

**Desert Landscape Conservation Cooperative Outreach Meeting/Session at:
Climate Change Adaptation in the Arid Southwest: A Workshop for
Land and Resource Management
September 21, 2010
Tucson, Arizona**

Leslie Meyers, Bureau of Reclamation provided a brief presentation on Landscape Conservation Cooperatives (LCC) their purpose, and status across the country. Following the presentation, participants broke up into smaller groups for facilitated discussion and provided input on the formation and working of the Desert LCC.

Compilation of Small Group Facilitator Worksheets

What landscape scale partnerships exist in your area that could benefit from the LLC (value added)?

- Altar Valley Conservation Alliance
- Animas Foundation (Diamond A)
- Appleton-Watel Audubon Research Ranch
- Arizona Association of Conservation Districts (AACD; similar for other states)
- Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies
- Audubon Arizona
- AZ Invasive Species Council
- AZ Riparian Council (similar for other states)
- AZ Wilderness Coalition
- Border Governors Conference – Wildlife Working Table, Water Working Table
- Borderlands Management Task Force
- Cattle Growers Association
- Colorado River Program (TNC = lead organization)
- CONANP
- Cooperative Weed Management Areas (county/area specific)
- Department of Agriculture
- Desert Fishes Council
- Desert Southwest Cooperative Ecosystem Studies Unit (CESU; Contact: Larry Morris)
- DOD
- Energy - Partnerships (there must be some, but group could not identify examples)
- Long-Term Ecological Research Network (Funded by NSF, managed by universities; 2 in NM, 1 in AZ; Objectives: Landscape level science)
- Malpai Borderlands Group
- Marsh bird Monitoring Program (Colorado River focused – state and federal agencies; multi-partner annual monitoring effort; 15 organizations including Mexico organizations)
- Mexican Agencies/Organizations/Universities
- National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON); (Climate observation over the long-term; Santa Rita experimental range; parallel initiative in CA; Contact: Dave Breschares, University of AZ)

- Naturalia
- Northern Jaguar Project (Mexico)
- NPS Inventory & Monitoring effort (15 Organizations including Mexican organizations)
- NRCs (Natural Resources Conservation Districts)
- NRCS
- Pima County
- Pima County Environmental Education Program
- Pro Natura
- Resource Conservation Districts
- Riparian Councils (AZ and NM)
- SIA
- Southern California (CA BLM, CA Fish and Wildlife; Desert Managers group co-organized San Bernardino meeting)
- TNC
- Tribal Groups
- Tucson Audubon
- Tucson Basin Managers Group
- Turner Endangered Species Fund
- Upper San Pedro Partnership (contact: Holly Richter)
- USGS (modeling ecosystem services on Santa Cruz; contact: Laura Norman)
- Watershed Keepers OSM/Americorps Vista

Questions and Concerns

- How will science groups be vetted (RFPs – will it be a competitive process)?
- How will groups compete if relevant area is small part of the LCC? (For example: the Southeastern Arizona Bird Observatory only covers a small portion of the area)

Are there any entities/organizations (not specific people) within these existing partnerships that we haven't invited here today?

- Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT)
- Arizona State Association of Conservation Districts
- ASU, other universities
- AZ Association of Environmental Educators
- AZ Forest Health Council
- AZ Land and Water Trust
- Border 2012
- Cattle Growers' Associations
- Commission on Environmental Cooperation (CEC) (has a tri-national coordinating entity with seamless datasets across, US, Mexico, and Canada)
- Conservation System Foundation (works with BLM land management units)
- DCDC (NSF Decision Center for a Desert City, ASU)
- Desert Museum
- DOD (Kirtland AFB, Goldwater)

