

Steering Committee Meeting July 14-15, 2015

Steering Committee Meeting Notes Day 1

Introductions – David Whitehurst

Cultural resources are a strong need and would identify us as an LCC. We should look into incorporating them more into our work.

State of the LCC – Cal DuBrock

Do we reflect the values of society at large, or the organization, or our personal values? Work through that via conversation, the value of the diversity of folks we have here. LCCs focus principally on areas of goal-setting, conservation design, science translation, biological assessment, priorities, and information management.

On Assessment side of things – funded a lot of work – Stream Classification, Cave/Karst, Data Needs Assessment, Vulnerability Assessment, Ecosystem Services – foundational work – hard to define where you are going to go if you don't know where you are. In terms of where you want to go – Data Needs Assessment, Ecosystem Services, Energy Forecasting, Hydrologic Flows, Interactive Conservation Modeling. Science Translation – Energy Modeling Tool and the Riparian Restoration Tools. Information Management – Website Portal Development and Support

Funding – Of all the LCCs, the AppLCC trails behind the others – is second from the last in the listing of how much each LCC has spent on funding projects, i.e., getting very little partners co-funding or leveraging cost of projects -- 21st out of 22nd in leveraged funds. How can we further share resources to continue to see this work move forward – to truly demonstrate the partnership? As we think about projects and next steps, consider how we can advance those next steps in the face of static and declining budgets if we want conservation to move forward – both natural and cultural resources.

Assessing Future Energy Development across the Appalachians – Thomas Minney

The science delivers the information to advance the conversation that we need to have – among ourselves, industry, with society and decision-makers. Deliverables produced as a result of the AppLCC grant were the report, the models for coal, wind, and natural gas. From models, began to develop overlap with natural areas and all that data is available on the web-based mapping tool to see results. How do we use the science now to implement solutions – to begin those discussions with key stakeholders?

Ken Elowe – Has this been put to use yet, have you had a conversation? This looks great, but how is it going to be useful. We really need to get people that see potential conversation to start using it. Is this the right information to guide conversations that we need to have? It is all about relevance now. Are what we producing relevant to your needs?

Cal DuBrock – Staff can work with you, with your staff and partners on helping you understand purpose of tool, how useful, and how applicable to the issue of relevancy.

Thomas Minney – This tool is looking at a regional scale of where this development could take place.

David Hartos. – What has been the reaction by industry in natural gas and coal so far?

Thomas Minney – They were interested in it, but wanted to talk about the solution. We are ready to talk about that solution if you have the decision support tool ready. For the government agency side, this tool has been useful and has been used to understand what is coming.

Ken Elowe – Can we start a conversation that will minimize impact to natural resources. From conservation standpoint, that is the value of this.

Dan Odess – How are you capturing use of this tool?

Jean Brennan – Can track how many people are coming to the landing area where all information is, who is accessing the mapping tool, who is downloading the data. And then those asking us for use of data. So they have contacted us to be proactive in that dialogue.

Thomas Minney – Advancing Next Generation Environmental Practices Shell Gas Conference. Workshop product will be a synthesized published report that define the challenge, prioritize existing and emerging solutions. What is emerging from this that has real relevance to the LCC. Positioned well to be a driver for the next steps.

Common themes emerging from the by-invitation-only workshop discussions:

- **Data (there is not repository of data that were consistent at the size and scale needed for these issues, need some organization to be that repository);**
- **How do you define what you are talking about as critical habitats across the Appalachians that are consistent and integrated across borders;**
- **Need to have convener on these conversations – landscape scale and cumulative impacts – to continue these conversations.**

What I found is getting into the realm of energy and solution-oriented stuff, it's been positive and not as onerous as we thought it should be.

David Whitehurst – When we chose to go down the energy road, not to prevent but to work constructively to guide conservation in the face of energy development. Action item to be considered is how to continue this work. For us to play the 3 roles above, we will need resources.

Cave/Karst Resources Classification and Georeferencing across the Appalachians – David Culver

We have a ton of data. And yet, there is no state we have visited 10% of the cave/karst environments. This cave data is available to be used. Not available to distribute to the public. Real biological hotspot in Indiana and of course Mammoth Cave. Southwestern VA a little lesser hotspot. More caves in northern Alabama than anywhere else in the Appalachians. High endemism in northeast Alabama.

Needs/Actions: There is a lot of data management/maintenance with this that is needed. Interested in understanding what you all would use this data for?

Evan Crews – We do have a database of our caves that grows, if we were to start doing a systematic survey of caves, knowing there are thousands out there, is there something out there to prioritize?

