**North Atlantic LCC Steering Committee**

**April 16, 2014 Portland, Maine**

**Minutes**

**Action items**

**LCC Network**: Steering Committee member and partners interested in serving on a National Academy of Sciences review panel for evaluating LCCs or serving on a Strategic Planning Team for the LCC Network should contact National LCC Coordinator Elsa Haubold (elsa\_haubold@fws.gov) or Ken Elowe as soon as possible.

**Individual State Meetings with LCC Staff**: LCC staff will set up additional meetings with individual states through state Directors that could include other agency or NGO staff from that state or area to provide background information and detailed information on available LCC products and tools. Mike Slattery will help coordinate meetings with Chesapeake Bay watershed states.

**Webinars**: LCC staff will set up additional webinars for ongoing or recently completed LCC and partner projects through the USFWS monthly science seminar series.

**LCC Communications Toolkit**: LCC Communications Coordinator David Eisenhauer will develop a draft “tool kit” that LCC agencies and organizations could include in their own communications products. The toolkit will be posted on the North Atlantic LCC website with downloadable materials such as talking points, fact sheets, and web resources. Steering Committee members interested in helping develop and test this tool kit should contact Dave (david\_eisenhauer@fws.gov).

**Instructions on LCC acknowledgements and credits to contractors**: WMI to include specific instructions on acknowledging support from the LCC in presentations, reports and include a high resolution logo for them to use.

**Science Delivery Projects**: Science Delivery Coordinator Steve Fuller will work with WMI to develop final scope of work and contracts for the four approved science delivery projects. Science Delivery Coordinator and Geographer/GIS Specialist Lori Pelech will coordinate among and provide training for these grantees to ensure they are well-versed in available LCC and partner science products.

**Regional Conservation Opportunity Areas**: Science Delivery Coordinator Steve Fuller Geographer/GIS Specialist Lori Pelech will work with Northeast Fish and Wildlife Diversity Technical Committee, State Wildlife Action Planners and State GIS staff to agree on a methodology for identifying Regional Conservation Opportunity Areas before the Northeast Fish and Wildlife Diversity Technical Committee meeting in September.

**Technical Committee Science Review and Recommendations**: LCC Technical Committee, sub-teams and LCC Science Coordinator Scott Schwenk will review ongoing and completed projects, identify priorities for funding next phases, consider additional immediate science needs and make recommendations to the Steering Committee prior to their next call.

**Hurricane Sandy Coordination**: FWS, USGS, NPS and BOEM staff will work together to update and maintain the Hurricane Sandy project database and identify opportunities for coordination between the DOI Bureau projects and competitively funded projects, once they are announced.

**Welcome, Introductions. Agenda Review, Action Items**

Ken Elowe (FWS) and Jim Connolly (Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife) welcomed the Steering Committee to Maine and to the LCC meeting. Prticipants introduced themselves; there were 43 partners in attendance in person or on the phone representing 28 agencies and organizations. Andrew Milliken (North Atlantic LCC) noted that there was a quorum present. Following a review of the agenda, Ken Elowe said goals for the meeting are to achieve consensus on: selecting a new vice chair; determining whether an Executive Committee is needed; approving new members; determining priorities for and balance between science development and science delivery; advancing LCC communications; continued involvement in SWAP updates; supporting landscape conservation design; and achieving LCC coastal priorities through Hurricane Sandy resiliency projects. Ken said the committee has given LCC staff great feedback to focus on putting tools on the ground.

Ken asked the committee for any comments or corrections on the minutes from the November, 2013 Steering Committee meeting. No comments were made. A motion to approve the minutes was made, seconded and passed unanimously. Andrew Milliken reviewed the action items and actions taken since November meeting.

**Selection of vice-chair, discussion of Executive Committee and consideration of new members**

Ken Elowe proposed the Committee accept the New England Wild Flower Society as the LCC’s newest member represented by Bill Brumback, Conservation Director. The Steering Committee unanimously approved.

Ken thanked Patty Riexinger (New York Department of Environmental Conservation) for her service as vice-chair, praising her enthusiasm and engagement promoting collaborative conservation and helping state directors and other partners understand the potential of the LCC. A nomination for Bill Hyatt (Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection) as new vice chair was put forward. No other nominations were made. Bernie Marczyk (Ducks Unlimited) made a motion to accept the nomination and elect Bill Hyatt as the next vice chair which was seconded and approved unanimously.

