



North Pacific Landscape Conservation Cooperative

Steering Committee Final Meeting Summary
Anchorage, Alaska
November 3, 2014

Contents

Welcome and Introductions	1
LCC Network Activities and NPLCC Accomplishments.....	2
2015 Strategic Planning	5
Next Steps	12
Attendees.....	13

Welcome and Introductions

John Mankowski, North Pacific Landscape Conservation Cooperative (NPLCC) Coordinator, welcomed participants to the meeting and acknowledged new faces. Lyman Thorsteinson, NPLCC Steering Committee Co-Chair, reviewed the meeting objectives:

- Learn about LCC Network activities
- Remind ourselves of NPLCC commitments we made and 2014 accomplishments
- Discuss a five-year outlook for the NPLCC
- Anticipate and plan for key activities in 2015

He noted the meeting is also an opportunity to provide advice about how to grow the partnership in 2015. He noted building cross-LCC partnerships will be a discussion topic at the Climate, Conservation, and Community in Alaska and Northwest Canada ([link](#)) conference taking place the rest of the week.

Rory Annett, BC Ministry of Forests, Lands, and Natural Resource Operations (FLNRO), resigned from the NPLCC as Co-Chair and named Diane Nicholls as his replacement. Ms. Nicholls is the Deputy Chief Forester and Executive Director in the Resource Stewardship Division of FLNRO. John Mankowski shared his appreciation for Rory's service and acknowledged the collaborative work British Columbia and the NPLCC have accomplished over the past three years.

Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues, reviewed the meeting agenda. The Steering Committee approved the July 9-10 meeting summary.

LCC Network Activities and NPLCC Accomplishments

LCC Network Update and Introduction to the NPLCC

John Mankowski gave an overview ([Attachment 1](#)) of LCC Network activities and the NPLCC. His presentation described the overall framework for LCCs nationwide and reviewed the LCC Network Strategic Plan ([link](#)), the appointment of the National Academy Committee for the National Academy of Sciences evaluation of LCCs ([link](#)), and key accomplishments of the LCC Network in 2014. He noted Terry Williams, Tulalip Tribes, is a member of the LCC Council. He also shared that NPLCC-funded projects were featured at the National Workshop on Large Landscape Conservation ([link](#)) and in the National Fish, Wildlife, and Plants Climate Adaptation Strategy progress report from September 2014 ([link](#)).

John then reviewed the mission, goals, and organizational structure of the NPLCC, as well as the region's geography, ecosystems, and major land management systems. He described how the committees and subcommittees work together to implement annual NPLCC priorities through projects, workshops, trainings, and partnerships. He expressed that at its core the NPLCC convenes partners, funds strategic projects, builds capacity, and communicates to share information.

Tribes/First Nations Committee

John provided an overview of the Tribes/First Nations Committee meeting held September 4, 2014 in Portland, Oregon at the Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission. The purpose of the meeting was to provide a forum for tribal members and staff to share their experiences working on climate change, traditional ecological knowledge, and with the NPLCC. Participants learned about the support the NPLCC and others can provide to Tribes and First Nations, discussed safeguards and appropriate use of traditional knowledges, shared their experiences and responses to climate change effects on cultural and natural resources, and provided ten recommendations to the NPLCC for how they can better engage and work with Tribes and First Nations. Recommendations included support for annual meetings and project funding, better measurement of the impacts of in-person meetings, support for ecosystem-based measures of conservation and restoration performance, and suggestions for how to refine the NPLCC's policy language and how the NPLCC could provide guidance to other LCCs.

Committee Discussion

Keith Hatch, Bureau of Indian Affairs, noted the ecosystem-based measures of conservation and restoration performance are focused on cultural resources such as food security.

Preston Hardison, Tulalip Tribes, added tribes want to maintain traditional lifestyles which include first foods, medicines, ceremonial resources, building resources, and stories. He noted lists of priority species may differ between tribes and non-tribal entities. He emphasized the importance of protections for traditional knowledge, noting tribal members or communities may not want to share their knowledge because it is sacred, private, and not easily shared. Preston concluded by noting participants discussed how to have a conversation about resource protection that respects and upholds tribal values.

Joe Hostler, Yurok Tribe, stated the meeting was productive and unique, a rare opportunity for tribes to gather and begin working immediately together. He noted the recent work on traditional knowledges guidelines and discussion of traditional knowledges was a highlight.

