



North Pacific Landscape Conservation Cooperative

Partnership Development Brainstorm Meeting Summary
MeetingSphere
August 20, 2013

Contents

Welcome and Introductions	1
NPLCC Charter and Partnership Development	1
Partnership Engagement	2
Partner Needs	3
NPLCC Mission/Goals and Partnership	5
Partnership Involvement	9
Next Steps	10
Attendees.....	10

Welcome and Introductions

Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues facilitator, welcomed everyone Partnership Development Brainstorm for the North Pacific Landscape Conservation Cooperative (NPLCC). Penny discussed how to use the MeetingSphere technology.

Penny reviewed that the purpose for the meeting was to have a discussion about partnership development and engagement within the NPLCC.

NOTE: The Partnership Development Brainstorm used MeetingSphere, an online collaboration tool, which uses specific activities to encourage discussion about key topics. Participants write in comments and ideas as part of a discussion. For this meeting, participants responded to a series of questions related to partnership development. This summary captures the written responses to those questions.

NPLCC Charter and Partnership Development

John Mankowski, NPLCC Coordinator, gave a brief presentation to discuss how the NPLCC's charter discusses partnership development. The Charter calls for the establishment of a Partnership Liaison Subcommittee that would *consist of an array of the interested partners, agencies and organizations that are working on conservation and sustainable resource management on a large scale within the NPLCC area*. NPLCC Staff along with Chris Tunnoch, British Columbia, and Sue Rodman, State of Alaska, have been working to clarify the role and purpose for this group but have realized that it is important for the

Steering Committee to provide direction on the needs and functions for how best to engage partners currently not involved directly with the NPLCC.

Partnership Engagement

Are there important voices the Steering Committee is not hearing from or entities we're not talking with? Who?

- NGOs (Mary Mahaffy)
- Conservation partners (NGOs and others) (Dave Brittell)
- State and federal transportation agencies (Stephen Zylstra)
 - Marine highway system (Sue Rodman)
- We have some collaborative conservation organizations in BC that are not included, such as the SCCP: The South Coast Conservation Program (SCCP), established in 2005, is a multi-partner, landscape-level conservation program for the South Coast (or Lower Mainland) of B.C. (Tasha Sargent)
- We are a little weak on Northern California players (Frank Shipley)
- First Nations (Mary Mahaffy)
- Climate science producers in Canada (John Mankowski)
- Entities engaged in conservation actions (Lynn Helbrecht)
- Aboriginal Aquaculture Association in BC (Tasha Sargent)
- Private forest landowners (John Mankowski)
- Connection with other forums that are attempting to outreach just like we are.....joint ventures, climate centers, etc. (Dave Brittell)
- Agricultural community (Stephen Zylstra)
- Fish and shellfish producers (John Mankowski)
- Cooperative extension service (Sue Rodman)
- State agencies involved in resource management (Washington Department of Ecology, Natural Resources, Puget Sound, etc. (Lynn Helbrecht)
- Ecotourism industry (Chris Tunnoch)
- Recreation industry (Wayne Owen)
- I don't think we are engaging tribal governments very well (Wayne Owen)

- State DOTs (John Mankowski)
- Other Canadian Federal Agencies (Mary Mahaffy)
- Regional land planners associations (Stephen Zylstra)
- Bureau of Reclamation (John Mankowski)
- Entities involved in funding conservation (Lynn Helbrecht)
- Local governments, particularly coastal communities (Tasha Sargent)

Partner Needs

Is the Steering Committee representing/considering the needs of NGOs and other organizations or groups involved in climate change? If not, should you be?

