



North Pacific Landscape Conservation Cooperative

S-TEK Subcommittee Meeting Summary

October 12, 2016

Attendees: Mike Cox (EPA), Nicole DeCrappeo (NW CSC), Eliza Ghitis (NW Indian Fish Commission), Debbie Hart (SE AK Fish Habitat Partnership), Jennie Hoffman (Adaptation Insights), Peter Kiffney (NOAA), Linda Krueger (USFS), Frank Lake (USFS), Chris Lauver (NPS), Kathy Lynn (Univ. OR), Eric Mielbrecht (EcoAdapt), Louise de Montigny (FLNRO), Steve Morey (USFWS), Miriam Morrill (BLM), Tory Stevens (B.C. Parks), Chris Tunnoch (FLNRO), Jen Watkins (Conservation NW), Andrea Woodward (USGS), Meghan Kearney (NPLCC), Mary Mahaffy (NPLCC), John Mankowski (NPLCC), Tom Miewald (NPLCC)

Overall S-TEK Meeting Presentation – presented by Mary Mahaffy ([link](#))

- A 5-Year Strategic Plan for the NPLCC is under development and will be discussed by the Steering Committee at their Nov. 30 – Dec. 2 Steering Committee meeting in Vancouver. A draft with measurable objectives will be out soon. [The new, expanded NPLCC Mission has been adopted by the Steering Committee:](#)
 - In the face of a **changing climate and other landscape-scale stressors**, the North Pacific Landscape Conservation Cooperative supports development and application of useful science; we coordinate and disseminate that science; and we serve as a convener to further collaborative efforts to inform and advance landscape-scale conservation and sustainable resource management.*
- Possible objectives that will be included in the Strategic Plan are the following:
 - Facilitate and support landscape planning
 - Promote/support climate adaptation planning efforts
 - Determine and prioritize the information and support gaps the NPLCC can most appropriately address
 - Convene and support activities/projects that address trans-boundary natural and cultural resource opportunities and/or barriers to landscape-level conservation
 - Establish the ability for the NPLCC partnership to respond to new opportunities.
- A vote is out for the Steering Committee to decide if the Steering Committee will be expanded to include one representative from the 5 National Fish Habitat Partnerships in the NPLCC geography and NGOs (3-4 seats). A decision would be made by October 14th. A preference will be given to NGOs that meet the following criteria:
 - Work collaboratively on natural and/or cultural resource science, conservation, management activities within the NPLCC region
 - Share a common vision with NPLCC and seek to advance common conservation goals
 - Can represent a larger geographic coverage and/or function in a consortium role for numerous NGOs
- During the discussion about the expansion of the Steering Committee, Debbie Hart commented that she was excited to have the Fish Habitat Partnerships engaged with the NPLCC in this new role. The inclusion of NGOs was also considered an important and needed step for the NPLCC.

- *Update Note - the Steering Committee has approved to include National Fish Habitat Partnerships in the NPLCC geography and NGOs on the Steering Committee.*

PNW Coast Landscape Conservation Design – presented by Tom Miewald ([link](#))

- The Pacific Northwest Coast Landscape Conservation Design covers a broad geography along WA and OR coasts and includes the lower Columbia River (see presentation for a map). A project plan has been developed. For more details visit the project website ([link](#)).
- A question was asked about how connectivity is being defined for the project and if they are thinking about historical conditions when assessing future conditions. Tom’s responses were the following:
 - They are including all sorts of connectivity – landscape, terrestrial, aquatic habitat, etc. They are focused on mix of landscapes and habitat. Not going to go deep into freshwater connectivity world because there are already pretty solid workgroups addressing this (especially as it relates to salmonids, culverts, etc). They are looking at a mesoscale level that includes permeability and barriers across the landscape.
 - They are considering historical conditions. The framework being used is Open Standards which has a solid way of looking at key ecological attributes of targets. Knowing with climate change we have to consider that it will be different. Think about if we manage for historic or significant CC impacts.
- A question was asked about how we are thinking about leveraging social network analysis and how it might connect to strategy development. We should be able to develop strategies based on the social network analysis and identify current nodes of communication and information transfer and where we can strengthen them. We are working with a contractor Ken Vance-Borland (Conservation Planning Institute) to design a questionnaire; however, we have to go through OMB approval process for surveys which will take several months.

Cascadia Partner Forum – presented by Jen Watkins ([Link](#))

- The Cascadia Partner Forum, created in 2012, is a network of natural resource practitioners in Washington and British Columbia’s Cascade mountains that prioritizes building adaptive capacity of the landscape and species living within it.
- Four priorities have been identified:
 - Ecological connectivity – terrestrial and aquatic
 - Water
 - Conservation Targets from the Great Northern LCC Science Plan present in Cascadia prioritized for coordination and planning: Bull trout, Canada lynx, Grizzly bear, Salmon, and Wolverine.
 - Access Management
- The next WildLinks will be held in early Nov. and they will begin development of conservation priorities/targets for the NPLCC. They will likely build off of existing priorities because a good set with aquatic and terrestrial ecosystem processes already has been identified for the GNLCC.
- They will hold a webinar in mid-late November to receive broader input on the priorities identified during WildLinks and they should have a plan in place by the end of the year.
- B.C. is early in their thinking and their aim for WildLinks is to bring more people from BC together and settle on a way to approach this on a Provincial level. More coordination is required for the needed conservation planning and BC is working towards that with American partners and colleagues.
- Both Tory and Chris commented that without Jen, this effort wouldn’t be as on track or succinct.