David Redhorse, Bureau of Indian Affairs, stated tribes have embraced the concept of climate change, even though it may not seem tribes are participating in all LCCs. He explained both the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission and Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission dedicated funds to look at the impact of climate change on treaty resources, specifically fishing rights. Over half of the tribes are in the NPLCC region. He added the Bureau of Indian Affairs has support for tribal liaisons with the U.S. Geological Survey's Climate Science Centers but it is unclear how the positions will be structured and will function. Overall, there is active work to identify how national and local tribal work will be organized.

Lynn Helbrecht, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, noted the prevalence of national tribal efforts and asked if the NPLCC has a liaison to the national efforts.

Mary Mahaffy, NPLCC Science Coordinator, noted the NPLCC has worked with the Institute for Tribal Environmental Professionals on trainings and that NPLCC members participate in other national efforts such as the First Stewards. Preston Hardison added Rising Voices is another area where NPLCC members are involved. Mary shared there were seven presentations including a panel on tribal and traditional ecological knowledge work at the National Workshop on Large Landscape Conservation. She invited Steering Committee members to share partnership ideas for tribal work.

Science-Traditional Ecological Knowledge Subcommittee

Frank Shipley, NPLCC S-TEK Subcommittee Chair, introduced the S-TEK update ([Attachment 2](#)). He noted the NPLCC was established to respond to the need to connect science and management on-the-ground to address climate change. He reviewed S-TEK's work since the NPLCC was founded and described their evolution from a focus on strategic project selection to developing project accountability metrics in more recent meetings.

Mary Mahaffy noted S-TEK's key focal areas are being climate-smart and connecting scientists and managers. She reviewed S-TEK project funding to date, noting the NPLCC has funded 47 projects ranging from \$5,000 to \$100,000 since its inception. Nineteen projects have been completed, and there are seven new projects this year. In 2014, S-TEK focused on adaptive learning, updating the website, and project management and accountability. In 2015, S-TEK will focus on refining their direction to remain consistent with NPLCC strategies, funding high-priority projects, adaptive learning, and communication.

Mary shared action items for 2015:

- Update 2015-2016 Implementation Plan and all future Implementation Plans to include all activities that support the S-TEK strategy. Previous plans focused on identifying potential projects.
- Derive draft measurable objectives from the NPLCC Conservation and Sustainable Resource Management Goals ([link](#)). These will aid adaptive learning and project evaluation.
- Fund projects supporting one or more of four activities
 - Support the use of vulnerability assessments or resilience studies in adaptation planning and implementation (funded through RFP process)
 - Improve information on how climate change and associated adaptation actions will affect linkages between ecological and human resources (funded through RFP process)
 - Data and information sharing and synthesis (funded via salary, contract, or agreement)
 - Conduct, support, or facilitate landscape-scale conservation planning exercise(s) in a particular geography or region (funded via salary, contract, or agreement)
- Implement the approved Project Accountability Plan and project tracking system

- Develop project evaluation criteria and an evaluation framework
- Communicate project results effectively, for example by providing a S-TEK liaison for each project funded in 2015

Committee Discussion

Karen Kelleher, Bureau of Land Management, noted making data accessible and usable is a challenge in Alaska and asked for lessons learned.

Mary Mahaffy responded that the project tracking helps identify opportunities to communicate data and results. Frank Shipley noted there can be different processes for communicating project results depending on the audience. For example, sharing traditional knowledge is different than providing online data for download by scientists.

Lyman Thorsteinson asked if the call for pre-proposals could be moved forward into November to provide enough time over the holidays to develop the pre-proposals.

Mary Mahaffy noted the list of proposed topics will be sent next week and there must be a two-week review period for Steering Committee members. Frank Shipley added that working around the holiday was one factor they considered when developing the RFP schedule.

Communications and Outreach Subcommittee

Mike Tranel, NPLCC Communications and Outreach (COR) Subcommittee Chair, introduced the COR update ([Attachment 3](#)), noting the subcommittee is active and has broad representation across the NPLCC. The subcommittee is proceeding with their five-year plan and has performance measures aligned with each COR goal in place.

Meghan Kearney, NPLCC Communication Specialist, shared 2014 successes including a more user-friendly website, regular newsletters and science-management webinars, and improved connections with climate science entities, the LCC network, and Tribes and First Nations. In 2015, COR will continue successful activities from 2014 as well as focus on performance measures and highlighting partner successes.

