

**Appalachian LCC  
Interim Steering Committee Conference Call Notes  
September 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2011**

**Meeting Notes:**

**Agenda Item: Topic 1) To review the comments on the draft Governance document that the ISC has had in review this past month. Based on this discussion, the ISC will be asked to VOTE on acceptance of the revised Governance document as proposed or with approved changes.**

**Corresponding Handouts: Handout #1**

**Discussion:**

**Can an individual represent outside of their geographic boundary?**

Chuck S.: Two of our regions are part of the LCC and we have 15 forests in the boundary, how is the region defined?

Jean B.: Region 8 and 9 – agree to participate across regions and have one per meeting

Danny L: Where does USFS research come in on that?

Jean B.: Because this is interim, we invited the northern research station – they declined. The research section has one vote. Southern research unit is distinct and for the ISC you are treated as two separate entities with two separate votes because you both manage lands

David W.: Need to be clear because most of the entities sitting here need to be resource managers. Is everyone comfortable with this?

(Unidentified): Sounds like USFS gets two votes with this arrangement.

Diane P.: Doesn't the Northern get a vote?

Jean B.: Not at this point as they declined.

(Unidentified): Lines 270 – 244 thru 247 It says fed and state agencies only get one vote – but is that only for resource allocation votes?

Rick B.: What was the intent for voting? Originally outside of this document?

Jean B.: That each organization would have one vote. But further discussion there was concern for agencies that had large land responsibilities could make an independent votes per unit.

Rick B.: My understanding at the last meeting was that there were multiple people at the table but each agency would still only get one vote.

David W.: I remember that but the drafting team came up with this idea and it's up to the ISC to decide how they want to do business and choose between these two.

Tai M.: At EPA we do manage to sit together and come up with a reasonable unified position.

David W.: Remember that we are working at the landscape level and if we aren't managing at that level we are probably not on target.

(Unidentified): What is the standard across LCCs?

Rick D.: One agency or one state per vote in the South Atlantic LCC. A lot of discussion about how the states and agencies coordinate internally to ensure that the larger, broad-scale issues come up to the LCC.

Pat C.: We have three diverse regions and may not be able to come to consensus because we are all dealing with such diverse issues.

Rick D.: Logarithmic growth of votes.

(Unidentified): Agency level for a vote.

David W.: If our partners can't even come to consensus, then how could this steering committee? One agency one vote would make it easier to move forward and do management.

(Unidentified): Establish a committee that would review proposals coming in for allocation of resources?

Paul J.: Vote early, vote often. That causes some problems for people. I'm an advocate for keeping things simple. From the standpoint of the ISC. let's give each agency one vote. If we need to change it later, we can. This will encourage those agencies to work together offline.

David W.: The better solution would be one agency one vote. The document can be changed with the will of the vote. Does that work?

Tai M.: Second

David W.: Any arguments? Don't hear any and will make that change.

**Page 8 line 99 - Executive sub-team: Proposed structure: State, federal, partnering organization, conservation partnership like the bird and fish habitat joint ventures.**

**Clarification: Executive sub-committee = executive steering committee**

David W.: The executive sub-committee – only voting on behalf of the steering committee. Simply in place to do the work of the entire ISC between meetings.

Pat C.: Line 263 for the states: does this open the door for multiple votes?

David W.: We will go back and revise that. We will need to amend that and this will be one of the issues we fix when we vote.

Unidentified: Is it a given that we vote along priorities set up by the Appalachian LCCs? Will there be a strategic plan or list of needs that give us guidance that we vote along?

Jean B.: We are pursuing a process for identifying those needs and priorities. But the intent was to keep this a higher-level guidance document.

David: We make the modifications to the document and then schedule another conference call to vote.

Unidentified: Can we just respond electronically?

Mike L.: Since we decided that everyone has one vote, will we ask those states and agencies to designate the voting person? Will that be noted on the list?

Unidentified: USFS will need to consult with the other agencies. It makes sense for this designation to be made so that we can know who's on first. There is value in having the agencies decide on who will be the voting member.

