

## 2016 Survey: AppLCC Steering Committee & Partners (Aug)

### REVIEW & IMPROVE:

Number of Year Participating

1 <sup>st</sup>	25%
2 <sup>nd</sup> -4 <sup>th</sup>	22.9%
4 <sup>th</sup> +	52.1%

### Q3 Identify your organizational Representation

Federal	37.5%
State	14.6%
Regional Partnership	16.7%
Non-profit org (stewardship)	6.3%
Non-profit org (policy/advocacy)	4.2%
Other (Tribal, University)	8.3%

**Q4 SUCCESS: Reflecting on the past several years (at the end of its 1st "develop" Phase), answer the Question: "What's been working?"**

### PARTNERSHIP – Serving the LCC Community & Engagement Roles and Communications (*Enhancing the Partnership*)

1. constructive cooperative attitudes of partners, stakeholder driven priority development, progress made on many projects, a lot accomplished notwithstanding limited resources
2. Collaboration with the scientific community on research products and tools.
3. Collaboration
4. I believe that there is a synergy between the participants; there is allowance for open, candid discussion; the information flow from the LCC staff has been fantastic; there are products on the table to boast about; there is a vision guiding us; the meetings are well attended; the participants are still very interested after 5 years of engagement; the LCC has persisted for 5 years!
5. communications, common research projects, establishing relationships
6. The collaborative evolution has been great; passionate staff;
7. Participation in steering committee meetings from reps across most of the landscape (some key gaps though). Good research products. TRBBN Partnership.
8. The AppLCC has served well as a coordinating body for disparate conservation partners across an expansive area. The ecological assessments and other scientific endeavors would likely have not been accomplished through any other source.
9. Collaboration, research funding, tool development

10. Communication among many partners
11. (LCC) capacity as an umbrella organization has worked well. This is reflected in the science projects that have been funded in order to support multiple organization needs
12. Engaging diverse partners, filling science gaps, disseminating information to partners, high quality of projects and communication, tackling important topics for the region
13. Inter Agency Coordination, identifying landscape level challenges and threats
14. Communication with ongoing ALCC initiatives/activities to steering committee members has been strong via electronic communications,
15. Work of AppLCC and Partners visiting the web site for information sharing
16. I'm not that familiar with the products from the AppLCC. I think the website has been organized well and is effective in communicating with others.
17. Webex Conference Calls

## **SCIENCE FRAMEWORK – Foundation & Forum**

### **Science Products and Delivery (*Science in the Hands of...*)**

18. The AppLCC's biggest contribution from our perspective is in the delivery of a framework to collaborate on science-based conservation.
19. The science of the App LCC is innovative, well marketed, and strong. The conservation design process is compelling, and has had an impact already. The conservation fellow partnership with TVA is a cool idea.
20. Producing some specific science products, and making the products of partners more readily available.
21. Development of base line science and the science to develop priority conservation areas for investment
22. The tools developed in the first phase should prove to be useful to cooperative members and the activity at finer scales within key geographies has been successful.
23. The foundational components and development of the scientific expertise to support the other tools, information delivery.
24. The ALCC has supported excellent research to help guide and target conservation projects.
25. Great stream products on flows and stream classification
26. Developing the science tools that were needed as the "base layer". Other tools such as the Riparian Restoration Tool have been particularly useful to the Eastern Brook Trout Joint Venture.
27. Good research projects focused on ecoregion
28. The LCC has funded several important research projects and tied them together into a nice webpage

29. Developing key tools and resources that target the conservation communities' top science needs. Generating awareness about the LCC within the community.
30. Amazing products being produced!
31. Some foundational research was completed
32. Excellent job of vetting, monitoring, and delivery of projects
33. Science projects, especially tools/analysis
34. Good science delivery
35. Information sharing and initial development of conservation design

### **PROGRAMMATIC – Conservation Vision & Purpose of LCCs Strategic and Operational Planning (*Sustaining the Partnership*)**

36. Promoting the need for systematic conservation planning at multiple spatial scales. Funding great projects.
37. Inclusiveness in decision-making; excellent science products; superior landscape planning effort
38. Excellent collaboration among the Steering Committee Members; excellent process for prioritizing work and selecting research projects to fund; excellent oversight provided to researchers working on funded projects.
39. The LCC is very clear as it established priorities and sticks to them. It is focused on a very specific value added niche, not trying to be all things to all partners
40. Natural Resource Planning and Design
41. Development of decision support tools to help managers make better resource management decisions and a good job of organizing existing geographic-specific resource info to help drive better decisions-pretty much what LCCs were set up to do.
42. funding useful science; moving forward with a basic conservation prioritization
43. The LCC is well organized, the membership is engaged and informed. The products are valuable and are of use to a wide audience.
44. Good staff work, good communication, good results
45. Connecting stakeholders across geography and political boundaries. Raising awareness around the breadth of vision and goals for LCCs generally and this one in particular.