David Culver – We could take the grids from this dataset and ask are there unsampled grids we can discern. That is just a GAP Analysis. We can do that by this afternoon. Are there areas that are unsampled?

Evan Crews – Also cultural resources come up a lot when dealing with caves, and so conservation of cave areas can preserve both natural and cultural resources.

Dennis Figg – We know there are areas, that you represented, that are significant for cave biodiversity and ecosystem services. The grey area is pretty much a predictive model of where the cave/karst area is.

David Whitehurst – Do we have the data we need on cave/karst for landscape planning process? If we don't have the data, what process do we need to attain it?

Jean Brennan – We do have funding from this original project, for end-user consultation. So identifying personnel (researchers, staff, partners) who would participate in that consultation. If you know of relevant experts and land-use planners for the next phase, let us know.

TVA's Water Resource Partnerships & TN River Basin Partnership – Evan Crews and Jean Brennan

Tennessee River Network Meeting. August 4&5 event in Chattanooga, inviting all the stakeholders in the TN River Valley, State and Federal agencies and NGOs. First day will be celebration of past successes. The 2nd day is more about networking and focus on facilitated discussions on education and outreach, habitat, innovation, and value of building partnership. End goal is sustainable network across the entire TN Valley to have continuing dialogue on how to collaborate more effectively. Aligns

with Jean and her trying to implement project – getting broader group of stakeholders in one of the highest biodiversity boundaries within the LCC.

Jean Brennan - To consider for the Steering Committee the Tennessee River Basin as a priority landscape/priority resource. If you identify that, then need to approve staff time to be allocated towards doing that sort of partnership.

David Whitehurst – It does seem to be a very clear and present opportunity. We really need to be focused on the total picture and scope of work. The Executive Committee is very encouraged. Will need to be broader than the aquatic community to have full support of this body.

Ecosystems Services and Environmental Threats Assessment – Lars Pomara

Respond to needs of conservation partners. Spatially explicit, at large landscape scales. Not a majority urban/large city population, largely still rural.

First year – inventory existing assessment efforts

Second year – develop framework for a comprehensive assessment

Data incorporated from state, federal, NGO work. 42 Assessments. On Portal – summary of all the assessments used in this work. As well as the major risks.

Access to data sets within the narrative context – careful kind of selection and reworking with this sort of assessment and analysis.

Three major categories – landscape capacity, flow of services, and drivers of change. How do we do this type of intensive work – how do we add value to this type of approach that can inform decision making around multiple resources.

Integrative landscape approach – Environmental/Social drivers ---trajectories of landscape change ---inferred ecosystem service sustainability. Getting at a suite of metrics that help us get at landscape resiliency. Key point is we are not just after a couple of fixed endpoint deliverables – this idea of developing monitoring tools for the LCC in interpreting landscape change and how to inform future trajectories of landscape for planning.

Dan Odess – Have concern when talking about ecosystem services and benefits. We are as non-diverse a group of people here. How to make datasets more rich in those terms.

Lars Polmara. – There is a burden on us to make sure we are relevant to society.

Ken Elowe – Given us a parallel framework to a lot of natural resources metrics. What does the landscape need to look like and provide? – Is that what this work will inevitably lead us to Lars?

Lars Polmara – Yes

Synopsis of recently completed or to-be-completed LCC science projects – Jean Brennan

All of our projects have finished up. Divide them up between Take Action and Invest Now; Make Decision Near Term; Plan to Achieve Longer Term

- **Take Action and Invest Now**
 - **Riparian Restoration; Cave/Karst; Climate Change Vulnerability**
- **Make Decision Near Term**
 - **Energy Assessment; Aquatic Flows; Stream Classification; Climate Change Vulnerability**
- **Plan to Achieve Longer Term**
 - **Landscape Model Products; LCC Vulnerability Analysis**

Interactive and Iterative Conservation Modeling in the Appalachian Region – Rob Baldwin, Paul Leonard

Timeline overview:

- Straw Man (Last Steering Committee Meeting July 2014).
- Propose candidate list of priority resources - Receive funding to commence Design (Gather technical team input on priority resources, develop data sets.
- Present priority resources and draft design (Phase 2).

Strategy to build priority resources – Used seed group of resources and built out. Assembled by LCC staff with the goal of representing LCC partner priorities.