- Environmental Education Educators
- Good Neighbor Environmental Board
- Hewlett Foundation
- Interest from Congressional delegations or their staff? (there have been briefings on the Hill but not local involvement)
- Land User Organizations
 - ADWR (including ADWR's Colorado River Management Office)
 - Arizona Cattlemen's Protective Association
 - Alta Valley Conservation Alliance
 - Farm Bureaus (FSA, etc.)
 - Malpai Borderlands
 - NM Association of Solid and Water Conservation Districts (NM)
 - Quivara Coalition
 - Ranching Organizations
- Mexico - Federal Agencies, NGO's, etc.
 - CONABIO (Mexico's equivalent of USGS and USFWS)
 - CONAFOR
 - CONAGUA
 - CONANP
 - IBWC-CILA (International Boundary & Water Commission)
 - INIFAP
 - Pronatura
 - SEMARNAT
- Mexico - United States groups working with Mexico - Sonoran Joint Venture; Conservation International; Arizona Game and Fish, Arizona Fish and Wildlife; World Wildlife Fund
- National Park Service Inventory and Monitoring Networks
- New Mexico - University of New Mexico; New Mexico Game and Fish; New Mexico State University; Highlands University including the Watershed Restoration Center;
- New Mexico - Secretary of Indian Affairs (Alvin Norris)
- National Fish and Wildlife Foundation
- Other Counties
- Sonoran Institute
- SRP
- State Heritage Programs
- Tribes - Tohono O'odham, others
- Trust for Public Land and Water
- Tucson Electric Power and other electric power providers
- Turner Foundation
- USGS Sonoran Desert Research Station
- Western National Parks Association
- Wilbur Force Foundation

What is the best steering committee function, overall criteria and individual criteria?

- **Functions of the Steering Committee Include**
 - Less is better
 - Conduit to all the partners – need to stay connected to the group
 - Provide direction - overall vision, goals, priorities; should not get into details
 - Review function - periodically evaluate various aspects of the LCC such as: how well the organizational structure is working; whether the various committees are functioning well; and whether the work by the Coordinator and Science Coordinator is effective
 - Define mechanisms used by all LCCs (data conventions, standardization)
 - Develop learning of organizational framework (shared source for GIS data, research, decisions tools, models, reports, etc.)
 - Could have rotating position from each agency
 - Disseminate information and provide decision support: Translate, apply, communicate
 - Design connectivity, create communication network
 - Develop AD Hoc Committees to develop RFP and SOW
 - Provide guidance and final approval of grants
 - Think tank model – envision and discuss ideas and purpose solutions; clearing house for ideas, with science coordinator
 - Should not be allocating the funding
 - Not sure of communication with CSCs should be steering committee

- **Potential Criteria for Selecting Organizations/Entities to Serve on the Steering Committee**
 - Lean – Keep it small (about a dozen people)
 - Represent multiple interests groups (land use, scientists, policy planners, agronomist)
 - Diverse jurisdictions/sectoral and organizational representation - geography, nationality
 - Geographic representation - if not broad geographically then funding may get funneled to individual areas or institutions
 - Bi-national - Engage Mexico
 - 50/50 US and Mexico
 - At least one member from Mexico (not a subcommittee for Mexico)
 - Consider: How has Mexico been engaged to date? What relationships are already there? Make this proportional to the land area?
 - Do not decide before going to Mexico
 - Focus on the US and slowly get to know and engage groups/people south of the border - this region is divided very unrealistically
 - Able bring money, resources, or special knowledge/skills to the table
 - How do we define “local” in terms of representation?

- **Potential Criteria for Selecting Individual Steering Committee Members**
 - Land Management responsibility
 - Optical expertise
 - Outreach experts

- Responsive (good representation) - good grasp of the scientific underpinnings and understand diverse perspectives
- Ability to make decisions and commit resources
- Scientist(s) to inform RFP process and science goals and proposal review
- Seniors management (good, but may be hard to get together)
- LCC Coordinator and Science Coordinator should not be part of the committee
- Local interests