- NGOs are participating on the S-TEK Subcommittee and are making recommendations to the Steering Committee for consideration (Mary Mahaffy)
- We should be considering how to incorporate needs of NGOs; however, it must be done efficiently because all are being asked to "participate" in various conservation forums too much. (Dave Brittell)
 - Maybe we could invite the NGOs to share their climate change interests or objectives to find out where we align and how we can leverage off one another (Sue Rodman)
- The NP LCC provides funding, which is important and is a need. We could provide more opportunity for NGOs to share their work to the board as well as each other - the NP LCC is a large area and I'm sure many NGOs would like to reach out to potential collaborators and peers. NGOs needs are mainly dollars and forums to share information and partner. (Tasha Sargent)
- Yes, especially when the needs of the NGOs overlaps with the needs of the representatives on the Steering Committee. We are doing so on an individual basis. (Barry Thom)
- Some NGOs have contacted me and asked 1) why they are on the Steering Committee; and if not, 2) how can they best influence/contribute to our work. (John Mankowski)
- The NPLCC could coordinate more directly to assist non-conservation regional planning and land managers as their work effects the success of conservation efforts (Stephen Zylstra)
 - I like the idea of leveraging by working those organizations who help to "enable" conservation outcomes - either through funding, planning, etc. (Lynn Helbrecht)
- S-TEK workshops have involved numerous organizations in developing science needs approved by the Steering Committee, but we need more work on linking to the resource management issues. (Frank Shipley)
- I would say "somewhat" (for example, the STEK and we had a presentation from an NGO at the Dec Steering Committee) - it seems to be opportunistic though rather than a systematic

approach, i.e., one which makes sure that we extend the invitation to participate to all we feel should have a voice. (Lynn Helbrecht)

- The LCC has a responsibility to make it clear to potential partners what it can offer. The NGOs and LCC need to understand their joint interests. These may not be immediately evident. (Barry Smith)
- Some state agencies not on the SC, have asked to be better connected, without a specific recommendation (John Mankowski)
- With closer coordination with some NGOs that provide funding (e.g., TNC, JVs) for conservation, the NPLCC could better leverage funding (Stephen Zylstra)

Do you, in your organization, consider the needs/priorities/contributions from NGOs or other organizations relative to natural and cultural resources or climate change? Why or why not? Is that answer different for the LCC? Why or why not?

- YES - the Joint Ventures rely heavily on NGOs for its science, decision support tools and other conservation tools. We consider their needs greatly as we rely on them a great deal to do the work on the ground. As a JV, I represent all of these groups with the NPLCC, so I feel their needs are met. (Tasha Sargent)
 - We have talked with NFHP and they are interested in partnering with the NPLCC and leveraging resources. We discussed looking at priorities that overlap and ways we can connect the different puzzle pieces especially as they do the work on the ground. (Mary Mahaffy)
 - Yes, EPA intends to collaborate even more with NGOs as we look at adaptation. Tribal organizations may be resources as well academic institutions. At times, NGOs may be more effective in establishing partnerships or current relationships with hard to engage groups and/or may offer new approaches. (Joyce Kelly)
- Yes, the FWS field offices do rely on NGO's for conservation planning efforts. I think the NGO's are aware and engaged on LCC efforts, although they may feel underrepresented (Terry Rabot)
- Yes, Alaska Dept of Fish & Game partners with some NGOs on select projects to join expertise on habitat, climate change and wildlife behaviors. We look at UAF's Scenarios Network planning for climate change and potential impacts to species and habitats. (Sue Rodman)
- I work in a science agency (USGS), and we frequently consider the needs of outside organizations both from the standpoint of users of the information, and as partners in carrying out the science...often the focus is Department of the Interior. The mission is different from the NPLCC mission in being wholly science. (Frank Shipley)
- Yes, Reclamation considers the needs of NGOs relative to climate change through various programs as it relates to water management such as the Basin Study Program (WaterSMART). There is some overlap with LCCs yet no consistency. Reclamation's S&T Program works with NGOs on developing new climate science. (Carri Hessman)

- For NOAA it's really a two way relationship where we consider the needs and priorities of NGOs in order to support them, but also rely on them to do a great deal of work on the ground. I don't think it should be that much different for the LCC. (Barry Thom)
- I have involved NGOs in workshops, and included others (state agencies, tribes, climate scientists) in a working group that developed recommendations for the Washington Integrated Climate Response Strategy. It seems that it depends on what it is you need to accomplish – design the outreach and engagement accordingly. Who needs to be at the table, or involved, in order for you to be successful? (Lynn Helbrecht)
- Yes, we work regularly with NGOs related to natural resources and climate change. We have agreements with NGOs to assist us in our work on these topics. As we set priorities for research, we ask NGOs as stakeholders to be involved. NGOs vary in their missions and have needs that intersect with ours in many ways and this in part strengthens our research. They also often are able to help us market, transfer, and in some cases develop our research for use. Seems like this would be similar for the LCC efforts. (Cindy Miner)
- Yes WDFW does; it may not be as systematic as it should be or effective.....currently a more sporadic effort based on conservation priorities at the time, staff participation time, scheduling. Cascadia Forum is a good example; supported by both GNLCC and NPLCC, good state agency, and NGO participation. (Dave Brittell)

NPLCC Mission/Goals and Partnership

Goal 1: Identify and address trans-boundary landscape-level natural and cultural resource information needs that the LCC is uniquely qualified to address

What do we need to do, beyond our Steering Committee and subcommittee work, to achieve this goal? Who needs to be involved?

