

**Appalachian LCC  
Interim Steering Committee Meeting Notes  
December 8<sup>th</sup>, 2011**

**LCC Administration - Meeting Notes:**

**Topic 3) AppLCC financial support for the Upcoming NEAFWA Conferences**

**Dave W:** We might want to contribute a small amount to be a sponsor the upcoming NEAFWA meeting in Charleston WV (April). I suggest that because there will be 500-600 people there from the Northeast and this will start to raise our visibility. Money would come out of project funds. I was thinking around the \$500-1000 sponsorship level? Does the group think this is a good outreach activity?

Clyde T: I think it's a good idea.

Tom S: What is going to be our policy for sponsorship? Are we going to sponsor all events, any event?

Paul J: WV is not coming to the table asking for money. But we would welcome the opportunity to provide some visibility for the LCC. We'd welcome the opportunity to feature the LCC even if you didn't give us the money.

**David W:** If group is not comfortable, just vote it down.

**Jean B:** In our governance document we specifically commit to supporting stakeholders and stakeholder events.

**No motions were made to propose funding. Issue was tabled.**

**Topic 4) LCC Boundary Change Requests**

**David W:** Regarding the boundary issues Jean has presented [a handout was distributed]– please refer to your handouts. We will decide how to respond to this together in the next conference call.

**Jean B:** Looking at the request from the NALCC to excise the northern thumb – one criterion is based on the biological base and there was considered to be no bio significance or impact in changing that boundary.

In the S. moving into the Appalachia basin.

On the Great Lakes/Northwest corner – three reservoirs in PA that may be tapped into as a potential resource for fracking so proposal was to include the drainage basin in the AppLCC.

The issue of the joint ventures, AMJV/CHJV/Ohio River drainage. The table handout is based on numerous consultations on the GCPO proposal to take that out of the AppLCC and the GCPO LCC.

**David W:** Question is - How would the ISC like to proceed in addressing this issue? Get a small group together to look at the boundary issues? Ask staff and the chair to spend more time and come back with a recommendation.

Clyde T: Small ones have staff deal with. The last one, leave alone and see what develops. There doesn't seem to be anything pressing related to that.

Bill R: Any pressing need to take action on any of them? The LCCS are supposed to have fuzzy boundary anyways.

**David W: I agree, I don't see any real reason to take action right now either, especially as we are all still developing and growing.**

Rachel M: Strong ops from the JV perspective?

Brian S: From the JV perspective, they've done a lot of bird modeling in that geography and that is why they are so invested. I support the idea of trying to put it back together from their perspective, but as long as we have strong communications, it doesn't matter where the lines are drawn but it is important we support the weaker organizations out there.

**Jean B:** Waiting has been our approach so far, but as we add partners we have confusion. Partners are wondering which LCC to align to and who they are supposed to talk to. National guidance says that the primary decision on boundaries should be biological, but beyond that considerations are on the LCC to develop.

Wendi W: This is not a Service decision but a DOI one that goes up to the SecDOI.

Rick B: If the parties can agree, then start operating that way while you wait for the decision. For the more complicated CHJV area to the west, that is more complicated.

**Jean B:** The coordinators have not yet sat down to figure out how the joint administration might work yet.

Who does the partnership talk to?

**David W: Asking several boards to figure that out is a tough challenge. If the coordinator's can come up with a recommendation and then give it to the board, that would be the way to go.**

Rick B: So that means, it is still within the AppLCC. There still needs to be coordination on issues and clarity, back and forth.

Bill R: Any opportunity for further modification to expand the Appalachian LCC? Where the boundary goes into Alabama it excluded where the actual Tennessee River goes through Alabama.

**Jean B:** Any request for boundaries needs to come through the ISC according to the governance document.

**David W: If we are going to write a proposal, we need to have the other LCC sign off on it. The only way to do this is to have staff sit down and figure out a recommendation for both steering committees.**

#### **Discussion Decision:**

Requests for boundary changes needs to be approved by the AppLCC ISC according to the governance document; for modest and mostly "administrative" changes proposed by neighboring LCCs the ISC delegated decision-making authority to LCC Coordinator.

In the case of the GCPO LCC proposal to keep the boundaries of both LCCs intact (i.e., administrative responsibility) but to allow the GCPO LCC to take over the partner coordination and planning work across for all terrestrial systems (i.e., functional responsibility) of a substantial portion of the AppLCC (mostly dealing with the state of TN and adjacent lower-plateau states that make up the CHBJV (Bird Conservation Region) Eastern “lobe”.) The ISC decided not to entertain the request from the GCPO LCC but to defer its decision until the AppLCC was in its own planning phase. In the mean-time asked staff to consult with GCPO LCC staff to better define how that actually be coordinated and achieve the higher vision of the LCC concept to manage at a landscape-level, across taxa, and across habitat types.

### **Topic 5) Proposal to hire a shared Conservation Communications Specialist**

**David W:** Many questions have arisen regarding how do you do in-reach to all the partners? How do you build tools? How do you look to this for information and know how. We don't have a communications plan yet, so know that. One of the ideas that we came up with for the AMJV, who has no communications person, was to share a position. If we decide we want to do that, that money would need to come from our project money. FWS doesn't have the salary money to pay for that. We would commit up to half of the high amount if the LCC wanted to commit to this at this time. We could jointly share and address that need.

? : Looks like AMJV has a communications plan? (Brian S: No, but will have one soon.) How do we develop a communication plan then?

**David W:** I can't provide you with a communications plan for the AppLCC, as many have expressed interest in. Is there a motion to move this forward.

Brian S: Tasks from Ops Plan for JV came out pointing to communications and specific tasks in addition to those on list.

**David W:** This person would be the one to coordinate development of a communication plan with AMJV. This LCC has little staff; 3 people but only one is full time. Weber approved 2 years for Science Coordinator but we still have only half communication support from RO. Jean may want to talk about communication needs we have now?

**Jean B:** It's communications but really facilitating communication with COPs, others. In addition to traditional communications it is also workflow for our COPs and our ability to be represented at larger forum; Brian and I are already turning down requests to speak at Land Trusts, other venues. Most importantly, it allows Megan's reach to extend to makes sure we're well integrated with partners and national LCC. Continues flow of dialog exchange. Many levels that we'd rely on this staff person to help us with.

Jim S: 2 year commitment?

**David W:** Yes, 2 year. We're not able to take on full financial responsibility or bigger commitment than 2 years.

**Wendi W:** I support this. Need for prioritization re: what this person works on. Intense need to communicate early on all aspects of our work. We are asking this person to do a lot. Another communications person in addition to Megan will require more dialog on responsibilities for JV vs. LCC.

Mike H: Can we see a work plan before we make that decision?

**David W:** We'd need staff to develop a full SOW very soon. [Staff passed out a list of duties for LCC & AMJV. Read to phone participants. Whitehurst read duties for LCC and JV.]

**So moved by Clyde T. Seconded by Paul J.**

Rachel M: It's a great idea.

Doug S: How does the LCC develop so that we can take advantage of this person and develop a communications plan? The JV used to have the capabilities, we don't anymore, and we are suffering for it.

**David W: We would be trying as much as possible to coordinate those jobs.**

**Call to Vote: Anonymous consent.**

**Next ISC meeting: May vs. June or a doodle poll? DW: We will email ISC.**