(4 responses – NA – too early in Tenure)

**Q5 RATING: What overall "star rating" would you give the AppLCC to this point?**

Average: 4.0 Stars

2	2.1
---	-----

3	22.9
4	52.1
5	22.9

**Q6 IMPROVEMENTS: What would it take to improve the LCC?**

**PARTNERSHIP – Serving the LCC Community & Engagement  
Roles and Communications (*Enhancing the Partnership*)**

1. I think the AppLCC could improve upon relationships at the partner level and build off of all the great work that has already been done, especially at the state level. I also think there is a strong partnership in the NE but less so in the SE that could be strengthened.
2. Provide more connectedness between organizations working in the region through interaction with the website; increase its utility for online collaboration; increase strategic implementation development by highlighting bottom-up and top-down projects that feed into the LCC
3. We have established a sound foundation for this LCC. Even in the face of limited resources. I do think that state engagement can be improved and that state level threats, priorities and actions need to be better understood.
4. more contact with the partnerships Messaging (tools, landscape conservation design, etc) within their agency and networks
5. More participation from state agencies who have much of the natural resource management authority and Responsibility. Greater involvement of steering committee - more conference calls and webinars

**ADMINISTRATIVE / MEETINGS**

6. I understand the need for consensus and the desire to not stifle discussion, I get that, but some discussions at the meetings need to be better facilitated to keep us on track
7. More advance notice on meetings

**SCIENCE FRAMEWORK – Foundation & Forum  
Science Products and Delivery (*Science in the Hands of...*)**

8. The framework and expertise is in place, just need to get others to take advantage of what you have to offer.
9. (answer separated) ...it would be great to be able to track who visits the portal, who uses the data, etc. At present I find it harder to see the IMPACT of the work we have done or sponsored than I would like
10. Are people using the products?

11. Completion of the AppLCC Blueprint. Inclusion of measurable indicators of ecosystem services benefits/values being protected. Working with two to three targeted audiences that the LCC believes can make the biggest initial impact in landscape conservation protection efforts/activities on-the-ground
12. products and focus needs to be more directed to on the ground implementation
13. Making it easier for partner feedback and sharing of projects, expertise; training on how to adopt information/tools
14. Difficult to answer briefly, but improved communications with the partners. I don't feel the appropriate members of the partners (i.e., technical staff) are included throughout the development of science products. However, I'm also unclear how much those types of individuals are included in the first place.
15. need to continue to deliver practical tools to managers
16. It is a real challenge to be such a broad umbrella organization while still being able to provide tools that are useful to the partners involved. Those successful tools to date would be the cave/Karst mapping and the Riparian Restoration Tool. Development of future tools along those lines would be useful.
17. Science Production
18. I find that sometimes the information can be very technical and I have issues understanding exactly what is happening
- 19.

## **PROGRAMMATIC – Conservation Vision & Purpose of LCCs** **Strategic and Operational Planning (*Sustaining the Partnership*)**

20. focus on fewer objectives, commit real resources from partners to achieve them
21. The AppLCC is involved in many conservation support roles...which good, but this diversity of interests also seems to complicate understanding its purpose. It would be helpful if this LCC could succinctly and clearly identify its focus--- so when people see "APPLCC" they quickly know the purpose of this LCC.
22. Deeper alignment of partners to promote and implement priority actions beyond science delivery
23. As the ALCC moves towards the next phase would be great to see an emphasis on supporting on-the-ground work, based on upon the research from phase 1.
24. Continue to expand partner involvement
25. better partner engagement; better staff organization and filling primary staff positions
26. Greater engagement from the partnership - in coming together (more meetings among Steering Committee), in using tools to enhance conservation, in success stories that indicate the LCC is of value to partners at various levels.
27. Increased communication with the public and diverse stakeholders
28. Greater concentration on the conservation design with objectives and the delivery of the design as a primary tool. I understand that this is going to be the emphasis.
29. From my perspective, broader support for scientific collaborations that can bring other perspectives and expertise to the conservation questions
30. Stronger links to existing scientific concepts and frameworks, as found in the literature on conservation planning and environmental assessment

## ADMINISTRATIVE / RESOURCES

31. more funding, more staff, more ongoing partnership initiatives, more outward communications on the importance of the landscape and proactive efforts to conserve its resources
32. Increased staffing levels
33. \$\$\$
34. A devoted science coordinator is needed. No one person can be expected to excel at Coordinator and Science Coordinator
35. Administrative staff support would be a big help. This would allow the LCC Coordinator to focus on the big picture, new projects, new funds and the partnership. I would also like to see some data on how the current suite of tools is being used. Are we successfully integrating science into management and conservation?
36. Dedicated funding for more staff; more agency/NGO partner investment, steering committee reps communicate LCC
37. Increased commitment from SC for staff support. Dire need for full-time science and landscape planning staff.
38. More funding of course
39. Increase funding to allow for building staff capacity (i.e., there is a strong need to fill both a Coordinator position and a Science Coordinator position); more direct involvement from USFWS-Region 5; more complete involvement/participation by some states.
40. Jean needs staffing assistance via a fully-funded PhD Science Coordinator through USFWS (not a term position)
41. In my view, we need to fund both of the positions that Jean is currently occupying, and staff them appropriately. The App LCC is currently very vulnerable to the loss of a single person, which is never a good position to be in.
42. Need to be able to hire a science coordinator. This person would coordinate science projects, facilitate science delivery, and support research partners. Need much better financial support for this LCC; funding should be comparable to other neighboring LCCs. Consider eliminating most northerly states from the App LCC, and combining those with NALCC. Jean needs to get more credit for the tremendous, one-person job she has done. But, she needs more staff support. And, more funding for research and delivery, meetings, travel, etc.
43. Hire a coordinator; get additional funding akin to other LCCs
44. A dedicated science coordinator and dedicated LCC coordinator are needed. A clear vision for the establishment of a system to deliver science and decision tools developed by the LCC, to facilitate application of those tools in situations that are meaningful to the partners
45. Additional staff, increased partner engagement including funding, regionally-focused efforts, continued engagement of communities of practice, incorporation of non-traditional partners and cultural resources.
46. Increased staffing and funding
47. Consistent funding that would allow for long term planning

(4 NA response / Don't know)