Meghan described action items for 2015:

- Develop 2015 Implementation Plan with both qualitative and quantitative measures
- Recruit new members to increase communications expertise, including a Tribal or First Nations representative
- Provide communications support to NPLCC staff and committees, for example by communicating project results and reviewing outreach materials
- Strengthen collaboration between communication specialists who are affiliated with NPLCC partners

Partnership Engagement Strategy

John Mankowski reviewed the status of the Partnership Engagement Strategy ([Attachment 1](#)). He noted an action plan was approved in February 2014 and objectives aligned with NPLCC goals were established. Several interviews have been conducted and recorded. Additional interviews are planned for 2015. The goal of the Partnership Working Group is to make staff recommendations to the Steering Committee.

2015 Strategic Planning

Penny Mabie introduced the strategic planning activity and provided instruction on how to use MeetingSphere, which is an online software for discussion and collaboration. She explained the activity would begin with committee members brainstorming a five-year outlook consistent with the NPLCC mission and goals, followed by identifying opportunities and barriers to achieving the five-year outlook. Based on this discussion, committee members will identify a 2015 Work Plan, including major deliverables, task leads, and meeting dates and locations.

Five-Year Outlook, Opportunities, and Barriers

Penny Mabie facilitated discussion of the following seven discussion questions:

- What will "informing landscape level conservation and sustainable resource management in the face of a changing climate and related stressors" mean in five years?
- What does the NPLCC already do really well? What can we take advantage of in the next five years?
- Five years from now, what will the NPLCC have accomplished? What will the NPLCC be known for? What obstacles will we have overcome?
- Keeping in mind the NPLCC mission and seven goals, what would you suggest the NPLCC focus on in the next five years?
- What current or potential partnerships could really help us be successful in five years?
- What would you say are the top two barriers to achieving the five-year outlook?
- What would you say are the top two opportunities to take advantage of to realize the five-year outlook?

Steering Committee Discussion

The following summarizes the key points made during the discussion.

1. What will "informing landscape level conservation and sustainable resource management in the face of a changing climate and related stressors" mean in five years?
 - There will be greater engagement and awareness about NPLCC activities and missions within communities in rural regions such as southeast Alaska.
 - There may be policies at local or larger scales that will require states or specific operations to address changing environmental conditions. However, if data and research does not address the decision context in which it is applicable, it may not be useful.
 - We will need to navigate the increasing amount of research and data generated. With finer-scale projections of change, we may be in a position to respond to finer-scale changes on the landscape. We will need to be able to mine "big data," put information in a form people can use, and provide access to what is available.
 - A "landscape scale manager" may mean something entirely different. It may refer to someone who incorporates multiple social, economic, environmental, and cultural factors into their work.
 - In five years, it will be common practice to incorporate climate change into management practice. More attention may need to be paid to evaluating the success of implemented adaptation measures. Working on natural hazards issues will be commonplace.
 - We will need to be able to assess "hot spots" for priority funding or investment, problems to be addressed, and species, habitats or ecosystems to be protected. This includes identifying trends and changes to systems.

2. What does the NPLCC already do really well? What can we take advantage of in the next five years?
- The website is a great platform and can be leveraged further as more learn about it. The newsletters and mailing list demonstrate the NPLCC is a resource. It is important to keep it current.
 - The NPLCC brings together a large and diverse community of scientists, managers, and decision makers responsible and accountable for ground level work across a unique landscape unit that might not otherwise meet or work together. The NPLCC coordinates very well with regional partners and provides opportunities for multiple agencies and groups to communicate about common issues.
 - The NPLCC provides a robust, inclusive science planning process that focuses on management applications to create a comprehensive agenda for science activities. The NPLCC focuses on management- and decision-relevant actions, as well as actionable science and relevance in use.
 - In the next five years, LCCs need to mine lessons learned from cases in which science is used in practice for adaptation. LCCs also need to take advantage of the unique characteristics of being defined by landscapes to learn unique lessons about landscape adaptation and plan strategic activities and interventions.
3. Five years from now, what will the NPLCC have accomplished? What will the NPLCC be known for? What obstacles will we have overcome?
- The NPLCC will be known for translating science into management action and bridging the science-policy gap in the climate change field by:
 - i. Supporting on-the-ground projects that demonstrate best practices in applied science and informing policy and management decisions
 - ii. Funding strategic projects to leverage existing research and data
 - iii. Being a leader in incorporating traditional and local knowledge into science planning and assessments
 - iv. Helping mainstream climate change
 - v. Conducting integrated landscape level work combining science and adaptation practice that no one else is accomplishing, for example by supporting efforts to manage resources at a truly watershed or landscape level
 - The NPLCC's work will have generated additional projects including collaborative projects.
 - The NPLCC will be known as a "go to" for climate change information and for making tools easy to use by the average person.
 - The NPLCC will be known for working with Tribes and First Nations. For example, the NPLCC will be known for its organizational structure, in which the Steering Committee and Tribes/First Nations Committee are at the same level.
 - The NPLCC will be known for addressing trans-boundary issues and coordinating with other LCCs. Over time, the NPLCC may become better known as an Alaskan LCC as they pay greater attention to partner needs and interests in the northern NPLCC and make connections with neighboring LCCs, the State of Alaska, and others.

