

2016 Survey: AppLCC Steering Committee & Partners (Aug)

PROGRAMMATIC: STRATEGIC & OPERATIONAL

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/adv)	4.2
Other (Tribal, Research)	8.3

Q8 What anticipated **threats/risks or challenges are critical for the partnership to focus on over the next 5 years?**

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

1. Relevancy - and its effects on partner fatigue, funding, and conservation effectiveness.
2. Institutional: Funding, "Balkanization" of the partners into "camps", apathy among partners leading to poor participation. Programmatically, how to support high quality science and incorporate it into information/decision-support tools that have broad applicability.
3. Maintaining relevance for states, Downscaling LCD into decision making and specific conservation actions, Guidance from national LCC on LCD theoretical framework
4. The lack of participation by states sets up a threat of lack of political support for the whole LCC system.
5. Some risks are internal. The LCC at times as seemed to want to eat itself alive. Everyone needs to pull in the same direction. States need to not expect every conservation problem they have to be solved by an LCC, but rather, see the benefit of belonging to greater regional initiatives and contribute to those, in turn allowing those priorities to inform internal decisions.
6. Continuance of LCC program; demonstrated successes and increased buy-in by partners
7. Climate change adaptation strategies, management based on good science and in a regional context; how to best influence decision-makers who influence local land use patterns.
8. Energy Impacts reduction from traditional sources and renewables, economic impact of the loss of coal and how it will impact overall interest and investment in conservation as well as present opportunities for LCC focus on post-coal actions like restoration
9. planning for extreme weather events, floods and drought

SCIENCE FRAMEWORK – Foundation & Forum

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

10. implementation funding, climate adaptation, how to best facilitate collective action beyond traditional federal partners to meet conservation goals
11. Development of adaptation strategies to address climate change; energy development and transmission; human population growth; urban/suburban sprawl.
12. Value added engagement with partners/initiatives (let's not reinvent the wheel, many things already occurring out there), Marcellus Shale Impacts, Climate Change
13. Adaptation tools related to significant stream flow alteration as called out in the ORBA climate change adaptation report.

PROGRAMMATIC – Conservation Vision & Purpose of LCCs

Strategic and Operational Planning (*Sustaining the Partnership*)

PROGRAMMATIC / ORGANIZING FRAMEWORK

14. I think water should be considered the connector of everything.
15. Conservation Conflicts Between Different Natural and/or Cultural Resources and other Social Science of Conservation issues, including economics.
16. Climate change impacts are so rapid that the efforts to stay in front of changes and impacts to the landscape. Resiliency options are too constrained by existing development. Barriers to connectivity cannot be overcome and fragmentation of habitat cannot be effectively addressed.
17. Improving diversity, thinking about how ALCC can connect with NALCC and SALCC to do projects at landscape scale.

SUSTAINABILITY / LCC PROGRAM CONTINUANCE

18. funding. leadership. Communications
19. a change in political wind direction; a perception that the LCC has become stagnant (which is not); not following the scientific method and allowing our products to fall into ill-repute (which they currently are not)
20. The main issues are ones that face all of the LCCs. Funding cuts and continued commitment of DOI in particular as well as other organizations. At the level of conservation needs, the main risk in my mind is that this and other LCCs will not focus on those species needs that are at greatest risk of loss to extinction, relying too much instead on umbrella species indicators. Some form of gap analysis may be needed to determine how well priority species needs are served by existing umbrella species and setting up more specific indicators of habitat needs and threats where gaps occur
21. The biggest threat is the ever-diminishing political relevance of biological conservation, the most critical challenge is getting average citizens to actively support conservation programs and actions.

22. Risks associated with loss of funding/support due to the need to show measurable on the ground results of using conservation tools
23. continued funding of LCC
24. Funding is insufficient. The LCC needs to document it's relevancy and to demonstrate that the tools from round 1 are being used.
25. Budget restrictions at state level
26. Operational capacity (budgets and staff) of agencies limit ability to take on new efforts. Partnerships with creative funding is needed to take conservation priorities to the next level. LCC must be viewed as value add to state and fed agencies and NGOs as well as existing and potential new partnerships
27. Funding challenges, partner involvement
28. Sustainability of funding, partner contributions, staffing staffing staffing, need to build human dimensions / ecosystem services / cultural resources into the work we do.
29. Diversify funding sources and letting Congress know of the partnerships support for the federal contribution to the LCCs.
30. Capacity to deliver science, tools and the landscape approach; need (staffing level), lack of funds.
31. Inadequate funding; inadequate clarity of purpose ("mission drift") or competing priorities; integration with other regional partnerships; information overload to decision-makers/partners is overwhelming.