The Committee considered a proposal to establish an Executive Committee and reviewed other Executive Committee structures. Bill Hyatt said an Executive Committee can provide transparency but adding a different layer may introduce additional communications challenges. Becky Gwynn (Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries) said an Executive Committee could add value in collective contribution and decision making. Andrew Milliken and Ken Elowe said an Executive Committee could help provide more collective input but both agreed the LCC staff could work with either structure.

Rachel Muir (USGS) said other LCCs have large Steering Committees. Though transparent, size is a factor and a small nimble group to assist the full Steering Committee as it grows might be something to consider. Ken Elowe said he wants to ensure the LCC governance structure works for the Steering Committee and they are comfortable with it. Jim Connolly said the only challenge to the current structure is ensuring the full partnership is represented and the LCC is not viewed as FWS-centric. Bill Hyatt reiterated that if there is not an identified problem, we should not add another layer of governance. Ken asked for other input on whether an Executive Committee was needed at this time. Hearing no further input, he suggested we table the idea for now but keep it open for future consideration as needed.

**LCC national network updates**

Elsa Haubold (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National LCC Coordinator) provided an overview of the LCC Council, which will give the network a voice in Washington to make sure purpose of LCCs and value are understood (sustaining funding and support). The council also will provide guidance from an overarching perspective on landscape conservation generally. Council members are composed of federal, state, Canadian, tribal, first nation, and NGO partners. In its first meeting last February, the council named leadership and determined governance structure. Its next meeting will be in June.

Rachel Muir said the council is a unique idea and emphasized the importance of providing guidance and coordination to make sure what we produce at the LCC level can be applied at a regional scale. Sharri Venno (United South and Eastern Tribes Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians) asked if the council was looking for tribal representation – from regional LCCs or beyond. She will share ideas for tribal representation with Elsa. Ken Elowe said the network is trying to evolve so we have similar capabilities across common borders. He said the network needs some kind of seamless nature and the challenge is to connect with each other as well as other entities on the landscape, such as USGS Climate Science Centers. Jad Daley (Trust for Public Land), a council member, said those are questions the council is well positioned to think through. Other items:

* Elsa said an internal FWS review (funding and staffing) indicates the network is headed in right direction.
* Appropriations bill includes a $2 million cut to LCCs and a requirement from Congress for a National Academy of Sciences (NAS) review to look at whether fish, wildlife human health have improved as a result from LCCs. She is looking for folks to serve on NAS review panel.
* A priority of he LCC network all hands meeting in January was to develop a strategic plan. Elsa is looking for someone to serve a 5-month detail to assist. There will be a training session at NCTC in July. Other LCC strategic plans can serve as a model.
* A large landscape conference will be held in Oct. 23-24 in Washington, D.C.
* The national LCC website his hitting its stride and pulling information and news from LCCs throughout the network (www.lccnetwork.org).
* FWS had to make difficult budget decisions regarding LCCs with a $2 million cut and the added cost (up to $1 million) of a NAS evaluation. LCCs across the network were evaluated for performance in meeting objectives of conservation planning and design. Some LCCs that had received no project dollars previously were given an increase in funding. The North Atlantic LCC was in the top tier of funding for projects previously and these LCCs all had to take cuts. Elsa is hopeful that next year the President’s budget will show an increase for LCCs.
* Ken Elowe said the North Atlantic LCC is one of the models for LCCs – the $400k budget cut doesn’t reflect poor performance.

**State of the LCC**

Andrew Milliken (North Atlantic LCC) introduced this session by saying he is honored to work with the dedicated partners and staff of LCC. He said the state of the North Atlantic LCC is strong and getting stronger. Where we are at this point in time is that the LCC has developed the partnerships and capacity to achieve our mission; LCC has the capacity and network to communicate with a variety of key audiences; LCC and partners has supported priority projects consistent with the northeast conservation framework and strategic plan; and LCC and partner projects are at the stage where information and tools are available to support conservation decisions. We are at the stage where projects are producing information, products, data and partnerships we can put on the ground. Key areas of focus going forward include information management; science delivery (translating and synthesizing information so it’s accessible in formats and scales partners need, demonstrating application) and conservation design to guide decision making.

