

**Desert Landscape Conservation Cooperative (DLCC)
Scoping Team Meeting
AZ Game and Fish; 5000W. Carefree Highway; Phoenix, AZ 85056
January 19, 2011
9:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m.**

Participants

For a complete list of meeting participants, please see **Appendix 1**.

Objectives

- Updates from recent LCC meetings and discussions of LCC process
- Identify final changes to the draft Governance Document
- Identify Steering Committee membership and invitation process
- Identify final changes to the draft Operational Plan
- Update on Science Committee and agreement on next steps
- Updates on WGA Wildlife Corridors Initiative
- Discuss Funding Mechanisms for the LCC
- Report-out from Scoping Team Members on what each entity hopes to be able to contribute to the LCC (funding and funding mechanisms; other resources)
- Agree to next steps for briefing paper

Outcomes/Agreements

- The group identified changes to the draft Governance Documents (see pages 4-5 for details).
- The group agreed that the Steering Committee should have approximately 20 participants and agreed to a list of entities to invite to the Steering Committee (see pages 6-7 for the list)
- The group acknowledged the Scoping Team's lack of representation from Mexico, tribes, and some states as well as a lack of expertise in cultural resources and the need to engage these entities/interests.

Action Items/Next Steps

- Governance Document (all edits to be submitted to Leslie Meyers)
 - Tom Owens: Will work on the improvements to the mission statement.
 - Amy Heuslein and Mary-Catherine Manuelito: Will work with wording that is inclusive of tribal science/interests; add more language under Goal 1 to be more inclusive of TEK; and work on wording for "trust responsibility" (with input from John Nystedt).
 - Carol Beardmore: Will work on language on the relationship between scientists and land managers.
- Steering Committee Structure:

- Leslie Meyers, Russell Scofield, Bob Davis, Kate Kitchell, and Christina Vojta: will work on the subcommittee structure options
- Leslie Meyers, Christina Vojta, Jeremy Mikrut, Avra Morgan: will work on the invitation list.
- Amy Roberson, Mary Manuelito, John Nystedt, and BIA Pacific Region: will work on the tribal invitation list and suggest outreach strategies.
 - Jeremy Mikrut will send this group the current list kept by Bureau of Reclamation.
- Leslie Meyers: will send the group the draft of the priorities for funding as well as the FOA information.
- Christina Vojta and Rick Kearney: will discuss and begin to draft the briefing paper.
 - Jeremy Mikrut will send the Bureau of Reclamation letter to Rick.
- A Scoping Team call will be scheduled for early February.

Overview of Discussion

Review of Relevant Information from other LCCs

USIECR Report on LCC Governance

Maggie McCaffrey, US Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (USIECR), provided an overview of a USIECR study on the structure and governance of other LCCs; coordinators for six LCCs were interviewed. Findings include:

- Each LCC interviewed had an “executive guidance level” as its first tier; this often was a Steering Committee. The second tier for the LCCs was a “coordinating input” level where most of the actual work is completed, e.g., through working groups. The third tier was the staff level.
- The group was reminded that when looking at other LCCs, it is important to note that often their shape can be a result of pre-existing conditions which differ from LCC to LCC and will also differ for the DLCC.
- It was noted that many of the Steering Committees have a chair and co-chair made up of a state and federal participant. Additionally, one LCC has a chair person for a tribal representative.

Update from the Tribal Outreach Meeting

The group was given an update on the Tribal Outreach Meeting on December 13, 2010 in Albuquerque. The update included:

- The DLCC and the SRLCC hosted a half-day Outreach Meeting for tribes in Albuquerque on December 13, 2010 and plan to set up future meetings in different geographies.
- The meeting included discussion about funding structures, opportunities for tribes, inclusiveness, and the idea of tribes as a sovereign nation.

- There was also a conversation on tribal data collection and availability of tribal data to other entities. One theme that emerged is that tribes are in possession of existing data but they lack personnel to manage the information.
- While traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) was discussed, including how and what it defines, the discussion did not include how traditional cultural properties could be tied to TEK.
- Currently, the SRLCC has put forth an effort to work with the regional BIA office for continued outreach to tribes. This group may opt to do the same.

