering Committee isn't as representative as it could be. What are the first principles of the LCCs?

Andrew: We wanted to take network of representatives in this room- are there folks in your organizations to help us on this topic? If not, can you use your networks to help us find appropriate folks to assist?

Glenn: Have we been in touch w. the ocean planning process? Enormous effort, he is on the board. We are being left by the wayside if we aren't involved in that process. It will be printed in a year.

Andrew: Yes. We have been somewhat involved in Northeast not as much in Mid Atlantic. This may be an example of whether there is a value added for LCCs in the regional ocean planning? The answer may be no, and that's ok. Continue to maintain strong links w. NROC and MARCO but to probably keep the focus on the coastal realm and the linkage between marine and coastal processes and aquatic processes. Some LCCs have delved into true marine stuff some have not.

Glenn: They have a giant mapping operation, whales, marine birds, it is extensive at this point. Not sure where they are going to cut off. For coastal states there is an interface in a big way.

Pete: BOEM is representing FWS and USGS because they only wanted 1 DOI Bureau at the table for ocean planning.

Andrew: Hopefully the ocean planning process will produce products that we can fold into our conservation design.

Sharri: It is hard to grapple on both sides of the shoreline divide- with respect to anadromous fish. Coastal and ocean issues are best resolved by doing it collaboratively. We are a river region and it has a strong tribal connection. We aren't grappling successfully yet on either ocean or coastal side. Sharri- sign her up on top two issues [Cross border w. Canada and Enhanced involvement w. Tribes]

Andrew: Let's articulate those connections

Mike Rasser: BOEM (on phone) We are working w. LCCs on projects such as renewable energy, sand and minerals, happy to have further conversations w. LCC

Ken: To Glenn, Sharri and members of LCC working on ocean plan, if there are pieces of information that we can give you and be of assistance to you, please let us know.

Mike Rasser: Bob LaBell also works a lot w. NROC, this is a resource for us to reach out to.

Becky Gwyn (on phone): Wants to support moving to June 2017. Partnership w. Northeast Fish and Wildlife Technical Committee is phenomenal and should be used as an example to funders of success. Nine month review period by FWS will allow the plans to be approved and will contribute to our collaborative strategic direction.

Bill: Is the schedule pushed back enough even with this proposal? Do we know what kind of staff capacity is needed to achieve our science delivery objectives?

Andrew: We can adjust as we go, focus on articulating our modifications a bit more. We can have a learning year as our next year. For our workshop- start to target a date, around June 2017 seems like a good target.

Cathy: Regarding involvement with tribes- what does that mean. More tribes? More hands on with the tribes that we work with already? If just more tribal contacts- its easy. Does it mean an outreach effort to bring more tribal influence to the table?

Andrew: The history is that when the LCC first stood up, each tribe was individually invited to participate. This was a big ask. There are multiple interests that make it difficult for tribes to participate in a partnership like this. Next step was regional tribal approach all federally recognized tribes in the Northeast are in United South and Eastern Tribes. They passed a resolution to support LCCs. Andrew attends their natural resource committee meetings. But not enough time for meaningful exchange of information with that group. Its helpful to have Sharri attend with support from Bureau of Indian Affairs travel funds. Figuring out how to best engage tribes in our work is a challenge. We can re-issue invitations to each tribe.

Sharri: lots of tribes are engaged in restoration activities. Now that LCD includes restoration, this is where tribes are at and she's excited to help us to explore the opportunities.

Andrew: Shall we move forward on this revised schedule? We can engage with you and technical communities to see if we can work on these modifications. If you have a good contact on staff, please let Andrew know. We will take this year to work on LCD and we will work with the Northeast Diversity Technical Committee for June 2017.

Ellen: Regarding doing all these, it's a lot.

Andrew: We can scope them all out and come back to Steering Committee.

Roger: Agrees with the proposal. Are other LCCs in the network doing this similar work and anything to be learned there? Are we blazing the way or are taking a wrong turn?

Andrew: There is a different answer for each topic. We are behind the curve on cultural resources. Helping to scope this by reaching out to other LCCs.

Pete: Think about budget, and how to bring closure to highly productive activities. Need an exit plan and a legacy to build from. This potentially provides visibility for the budget process in the future for folks to pick up on.

Andrew: Anything else?

Other business, next meeting- Ken

Ken: We are at the end of agenda early. We are going to keep contacting state agencies to get your reflections/feedback. Follow up with those that had initial contacts to see if there are next steps that you want. What do you need next? Will put out schedules of who we are meeting with when and keep a running tally so its transparent where we are going and making connections with for feedback.