In addition, the North Atlantic LCC has stepped up to take a role in Hurricane Sandy project support and integration. DOI awarded LCC through FWS $5.2 million to address resiliency of streams, beaches and marshes. The LCC also is providing ongoing support for SWAP updates – making sure states have the regional context they need for making decisions.

On the information management front, the North Atlantic LCC now has 100 spatial data layers on Data Basin site. A majority of LCCs use Databasin, which is linked to CSCs. It is a powerful information tool. The LCC has also developed a nested site within our site to support the SWAP synthesis effort.

The North Atlantic LCC is also expanding communications to partners through its newsletter, website and individual outreach efforts to states, tribes and others.

Andrew said the LCC self-assessment discussion conducted at last November’s steering committee meeting revealed that overall, the LCC is on the right track, is helping accomplish what agencies and organizations could not do on their own; is developing sound science; is providing an important role in developing and integrating science with a broad network of partners. Steering Committee members need help getting key messages and information from LCCs to other staff in their states and organizations including basic messages on LCCs. Increasing webinars, more one-on-one meetings with states (particularly in the Mid Atlantic), general fact sheet, presentations, and project fact sheets.

Bill Hyatt said individual meetings are helpful to build support for the LCC at all layers – not just state staff but also in-state conservation partners. Ken Elowe said staff did this with states involved in the Connecticut River pilot. Ken suggested he and LCC staff are ready to hit the road if Steering Committee members and partners find these visits valuable.

Zoe Smith (Wildlife Conservation Society) asked about relationships with partnerships. Andrew indicated that addressing the needs of large regional partnerships (e.g. joint ventures) has always been a top priority and links to these partnerships happen through both common steering committee/board members and staff coordination. He is hoping that science delivery will allow the LCC to reach smaller partnerships more effectively.

Curt Griffin said the CSC has a close relationship with LCC but also welcomes the opportunity to work with states in partnership with LCC.

Sharri Venno (Houlton Band of the Maliseets) discussed need for outreach to tribes. USGS and NRCS doing GIS training on websites and it would be good for the LCC to connect this organization with tribes to figure out information out there and how to train tribes.

Other key messages included: tools that are developed should be as simple and flexible as possible; tools need to be relevant to and reach partners making decisions on the ground; information and tools need to more fully incorporate other elements including plants and natural communities and cultural and socioeconomic needs; LCC should take advantage of delivery networks and reinforce existing partnerships. Steering Committee also noted that it is up to the partnership to make things happen and make sure things are on the right track, not just the staff; partners need to provide more of the funding toward common priorities; need more transparency and steering committee involvement in decision-making between meetings.

Andrew reviewed the said the Science Investment and Accountability Schedule that each LCC had to fill out. In general the North Atlantic LCC scored highly. A few areas needing improvement included leveraging resources, and tracking delivery on the landscape.

Issues to address and key next steps include: technical committee focus on assessment of ongoing and completed projects and considerations of next phases; coordination with neighboring LCCs & Network; further develop cultural resource science needs. He mentioned other steps for science project implementation & tracking; science delivery and conservation design; Hurricane Sandy science coordination and enhanced communications and information management.

Becky Gwynn referenced presentations at the NEAFWA Conference on projects North Atlantic LCC has funded which was great to see. But we need to make sure in the future that the North Atlantic LCC receives credit for the funded work and that there is acknowledgment of funding using the logo of the LCC. The credit was given to the FWS instead. Scot Williamson (Wildlife Management Institute) noted that he will make this clear in project agreements and provide a logo.

Scot Williamson asked if Hurricane Sandy funding that Andrew discussed includes NFWF and DOI projects. Andrew said the LCC is currently coordinating among DOI projects but will be looking for opportunities to link our projects with their (NFWF) projects when they are selected.

Jeff Willis (RI Coastal Res. Management Council, Northeast Regional Oceans Council - NROC) said NROC can provide coastal perspective. They can integrate LCC work into their work plans and share information and coordination.

Andrew said the June Steering Committee call will look at results of NFWF competitive funding proposals for opportunities.

**Review and discussion of budgets and ongoing science projects**

Scot Williamson provided a budget overview. The LCC is starting to see project contracts completed. He said we are seeing projects mature and resulting in outcomes for LCC. No payments are made unless approved by LCC staff and associated oversight teams. WMI pays invoices on behalf of LCC. The OIG audit resulted in transition to direct billing for personnel time and overhead.

