**Notes Section-7- Brainstorming** **2:00– 4:00**

**Afternoon Brainstorming Sessions**

What guidance can we offer to the National and **Regional Conservation Efforts**?

What priority request for **science delivery** (application/staff-fellowship) and **Project-level support** across the region if FY18 Allocations available?

How can our science partners **keep the vision & forward movement** on this important conservation agenda: i.e., contribute to the larger and longer-term vision of advancing the art/science/fellowship of system-conservation?

**Greg Wathem, TN** (based on conversation with Bill Uihlein, FWS R4 SA ARD) – SA will be funded in FY18 close to FY17; staff at least in R4 FWS intact and will continue to work on FWS priorities identified as SECAS (if states agree), at-risk species. Also funds for projects TBD. One big hurdle would be if it would fund an outside agency ($50K cap on review by DOI).

**Dan Odess, NPS** – DOI perspective, must articulate what is public benefit; different review of contracting and cooperative agreements than in past – push toward contracting.

**Jean Brennan, FWS** – We no longer have LCCs or therefore LCC boundaries and therefore this partnership is in two geographies of FWS and must manage/operate accordingly.

**Dan Odess, NPS** – Suggest we ask Jean to seek clarification about how FWS R5 and R4 will make funding decisions for our partnership’s 15 states. Will need help from state partners to help to get this information and advocate to FWS. Secondly, from taxpayers and agency point, $1M web portal needs to be supported.

**David Whitehurst, VA** – Not sure we have a strong advocate for Appalachia. If NE tries to keep LCC staff from NALCC, then redirect to NE priorities of FWS we could lose Jean’s expertise.

**Paul Johansen, WV** – Shed light on what he heard at NE Conf. What will be key to moving this forward (beyond AppLCC) is governance structure; AFWA taking charge of thinking on this. Interest in keeping landscape conservation moving forward driven by Regional FWS and AFWA. Clear recognition of partnerships as well, but have not figured out their role. Advocated for Appalachian partnership, not just NALCC. Genuine interest in keeping good work here in Appalachia going; focus on forward-planning; maintain tools & products.

**Greg Wathem, TN** – capacity of Coordinator plus GIS support can’t continue; Appalachian has enough support to continue but need to support SWAPs;

**Evan Crews, TVA** – would state of TN cost share on that modeling?

**Greg Wathem, TN** - We could apply soe staff towards the down-scale modeling; maybe section 6 funds? Also don’t forget about CCS’s, SE one now includes Univ of TN so it’s on their radar; Governor of TN has new task force on water conservation.

**David Whitehurst, VA** – we’ll also got SWG process and that may be open now; as a partnership we could apply for TRB modeling.

**Evan Crews, TVA** – I would support that.

**Rick Durbrow, EPA** – EPA wants to support state needs but also recognizes need for partnership to focus beyond species and habitats; time to apply what we’ve learned; science tools plus LCD. Lastly, the partnership moving forward needs to be ready to pivot based on output from AFWA over coming months.

**Iara Lacher, Smithsonian** – a lot of science, data developed and we talked about down-scaling to local efforts; need to show groups-up support. Don’t need to pursue new projects right now but instead to focus on dissemination on tools that could be most helpful to decision-makers. Where can this partnership help through our past investments. We need to show ground-up response. Not creation of big information, but application, so identify for local entities what have they invested in already, and where can the AppLCC help with preserving their information?

**Tom Akre, Smithsonian** – Lacking direct history, process of creating LCCs and partnerships together brings about landscape-level thinking, but that immediately also brings responsibility to down-scale. Brings up issue of delivering the science/science tools and also deliver the application of those tools (facilitating delivery and supporting that delivery); down-scaling the tools to community level. We’ve unpacked the spectrum of what we could be, and it seems that value of iterating new science and the insights it supplies can be achieved through the drill-down to smaller landscapes.

**Tom O’Connell, USGS** – We seem to have support for continuing to disseminate our science products, but need to identify specifics and an amount to keep moving forward. So: what products would we pursue in FY18, and how to pursue? 1) maybe we need a list of products and think about which ones are priorities. Secondly, do we need a coordinator person to allow us to continue either the Project Manager as described in paper summarized by Gasset; either an interim Fellow would be cheaper.

***Action Item:*** *1) compile list of existing tools, information and then prioritize which ones will be important moving forward. Make a plan to apply tools in conservation contexts and train conservation practitioners. 2) seek funding for program manager position.*

**Jean Brennan, FWS** – regarding stock-taking that’s a discreet SOW and we need it done plus cost estimate; partnership can request that. I’m closing up everything now into a discreet package. Don’t have GIS or modeler now so limited skill set.

**Evan Crews, TVA** – completion of a down-scale could demonstrate applicability of tool.

**Dan Odess, NPS** – can we request Jean to do this assessment of our tools and devise a plan for disseminating our science project.