Update from the Southern Rockies LCC Interim Steering Committee Meeting

The group was given an update on the SRLCC Interim Steering Committee Meeting on December 14, 2010 in Albuquerque. The update included:

- The SRLCC Interim Steering Committee Meeting had a very similar agenda. Some time was dedicated to orientating new participants to the processes of the Interim Steering Committee.
- A decision was made to move forward with the Steering Committee and be inclusive of all 30 tribes in the SRLCC region and all state and federal agencies who would be interested in participating (e.g., water/fish and game from each state). The group also agreed to have invitations sent to some NGOs (specific organizations have not been determined).
- Because the Steering Committee may result in a large group, the SRLCC Interim Steering Committee also agreed to include in the Governance Document an option for the Steering Committee to create a smaller executive decision making body.
- An invitation list is being created with hopes to have a meeting in March.
- The group broadly discussed other entities especially utility or consortium groups but did not resolve if and how they would be asked to sit at the table.

Desert LCC and Scoping Process To-Date

The group had the opportunity to discuss any benefits and/or concerns regarding the DLCC and to discuss any process concerns and how to address them going forward. This discussion included:

- The group acknowledged the lack of representation from Mexico, tribes and indigenous cultures as well as a lack of cultural resource expertise. The group is also missing Nevada Division of Wildlife.
- Tribes should already be at the table; some tribes are currently in protest of this process due to what they see as lack of engagement. Bureau of Reclamation has spent time working on this and is calling in external forces to help broaden its reach to achieve its goal.
 - Without allocated resources, it is nearly impossible for many tribes to come to meetings. There are some LCCs that have set aside funding for this purpose.
 - As this process is considered science-based, the value system is quite different than tribal use of TEK.

- The Southwest Climate Center (CSC) has been designated but at this time is not funded. It is important to be aware of and in communication with the CSC.
- Participation from elected state and local officials has been uncommon on other LCC Steering Committees; the LCC is regional in scope but local officials may want to participate in some way.
- The group should revisit the mission/vision that was formulated at the beginning of the process; the group should have a scope and target objectives and should consider attainability.
- Western Governors Association has a goal of a seamless decision support system by 2013; how will the LCCs overlap with or mimic this effort?

Draft Governance Document

The draft Governance Document has been evolving for the past few months. This document and the Operations Plan will ultimately be up for approval by the Steering Committee who has the option to adopt, discard, or edit. Leslie Meyers, Bureau of Reclamation, gave an overview of the Governance Document:

- The goal was to outline the mission and goals of the Desert LCC and look at the governance structure in detail.
- Feedback was gathered at the outreach meetings and utilized by the subgroup and Scoping Team in preparing the draft.

The group identified the following changes to the Draft Governance document (discussion/rationale for these issues is noted in italics):

- General
 - Use the term “entity”, as applicable, to replace the term “organization” throughout the document.
 - Revise language to be inclusive of Tribes: (Amy Heuslein and Mary Manuelito will send suggestions to Leslie).
 - Goal 1 – include TEK
 - Add language regarding trust responsibility (see the language in the Operational Plan)
 - *There was some concern that the federal government has other trust responsibilities but they should not all be enumerated in the Governance Document.*
 - Along with the draft Governance Document, provide to the Steering Committee a document that flags specific issues or ideas that the Scoping Team feels should be noted/considered.
- Mission statement could be word-smithed (Tom Owens will send suggestions to Leslie).
- Goals Section
 - Revise for consistency with the Operational Plan (e.g., Science Delivery and Development, Outreach and Education).
 - Emphasize relationship between science and decision-making. (Carol Beardmore will send suggestions to Leslie).