What are the best governance structure options for the Desert LCC

- Ability to expand the Sonoran Joint Venture

Subcommittees

- Organize by issue – but keep integration across issues (habitat, lands use changes, water, species issues, governance, monitoring)
 - Benefit of subject committee: facilitates sharing lessons learned across geographic areas
 - Drawback: cross-over of subject (e.g., species, forests)
- Organize by categories (e.g., technical and education/outreach committees), then by geographic area (like Sonoran Joint Venture)
- Organize meetings by geography (Split up by geography *at* the meeting)
- Organize by geography then by issue
- Organize by geography
 - Similar structure as national LCCs – by smaller geographies
 - Sub regions by desert
 - Groupings may be different according to whether working on goals or actions
 - Based on the three deserts
 - Science needs would be addressed by each of the specific geographic subcommittees, this would prohibit the need for a separate Science sub committee
 - Do not think the governance should be broken up by geography. Need to make certain not all the representation from the same region – need diversity of interests and areas represented
 - Would a geographically organized committee separate members due to lack of travel budget and need for long-range travel?
- Organization may need to be both geographic and topical - find a way to integrate
- Other committees
 - Adaptation/Mitigation Committee (to reflect goals of the LCC)
 - Applied Management Committee
 - Education/Science Translation Committee
 - Chart
 - International Outreach
 - Mexico Committee/Sub Committee
 - Possibly break up by sectors: water, conservation groups, ranching
 - Science Committee: Establish RFPs and evaluate proposals - Some division about whether Science Committee should be integrated with Adaptation Group
 - Specialty: Colorado River, Water Group, etc.

- Sub-Region Committees or a larger body
- Technical Committees – pick up on themes; issues specific; but need cross-fertilization
- US and Mexico subgroups - this is a complex question for this cross-border region
 - Bi-National - Build in 50-50 membership instead of designating a separate committee to address bi-national aspect)
- Committees comprised of a mix of scientists, managers, nonprofits, etc. Seek diversity in stakeholder groups and perspectives
- Committee membership flexible

Steering Committee

- Steering Committee member serve 3 year rotations
- 1 Chair, 2 vice chairs (one US, one Mexican)
- 1 Chair, 1 co-Chair
- Have a big committee – but limited number of voting members; Seats are identified by each category (federal, state, local, etc) and individuals can swap out with rotating seats
- Want to get things done but maybe we need to be more inclusiveness. (Example Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan – we were very large to be inclusive)
- Board of Directors overarching goals/objectives
 - Board (3 staff and partners) – members have to pay to attend meetings
 - They provide guidance and final approval of grants
 - Current focus of the Sonoran Joint Venture and habitat/water fowl
- “Game & Fish Department” seat that could rotate among LCC member states
- Meet every two years in person, otherwise conference calls and webinars (like Western Bat Working Group)
- Scholarships for travel provided, which may be necessary to support Mexican members - travel costs of this LCC may be prohibitive
- Members need to be involved in partnership in the LCC
- Members need to be careful to not be over tasked

Staff

- GIS staff
- IT
- Climate change stuff
- Outreach/Public Affairs
- Liaison for Mexico
- Liaison with other LCCs - inter-LCC representative/liaison to communicate among LCCs

What is the appropriate balance of an effective steering committee (large or small, heavy on agency folks, light on agency folks, etc.)?

- Small as possible while being representative
- 10 or less (no more)
- 12 or less

- 15-20 people
- More than 10, less than 40

- Models:
 - CESU model: one board member per member org/group - Unwieldy elements include questions of quorum
 - Sonoran Joint Venture board
- Heavy on land and resources managers
- Equally divided among agencies, academics and NGOs, local government, tribes, and landowners
- NGOs and resource management – need both; but if voting spots are limited; land managers should be given preference

Questions and Concerns

- Will there be a CSC representative on the LCC steering committee?
- Would the coordinators become members of the SC, or work for the SC?
- Would the SC play a supervisory role?
- What happens to small-scale scientists, managers, NGOs that want to be involved?
- How will we manage competition for involvement? (ex: UA v. ASU)
 - Suggestion: rotating membership (of NGOs, universities)
 - If keeping SC and committees small, seek well-connected members
- Concern: SC sets vision and priorities behind closed doors?
- Will LCCs nationwide compete for the same funding?

What entities should be on the Steering Committee (organizations, not individuals)?

- Grant writing expertise – (National Academy of Science for example)
- BLM
- BOR
- CSC(?)
- DOI
- Funding (will be necessary to help members participate)
- FWS
- Managers
- Mexico Federal Government
- NGO Representative
- NPS
- Policy makers
- Scientists
- Should include (one representative from each of the following):
 - Forest Service
 - Major funding agencies (FWS, BOR, USGS)
 - Mexican natural resource agency
 - Military lands

- NGO (rotate every year among the largest NGOs)
- One each from the suggested 3 desert sub committees
- Utilities and/or Energy consortium
- Water Use consortium
- Western Governors Association (thus avoiding one from each state)
- State Game and Fish Agencies
- State representative for each state
- State Water Agencies
- Tribal Representative
- University/academic