Initial (Modeling) “Seed” Resources or Targets

- Early Successional – Golden-winged Warbler, Spotted Skunk,
- Mature Lowland Forest – Wood Thrush
- Upper Elevation – Brook Trout
- Low-mid elevation larger streams and rivers – Hellbender
- Large landscape connectivity - Black Bear

Held 5 webinars with technical teams to receive feedback on seed priority resources and on how to use them as targets in Phase 1 Design. Feedback from Central Appalachians – how to consider cave/karst resources, species for Forested Wetlands, high-elevation forests and streams, consider more representative early successional species. Southern Appalachians Feedback – consider breaking out early successional habitats (shrub, grass, young forests), high-elevation forests, high-elevation streams consider sensitive fish guilds as seeds instead of species, Interior Low Plateau feedback – balancing life history traits of species, disturbance dependent ecosystems.

Also wanted to capture what the landscape might look like – 2030 horizon. Incorporated top 10% of TNC resilient scores.

For most part we built on certain principles and questions:

- Data of AppLCC funded projects – TNC Energy Development and Aquatic Classification, Cave/Karst, Data Needs, etc.
- How would you like to see “Cost” incorporated into design – Landscape Fragmentation (inverse of connectivity);
- How would you like to see landscape connectivity incorporated into the Design;
- What % of each of these resources would like to see in prioritization framework – Varied for each priority resource;
- How important is the inclusion of this conservation resource for the LCCs design process – Cove Forests, Balds, Rocky Outcrops (top 3);

We mapped several conservation design elements:

- 5 Regional Cores
- 8 Locally Cores
- 4 regional linkages (linking cores)
- 4 East-West Linkages (linking ridge to valley)
- Local Build Outs – unprotected areas or areas to consider lower-level Gap status management. High irreplaceability. Or protected areas where it can expand further.

All 5 – regional cores, locally cores, linkages, and build outs occur within the Tennessee River Basin.

Found the highest irreplaceability areas, basically most valuable conservation targets also have highest threats. Especially Central Appalachians and Upper Tennessee River Basin. We parameterized this terrestrially. Aquatic connectivity is not included directly.

Connectivity at multiple scales – fine grained connectivity analysis is completely unique to this region and reveals both large extent regional patterns and when zoomed in, surprising detail on local habitat connectivity.

Ken Elowe – How do you know whether you are taking the top 10% if you don’t know what the 100% are? Where do we go from here in the conversation about priority resources?

Rob Baldwin – This is why I see conservation design as an iterative process. Need richer feedback and input to answer that question.

Mark Hudy – Approaches that work for terrestrial and aquatic hardly ever work in prioritization. It almost like you would have to do a terrestrial and an

aquatic and overlap them. Is there an invasive part for threats? Need to look at land use and climate change and invasives. Can't ignore any of those 3 when you focus on prioritization.

Need to look at aquatics. Need to look at invasive.

Andrew Milliken – What is driving the white space?

Paul Leonard – One is fragmentation. There might not be any conservation targets there that we included. Do you have the targets, that is a never-ending process, have to start somewhere. How do you want to penalize a salt and pepper output? How clumped do you want the algorithm? We penalize salt and pepper, and mostly want clumped.

Perry Wheelock – Briefly talked about cultural resources – what dataset did you pull from?

Rob Baldwin – Task was to build a methodological framework. We have a way for doing what you are asking.

David Culver – We should look at geodiversity – that shale barrens, rock outcrops, glades, and bogs should always be planned for because of their uniqueness.

Dan Odess – Not talking about climate change as this monolithic thing. Will vary independently and high degree of uncertainty. Precipitation and temperature and seasonal dimensions of those variables will be key.

Paul Leonard – The complexity of the interactions of all those threats is largely unknown, much uncertainty.

Rob Baldwin – The historical data is very spatially explicit and the projections get very broad.

David Whitehurst – This was Phase 1, the process to help us focus on our conservation design. One of the questions that we are going to ask the group is do we continue with Phase 2. You should be able to answer if you are comfortable with us continuing with next phase.

Dan Odess – As we identify key species or ecosystems, what are the cost of adding additional variables in terms of scalability?

Paul Leonard – The data itself cost us \$4500 for Hellbender.

Rob Baldwin – If you add a bunch of things – have staff time going towards it.

Paul Leonard – We don't target endemic but clearly a lot of those endemics in those places.

Thomas Minney – For every choice that we make it's a new map. Then new map and you choose different species and get a new map. So when do we get to the prioritization process.

Rob Baldwin – I feel like there are some real pieces that are not done yet – like aquatics, and building accessibility and tools. Cultural and aquatics.

