**Notes Section-5 – 11:30 – 1:00 - Table Discussion: Review, revise our “Resolution” (Dec. Workgroup)**

**12pm**

**Statement of commitment, “resolution” discussion.**

Led by Bridgett, 5 goals as a continuing resolution to USFWS. we are self-monitoring, self-developed. So, need to think about how to fund positions and get goals.

Diana: make sure we talk about the value of resources, a lot of the on-the-ground management is done by the state, so: this partnership wouldn’t be doing on-the-ground work, correct? So we’re just doing science to support conservation. The “efforts to achieve this vision," more like action plan rather than vision. Maybe this part should go somewhere else.

Diana: cannot access google doc, her agency doesn’t let her

Rick: question, Greg spoke earlier about moving science apps to a different place in AFWA, so how is the partnership supporting science apps.

Jean: this document was started in December, so this meeting today was to see how the partners are doing. Regardless of the rest of the world, we as a partnership have an opportunity to define ourselves as such. We have the ability to redefine and reimagine the partnership regardless of anyone else, so what do you want from a partnership? What others are doing over there is less important, how can you define yourself as a partner in *this* partnership? All the science tools and information will remain documented by USFWS but, we need to give training to partners on the tools and workshops with partners on the application of the tools. This second part doesn’t exist in everyone plans. The tools may not be in a usable form, so we have to think about this.

David: yea, there’s nothing definite about any AFWA stuff, so let’s focus  on this particular partnership.

Bridgett: anything else?

Dan: part of the strength of the partnership, the moral authority, is the breadth and diversity of membership. So we can strengthen the vision statement by adding that into the mission statement.

Bridgett: concerned about AFWA, as the language doesn’t have NRCS involved in work. So: concerning this partnership is much broader.

Dan: another unique aspect of this partnership is that while we are a partnership, we are also a partnership of partnerships. So: allows us to deliver science at a different level that doesn’t always happen with other groups.

Rebecca: so: does this network allow us to communicate further?

Dan: yes, and also informs work.

Jean: yes, we had 100+ scientists develop science needs. Energy forecast model, riparian restoration , etc. So, always addressing needs of managers at both large scale and long-term. Partnership decides what it wanted, and staff delivers the products and strategies, but not actually changing decisions.

Iara: why haven’t they changed decisions?

Jean: well, Ray Albright and Perry will say there’s change. Well, what she’s saying is they’ve just finished tools and now the floor is dropped from under them, so it’s not like they aren’t being fully used…but in terms of having dedicated time to train groups in tools, not as much is done. Issue is do they have the capacity, training to use the tools.

Bridgett: when had RFPs, the goal was to at the end supply decision support tools, but not always possible with budgets. Sometimes just applied science was done but no ability to turn it into a tool.

Iara: so asking because we work at 15 county scale and are confronted with this challenge all the time, even at our smaller scale. Been hard to link the tools to users on the ground.

Jean: we have this. Naturescape, 27 variables, 15 states. We want to downscale this…so we need more specific data for smaller, focused areas.

Iara: maybe we need multiple, smaller entities

Jean: this allows you to magnify, with model land trusts they have very little capacity. Process rather than case study might be more effective. Land trusts in TN wanted to see our climate change models, it’s there, they’re using it, so we need to go beyond one-offs and develop a sustainable process, mechanism to accomplish work.

Bridgett: should we add language about tools, and translating them to local communities.

Jean: partnership should define own funding for the future. Let's make sure we all know, what we could call a success, what would this look like in the future? We are known for cultural resource commitment, unlike other LCCs. we are known for cultural resource commitment, unlike other LCCs. we are here to advance emerging science, wants to have a greater impact for the larger needs.

Rebecca: so, it sounds like we have science and tools, but need ability to implement tools, take them out.

Iara: goes even further, creative approaches to creating tools and delivering information.

Jean: also, co-generation of knowledge. What we are doing will come from the field. Keeping the pump primed, we have products to be delivered, the value of products and their generation comes from applicability and use. The field will inform how tools are used/modified. Need to keep the momentum going.

Bridgett: so is anything missing from your organization’s perspective? Things you’d like to see stronger in the goals/vision?

Dan: 1) need thoughts on communities, who we do this for. Although it’s for the public good, communities in this region will feel this most acutely, so this is a major benefit. 2) this region has the highest biodiversity of any region in NA, so we should trumpet this.

Tom: maybe building off what Dan just said, the factors that are affecting these communities and environments. Extend the jurisdiction of any one group here, so we need to work together to tackle these issues.

Perry: here we can collaborate beyond our jurisdictions. Collaboration rather than cooperation.

Amanda (NFWF), creating science tools, sharing tools, also that you’re meeting the demand for science that people want. Science that is being asked for.

David: insightful study of landscape partnership. But how can we share this with AFWA? And their decision making?

Mallory: Science applications will be funded (same) under FY18, some portion to also funding for white-nose syndrome.

Jean: talking about fellowships, get beyond the bureaucracy and the HR system. To advance the science.

Rick (EPA): from the EPA standpoint, state leadership is a priority. LCC has really done a good job of landscape approach and cultural resource integration. It's time to apply what we’ve learned. No problem for him to move forward with the partnership, but we need to be ready to pivot based on the AFWA.

IARA: to make this live on, we talk about downscaling. But we need to show ground-up response. Not creation of big information, but application, so identify for local entities what have they invested in already, and where can the AppLCC help with preserving their information?

***Action Item:*** *revise vision statement to include the following: 1) diverse partnership; 2) biodiversity of Appalachian region as an asset; 3) add language about tools, and translating them to local communities; 4) co-generation of knowledge, the process of science; 5) connection to communities who will benefit from work; 6) partnership of partnerships, extend reach of work beyond jurisdiction.*