4. Keeping in mind the NPLCC mission and seven goals, what would you suggest the NPLCC focus on in the next five years?
- The NPLCC could focus on stronger science management engagement including:
 - i. Working hand in hand with managers to ensure they are asking the right science questions to inform their climate adaptation challenges
 - ii. Assisting managers in their efforts to truly do adaptive management, for example by assisting efforts to make large scale changes in how the landscape is managed using an existing plan instead of creating a new plan
 - The NPLCC could focus on science translation and science and traditional knowledge use including:
 - i. How to incorporate new science into existing models such as models for fish populations and identifying which vegetation species will persist over time
 - ii. Data delivery efforts such as the Conservation Planning Atlas
 - iii. Efforts to make traditional knowledge available and usable in science and resource management decisions
 - iv. Ecological science focused on resilience
 - The NPLCC could focus on specific natural or cultural resource challenges such as:
 - i. How to respond to the spread of harmful invasive species, including the ways in which climate change influences their spread and establishment
 - ii. How to prioritize restoration given projected climate impacts
 - iii. Using mitigation techniques to address the loss of cultural resources, provide a non-commercialized source for foods such as salmon and huckleberries, and sustain a resource in a particular location. One example is techniques to keep culturally significant species in an area in which they may otherwise move in response to climate change.
 - The NPLCC could actively facilitate trans-boundary and regional forums to identify needs for collaboration regarding climate and other stressors.
 - The NPLCC could continue to work closely and collaboratively with the Climate Science Centers.
 - The NPLCC could focus on its unique role and work to identify, address, coordinate, and manage trans-boundary landscape-level natural and cultural resource priorities via informed decision making and learning using information that the LCC is uniquely qualified to supply including the identification of opportunities for (and barriers to) landscape-level conservation and sustainable resource management problems.

5. What current or potential partnerships could really help us be successful in five years?

- Committee members identified several current and potential partnerships with federal, tribal, state, local, non-governmental organization (NGO), and other stakeholders that could help the NPLCC be successful in the next five years. They are summarized in the table below.

Type of Partner	Suggested Partnerships	Notes
Federal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Climate Impacts Research Consortium Alaska Climate Change and Assessment Program USDA Climate Hubs National Conservation Training Center (NCTC) Department of Defense (DOD) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NCTC organizes and implements training programs. Due to the likely funding future, partnering with existing programs such as those in DOD will be needed.
Tribal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Central Council of the Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska (CCTHITA) 	
State/Local	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Juneau Economic Development Council (JEDC) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One opportunity is to continue and increase involvement with states. There is potential to take advantage of developed partnerships with CCTHITA, the JEDC's R&D cluster in the Southeast Alaska Cluster Initiative, and the Alaska Coastal Rainforest Center.
NGO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pacific Coast Joint Venture National Fish Habitat Partnership National Audubon Society (Audubon) Land trust alliances Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (AFWA) Inuit Circumpolar Council-AK (ICC-AK) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Audubon has a climate change initiative focused on birds. There is a land camp next spring that will focus on tools for conservation. The NPLCC could work with existing groups that are already implementing conservation such as Joint Ventures, AFWA, and restoration practitioners. ICC-AK is doing a project on food security and how to work with Inuit knowledge and decision making. There is a report coming out.
Other stakeholder or partnership opportunity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Farmers Ranchers Restoration practitioners Alaska Coastal Rainforest Center (ACRC) Alaska Forum on the Environment (AFE) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One suggestions is to identify which groups are talking with farmers and ranchers, then connect with them to provide talking points on climate change. The AFE already has circumboreal participation, Native involvement, multi-agency support, and a focus on climate change. The next annual meeting is in Anchorage, Alaska in February 2015.