Gwen B. – Wondering if there is a role in phase 2 for partners and the ground truthing aspect of it? And how much is that is valuable?

Paul Leonard – One of the ways is through the outreach – need the social process to hone that in.

Rob Baldwin – Partners can help with validation of the ground truthing in the model.

Dick Cole – I think there is a link here with the Forest Service work, to integrate their risks and ecosystem services.

Rob Baldwin – That is a no brainer, we would certainly do that.

LCC Priority Resources Discussion (Priority Resources (systems/landscapes))

David Whitehurst – It is pretty clear the conservation design process points to Tennessee River Basin as a high priority.

Ken Elowe – What would help me is the slide about species and special places that they had incorporated so far. What is missing from this list? Did we look at the full suite of everything that was represented before we make a final decision?

Mark Hudy – Is there potential leveraged funds in the Tennessee River Basin? Also, that is SARP's neighborhood and they are doing a lot of great work there.

David Whitehurst – Whatever this LCC does will be additive and in support of other partnerships. The leadership approach was to let's talk about where we should be doing our work in first before looking at resource limitations and other issues.

Mark Thurman – There is a good amount of investment there already. We need to figure out what it means that we are going to invest in that region?

Thomas Minney – Are we going to move forward on anything and is the process in phase 1 adequate to do this? Second part of process, what are we going to do next to enhance this work? I would propose that the solid things on what we know now

based on Phase 1 we invest in. The questions/answers that are still needed we develop those through the next phase of the mapping.

Ginny Kreidler – This gives us a solid enough basis to do work, don't want to hold off on it for next phase.

Dan Odess – There were a couple things about the modeling that gave me a little bit of unease. In particular asking a fairly narrow group of experts for their opinions and priorities and getting only a subset of those experts to complete Phase 1.

Cal DuBrock – There is a refinement process that one can go through. The question for the Steering Committee – what are you trying to do? Is it to serve the Technical Community? We have a process, have some outputs, have some suggestions on how to proceed. Just one step in the process. We can continue to refine that, continue to validate it. Expand the universe of people and values and inputs as we move along. Does it allow us to advance the mission of the LCC – decide on priorities and produce sustainable landscapes within this region.

David Whitehurst – Is the group comfortable with moving forward with some actions based on the results of this effort (phase 1) with refinement of the conservation design process moving forward (phase 2). As we continue to improve it, need leveraged resources to do so.

Brian Burhans – This is as much an analytical tool as a communication tool. Does this provide the communication messaging that the LCC wants.

Paul Johansen – We should be engaging in the real work of the LCC in helping our partners develop sustainable landscapes. And I think the Tennessee River Basin is a perfect study area for us to see if this will work. If the Appalachian LCC can engage and actively help all the partners down there to move their conservation agenda forward, it will be a major success. I think we can continue to work with Clemson to refine the model, but we need also to put action on the ground.

Ken Elowe – There are a lot of partners here who don't live in that area, but we have information from this model that will help them put habitat on the ground in these areas as well. One question to ponder today is the conservation design effort is a communication piece and how it gets communicated about is what you think is important.

Perry Wheelock – Is it possible to “test drive” this in more than one area?

Thomas Minney – Simple criteria to use when selecting critical areas to work is for example Tennessee River Basin there are partners there, biodiversity is there. If partnerships are there, the biodiversity and challenges are there.

Evan Crews – Tennessee River does have a robust aquatic dataset. I think there is buy in to refine the message to convert scientific aspect of this to more that is a communication plan for broader buy in.

Clyde Thompson – What I hear is moving forward need to get more cultural and aquatics information implemented and to really think about the communication piece of it and get more partner involvement.

Jean Brennan – Landscape conservation design is both a product and a process. Is group acceptable with the product that they gave us? Where can we get leveraging resources and the overlap of that?

Mark Hudy – I am still concerned with your aquatic partners about showing them a map like that. Showing rivers and water in those things would be helpful in the communication part of this

David Whitehurst – Provide direction about doing the aquatics.

Dick Cole – Be clear in the roll out that this is phase 1, primarily terrestrial, and next phase will include aquatics.

Matthew Cimitile – There are a variety of different types of releases and should think about what type of release this should be, who is primary audiences. Also, I would think the major messaging about a product like this is connectivity and corridors.

Ken Elowe – If people can feel that what they think is important is in here, will be crucial.

Ginny Kreitler – What do we mean by deciding on where we are going to work and what is that work? Is it communication? Is it on the ground protection efforts?