Strategy for Identifying Priorities: examples in Mary's presentation ([link](#))

- Two processes were presented and discussed – narrowing priorities using a matrix format or using an Open Standards process to identify priority targets and goals.
- Using a matrix, current priorities included in the S-TEK Strategy and new priorities would be evaluated in a similar way as to what we did for the 2012-2016 S-TEK Strategy. The framing questions we developed at our in-person meeting would be used in the evaluation along with any other criteria developed to narrow down the selected priorities. The framing questions (detailed definitions are available online for August 22, 2016 S-TEK meeting) are the following:
 - What are the most immediate conservation needs across the NPLCC landscape?
 - How valuable is this information for managers and other decision makers?
 - How critical is it for the NPLCC to focus on this type of work?
 - Is there relevant work of this type already being done by others?
- Using an Open Standards process, priority conservation targets and goals would be identified then a theory of change or event change would be developed. We're dealing with things across broad landscapes that are difficult to measure. Open Standards tries to find a way to look at long term goals and objectives that you can measure. The framing questions we developed will be used for this process too, just not as part of a matrix.
- A question was asked if we would select a few narrow targets at the beginning and see how it works over 5 years. Also, if we could stop half way through the 5 year Strategy if it isn't working. The response was that yes we want to narrow our targets to a few and evaluate along the way to see if the process (and targets) we have selected is working.
- One S-TEK member responded that an Open Standards approach is a lot more satisfying than what we did before because it provides a better context behind the issue being addressed. She liked the idea of having a goal and developing possible strategies. She said it would be intellectually satisfying.
- A request was made for hearing case studies so we could learn from them.
- Frank Lake discussed a process that TNC led in the western Klamath Basin. They worked with the Karuk Tribe and several agencies and organizations to develop a tool kit to use for addressing climate adaptation in their 1.2 million acre area. The Open Standards process was effectively used as an adaptive process to go from guiding principles to understanding shared values and geographic interests. Frank said the process was very objective and engaging.
- It was noted by one S-TEK member that he thought we would be better able to define metrics if we establish goals which should give us insight for the products we support.
- **S-TEK decided to try using the Open Standards process to identify priority conservation targets, threats, and goals for the 2017-2021 S-TEK Strategy. We will learn more about this process at our next meeting.**

Tracking Project Accomplishments: [draft table](#)

- Overall the project tracking table was well received and people liked the template. It is considered a wonderful step in the direction of capturing information on how to measure success.
- It was recognized that a lot of work needs to be done to address the last two columns in the draft table (*Use of products* and *Specific Outcomes*). How can we manage this going forward? Is it realistic to expand and continue? Follow-up calls for all the projects are needed. Mary responded that it will take a lot of work and this is something we may need to get assistance with using a contract or a student intern to get us at base level with all the past projects.

- **Recommended additional columns to add:**
 - **Strategies Used:** for example Social Network Analysis, etc.
 - **Challenges:** include challenges both during implementation and at the use level. Any challenges along the way.
 - **Hypothesis of the theory of change** (a shorter heading will need to be identified): how did we think the projects would be used and how were they actually used. Was our hypothesis supported?
 - Include communication used in the project and did that help make something happen
 - Differences are expected for older projects versus newer projects
 - **Recommendations:** Recommendations from PIs about how to build on work completed in the project or how their products can be developed further; link them up with other data needs for example. Include recommendations for next steps.
- Allison Meadows, Univ. of Arizona, has been doing project evaluations for SW CSC and maybe NW CSC next – she’s looking at science process and content variables. She’s a social scientist and it would be worth looking at what she is doing (*Mary will follow-up with her*). Would be interesting to capture, how we thought the project would get used and how it actually was used. i.e. was our hypothesis accurate.
- Eric asked if we are connecting the information included in the table with the metrics we developed last year. Mary responded that yes several of the columns were from the metrics. Some of the metrics didn’t fit the table well so weren’t included. People were encouraged to let Mary know if they thought there were other columns that should be added to the table.

Round Robin

- Eric reminded everyone that the National Adaptation Forum is May 9-11, 2017 in Saint Paul, Minnesota and full session proposals were due on Oct. 14th. Posters, Tools Café and oral presentations can still be submitted ([link](#)).
- Eric shared that EcoAdapt is working with the Commission for Environmental Cooperation (includes Canada, U.S., and Mexico) to help develop a tool kit to integrate monitoring for marine protected areas up and down the coast.
- Kathy Lynn shared that there is a technical input process for the National Climate Assessment and there will be different kinds of requests for information. They will be offering tribal mini-grants across country. She will share more as it becomes available and hopes to have a listening session in November.
- Linda shared that she just attended a conference in Spokane on partnership opportunities (WA, OR, MT, AK, BC and Alberta included). Intertribal Timber Council and American Forestry Association participated. Topics included case studies of partnership in forest management (what’s being done; are we doing enough), First Foods, Project Learning Tree, and sessions on workforce development. Great meeting with tribal involvement. Contact Linda if you want more info.

Next S-TEK Meetings

Please provide your availability by October 24th on the doodle poll included in the email for a 2 hour call in November and a 2 day in-person meeting in January or February. Per our discussion:

- The November S-TEK meeting (2 hour call/webex) will focus on the 2017-2021 S-TEK Strategy (presentation of a case study using Open Standards to select priorities).

- A 2 day in-person S-TEK meeting will be held in Jan. or early Feb, likely in Seattle (possibly Portland). We recognize that not everyone will be able to travel so anyone not able to join in-person will be able to join remotely via phone and a webex.