Paul J.: Process wise, trying to get this structure approved. I'm almost thinking that at this point, let's just go ahead and edit it, send it back out – including everyone who's on the list so far and see how it shakes out and then if these additions get approved folks can go back to their agencies and figure out who the voting member is. I think we should send it out electronically for approval or disapproval.

**Agenda Item: Topic 2) Staff will provide and update on the status of the fall "Conservation Priority Science and Research Needs Workshop." ISC members will be asked to submit nominations to serve on the Workshop Planning Team and nominations of researchers or science-managers to participate at this workshop.**

**Corresponding Handouts: Handout #2 - showing flow chart of the Workshop Process; illustrative slides of Workshop Organization; Organizing framework to capture the AppLCC Science Needs Portfolio; Handout #3 – review of the current Science Needs Portfolio; Handout #4 - template to use in nominating experts to the November 29<sup>th</sup>-30<sup>th</sup> Workshop.**

## **Discussion:**

Jean B.: Nominations for the workshop planning team builds on the structure we presented in the Charleston meeting. We want to generate expert based recommendations that then go to the steering committee for prioritization and allocation. Proposed a November 29 and 30 workshop that would assemble experts to guide and identify what is the research portfolio across the Appalachian LCC. If the ISC or others nominees wish to participate in this structure. There is also a spreadsheet, which is illustrative of the type of nominees we need. Nominations are due within one week from today. Looking for 8-10 people. Most of the interactions via phone conference or webinars.

Paul J.: I thought Jean wanted a small planning team but I also hear that there is a need to fill the spreadsheet out. Are they different? When is the spreadsheet due? Could you provide a clarification email?

Jean B.: I will send out an email detailing the nominations needs.

Unidentified: How will the workshop planning team – plan the workshop and communicate?

Unidentified: Regarding the technical experts on the spreadsheet – what will be their workload expectations, what are they assembling to do?

Jean B.: Workshop – Has two hopeful outcomes 1) immediacy of top ranked activities or proposals to pursue for fiscal year 2011 funding. During the workshop, we have technical writing experts who are synthesizing and writing up the day's work. After the workshop, 15 technical leads would then do a compilation of each day's reports. So the ISC will get a full report and synthesis and rankings on the 8<sup>th</sup>. 2) Also to help develop an Appalachian LCC science portfolio to help direct how we allocate resources in off years. And start the building of our science foundation for the Appalachian LCCs.

Pat C.: I see this as deciding on the needs and the really big topics we need to go after. After this workshop, we can decide on the top areas. Then send out RFPs to have folks submit well-developed proposals. This group of technical experts isn't going to be the people putting together or doing the work.

**Agenda Item: Topic 3) Reminder and update on the ISC on the next in-person meeting, is now confirmed for Dec 8<sup>th</sup> to be held at the Inn at VT, Blacksburg VA. (Meeting logistics are still being worked out and will try to tag onto the AMJV annual meeting.) Closest airport is Roanoke.**

Jean B.: Face to face meeting at the Inn at Virginia Tech. Place where most everybody can drive.

**Agenda Item: Topic 4) Nominations for Vice-Chair and members to serve on the Executive Steering Committee will be presented. The ISC will be asked to vote and approve the nominations.**

Jean B.: Megan will be sending another email with the list of nominees and copies of their bios and photos. Voting for the Executive Steering Committee will take place at the face-to-face. Have another call in mid-January. Any additional nominees?

Vivienne: Nominated Rachel M., USGS.

Jean: Cannot nominate Rachel, as she is not on the ISC.

Unidentified: Danny L. nominated and declined.

Unidentified: Nominated Lisa H.

Mike Harris: I nominate Chuck Sands. Chuck accepted.

Group discussion regarding whether the balanced representation is required. Does not say that in the charter. Does it need to be the voting member?

Danny L.: Leave language like it is but let people vote on a whole slate of nominations. Leave them open for another week.

David W.: Nominations will be open for another week. Please get Megan bio information and photos up online and distributed.

Jean B.: If you have not already done so, (a) please confirm your willingness to serve on the Appalachian LCC ISC and/or (b) designate an alternate (standing or for this meeting only).