David Whitehurst – Come out with at least one good example of working at the landscape. If we decide on the Tennessee River Basin then need to look at SARP and CHJV and EBTJV and organizations represented here that have responsibility in that landscape. What we need is to have some clear examples where we are taking a corporate agreement and that we will support people on the ground and that is the model we can replicate.

David Hartos – We should do a really good inventory of initiatives in those key areas already taking place.

David Whitehurst – Do we have the ability to give an overview of what we have going on across the landscape?

Jean Brennan – We have put in place for the Tennessee August meeting we are going to do an inventory of partner capacity in each of those four working groups.

Evan Crews – There are a multitude of effective partnerships in that area that leverage millions of dollars.

Doug Besler – We also need to think about where state resource agencies are putting in their effort. Certainly the Tennessee River Basin is a strong one for that. A lot of the on the ground work is coming from the agencies.

Mike Piccirilli – I struggle with how we invest in this. There is a lot of money on the wildlife-side that states are trying to find a way to spend it. I am pretty sure that we can leverage that money and go through a 3rd party for match. If we had a list of priority resources or areas then when we meet with our states and see where they are looking for projects, we can steer them in that direction.

Dan Odess – Last year when we met, Tim Murtha of Penn State gave presentation on Marcellus Shale. He is interested in expanding that effort to what this LCC is about. Has a couple graduate students to throw at that. Penn State is willing to chip in tuition if LCC can provide a stipend. Penn State would also chip in Murtha’s salary. Regarding cultural resources – this is one of the best LCC opportunities for cultural resources integration I have seen. If you are looking to take a stab at cultural resources into what you are about and interested in continuing in the energy arena, I’d encourage you to think about that. Develop it as something scalable. In neighborhood of \$30,000.

Cal DuBrock – Cultural resources is really important. His approach sounds very unique.

Dan Odess – We need to attach what other values there are within a value of ecologically significant or energy significant area.

David Whitehurst – What I am not hearing is there are no data sources on cultural resources that we can put into those evaluations. We don’t seem to have any geospatial datasets.

Perry Wheelock – It sits out there, people have not brought it into these conversations.

Cal DuBrock – I would encourage us to apply the same standards to collect biological information to collect the cultural information.

Gwen Brewer – Where can we really add value, where does LCC add value? What are the logical next steps – the things nobody is going to do to take those products forward?

Dan Odess – I can ask about datasets and getting them to share State Historic Preservation Offices. I think that all but maybe 3 states are ready to have their information in geospatial form.

Program and Project Priorities for 2015

David Whitehurst – Steering Committee members provided list of Appalachian LCC project opportunities to rank from 1-9 to help discussion of where LCC funding should go. To help focus our discussion and identify the best work for us to do.

Ginny Kreidler – I would like to see us prioritize to support action on the ground.

David Whitehurst – I don't think there is any opposition to it, just more analysis about how to do it and what opportunities there are.

Paul Johansen – It becomes difficult to rank projects if you don't know how much they are going to cost. Trying to separate the cost and what would be of most value to LCC and its partners.

David Whitehurst – We wanted to identify what the most important work is without price tags.

Cal DuBrock – Think about the LCC and its overall mission and the Work Plan and the importance of those elements. Then get into funding options.

Cal Dubrock – Based on polling, here are the results - Modeling Phase 2 – Paul and Rob (1), work in Tennessee River Basin (2), Lars Environmental Services (3)-Classifying and geospatially referencing cultural resources (4), and delivering Science information, products, and Decision Support Tools (5)

Steve Faulkner – Keep in mind what we can leverage from partners.

Perry Wheelock – I believe there is tuition match by Penn State, Murtha's salary matched by Penn State. Close to a 50/50 match.

Cal DuBrock – We only have \$260k to spend for everything for next year's projects/priorities.

David Whitehurst – For Phase 2, would there be inclusion of aquatic and cultural and additional special features?

Jean Brennan – Yes.

Ken Elowe – We really need to do cultural resources in the North Atlantic. So we have a little bit of money to put in from the North Atlantic. I think there is a way we can parcel this together.

Mike Slattery – Chesapeake Conservation Partnership, there is potentially funding partners through that group. The new Secretary of Department Conservation Natural Resources – Cindy Dunn, very supportive of this work.

David Whitehurst – It sounds like to me that the first 6 items (Clemson modeling phase 2, Tennessee River Basin staff support, Forest Service risks/services phase 2, Cataloging and mapping Cultural Resources, Delivery of science information, products, and decision support tools, and [with support of Steering Committee and staff time] facilitating energy discussions engaging partners and industry.) Is body comfortable with focusing on those 6 items in near future?