Scott Schwenk provided an overview of LCC science projects status and schedule. Technical Committee focused this year on seeing how we are meeting the LCC science strategic plan 3 years in and what ongoing or completed projects warrant additional phases. The goal will be to make recommendations on additional phases or other critical needs on the Steering Committee Conference call in late June call. Scott provided a breakdown of projects related to the Northeast Conservation Framework and systems (freshwater aquatic, coastal marine, terrestrial and freshwater wetland). Deliverables have been all we’ve asked for under the foundational projects, assessment and conservation design categories. Challenges include sufficient partner involvement and timelines for such large scale projects. An important emerging role for the LCC is bringing together P.I.s and integrating projects such as stream temperature projects and various attributes of conservation design.

Rachel Muir noted progress on habitat mapping. The Northeast Region is covered by consistent terrestrial, aquatic and coastal maps; Climate Science Center is supporting project to bring together lead mappers for consistency across the Northeast-Midwest and Southeast regions. Ken Elowe said the LCC is supporting an important body of work that sets stage of where we’ve been and where we’re going. This is an opportunity to step back and evaluate projects and reassess where holes really are – we don’t just want to be an RFP process, but tactical strategic conservation process. In a year where there are budget constraints we should focus on building off existing projects and getting tools to partners on the ground.

Bill Hyatt said with LCC activities to support science delivery and the Connecticut River pilot, it is a good approach to step back, learn and make strategic investments based on that learning.

**Recommendations on funding projects for science delivery**

Steve Fuller (North Atlantic LCC) summarized recommended science delivery projects for LCC funding ($300,000) based on the Request for Proposals. These include Chesapeake Conservancy, Wildlife Conservation Society, Open Space Institute and Highstead Foundation. Steve said that is funded these four projects will work together to establish a network of organizations reaching out into the conservation community and demonstrating the application of tools. Other projects scored significantly lower than these four but also had merits.

Bill Hyatt asked whether partial grants can be used to spread the funding and asked what the implications are of us going over funding level. Ken Elowe said the LCC has the ability to increase budget for science delivery projects if needed but this would reduce science project budget. Steve said the science delivery review team did make small adjustments in project budgets and are recommending a slightly higher overall funding level, from $300,000 to $320,000.

Bernie Marczyk requested clarification on the Chesapeake Conservancy product. Steve Fuller said the project will educate towns and stakeholders in the Susquehanna Watershed as part of the larger *Envision the Susquehanna* effort about landscape conservation data and work with them to create prioritized landscape conservation design for the watershed and implement several projects based on this data.

Mike Slattery (FWS Chesapeake Coordinator) said the Conservancy already established a rivershed-wide council and have used LCC science tools hope is to apply tool more broadly and use council to engage with partnerships to aggregate and apply tools to meet the needs of communities downstream.

John O’Leary (Massachusetts Division of Fisheries and Wildlife) asked if there is a lessons learned component to the grant process the LCC can look at to refine our actions in the future. Steve Fuller said the Science Delivery Team has built in ways to measure success and evaluate.

John Kanter (New Hampshire Fish and Game) said if you’ve worked with towns to get to actual action on the ground you’re talking years of meeting with volunteer commissions and boards with turnover. You have to continue to connect with an enduring system (like cooperative extension program) because once you start down the road of delivery you need a long-term system in place before you are likely to see results on the ground. Enduring systems help keep it going, and can effectively help step down tools in the right format so they are useful to people (format, usefulness and scale). Andrew noted that there were no applications from cooperative extension programs but that this is a critical partnership to explore. Ken Elowe noted the importance of working through states to reach towns.

John O’Leary, Becky Gwynn and others voiced support for the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJ DEP) project to utilize GIS to prioritize and inform conservation actions on managed lands. He said it is a project that would help us prioritize how we do management, which is the next step in our conservation framework. Makes sense to develop prioritization scheme that would incorporate these ideas.

Barbara Vickery (The Nature Conservancy, Maine Chapter) said the NJ DEP project seems to be about management and choosing what kind of management activities to do and yet the description of delivery is going to GIS groups. But this is about talking with managers about how we use these tools. I’d like to see that exported to other state wildlife agencies.

Bill Hyatt proposed two motions, one to accept the Science Delivery Team’s recommendation (option 1) to fund the four projects at $320,000 and another to determine whether additional funds should go toward something like NJ DEP project.