- Include TEK under Goal 1 (Amy Heuslein and Mary Manuelito will send suggestions to Leslie).
- Emphasize the scale (landscape scale).
- Steering Committee
 - Functions
 - Add a clause similar to “for decision making related to scientific knowledge” under the first bullet.
 - Add language, under the third bullet, to expand the partnerships so that it does not appear exclusive to the Southwest Climate Science Center.
 - Flag the statement “commit resources” until the definition is finalized.
 - Chair/Co-Chair:
 - Increase the chair and co-chair terms to two years, with the option for extension.
 - *1 year for a chair person seemed to be too short to be an effective leader. The group also discussed that given the LCC and Science Coordinator positions, the Chair’s role may be more as a host.*
 - Maintain the notion of “rotation” but use the term “non-federal entity” rather than only State entities, and flag the idea of rotation for the Steering Committee to decide upon.
 - *Requiring a state/federal rotation could be problematic. Interest of Steering Committee members in serving should be gauged.*
 - Decision-Making
 - Individual organizations should identify a representative and proxy in a letter that also endorses the governance document.
 - *The group advised against having a formal signatory or MOU process for the governance document and also emphasized that each organization should determine who represents them; this should not be dictated by the governance document.*
 - Addition and Replacements
 - *The group flagged this section, noting that the language feels exclusive and that this section needs to be determined by the Steering Committee composition and whether there are specific seats or it is all-inclusive. Also, this could be part of bylaws or addendums; the document should be consistent in terms of generality vs. specificity.*
- Working Groups
 - The group agreed to keep the three current subcommittees (science, LCC, and GIS) as interim.

Discussion of Steering Committee Membership

- Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) and US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) are co-leads for the LCC as identified by the Department of the Interior. Once the group decides how the Steering Committee is going to be populated, BOR and USFWS will extend an invitation.
- The group brainstormed and discussed several different models for selecting the Steering Committee, including:

- Agencies and other representatives selected by sector
 - e.g., the Glen Canyon Adaptive Management model
- Subcommittees by region that select their Steering Committee members
- State working groups (all partners within the state)
- Agencies (federal and state), with additional partnerships
- Coalitions of interests, e.g., wildlife, water, and cultural resources
- Subgroups by watershed, desert regions, Mexican subgroup, etc.
- Private industry could be included on Steering Committee or included in subgroups
- The group also discussed important interests/criteria for Steering Committee structure:
 - Broad-scale view
 - Pooling resources
 - Geographic balance
 - Allowing Steering Committee to determine how the subgroups will work
 - Timing
 - Reflect the mission/DOI direction
 - Balance of ecological areas
- Next, the group brainstormed potential Steering Committee sectors and specific entities within each sector (see **Appendix 2**).
- The group engaged in a conversation regarding whether or not scientific knowledge should be a criteria for Steering Committee members. The group agreed that there will be a connection between scientists and the Steering Committee. These connections will include working groups and land managers with scientists on staffs, and potentially a specific seat for scientists/researchers on the Steering Committee. The group agreed to add language to the governance document that stresses the relationship between land managers and scientists.
- The group agreed the Steering Committee should be populated by approximately 20-25 representatives.
- With consideration of the brainstorm list in Appendix 2, three subgroups were formed and tasked to brainstorm what the actual composition of the Steering Committee should look like, given the goal of a 20-member steering Committee. The results from the three separate subgroups are in **Appendix 3**.
- There was strong overlap among the subgroup lists. The Scoping Team decided to include all of the subgroup suggestions on the invite list, specifically:
 - Federal Agencies (send invitations to multiple regions, have agency send 1 rep):
 - US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
 - Bureau of Reclamation (BOR)
 - Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA)
 - National Park Service (NPS)
 - USDA Forest Service (USFS)
 - US Geological Survey (USGS)
 - Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
 - Department of Transportation (DOT)
 - US Department of Agriculture (Farm Bill contact)
 - Department of Transportation
 - States (Agencies TBD):

- Arizona
 - California
 - New Mexico
 - Nevada
 - Texas
- NGOs and Partnerships:
 - The Nature Conservancy
 - Pronatura
 - Desert Fish and Habitat partnership
 - Rio Grande Joint Venture
 - Sonoran Joint Venture
 - Desert Managers Group
- Tribes
 - Invite all and accept all who are interested
 - An invitation letter alone will likely not be successful; a follow-up call or additional outreach will be needed.
- Mexican Federal Organizations
 - Secretaria del Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales (SEMARNAT) – Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources
 - Comision Nacional de Areas Naturales Protegidas (CONANP) – National Commission of Protected Areas
 - Instituto Nacional de Ecologia (INE) – National Institute of Ecology
- Next Steps:
 - Leslie Meyers, Russ Scofield, Bob Davis, Kate Kitchell, and Christina Vojta will work on the subcommittee structure options.
 - Leslie Meyers, Christina Vojta, Jeremy Mikrut, and Avra Morgan will work on the invitation list and making sure the right contacts are being invited.
 - Amy Heuslein, Mary-Catherine Manuelito, John Nystedt, and BIA Pacific Region will work on the tribal invitation list and suggest outreach strategies. Jeremy Mikrut will circulate the current tribal list to the subgroup.
 - A call will be scheduled in February to review this work.
 - The hope is to have the first Steering Committee meeting in March.