6. What would you say are the top two barriers to achieving the five-year outlook?

Committee members identified organizational, political, legal, and technical barriers to achieving the five-year outlook:

- There are tensions between the needs of transformational change and the political and legal reality in which we are embedded. Opportunities to integrate climate change may be limited by planning cycles. For example:
 - i. When boundaries are established, it is difficult to change them.
 - ii. The NPLCC's work may be out of sync with planning processes such as forest planning. Plans may be for five, ten, or more years.
- There is a lack of integration between economic and conservation interests.
- Our ability to sustain momentum as a partnership is a barrier. Working with many separate jurisdictions and over such a large geography make it difficult to be relevant to all. We are not necessarily creating the capacity to do the science we need to do.
- The NPLCC has a process and governance focus – a top-down effort – and does not balance it with bottom-up learning from the work they are doing.
- Funding is always a barrier, as is time and capacity for labor-intensive activities.
- It is difficult to do extension work well, but the extension approach is often suggested as a way to respond to climate change effects. There is a learning curve among farmers, ranchers, and the military.
- We need to learn how to manage a landscape with people on it.

7. What would you say are the top two opportunities to take advantage of to realize the five-year outlook?

Committee members identified collaboration, capacity-building, relationship-building, and resource management opportunities to take advantage of to realize the five-year outlook:

- The collaborative partnership already developed is a huge asset for expanding communication and interest in the NPLCC. Coordination with related initiatives such as NOAA's Habitat Blueprint Initiative may be productive.
- Build knowledge among entry-level positions that the NPLCC is a resource. Work with colleges and universities to educate them on what the NPLCC is, what it does, and what it can do. This includes bringing on college students to work with the NPLCC. Ideas include:
 - i. Collaborate with Climate Science Center (CSC) graduate fellows who are interested in doing more applied work. For example, the Pacific Northwest CSC Boot Camp has been a successful model for involving graduate students and early career professionals in climate change work. It helps them understand what a climate change career may look like. We could consider a similar model in Alaska.
 - ii. Extend the opportunity to work with LCCs to undergraduate students as well, for example through a foreign exchange student model in which students can work in other areas of the country or world.
- Build and maintain support from Congressional partners for the work we do.
- The NPLCC needs to make sure the results of funded projects and workshops are widely available and able to be used by policy makers and others. For example:
 - i. Continue to offer opportunities for organizations to understand how projects can be applied.

Steering Committee Discussion

Barbra Schrader, U.S. Forest Service, noted the items on the work plan are the same as those for the last 30 years and asked what is new and will really make a difference.

Frank Shipley suggested tool building would make a difference. John Mankowski added science management webinars can be used to help translate the science and increase capacity. Barbra Schrader suggested focusing on what is different because of the NPLCC and how to incorporate it into NPLCC metrics. She offered the emphasis on coordination and collaboration as one idea for what is different because of the NPLCC. Preston Hardison added we need to work on “front porch forums,” which are public forums with scientists and citizens in the room to galvanize climate action. He noted the Tulalip Tribes and partners held such an event at the Tacoma Dome. To make it work, the people working on and managing the land – the stakeholders – had to be involved.

Lora Leschner, Pacific Coast Joint Venture, noted S-TEK is the only committee with metrics, while the metrics mentioned earlier are to measure social change.

Terry Williams noted the science needs to be able to track the changes that are occurring in order for the NPLCC approach to be successful.

Lora Leschner noted one way to engage the “front porch” would be to issue RFPs for how to do the work.

Committee members suggested discussing the RFP at an in-person meeting. They noted social scientists are doing this type of work – reaching out to farmers, ranchers, and others – and could inform the NPLCC’s work. Mary Mahaffy added that a lack of social science has been identified as a gap among both Steering Committee and S-TEK Subcommittee members. Terry Williams noted the “no net loss” model is insufficient and there is work to move to a “net gain” model in the Puget Sound region.

Penny Mabie asked the committee if the proposed activities shown on the sticky wall were reasonable.

Terry Williams suggested the next Tribes / First Nations meeting be scheduled later in the year. Karen Kelleher noted September and October are hunting season for northern Alaska tribes. Steve Brockman, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, noted October is the best time in the fall for southeast Alaska tribes. Committee members agreed on an October meeting.