Becky Gwynn seconded the first motion and applicants and WMI recused themselves from the vote.

Barbara Vickery (TNC Maine) asked whether the Steering Committee last spring allocated $300,000 for science delivery so option 1 goes $20,000 above. That is an understood part of that motion.

Andrew Milliken said the Steering Committee will get back on schedule of approving science project allocations in its Fall 2014 meeting. We didn’t know what FY 14 budget was until about now (just got federal budget for LCCs last week - six months into fiscal year).

The Steering Committee unanimously approved the first motion to fund the four demonstration projects and agreed to continue the NJ DEP project discussion later in the afternoon.

During the afternoon session, John O’Leary motioned to add the NJ DEP project to the demonstration projects funded. Becky Gwynn seconded.

Steering Committee members discussed the value of the NJ DEP project, some pointing out that additional funding isn’t needed to use and apply the data. Jim Connolly said NJ DEP will still have ability to use data and create products without LCC funding. He noted the NJ DEP project goes to heart of what Pittman Robertson funds are for and state agencies could accomplish individually or through WMI and could be accomplished through NEAFWA. It doesn’t really need to tap into limited LCC funding source to accomplish that.

Bill Hyatt said the project demonstrates how utilizing GIS to prioritize and inform conservation actions on managed lands can be applied more broadly.

Ken Elowe recognized there was some concern if take money out of science we may not have flexibility for ongoing projects. He said the Committee can choose to keep this in reserve, wait for tech committee recommendations and see how they want to balance remaining funds.

Becky Gwynn said the LCC may need to scale back on science to deliver work we’ve done on the ground. She agreed with Bill and John there is value added in the NJ DEP project.

Zoe Smith said having a state agency demonstrate science translation and adoption is important so I think we should consider it.

Curt Griffin said even though the project is focused on New Jersey its methods can have broader application.

Bill Hyatt said the Connecticut River pilot is another big on-the-ground effort for the LCC. He asked if money allocated to the NJ DEP could compromise the Connecticut River project. Ken Elowe said we don’t know the answer until the technical committee presents science project ideas but the ability to apply the results of the Connecticut River pilot to other areas may depend on additional science funding.

Scott Schwenk said he was a reviewer on the panel for the demonstration projects and thought the four proposals stood out. The NJ DEP project in his view was “down a tier – there was a lot about its value as a GIS tool but not sure right folks were engaged.

Amanda Babson (NPS), who also served on the panel, said its was not technically advanced but there were other pros to NJ DEP project. She said she likes to see a balance of projects.

Jim Connolly said he is uncomfortable when we pick projects to address concerns of Steering Committee. Can we ask NJ to reapply and come up with an improved proposal rather than us address concerns on the fly?

John O’Leary asked if the RFP is flexible to work with the NJ DEP group and have applicants attend NALCC training to help select and finalize products, show them how to apply them.

Andrew Milliken asked if there was harm in waiting until the June 2014 decision meeting to get more information from the technical committee to inform our decision. It would be good to know choices before we make a decision.

Ken Elowe said the need for new science development needed to be balanced with the need to put stuff on the ground. Rachel Muir also suggested the Committee wait for full report from technical committee before we make a decision.

Lise Hanners (TNC) said investing to complete existing projects is a key decision and needs to be balanced with funding new projects.

Becky Gwynn indicated July 2014 is the timeline for the NJ project but if they do not know if they are funded until June they may have other work they need to get done.

Cathy Sparks (Rhode Island Department of Environmental Protection) said if the Committee votes on the motion (NJ DEP) would know if they have support pending a final decision in June. Can we vote with the caveat that we need more information for June final vote?

Ken Elowe said the Committee can vote to not fund today but hold in reserve for later decision on recommendation of technical committee.

Bill Hyatt said if the Committee votes down the motion it could vote on motion to take up the issue in June.

The Steering Committee voted 6 in favor of funding the $60,000 NJ DEP project with 9 opposed. Then Jim Connolly motioned to postpone a decision on the project and consider it in June with other recommendations from technical committee science and technical projects. The Steering Committee voted to approve the motion.