- Who - TNC, Pt. Reyes Bird Observatory, land trusts?, EcoTrust, (John Mankowski)
- This will be especially difficult given the State of Alaska's reluctance to fully engage in LCC business. They are critical, but not willing to participate fully. (Wayne Owen)
 - If you would like to discuss some specific instances, we can discuss. (Sue Rodman)
- The Federal Subsistence Board is also a major player in transboundary issues in Alaska. (Wayne Owen)
- relative to who.....there seems to be "close family" connections with other USFWS sponsored efforts that fold in NGO and other conservation partners.....such as joint ventures, climate centers, etc. that we should solidify and strengthen first. (Dave Brittell)
- We need regular communication among the states, US/Canada, and Alaska (somewhat of a special case state). Perhaps a new forum (could be a working group of the Steering Committee) could address this issue. (Frank Shipley)
- In the S-TEK Subcommittee we have the opportunity for discussing small scale transboundary issues but organizationally how do we do this. Is this a working group or what? (Frank Shipley)

- Some transboundary issues are mediated or directed by international treaties, so often the state is the moderator for that and there can sometimes be contentious relationships between states and the federal government. (Wayne Owen)

Goal 2. Identify priorities for applied science and other information for conservation/ sustainable resource management

What do we need to do, beyond our Steering Committee and subcommittee work, to achieve this goal? Who needs to be involved?

- This, being science and information oriented, is a significant activity of the S-TEK, and while the involvement of other organizations in this activity could be enhanced, I don't think we need a new internal subcommittee to engage the question. (Frank Shipley)
 - Agreed - I'm not clear on what connections with universities the S-TEK group has, but I would think that is a sector worth involving (Chris Tunnoch)
 - I agree, we could strategically broaden the engagement of the STEK and meet these needs. Add NGOs, climate science producers in BC. (John Mankowski)
- I see value in obtaining input from or engaging climate science producers and NGOs, although not necessarily via a new subgroup. (Joyce Kelly)
- We have 35 to 40 people from across the LCC region that participate on the S-TEK Subcommittee that are not involved in the Steering Committee. (Mary Mahaffy)

Goal 3. Promote identification, use, and sharing of science, traditional knowledge, and other relevant information

What do we need to do, beyond our Steering Committee and subcommittee work, to achieve this goal? Who needs to be involved?

- Once we have products on our website – actively market the website/products to organizations who could make use of the information (Lynn Helbrecht)
- How can we engage the smaller tribal organizations? (Wayne Owen)
- Beyond tribal governments and tribal resource agencies, tribal heritage organizations in US and Canada may be able to make significant contributions to our mission. (Wayne Owen)
- Consider bringing in state Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs) re: cultural priorities and potential climate impacts (John Mankowski)
- Establishment of the Tribal Committee (underway) will be a big help for address TEK, and reaching out to a wider group of Tribes. Another activity that is underway, the creation of a data platform, will benefit the sharing of science and information. These and other ongoing activities could benefit from improved partnership development, beyond just the tools like the data platform. (Frank Shipley)
 - A new tech team is being created related to the data platform and GIS needs so expansion of that group to include other entities would help (Mary Mahaffy)

- Many of the tools identified in the NPLCC Communication Strategy can help advance this goal (John Mankowski)
- an idea that has been floating around with a few colleagues here in BC is the idea of a FN/Tribal forum on climate change...something like that could cover a lot of ground going forward...e.g. engaging more FN and Tribal communities from a "partner" perspective (Chris Tunnoch)
 - Alaska has an annual Forum on the Environment which is similar in concept to this idea (Sue Rodman)
- Our 7 TEK pilot projects should generate useful ideas on sharing TEK. Where, when, how, who. (John Mankowski)
- The Tribal Committee will help, however it seems like our progress is slow in getting the Committee up and running. Have we established any timeframes for this goal? Working with other tribal organizations and colleges may help our progress. (Joyce Kelly)
 - Are there entities such as Chugachmiut or Tanana Chiefs Conference in the lower 48? These organizations provide technical and land management services to native allotments; they conduct a lot of science / data collection on the lands they help manage. (Sue Rodman)