Committee members discussed when to hold their next meetings and decided to schedule them after receiving key deliverables from the Tribes/First Nations Committee and subcommittees. John Mankowski suggested holding phone meetings as needed, noting they typically occur every other month. Phone meetings were scheduled for late January to review the results of the 2015 work plan discussion and late February or early March to review pre-proposals. In-person meetings were scheduled for May and November.

Penny Mabie reviewed the 2015 work plan, noting there were many activities in the beginning of the year and fewer toward the end of the year.

Committee members discussed how to spread out 2015 activities to even out the workload and keep themselves informed of progress. They decided to move S-TEK’s evaluation framework and implementation plan to later in the year. They also spread out the Partnership Liaison Working

Group tasks over five months. The COR Subcommittee's development of communications metrics was also moved to March.

Penny reminded committee members of the locations of previous meetings and asked where the committee would like to convene for in-person meetings in 2015.

Keith Hatch suggested looking at the carbon footprint of different locations and deciding based on a low footprint. Mary Mahaffy noted meetings could take place outside the NPLCC region to be efficient with travel cost and time, such as the December 2012 meeting in Sacramento. Lora Leschner suggested a location near where prospective speakers live. Committee members suggested Vancouver, British Columbia and Juneau, Alaska as possible meeting locations, then agreed to meet in Juneau in May to take advantage of good weather and field trip opportunities. John Mankowski suggested Portland for November and committee members agreed.

Barbra Schrader asked for a way to refer to the NPLCC mission and seven goals, either a handout or posters.

Frank Shipley added it would be helpful to see how all the NPLCC goals, including those for each committee and subcommittee, fit together. Preston Hardison suggested flip cards would help demonstrate the relationships between goals.

Next Steps

Penny Mabie reviewed the action items from the meeting:

- **EnvirolIssues** will create a 2015 work plan based on the sticky wall and discussion
- **NPLCC staff and committee chairs** will organize a phone meeting at the end of January
- **Committee members** can contribute to MeetingSphere through November 14, 2014
- **Committee members** will send John Mankowski good meeting dates for January, May, and November 2015

John Mankowski thanked everyone for attending and previewed the activities for the rest of the week, including the 2-day conference for Alaska LCCs and the Alaska Climate Science Center, and Thursday's cross-Alaska LCC meeting. He encouraged those who can to stay for the week and adjourned the meeting.

Attendees

Steering Committee Members and Alternates

Barbra Schrader	U.S. Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station (Alaska)
Chris Tunnoch	British Columbia Ministry of Forests, Lands, and Natural Resource Operations
David Redhorse	Bureau of Indian Affairs
Debora Cooper	National Park Service
Eliza Ghitis	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Frank Shipley	U.S. Geological Survey
James Partain	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
Joe Hostler	Yurok Tribe (California)
Jolyne Lea	Natural Resource Conservation Service, Portland
Karen Kelleher	Bureau of Land Management
Karen Taylor-Goodrich	National Park Service
Keith Hatch	Bureau of Indian Affairs
Kim Hyatt	Canada Department of Fisheries and Oceans
Lora Leschner	Pacific Coast Joint Venture
Lyman Thorsteinson	U.S. Geological Survey
Lynn Helbrecht	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Marcus Miller	Natural Resource Conservation Service
Mike Tranel	National Park Service
Preston Hardison	Tulalip Tribes
Rebecca Anderson	U.S. Geological Survey
Rory Annett	British Columbia Ministry of Forests, Lands, and Natural Resource Operations
Steve Brockman	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Sue Rodman	Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Tasha Sargent	Canadian Wildlife Service <i>and</i> Pacific Coast Joint Venture
Terry Williams	Tulalip Tribes (Washington)
Whitney Albright	California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Others in Attendance

Dianne Soderlund	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (Alaska)
Josh Foster	Northwest Climate Science Center and Climate Impacts Research Consortium
Jeremy Littell	Alaska Climate Science Center
Stephen Zylstra	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Susan Alexander	U.S. Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station (Alaska)
Tami Fordham	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (Alaska)
John Mankowski	NPLCC Coordinator
Mary Mahaffy	NPLCC Science Coordinator
Meghan Kearney	NPLCC Communication Specialist
Penny Mabie	Envirolssues
Tricia Tillmann	Envirolssues