**Kendrick Weeks, NC** – integrate with the cultural with natural resources

**David Whitehurst, VA** – first one to address cultural in a strong way; highest biodiversity;

**Kendrick Weeks, NC** – isn’t part of that …

**Dan Oddess, NPS** – don’t limit it to coordinator and a bit of project money; I’m concerned that in R5 someone might be making plans to re-direct Jean’s staff time. I think we need to make it clear that we need Jean’s continued support and 8 years of institutional knowledge.

**Jean Brennan, FWS** – since it’s a Greater Appalachian partnership, we can’t just expect R5 to support it. You can identify discreet tasks but have to say the Partnership needs help in these realms (not short-term…). Needs dedicated focus 2-5 years and what contribution can FWS make.

**Kendrick Weeks, NC** – I recommend asking for support from both Regions; share with AFWA.

**Paul Johansen, WV** – could send letter from a state agency (Gwen?) laying out our plan and sending to RD and ARD cc’d. I’m comfortable with that approach. Issue of support for Jean is a longer-term and I’m comfortable with a strong letter of support for Jean’s work going to R5 since that’s where she’s housed. Not sure where we are with Resolution but regarding TRB since most of it is in R4, maybe we need to approach R4 as well (here’s our partnership, why it works and is important) – I’d have no issue with supporting that. Need for short-term requests, “we understand there are funds available and here’s what our priorities are…” and also a letter of support for Jean to R5.

**David Whitehurst, VA** – I think we can make a powerful argument for TRB modeling, have partnership support for that. Can make a strong request noting at-risk/listed species concentrations in TRB in VA and south into R4. Coming from arguably the best conservation design available to demonstrate how to move to down-scale/local step and that hasn’t been done and is the answer to the criticism of relevancy of LCC work.

**Jean Brennan, FWS** – WV is uniquely placed in that it is also wholly within the MARXAN modeling. We could use WV as our state-centric demonstration of down-scale. My question is would that be of interest to WV?

**Paul Johansen, WV** – I think it would have great merit; a proposal that focuses on SGCN and if WV would use as a model. Might also consider a multi-state region in NE. Can’t be focused on the tool itself, has to really make a difference in on-the-ground conservation to resonate powerfully.

**Evan Crews, TVA** – another benefit of the TRB watershed modeling would be to marry up SWAPs, watershed plan of FWS, TVA aquatic data, etc.

***Action Item:*** *1) write a letter to USFWS conveying the partnership’s need to keep (former Science Applications) staffing capacity; 2) write a second letter asking for continued support for partnership, initially just to “leep the lights on” but ultimately to continue to develop projects and advance science. These letter will be best advanced by State Agency representatives.*

|  |
| --- |
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| What priority request for **science delivery** (application/staff-fellowship) and **Project-level support** across the region if FY18 Allocations available?   * *(*[*TRB “Downscale” Modeling Proposal*](http://applcc.org/partner-developments/whiteboard/research-proposal-drs.-daniel-hanks-rob-baldwin/view) *and Partner-support)* * *([NatureScape tool suite](http://applcc.org/research/applcc-funded-projects/interactive-conservation-planning-and-design) &* [*on-line training resources*](http://www.scienceapplications.org/enrol/index.php?id=16)*)* * *(Dec Workgroup: “*[*Partners Use and Application of Funded Science Products & Tools*](http://applcc.org/partner-developments/partner-resources/work-group-materials/acp-work-group-4.-evaluation-of-existing-tools-and-their-value-to-partners)*” and also available summary of funded products ( a quick-read of* [*fact sheets*](http://applcc.org/cooperative/applcc-outreach/applcc-fact-sheets/applcc-fact-sheet-collection)*) or* [*full listing*](http://applcc.org/research/applcc-funded-projects)*.)* |
| How can our science partners **keep the vision & forward movement** on this important conservation agenda: i.e., contribute to the larger and longer-term vision of advancing the art/science/fellowship of system-conservation?   * + *(*[*Scaling Up SECAS*](http://applcc.org/partner-developments/partner-events/secas-southeast-conservation-adaptation-strategy/scaling-secas-2013-engagement-is-key/view) *– paper at the Special Session of the North America)*   + *(proposal: focal review and synthesis towards an Open Letter / science paper – Note: have posted an example of the Charles Baxter “*[*Open Letter*](http://applcc.org/partner-developments/partner-resources/open-letter-to-the-fws-directorate-by-charles-baxter-2006/view)*” the FWS Directorate 2006.)*   *Reference Material Hotlink:* |
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* + *(see Dec Workgroup - “*[*Project Manager PD”*](http://applcc.org/partner-developments/partner-resources/work-group-materials/acp-work-group-3.-plan-for-project-manager)*)*
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