Goal 4. Promote coordination and efficiency of efforts among resource managers and science entities

*What do we need to do, beyond our Steering Committee and subcommittee work, to achieve this goal?
Who needs to be involved?*

- Perhaps create a list of common, large scale planning processes the partners implement so all understand what kinds of questions and analysis is involved, then get a commitment from partners to engage and involve the LCC in these planning efforts - with reports periodically to the SC on progress (Stephen Zylstra)
 - Agreed; there are numerous DOI endeavors and State planning initiatives that overlap in information requests. (LCCs and REAs come to mind with overlapping info needs with the Western Governor's Assoc. CHAT) (Sue Rodman)
 - This is a big one, and one in which the LCC has a unique position and perspective to offer. I'm not up to speed on what we are already doing in this regard, but I think activities that let others know what research projects related to climate change are underway throughout the region? Or if someone has already developed such a list - maybe we take it one step further and make sure that all on list know about each other? What regional or topic-related conservation initiatives are working on similar issues? (Lynn Helbrecht)
 - This may be the biggest challenge of all, since we are a cross-cutting, and not a chain-of-command organization. Communication and relationships are key, and a limiting factor is the lack of face-to-face meeting opportunities under strained budgets. (Frank Shipley)
- Host a pre-workshop before an RFP goes out, so folks have an opportunity to see who may be interested in similar proposals and possibly team up, or at least make an effort not to be

duplicative. (this happened to me in the last round! – I found out in the middle of preparing my grant proposal that two other groups were preparing proposals with some similar components and focused on the same geography. (Lynn Helbrecht)

- Similar to the CSCs, we plan on releasing pre-proposals to better link applicants proposing similar work - help make connections for full proposals/efforts (Mary Mahaffy)
- The biggest land use players are the USFS, BLM and the States so they would be first tier, but FWS, NPS, BR, Tribes, and some NGOs would also be likely players (Stephen Zylstra)
- Might be useful to compile a list of large scale processes and then develop a strategy for each relative to the NPLCC. Some we might list; but, need to take no action. Another (Cascadia Forum) might be supported via grant only. Another (joint ventures) might need LCC research or GIS mapping priorities to better align with their needs, etc. (Dave Brittell)
- Stronger linkages between agency and NOG conservation orgs can help create efficiencies. Folks are still working in silos and bemoaning limited budgets. The NPLCC can help forge this stronger partnership. (John Mankowski)
- I think we can do more to strengthen the connections between the NPLCC and USFS PNW and NOAA science. We have a great start but need to mature that relationship (John Mankowski)
- Stronger linkages within our own agencies and with partner agencies would be beneficial (Mary Mahaffy)
- Increasing information about products/actions of agencies/tribes/organizations in the NPLCC region on our website will be beneficial (Mary Mahaffy)
- The NPLCC should look at where it is uniquely suited and positioned to meet these goals. (Lynn Helbrecht)

Goal 5. Promote awareness and understanding of the effects of climate change on ecosystems, resources, and economies

What do we need to do, beyond our Steering Committee and subcommittee work, to achieve this goal?

Who needs to be involved?

- Connect at key intervals with natural resource-dependent business community to talk about climate change effects on selected economies (John Mankowski)
 - Agreed, and this may include community organizations/associations (Stephen Zylstra)
- Who - outdoor recreation groups and businesses (ski resorts), timber, agriculture, shellfish associations (John Mankowski)
- Mass and social media engagement has been a weakness of LCC communications. We can't make a difference if we are only talking to ourselves - REACH OUT! (Wayne Owen)
- Align and leverage our NPLCC effort with the national fish, wildlife and plants climate adaptation strategy which is entering its implementation mode. (Dave Brittell)

- Maybe consider local radio/TV or an NPR story that discusses the local effects but also how there are collaborative efforts like the NPLCC out there addressing them (Stephen Zylstra)
- Maybe plan to brief local and regional politicians with emphasis on how the NPLCC is working and can help (Stephen Zylstra)
- EPA will begin implementation of our climate change adaptation plan. Other agencies are already doing so or will also begin implementation. EPA's plan includes focus on awareness raising and promoting increased understanding of the impacts of CC. The NPLCC could focus on opportunities to leverage and/or support agency plans and NPLCC members can be liaisons. (Joyce Kelly)

Partnership Involvement

Given the discussions we've just had, is there a need to figure out how to involve additional groups in the NPLCC? If yes, how could that involvement happen?