It is an honor as serving as chair and I am passionate about the subject. However, doesn't need to be chair forever. If you want a change of chair leadership he is open to it. Willing to keep going in this endeavor if you want him to serve. Let him know.

Keep up the feedback on relevancy. If we aren't relevant then we aren't doing anything good, decent or helpful. Thanks for showing up. This LCC is leading the way on lots of things nationally. Andrew and Scott are humble- they and the rest of the staff works hard on your behalf on conservation.

Andrew: Wants to know what folks think about a NEAFWA symposium.

John: How does data collected by grantees get dealt with? Having data on connectivity brought in would be helpful.

Bill: Happy to see discussion from end of day yesterday brought up today even though it wasn't on the agenda today. Thought it was a productive meeting and lots accomplished.

Next Meeting- in conjunction w. NEAFWA meeting in Annapolis, Maryland on Wednesday, April 6.

Meeting Adjourned.

Attendees

Organization	Representatives	Title/Office of Representative	Attend
Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection	Bill Hyatt	Chief, Bureau of Natural Resources	Y
Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife	Jim Connolly	Director of Resource Management	Y
	Judy Camuso	Wildlife Director	Y
Maryland Department of Natural Resources	Gwen Brewer	Science Program Manager	Y
Massachusetts Division of Fisheries and Wildlife	Jack Buckley	Director	Y
New Hampshire Fish and Game Department	Glenn Normandeau	Director	Y
Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management	Cathy Sparks	Assistant Director for Natural Resources	Y
	Jay Osenkowski	Deputy Chief, Wildlife	Y
Vermont Department of Fish and Wildlife	Kim Royar	Director of Operations	Y
Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries	Becky Gwynn	Assistant Bureau Director Bureau of Wildlife Resources	P
Houlton Band of the Maliseets	Sharri Venno	Environmental Planner, Houlton Band of the Maliseets	Y
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Ken Elowe	ARD, Science Applications	Y
	Jed Wright	Project Leader, Gulf of Maine Coastal Program	Y
U.S. Geological Survey	Pete Murdoch	Regional Science Advisor, Northeast Region	Y
Department of the Interior Northeast Climate Science Center	Curt Griffin	Professor and Department Head, UMass Amherst	Y
National Park Service	Amanda Babson	Coastal Landscape Adaptation Coordinator	Y
Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement	Mike Rasser	Marine Ecologist	P
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	Ellen Mecray	Regional Climate Coordinator	Y
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Anne Kuhn	Office of Research and Development	Y
	Mike Marsh	Region I	Y
	Jaqueline LeClair	Region I Wetlands	Y
U.S. Forest Service	Roger Simmons	Natural Resources Staff Officer White Mountain National Forest	Y
Environment Canada Canadian Wildlife Service	Josée Lanctôt	Director , Atlantic Region	P
Environment Canada Canadian Wildlife Service	Karel Allard	Landscape Conservation Coordinator	P
Ducks Unlimited	Sarah Fleming	Great Lakes Atlantic Region	Y
Manomet Center for Conservation Sciences	Eric Walberg	Climate Director	P
National Wildlife Federation	Chris Hilke	Program Manager Climate Adaptation Program	Y

Handout 3a

Organization	Representatives	Title/Office of Representative	Attend
		Northeast Regional Office	
The Nature Conservancy	Kim Lutz	Connecticut River Coordinator	Y
National Fish and Wildlife Foundation	John Wright	Northeast Region Coordinator	Y
New England Wild Flower Society	Bill Brumback	Conservation Director	Y
Wildlife Management Institute	Scot Williamson	Vice President	Y
Wildlife Conservation Society	Zoe Smith	Director, Adirondacks Program	P
Northeast Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies	Gordon Batcheller	Coordinator	Y
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Andrew Milliken	North Atlantic LCC Coordinator	Y
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	David Eisenhauer	Science Applications Communications Coordinator	P
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	BJ Richardson	Regional GIS Coordinator	P
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Megan Tyrrell	Coastal Resiliency Coordinator	Y
North Atlantic LCC	Scott Schwenk	Science Coordinator	Y
North Atlantic LCC	Steve Fuller	Science Delivery Coordinator	Y
North Atlantic LCC	Renee Farnsworth	Data Manager	Y
North Atlantic LCC	Bridget Macdonald	LCC Communications Coordinator	Y
North Atlantic LCC	Stéphanie Cuenoud	Science Delivery Assistant	Y