

California Landscape Conservation Cooperative (CA LCC) Interim Steering Committee (ISC) Meeting Notes

March 31, 2011

Participants:

Lora Barrett, Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP)
Dave Ceppos, CCP
Ellie Cohen, PRBO Conservation Science
Diana Craig, US Forest Service
Rebecca Fris, CA LCC
Beth Huning, San Francisco Bay Joint Venture
Rick Kearney, US Fish and Wildlife Service
Fritz Reid, San Francisco Bay Joint Venture
Debra Schlafmann, CA LCC
Michelle Selmon, California Department of Water Resources
Karl Stein, Bureau of Land Management
Tom Suchanek, US Geological Service
Mike Tansey, Bureau of Reclamation

Action Items:

CA LCC staff will send ISC members a poll to determine the date/time available to have an in-person meeting regarding the Charter.

Agenda Review

Debra opened the meeting, welcomed attendees, and had introductions. Deb announced she and Rebecca will be attending the LCC national conference during the first week of April.

Open House

Deb reviewed the format for the CA LCC Open House on June 3rd. Current plans are to gather outside of Modoc Hall at Sacramento State for a few speakers to welcome everyone. Then there would be posters and information highlighting current projects downstairs inside Modoc Hall, and food and the currently funded project list on the second floor within the LCC office (Suite 2007). The purpose of the Open House is primarily to highlight the partnership among Sacramento State, USGS and the CA LCC. It also provides opportunity for mingling and highlighting projects that demonstrate what the CA LCC is doing. Deb asked for feedback on the format thus far.

Beth suggested that 30 minutes for speakers is too long. She suggested each speaker be given five minutes or less to greet the crowd and say a few things. Ellie offered to provide a PRBO representative, should one be needed representing a current NGO partner.

Rick asked if invitations were going out to the public and press. Deb mentioned that external affairs for USFWS and USGS have been included in the planning process. CCP has also been helpful in coordinating the event and will help with outreach. Deb asked that if there were external affairs representatives for any of the CA LCC partners that the CA LCC should keep in the loop, to please forward their contact information to her.

Steering Committee Structure

Debra thanked the subcommittee for their help with working on the charter. A draft charter was sent and a meeting was recently held to discuss comments. A couple key points from the discussion were 1) the subcommittee believes that there are too many membership slots on the proposed subcommittee and that 2) the subcommittee is not sure which of those slots should go away.

There was some discussion regarding the structure of other LCCs nationwide. Michelle commented that the Great Northern LCC has 25 members. The Pacific Island LCC has 29 members on their Steering Committee. Beth added that there are 27 members for the San Francisco Bay Area Joint Venture. Ellie suggested that a smaller executive board could be a voting body, and that a larger management board could help with recommendations. There was further discussion on the idea of having a multi-level membership. A consensus grew around the idea that those who are offered an opportunity to be a voting member should be able to meet certain criteria such as being able to bring something to the CA LCC. This could include dollars, data capabilities, or could be assistance with outreach. Voting members should be playing an active role for the CA LCC, and those members whose opinions should be represented but may not be able to fully participate should be given the opportunity for a different kind of seat at the table. Voting members should also be able to have influence beyond their own regional area.

Mike asked the group whether they believe there was enough representation from the Native American population. Deb mentioned that this seems to be an ongoing issue for all LCCs. There is not a person who has stepped up to represent the Tribes. Tom suggested approaching Indian Affairs. Rick cautioned that there may be tension between some tribes and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and that some tribes may not feel that BIA represents their interests.

Karl summarized that there appears to be two main questions before the substructure subcommittee; what is the organizational and governing structure / what do they do, and who can be a member. He expressed that some agencies within the Department of Interior such as Bureau of Land Management seem to fit more as a recipient of the CA LCC services, and do not have the science capacity to fully participate. He would be satisfied with being a general member.

Michelle brought up an example from another organization that has members and associate members. The members have voting rights and the associate members have the ability to participate through subcommittees and to attend the meetings. Ellie suggested that the ability to vote could be rotated, so that everyone continues to share information.

Rick offered that organizations such as the Cattleman's Association should not be forgotten in this process. They may not be focused on conservation, but have an interest in the same topics and may be valuable partners. There was further discussion on who the CA LCC may want to engage.

A suggestion was made that with a discussion of this complexity, an in-person meeting may be most appropriate in order to iron out the details. Deb brought up that she had hoped to have the first Steering Committee meeting at the Open House on June 3rd. She believes that even with an additional in-person meeting this deadline would still be possible. There was consensus that the task of setting up an organizational structure was important to get right, and that they will put in the time to get a strong structure in place.

Wrap-up / Check-in

Deb thanked the members for their participation. A Doodle poll will be sent out to the ISC members to determine the date/time that would be available for most people to attend an in-person meeting.