Update on Western Governors Association (WGA) Wildlife Corridors Initiative

Josh Avey, Arizona Game and Fish, provided an overview of the WGA Wildlife Corridors Initiative:

- The WGA Wildlife Corridors Initiative structure was based on Governors’ jurisdictions and captures all states. When the group came to fruition in 2008, the idea was to find consensus on crucial wildlife habitat and corridors, with the intention to define these within each state. The goal is to be able to build an interconnected network of wildlife data.
- The pilot conducted in California, Utah, Nevada, and Arizona was designed to have these four states “talking” with the same data and speaking the “same language”.

- The work has resulted in 18 states agreeing upon definitions – it is a success story.
- The LCC may want to consider adopting this series of data that has already been created. It could be more beneficial in terms of time than to instead recreate what has already been completed.

Update from Science Subcommittee and Update on Draft Operational Plan

Christina Vojta, US Fish and Wildlife Service, provided an overview of the science subcommittee and an update on the draft Operational Plan. The group had the opportunity, offline, to send comments and suggestions. These have been incorporated into the Operational Plan. On a future Scoping Team call, the group will have the opportunity to review again; the draft Operational Plan needs to be completed in time for the first Steering Committee meeting.

Discussion of Funding Mechanisms for the LCCs

- Bureau of Reclamation has prepared a funding opportunity announcement (FOA) and has the ability to carry over \$550,000 from the previous budget to be spent toward the funding of the DLCC. The priorities came from the science subcommittee; BOR will use them to their best of its given authority; entities within the scoping committee are encouraged to apply for the funding as well. The timeline for this proposal is March 1, 2011.
 - Next Step: Leslie Meyers will send the group the draft of the priorities for funding and the FOA information.
- USFWS would also like to pledge funding but wants to see the Operational Plan before pledging. The LCCs and Rapid Ecosystem Assessments (REAs) should also look to the states as resources to develop data in conjunction, when possible, with the WGA Wildlife Corridors Initiative.
- There are some LCCs who have accommodated travel support with funding. It would be great if the group could give input on how the BOR structures funding for travel and which groups should receive the funding.

Development of a Briefing Paper

Bureau of Reclamation has a briefing paper that can be used as a starting point for this group.

Next Steps: Jeremy Mikrut will email the document to Rick Kearney; Rick (with help from Christina Vojta) will revise this and present it as a draft to the group for a future Scoping Team call.

Appendix 1 – Meeting Participants, DLCC Scoping Team, January 19, 2011, Phoenix

Josh Avey (AZ Game and Fish)
Carole Beardmore (US Fish and Wildlife Service/Sonoran Joint Venture)
Dave Busch (US Geological Survey)
Robert Davis (USDA Forest Service Southwest Region)
Mary Gustafson (American Bird Conservancy/Rio Grand Joint Venture)
Ron Hawes (Bureau of Land Management)
Amy Heuslein (Bureau of Indian Affairs)
Rick Kearny (US Fish and Wildlife Service)
Kate Kitchell (US Geological Service)
Mary-Catherine Manuelito (Bureau of Indian Affairs)
Maggie McCaffrey (US Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution)
Elroy Master (Bureau of Land Management)
Leslie Meyers (Bureau of Reclamation)
Jeremey Mikrut (Bureau of Reclamation)
Tom Owens (US Geological Survey)
Jeff Raasch (TX Park and Wildlife)
Aimee Roberson (US Fish and Wildlife Service)
Russell Scofield (Bureau of Land Management)
Christina Vojta (US Fish and Wildlife Service)

