

FINAL Meeting Notes

California Landscape Conservation Cooperative Interim Steering Committee Meeting October 28, 2010

Attendees

Mike Allen, UC Riverside	Ted Meyers, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)
Alice Berg, (NMFS)	Bob Schaffer, CV Joint Venture
Diana Craig, U.S. Forest Service (USFS)	Debra Schlafmann, USFWS
Rebecca Fris, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	Rebecca Shaw, TNC
Beth Huning, San Francisco Bay Joint Venture	Karl Stein, Bureau for Land Management (BLM)
Rick Kearney, USFWS	Erik Vink, Trust for Public Lands
Mark Kramer, The Nature Conservancy (TNC)	

Facilitation Staff

Dave Ceppos, Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP)
Lora Barrett, CCP

Action Items

1. Deb Schlafmann, Mike Allen, and Mark Kramer will meet together to discuss selecting invitees to the Phase II Launch Workshop.
2. Deb will send a revised participant invitation list to the Interim Steering Committee (ISC) by next week.

Welcome and Introduction

Debra Schlafmann thanked everyone for participating in the meeting.

Rebecca Fris highlighted workshops that had recently occurred or are scheduled soon:

1. Rebecca recently attended a USGS Shoals Workshop attended by hydrologists, geomorphologists, and avian ecologists. Discussion at the workshop focused on what can be done to model shoal habitat and how sea level rise might affect shoals in the San Francisco Bay and the shorebirds and diving ducks that use that habitat. Outcomes of the workshop will be forthcoming.
2. The CA LCC funded a workshop on November 1, 2010, held by the Bay Area Open Space Council on climate change and potential impacts to San Francisco Bay biodiversity. Topics will focus on how climate research can support conservation planning. The San Francisco Bay Joint Venture (SFJV) will be sending a staff member to this workshop.
3. A workshop titled "Bridging the Gap" will be held at California State University, Sacramento on November 3, 2010. It will center on downscaling global climate change information to a

more regional and local scale. The workshop is filled to capacity for in-person participants due to high interest but it will be available via webcast. The focus is to connect managers and researchers. The link is on the California Landscape Conservation Cooperative (CA LCC) website: www.californialcc.org. At the workshop a focused panel will take place and will include Jay Chamberlin (State Parks), Bob Parris (USFWS), Maria Brown (NMFS), and Armand Gonzales (CDFG).

4. Beth Huning described the Upland Habitat Goals workshop which will take place in Oakland on November, 10, 2010. It will include a demonstration of a decision support tool that came from the Upland Habitat Goals process. More information will be on the SFJV website. (<http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/>)

General Update on Southern California / Central Valley Phase II Workshop

Deb described the purpose of the Phase II Launch Workshop, which is to expand California Landscape Conservation Cooperative (CA LCC) to the southern California and central coastal areas, as well as to include interests that did not or could not attend the March 2010 workshop (e.g. Sierra Nevada). Another purpose of the Phase II Launch Workshop is to inform all participants where CA LCC is going and describe the draft structure and approach of the CA LCC. Deb said she is targeting the end of January to hold the Workshop. There are some critical decisions to make in the near future.

Discussion: Phase II Workshop Participants List

Deb stated that she has received a lot of feedback from ISC members. The current list of proposed participants is over 300 people. She expressed the need to get a clear criteria set for who should receive an invitation to the Phase II Launch Workshop. She wants to reach as many people as she can at the appropriate level within their organizations. For the March workshop, the criteria was to include leaders within their respective organizations, and organizations that have state and national level responsibility. Deb stated that since March, she has told many interested and inquiring parties to “hold on” and that other venues are coming for participation. She expressed concern about making the criteria for this next workshop too narrow but recognized the same dilemma as the March effort due to size constraints.

Internal USFWS staff have advised Deb that the southern California partnerships tend to focus more on a local level and that she should acknowledge and honor that. Mike Allen said that a challenge in southern California is that most of the Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs) and Natural Communities Conservation Plans (NCCPs) are run by different entities (local, State, etc.) and that they are diverse.

Deb suggested that an invitation criteria should include participants who can speak on behalf of their organization. Bob Schaffer said that it sounds like they’re looking for the highest level of person in an organization. Beth agreed. Mike suggested that it would be helpful to better understand the work that will be done at the workshop. Deb referred to the draft agenda attached to her previous email and described the proposed January Workshop items.

Discussion: Agenda for Phase II Meeting

Deb asked about whether there should be breakout sessions. Beth asked Deb whether there was benefit to the breakout sessions in March. Deb stated there was a lot of variety in the results but that it was all over the map and of limited benefit other than to show that the LCC had a lot of start-up work to do at that time. Deb asked Dave Ceppos for his input as well. Dave concurred with Deb's description. Deb expressed concern about the benefit. Mike asked what the breakout sessions might cover and what the topics would be. Deb thought there could be smaller group discussions about goals objectives. Mike asked if there are specific items she'd want. Deb speculated that they could seek input on the purpose, goals, and structure. Another idea was to seek input on the Science Subcommittee's work on priorities for the coming year. Mike said that these don't sound like items worthy of a breakout session. Bob agreed. Rick Kearney stated that breakout sessions are a good way to get specific feedback on a specific topic. Ted Meyer suggested that breakout sessions would be problematic on items like purpose, goals, etc. Beneficial outcomes might not be achievable. He suggested that perhaps there could be information gathered about more local needs and that they could get good local insights. The local HCPs would be a good example of this as they see themselves as doing a lot of LCC-type work. Rick agreed.

Deb concluded that there may be benefit to having breakouts if there is a focus on getting information about local priorities and participants.

Revisiting the invitation criteria, Bob suggested having one person from each main organization. Beth said we should focus on having people participate that can represent other organizations. Rick stated that the trick is to ensure there is representation from someone that would otherwise not be represented or would not self-identify with other representatives. He used an NCCP or HCP as an example. Rick suggested a sidebar discussion to review the list of prospective participants. Deb, Mike, and Mark will speak together as soon as possible on this. Deb said that she will send out information on a revised list of participants within the next week.

Rebecca suggested that once a list of invitees is set, there might be benefit to surveying Workshop participants with questions that will help inform specific needs / approaches to be covered at the workshop.

Discussion: Location of Phase II Workshop

The following places were being considered for locations of the Workshop:

- Hyatt Mission Bay
- Paradise Point
- Tijuana Estuary Visitor Center
- Coronado City Hall (or maybe community center)
- County of San Diego Supervisors Chambers
- Various auditoria of UCSD, SDSU and USD
- Balboa Park Museum

Rick raised the point that the Department of Interior Secretary announced the start up of the Southwest Climate Study Center including University of California San Diego (UCSD) and Scripps as partners. UCSD and Scripps may have facilities available and this may be advantageous since they are now partners. Dave raised the issue that the facility must be able to accommodate food service. Deb agreed and said that will continue to be a consideration. Beth stated that she supports Deb's judgment.