**LCC national and regional communications**

David Eisenhauer (North Atlantic LCC) provided an overview of the draft communications framework. David said the framework is a living document that is intended to serve as a useful guide for engaging partners and stakeholders. LCC staff have been working to develop a simple elevator speech to communicate the broad vision and value of the LCC to target audiences. The LCC also has established a quarterly newsletter, has provided support for Congressional visits, and is integrating with neighboring LCCs and partnerships like the Atlantic Salmon Recovery website. The LCC is exploring ways to connect with other partners via the web (i.e. RSS feeds and news sharing).

Long-range efforts include expanding coverage of Hurricane Sandy science efforts in 2014; continuing to build relationships with partner communications staff; develop a simple “communications toolkit” that can assist Steering Committee members and LCC partners to communicate consistently and effectively about the LCC. This toolkit is in response to Steering Committee expressed need for communicating to their respective communities what the LCC is doing.

John O’Leary asked about capability for linking from the North Atlantic LCC website to partner agency and organization sites. David Eisenhauer said the LCC is planning ongoing efforts to highlight partners as well as to make their websites easier to locate on the North Atlantic LCC website. Ken Elowe said David and LCC staff are designing communication tools based on needs of the partnership and encouraged input from Steering Committee members. Zoe Smith said LCC communications products should be nested “within our own organizational resources.” Ken said that is more powerful. We want to help make that connection and get feedback to help step down broad communication for a variety of audiences.

**Updates of progress of LCC in providing regional information for State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP)**

John Kanter discussed the history and importance of collaboration between NEAFWA Fish and Wildlife Diversity Technical Committee (FWDTC) and LCC. Lori Pelech discussed meeting and training provided on SWAP synthesis tools with SWAP planners in February. They have formed a technical advisory team with state GIS folks to incorporate regional species and habitat data into plans. They designed a nested website within North Atlantic LCC site to contain all things related to the regional synthesis. The site is a resource for people working on SWAPS. Taxonomic teams were also formed, developing modeling methods.

Steve Fuller referenced support for science delivery and SWAPs through training workshops in Hadley and NCTC and follow-ups with NEAFWA technical team. The North Atlantic LCC will facilitate a state-driven process to develop a methodology for regional Conservation Opportunity Areas (RCOAs). This summer the LCC will continue to provide GIS training to state staff as well as with science delivery grantees and FWS. Later in the summer, they will facilitate a workshop to bring key stakeholders together to make final recommendations so we can present a complete draft methodology for RCOAs at the fall meeting. We also have a species model being developed and will have draft results to present at fall meeting of NEAFWA FWDTC. John Kanter noted the importance of leveraged NEAFWA RCN project to support the synthesis.

**Landscape Conservation Design and the role of the LCC in supporting regional and landscape scale conservation**

Ken Elowe introduced this session by saying the LCC is making significant progress toward conservation design. Andrew Milliken said the LCC is building on a strong science foundation and now looking toward the conservation design piece, across the region and landscapes within the region, with a focus on fish and wildlife, ecosystems and other considerations.

Andrew presented a summary of how various conservation design efforts fit together. A key priority in the Northeast Conservation Framework was the identification of priority areas for at the regional scale and smaller scales (e.g. watersheds, sub-watersheds). The LCC is facilitating a process to apply science and tools in collaborative conservation design process at multiple scales and apply learning to future efforts. These efforts also relate to another high priority of delivering and translating science to partners. Andrew referenced a white paper on multiple scales of conservation that he asked for input on.

Scott Schwenk provided an update on the Connecticut River Watershed conservation design pilot which collaboratively prioritizes places, strategies and actions to conserve ecosystems and species and establishes a process for conducting landscape conservation design. The pilot core team is advocating a multi-species, multi-ecosystem approach.

Mike Rasser (BOEM) asked if the LCC is using future climate to inform regional conservation opportunity areas (RCOAs) identified in regional-scale planning. Steve said the LCC staff will engage in discussions about including climate in RCOAs. Mike Rasser also asked how the RCOA effort fits in with SWAPs. Lise Hanners (TNC) said she liked the multiple-scale approach, but wondered wonder how RCOAs will be distributed across the landscape. Sharri Venno asked about connections between watersheds and oceans e.g. for anadromous fish.

Andrew Milliken said at the Connecticut River scale, the broader perspective is built in with weighting of systems and species based on regional importance. We’ll work on that at the more local scale, too. We are trying to address limiting factors for species in watersheds that may have other limiting factors elsewhere. John O’Leary said the pilot is a good example for what the LCC is trying to accomplish. If you think about RCOAs, these might be dams (connectivity), not based around a conservation action, but absolutely RCOAs. Rachel Muir said better decisions can result if you map risk on a geographic scale along with opportunities.