On Phone:

Pam Benjamin (National Park Service)
John Nystedt (US Fish and Wildlife Service)

Facilitators:

Niki Koszalka (The Keystone Center)
Julie Shapiro (The Keystone Center)

Appendix 2 – Participant Brainstorm of Sectors and Entities that Could be Included in the DLCC Steering Committee

- Federal Agencies
 - Bureau of Reclamation
 - US Geological Survey
 - National Park Service
 - Department of Defense
 - Bureau of Indian Affairs
 - USDA Forest Service
 - USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service
 - US Fish and Wildlife Service
 - National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
 - Environmental Protection Agency
 - Army Corps of Engineers
 - Department of Education
 - Department of Transportation
 - PLACE HOLDER: Department of Interior Climate Science Center
 - Department of Homeland Security

- States
 - California, Nevada, Texas, Arizona, New Mexico agencies
 - Water Resources
 - Energy Commission
 - Parks
 - State Land
 - Forestry
 - State DOE
 - Energy Commission
 - Transportation

- NGOs and Interest Groups
 - Environmental Groups
 - User Groups (Off Highway Vehicle recreation, energy development, mining, grazing, irrigation districts)
 - The Nature Conservancy
 - Land Trusts
 - Water Trusts
 - Pronatura
 - World Wildlife Federation
 - Defenders of Wildlife
 - National Wildlife Federation

- Partnerships
 - Geographic Partnerships
 - Southern Nevada Agency Partnership

- Desert Managers Group
 - Sonoran Joint Venture
 - Rio Grande Joint Venture
 - Western Regional Partnership
 - Department of Interior Field Coordinating Committee – Border/international issues
- Tribes
 - 50+ tribes
 - Tribal Organizations
 - Inter Tribal Organizations (Arizona, New Mexico, All Indian Pueblo)
 - Native American Fish and Wildlife Society
- Mexico
 - Federal Agencies
 - SEMARNAT
 - INE (Scientific Branch)
 - DGVS (Wildlife Permits and Listed Species)
 - CONANP (Management of Natural Protected Areas)
 - Robert Mesta provided handouts describing Mexican Federal Agencies and other potential participants.
- Academia
- Counties
 - Soil and water conservation districts
 - Zoning, permitting
 - Association of Counties (NACO)
- Broad Categories
 - Conservation
 - Recovery of Species
 - Protection of Cultural Resources

Appendix 3 – Subgroup Brainstorm of Potential Steering Committee Composition (with a Goal of Approximately 20 members)

- Group One
 - Desert Fish Habitat
 - Joint Ventures
 - The Nature Conservancy
 - Pro Natura
 - California
 - Nevada
 - New Mexico
 - Texas
 - Arizona
 - US Fish and Wildlife Service
 - Bureau of Reclamation
 - Bureau of Indian Affairs
 - National Park Service
 - USDA Forest Service
 - Department of Defense
 - US Geological Survey
 - US Department of Agriculture (Farm Bill)
 - SEMARNAT

- Group Two
 - INE
 - CONANP
 - Pronatura
 - US Fish and Wildlife Service
 - Bureau of Reclamation
 - Bureau of Land Management
 - USDA Forest Service
 - National Park Service
 - US Geological Survey
 - Sonoran Joint Venture
 - Rio Grande Joint Venture
 - Desert Fish Habitat Partnership
 - Desert Managers Group
 - The Nature Conservancy
 - California
 - Utah*
 - Nevada
 - New Mexico
 - Arizona
 - Bureau of Indian Affairs

- Group Three
 - California
 - Utah*
 - Nevada
 - New Mexico
 - Arizona
 - Bureau of Reclamation
 - US Fish and Wildlife Service
 - Bureau of Land Management
 - National Park Service
 - USDA Forest Service
 - Bureau of Indian Affairs
 - Department of Defense
 - Department of Transportation
 - 3 Mexican Federal Agencies
 - 1 US NGO (The Nature Conservancy)
 - 1 Mexican NGO (Pronatura)
 - As many tribes as are interested in participating

* Facilitator’s note: all groups noted that all five states should be included, but some groups listed Utah as the fifth state when in the DLCC when it is actually Texas.