Paul Johansen – Motion: I would move the Steering Committee used the guidance provided to move forward to exploring opportunities for seeking funding for these first 6 projects and activities and staff to attempt to accomplish that. As well as we should pursue other options on this list that do not require financial responsibility, but engage partners in these activities to recognize the importance.

Ken Elowe – 2nded that motion

Group – Favors motion. Fund Clemson Modeling Phase 2, Ecosystems Services/Threats Phase 2, Cultural Resources Classification and Mapping, and attempt to fund Hydrology/Flow ecology work (explore other funding or grant opportunities). Staff time towards Tennessee River Basin, Facilitating delivery of science and Decision Support Tools, and Facilitating engagement/discussion around energy.

David Whitehurst – Executive Committee would work to approve those arrangements for the funded projects and staff time.

Nominating new Chair, Vice Chair, Executive Committee Officers

David Whitehurst – Also need to address getting new officers, members on Executive Committee. Open the floor for nominations. Are there nominations for officers, for chair and vice chair. Its 2-year terms and it should start in April 2016.

Paul Johansen – I will tell you that it is really time for a change. I don't tend to walk away from the Appalachian LCC. I just need to slip down a bit in terms of involvement. I think its time to start to consider that Chair and Vice Chair not being a state agency person. NGO or federal can move into those positions.

David Whitehurst – For the health of the organization, people have different ideas and leadership style and think it is healthy that others step up.

Ken Elowe – Staff tries to give Chair/Vice Chair everything they need to make this run. All we need in leadership is engagement.

Paul Johansen – Like to nominate two folks for consideration –Gwen Brewer taking on one of those responsibilities and Clyde Thompson. For Chair and Vice Chair.

Ginny Kreitler – Seconded by Ginny.

David Whitehurst – Are there other people to place themselves in the nomination. Really is advocacy. Meeting time and management. Being a good partner. Its not a lot of work if you have staff support.

Bill Jenkins – I will volunteer for Executive Committee.

Thomas Minney and Perry Wheelock to continue serving on Executive Committee.

Evan Crews and Ginny Kreitler expressing interest in serving as well.

Group will identify a slate of potential officers. Give those people 2 weeks to confirm with their bosses whether they can or cannot serve. Do an email vote for those slate of officers and then those people would come on in April.

Slate – Gwen Brewer (Chair), Clyde Thompson (Vice Chair), Executive Committee – Thomas Minney, Perry Wheelock, Mark Thurman, Bill Jenkins, Evan Crews, Ginny Kreitler.

New Partner Organizations on Steering Committee

Cal DuBrock – National Wildlife Federation is not officially a member of the Steering Committee.

Group - Accepts National Park Service Federal Office and National Wildlife Federation to the Steering Committee.

Conflict of Interest Declarations

David Whitehurst – The onus is on the Executive Committee. For example, if we were to fund a project for an organization, and a representative of that organization is on the Executive Committee, then they would recuse themselves.

Scot Williamson – You want to make sure your minutes reflect those decisions so the minutes are clear. Many times when you are developing an RFP, might be efficient to utilize partners who are competing for those RFPs. Make sure those that are designing the RFPs are not getting input from partners who might compete.

Jean Brennan – The terms that have been used -- contract and RFP. RFP is for grant. RFA is for contract. Conflict of Interest impact RFP and RFAs.

Ken Elowe – WMI provides a service to this LCC that gives us ability to be financially responsible in terms of administration they do and time they give us.

National LCC Network – Elsa Haubold

National Academy of Sciences Review Report should be finished by October. Science Coordinators have been working on a science plan. We also have a communication Plan underway, and when new manager comes onboard will help to finalize that. As of 2 weeks ago, may have half of our annual appropriation. There is currently no Interior Appropriations Bill. With this deep of a cut in the LCC budget, every LCC would be affected.

Ken Elowe – One of the things articulated in this budget process, that LCC is not welcomed everywhere. Specifically by states and tribes. Which is why the value of communicating with your leadership is critical. Because there is perception out there of no value added with LCCs and in conflict with other partnerships.

Bill Jenkins – How does Service allocate funds to LCC?

Elsa Haubold – It starts at HQ. Allocate it out to the regions. They give to LCC.

Bill Jenkikns – Is there any talk of re-evaluating the Tier System and change how much each LCC gets?

Elsa Haubold – Ultimately our goal is that each LCC has \$2 million. But in this case, have to start thinking creatively.