NEW IDEAS?!

* Integrate LCC info into existing agency processes – in the course of the planning process many (agencies) learn of the new information….we can do better at that (it’s an ad hoc process)

[Value of SECAS, LCD2(=NatureScape\_TRBScape)- so partners in TRB can show the value – how you get from the coarse scale.

“Hungry partnership that’s out there – to foster”

-----------

[FWS contribution to support… realm of uncertainty] – so how to build a bridge under 2-pathways (#1) with FWS-funding, (#2) w/o funding. What can we do to keep it perpetuated…What CRITICAL THINGS we need to function on?

PANELISTS:

Perry Wheelock-NPS, National Capital Region

* Project looking at comparative natural and cultural resource management. With UMCES, Tim Murtha, looking at cultural and natural resource management strategies above the park level. “2nd century resource stewardship strategy”, “thinking outside of silos within our own organization”. Advantages of work in Maryland and Virginia will benefit LCC as well.

Bill Uihlein- FWS-SE

* SECAS Blueprint is trying to better implement action across scales. SECAS has asked for a broad goal, are going through a process to define what that is. Want this by spring meeting in Feb. Integrating SWAP’s at risk species, increased demonstration of value for local implementation and decision making, social science looking at hunting and fishing. Shift moves away from LCC up to SNERLG and SEAFWA to help coordinate within geography.

Paul Johansen –WV-DNR

* Regional Conservation Needs Program, since 2006. NEAFWA recognized need for larger regional perspective in conservation action, 4% of each of state’s conservation grant money has gone towards this Regional Conservation Needs Program. Accomplished a lot, e.g. leopard frogs, hellbenders, standardizing terminology across region, 30-35 projects completed. Difference in overlap between NEAFWA and NALCC vs. SEAFWA and SALCC, vs. AppLCC.

Bill Jenkins – EPA-R3

* “cooperative federalism”: EPA will be assisting state and local agencies to achieve their priorities. As states are engaged with LCC, this demonstrates the value of the partnership to states for achieving their priorities, and helps EPA stay involved. From a structure perspective, if states are involved, and can say how the partnership helps them achieve their goals, this would be most helpful.

Bridgett Costanzo – NRCS-WLFW-NE

* WLFW included at-risk species across the country. Worked on priority species in their restoration efforts. Money goes through EQUIP. Working on a forest age class assessment: deliverable is decision support tool for placing young forest habitat across Appalachia for migratory birds. Opportunity to build technical team, design a quality project, integrate this work with AppLCC LCD. Proposed Hellbender project: been working on strategic targeting tool for deciding where to do projects, opportunities to overlap with other TRB projects. Put money with Region 4 and 5 of FWS and USGS, to look at developing better metrics for watershed restoration. Some money available for technology transfer for 2.0 partnership actions, related to Hellbender and Quail, though could be broader in certain ways.

Evan Crews – TVA

* TVA had been trying to bring people together across their geography in the TRBN, LCC fits in and helps with this work, a good marriage. Turns out bringing people together was the easy part, now working on bringing together diverse perspectives and stakeholders to find the common ground. Common interests include: seeking better funding, raising awareness about the unique biodiversity in region, focus on public education aspects of their conservation work. Joint LCC, TVA funding of Gillian’s fellowship, which was good investment, allowed them to better interface with partners and grow the organization. Report Card from UMCES for TRB, also Clemson researchers’ interest in downscaling the LCD to the TRB area.

Jeff Lerner – Healthy Watershed Consortium Grant Program

* Emphasis on protecting watersheds before they become degraded. Limited funding, so decided not to do direct land acquisition but rather focus on capacity building, building economic case for watershed protection, looking for ways to tap into additional funding sources, interested in assessments and tools that lead to action/protection on the ground. They are supporting land trusts to accelerate their conservation outcomes. Public/private partnership, funding the pieces to get to conservation.

What is this new partnership?

What does it need to function?

What is the role of FWS, with or without funding?

What will it take for you/your agency to commit to the partnership?