**Department of the Interior Hurricane Sandy resiliency funding**

Andrew Milliken described the LCC’s role in leading aquatic connectivity and flood resiliency, marsh resiliency and beach resiliency projects as a response to Hurricane Sandy and other storms. He said that these three projects should greatly advance LCC existing priorities in these areas. He said LCC partner NROC has a network in coastal communities that can help with delivering information. Hurricane Sandy projects also link to the LCC’s Designing Sustainable Landscapes project through sea-level rise response components that will be built in. DOI is developing common metrics to evaluate effectiveness of increasing coastal system resiliency (for DOI and NFWF projects). The North Atlantic LCC website has posted a database of science projects developed collaboratively by USGS, FWS, NPS, BOEM and NOAA.

Rick Bennett (FWS) said the agency is helping to coordinate science proposals and inform NFWF competitive grant process.

Amanda Babson noted that a lot of projects are developing rapidly and there is a challenge to coordinate all these projects. Jeff Willis noted that the database will be helpful for them to see what existing project there are and others that came in the door. Please keep it updated. Pete Murdoch (USGS) noted that we have a great opportunity and huge amount of new data and understanding need to look at in an integrated way. Also have to add new metrics to make information valuable. Also in assessing, this data we’re collecting is important for measuring success. For science projects, success will be measured by the ability to reduce uncertainty.

Mike Rasser and Ellen Mecray (NOAA) noted that the database is missing many agencies, great product but there are a few things we can add and others that are duplicative. A HUD interagency task force is trying to do same thing.

**U.S. Army Corps of Engineers North Atlantic Coast Comprehensive Study**

Michelle Haynes (Institute for Water Resources, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers - ACE) provided a presentation on ACE efforts to reduce risk and support resilient coastal communities through Hurricane sandy funding for a comprehensive study. Ellen Mecray asked about models not included. Andrew Milliken asked whether Corps webinars are archived. Michelle provided URL to the website (<http://www.nad.usace.army.mil/CompStudy>. Amanda Babson asked if the Corps has lessons learned for dealing with local-scale projects while working at regional scale. Michelle said the Corps has identified nested objectives (scalable metrics) within a regional framework with weighted objectives at local scales. She said there are 700 data layers that can be used if the LCC can host the data. Ken Elowe said this is the first time we’ve looked at response to damage with commitment to doing something for the future instead of just reacting to what happened. He asked Committee members to consider the role of the LCC to support and help coordinate “so we’re not doing things at cross purposes.”

**Update from Northeast Climate Science Center**

Mary Ratnaswamy (USGS) and Curt Griffin (UMass) said the CSC has finalized 5-year strategic science agenda, which is posted on its website. Eight CSC RFPs including the Northeast CSC will be out next week. CSCs also have been discussing assisting state and federal planning processes.

**USDA Northeast Climate Hub**

David Hollinger, U.S. Forest Service outlined the USDA regional hubs, which have focus on climate adaptation and information for working lands. The target audience is forest landowners, and farmers. The hub identifies information already created and tries to get that in the hands of the end users. The hubs are developing a website, and will be producing webinars to share information. David said this is a cross-agency effort. “We’ve hit the ground running and expectations are high. Cathy Sparks asked whether the hubs have a plan to work through state and private forestry agencies or state agricultural agencies. David said the hubs will support common interests of farmers and forest landowners from Maine to West Virginia.

**Other Business**

Ken Elowe led a brief discussion of the meeting in conjunction with the next NEAFWA Director’s fall meeting the third week of October in Rhinebeck, New York. The LCC will reconvene by phone in late June to discuss technical committee recommendations for funding science projects. Andrew Milliken advised the LCC will need a quorum on that call, and he will send out a Doodle poll asap. Ellen Mecray asked whether a technical team meeting will be held between now and then. Scott Schwenk said he will convene the technical committee and sub-teams, probably via webinars and conference calls several times between now and that meeting. Ken Elowe closed the meeting by saying it is “a real honor to work with all of you at a point when I think we’re on cusp of doing something cool on a huge scale.”