LANDSCAPE-LEVEL THREATS

32. Each state has expressed their individual areas of concern and risks.
33. Climate change and its effects on the Appalachian systems.
34. Energy Development will continue to be a threat. An emerging issue within the Cumberland Plateau is wind power. We are seeing more activity related to this. Also we need to consider agriculture and think about engaging NRCS at the planning level to leverage funding in priority areas. Climate change is a continuing threat and we are now seeing the management of sport fisheries being affected. And of course funding and how the cooperative functions in the future in terms of cooperator investment.
35. stream connectivity
36. Climate Change. Acid Deposition and ANC threats. Development encroachment on largely pristine landscapes. Impacts of invasive species.
37. Energy Extraction and Production.
38. Threat: water quality and quantity; Challenge: delivery to local land and water resource decision-makers (e.g. state agencies, counties, municipalities)
39. Development, climate change, impacts on aquatic systems and karst environments; opportunities to work with private landowners on voluntary conservation for at-risk species
40. Climate change; urbanization; energy development and mining impacts
41. Infrastructure/pipeline development. Managing forests to be more resilient, especially the patchwork of private forestlands.
42. See State Wildlife Actions Plans for states in this LCC. Threats, at the state level, have been identified in these documents.

43. Invasives, existing and new diseases, industry brownfields, untreated discharges from flooded underground coal mines, urban decay/suburban expansion.

Misplaced

44. Creating collaborative efforts among partners to most effectively utilize resources for conservation efforts.

(3 – Responses NA or Don't know)

Q17 ROLE: Thinking about the strategies elements below, what do you see as the role of the LCC as a conservation partner to create long-lasting, landscape-scale impact?

Convening stakeholders	82.0 %
Assessing landscape condition	60.0%
Providing spatial mapping to identifying high value conservation areas	68.0%
Creating spatial design to reflect the optimal investment given large-scale and future climate and land-use changes (modeling design output)	62.0%
Creating a plan identifying strategies to achieve mutual conservation objectives	70.0%
Identifying ways to enhance the capacity of partners and other conservation entities (such as land trusts) to utilize the research products and resources available through the Cooperative	82.0%
Providing information regarding the co-benefits or risks associated with socio-cultural values land-use and natural resource conservation efforts	62.0%
Other (please specify)	18.0%

Other (specify)

1. With respect to the sixth strategy, the education of partners should to the extent practical useful include all resources, not just the LCC products. I think strategies 3-5 should have highest priority
2. Work closely with existing partnerships to develop plan using landscape scale data and conservation design to integrate into existing priorities. Be cautious in perception of imposing LCC goals; must identify mutual benefits and demonstrate value add to get buy-in.
3. Bringing IT suggestions forward that can help AppLCC and Partner work
4. #2-4 are also very important, but are more project/data specific. There is a role here for the LCC, certainly. But perhaps the more meaningful role for the LCC is to develop partnerships and collaborations among agencies/NGOs/private landowners/etc. to take these data and apply them in a landscape-level, coordinated way that help achieve larger goals in ecosystem/habitat health and connectivity. These tools are extremely helpful for the planning stage, but coordinating implementation is where there might be an important opportunity for the LCC.
5. Creating tools for partners to use in planning and design.

6. filling data gaps identified by the partners that no one else is doing
7. I feel I do not know enough to answer this question
8. An important role of the AppLCC could be supporting states in the implementation of their State Wildlife Action Plans at the multi-state scale. These plans are a great resource and should be used as much as possible. The plans offer a significant connection between the AppLCC and state resource concerns.
9. Build capacity "bridges" or ways to deliver tools to decision makers to support strategic conservation implementation. Need to train people not just in use of tools, but first in what the landscape approach is, then how tools support that.

Q20 Any other comments, questions, issues you would like to raise?

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

1. Explore opportunities to better engage field practitioners in the work of the AppLCC.
2. Great LCC underfunded needs better institutional support
3. States recently revised their State Wildlife Action Plans and the next 1-3 years will provide an important opportunity for the AppLCC to connect with the states and support needs identified in these plans.
4. This LCC has been doing great work. Additional resources (staff, money) are needed to make delivery phase successful.
5. Need to figure out how to support the local scale on-the-ground activities with the broader scale used in putting together the LCD for the AppLCC.
6. What role would the AppLCC want the participating Federal and State agencies to play?

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

7. differences between LCC's in priority as well as approach to the same problem ie how similar is stream classification to other LCC's

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

8. Given the limited resources, I think the LCC has been performing quite well. One problem the LCCs have with the Corps is getting its messages out to those who are most in need in the Corps. This may require bulleted fact sheets pointedly sent to environmental planning chiefs in each of the divisions and districts in the LCCs in addition to the usual postings.
9. Comparative lack of staff in this LCC is untenable and harmful to the partnership.
10. Great job, Jean! Keep up the good work!

11. If I could only change one thing, it would be to build a sustainable staffing model that does not crush Jean beneath an unrealistic workload.

(4 reply "no")