- Like Dave Brittell pointed out, different groups may call for different strategies. Can some of these groups be combined based in common needs, and then develop strategies for these grouping of entities. (John Mankowski)
- We need the help of a public relations professional. Perhaps there is some help in the FWS national (Washington DC) external affairs or communications staff? (Wayne Owen)
- A list of outcomes and achievements so far would be very useful for demonstrating the value of the LCC (Barry Smith)
- Yes, but it will be important to pay attention to what we are trying to accomplish and design the involvement/solicitation of other groups accordingly. Engaging other groups to identify related initiatives will not look the same as engaging other groups to promote outreach about climate change, etc. (Lynn Helbrecht)
- Yes.....after compilation of the many and various forums; strategize on each the need and "how" of strong involvement. From that we might identify a group that needs to be invited to the NPLCC board, a steering committee, or an ad hoc NPLCC forum. (Dave Brittell)
- Are we open to adding a few more seats to the SC? (John Mankowski)
- Linked to Goal 4 - we need to inventory all the large planning processes and make sure we are engaging the associated partners. (Barry Thom)
- Yes, we need additional synergy with both wider and deeper engagement. We need to consider our organizational structure, and strengthen what we have; only adding new subcommittees when we are sure one is needed. We are still in a developmental phase (for example the Tribal Committee) so part of this is already happening, and can be helped by all of us renewing engagement. (Frank Shipley)

- The partnership forums currently in existence (4?) between the NP and GN LCC's are creating some good discussion and outreach at very local levels. These are good models for getting additional involvement (Chris Tunnoch)
- I'd like to have a better understanding about what groups are out there that we may want to engage. What would be beneficial for them and for the NPLCC? We could prioritize and develop an approach on how to involve them depending on the group. We may want to consider basic guidelines or principles for our engagement for outreach to various groups. (Joyce Kelly)
- How about picking one "group" and doing a test run or pilot? ie. a local or state transportation entity, engage them in a discussion and find out their interest. (Sue Rodman)

Next Steps

Penny discussed the next steps after this brainstorm is completed:

- The MeetingSphere session will remain open until August 30th so all Steering Committee members can add to the discussion on partnership development
- At the September Steering Committee meeting, a major focus will be to review the discussion from the MeetingSphere and begin providing guidance on a direction forward towards a Partnership Development Strategy.

Closing Remarks

John Mankowski thanked everyone for attending. The meeting was adjourned.

Attendees

Steering Committee Members and Alternates

Joyce Kelly	US Environmental Protection Agency (Pacific Northwest Region)
Barry Thom	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (Fisheries)
Cindy Minor	US Forest Service (Pacific Northwest Region)
Dave Brittell	State of Washington
Lynn Helbrecht	State of Washington
Tasha Sargent	Pacific Cost Joint Venture (Canada)
Terry Rabot	US Fish and Wildlife Service (Pacific Region)
David Patte	US Fish and Wildlife Service (Pacific Region)
Wayne Owen	US Forest Service (PNW Research Station – Alaska)
Sue Rodman	State of Alaska
Frank Shipley	US Geological Survey (Pacific Northwest)
Barry Smith	Canadian Wildlife Service (Pacific/Yukon Region)
Chris Tunnoch	British Columbia
Lyman Thorsteinson	US Geological Survey (Alaska), <i>Steering Committee Co-Chair</i>
Nancy Munn	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (Fisheries)

Others in Attendance

Carri Hessman	Bureau of Reclamation
Stephen Zylstra	US Fish and Wildlife Service
John Mankowski	NPLCC Coordinator
Mary Mahaffy	NPLCC Science Coordinator
Penny Mabie	Envirolssues
Angie Thomson	Envirolssues
Daniel Brody	Envirolssues