**Meeting Adjourned**

**Meeting Attendees**

| **Organization** | **Representatives** | **Title of Representative** | **Attend** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***States/Districts*** | | | |
| **Connecticut** | | | |
| Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection | Bill Hyatt | Chief, Bureau of Natural Resources | Y |
| **Delaware** | | | |
| Delaware Division of Fish and Wildlife | Kevin Kalasz | Program Manager - Biodiversity | Y |
| **Maine** | | | |
| Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife | Jim Connolly | Director of Resource Management | Y |
| **Maryland** | | | |
| Maryland Department of Natural Resources | Gwen Brewer | Science Program Manager | Phone |
| **Massachusetts** | | | |
| Massachusetts Division of Fisheries and Wildlife | John O’Leary | Wildlife Administrator | Y |
| **New Hampshire** |  |  |  |
| New Hampshire Fish and Game Department | John Kanter | Wildlife Diversity Program Manager | Y |
| **Pennsylvania** | | | |
| Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission | Diana Day | Conservation Coordinator | Phone |
| **Rhode Island** | | | |
| Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management | Cathy Sparks | Assistant Director for Natural Resources | Y |
| **Vermont** | | | |
| Vermont Department of Fish and Wildlife | Kim Royar | Director of Operations | Phone |
| **Virginia** | | | |
| Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries | Becky Gwynn | Assistant Bureau Director Bureau of Wildlife Resources | Y |
| ***Native American Tribes*** | | | |
| United South and Eastern Tribes  Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians | Sharri Venno | Environmental Planner | Y |
| ***Federal Agencies*** | | | |
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | Ken Elowe | Assistant Regional Director, Science Applications | Y |
| Rick Bennett | Regional Scientist | Y |
| Mike Slattery | Chesapeake Bay Coordinator | Y |
| U.S. Geological Survey | Rachel Muir | Regional Science Advisor, Northeast Region | Y |
| Pete Murdoch | Regional Science Advisor, Northeast Region | Y |
| Department of the Interior Northeast Climate Science Center | Mary Ratnaswamy | USGS Director, Northeast Climate Science Center | Y |
| Curt Griffin | Professor and Department Head, Department of Environmental Conservation, 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 | Phone |
| National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration | Ellen Mecray | Regional Climate Coordinator | Y |
| U.S. Environmental Protection Agency | Jaqueline LeClair |  | Y |
| U.S. Forest Service | David Hollinger | Director Northeast USDA Climate Hub | Y |
| ***Canadian Partners*** | | | |
| Environment Canada Canadian Wildlife Service | Karel Allard | Landscape Conservation Coordinator | Phone |
| ***Non-governmental Organizations*** | | | |
| Ducks Unlimited | Bernie Marczyk | Great Lakes Atlantic Region | Y |
| Manomet Center for Conservation Sciences | Eric Walberg | Climate Director | Y |
| National Wildlife Federation | Chris Hilke | Northeast Climate Change Coordinator | Y |
| The Nature Conservancy | Lise Hanners | Director, Eastern Conservation Science | Y |
| Barbara Vickery | Conservation Director , Maine Chapter | Y |
| New England Wild Flower Society | Bill Brumback | Conservation Director | Y |
| Trust for Public Land | Jad Daley | Director, Climate Cons. Program | Phone |
| Wildlife Management Institute | Scot Williamson | Vice President | Y |
| Wildlife Conservation Society | Zoe Smith | Adirondacks Landscape Conservation Coordinator | Y |
| **Staff** | | | |
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | Andrew Milliken | North Atlantic LCC Coordinator | Y |
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | David Eisenhauer | Communications Coordinator | Y |
| North Atlantic LCC | Scott Schwenk | Science Coordinator | Y |
| North Atlantic LCC | Steve Fuller | Science Delivery Specialist | Y |
| North Atlantic LCC | Lori Pelech | Geographer/GIS Analyst | Y |
| **Guests** |  |  |  |
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | Elsa Haubold | National LCC Coordinator | Y |
| Institute for Water Resources / U.S. Army Corps of Engineers | Michelle Haynes | Decision Analyst | Y |
| RI Coastal Res. Management Council, Northeast Regional Ocean Council | Jeff Willis | Co-Chair Northeast Regional Ocean Council | Y |
| Wildlife Conservation Society | Erika Rowland | North America Climate Program | Y |
| Cornell University | Catherine Doyle-Capitman | PhD. Student | Y |