

LCD Leadership Team Meeting

1/25/2022

Attendees: Mary, Natalie, Phil, Kelly Cooley, Connie Simmons, Aubin Douglas, Amy ?, Mary McClellan, Erin Sexton, Benjamin Misener (CPAWS), Rich Janseen, Tara Carolin, Lihn Hoang, Alisa Wade, Richard Klafki

Regrets: Sean is gone at a Future of Conservation meeting (Natalie will take his place and facilitate today)

Agenda:

Funding (Erin)

Funding for this work is cooperatively met – wouldn't do this without the partners contributing. Half of Natalie's time from CMP and the other half from USFWS (science projects) contributing to our joint work.

Phil Matson works with CMP and database management, funded by CMP and USFWS.

Funding in place for some time now since the LCD inception. This is grant writing time of year. USFWS is looking at continuing to contribute funding for LCD and the 2 positions (and some for Erin, too, for administration).

Anne Carlson – There has been recent synergy between CMP and Wilderness Society, and she is seeking funding from Wilderness Society to support the LCD work as well. Wilderness team in final discussions about funding – inspired by the CMP funding model in the past and appreciate the joint fund-raising going on now.

Parks Canada, GNP, NPS, DNRC, USFS Region 1 office all contribute to the CMP pool of funding. Lots of pieces, whole is greater than the sum through this landscape collaboration. Seeking new funding moving forward to align with other partners and to continue this great work.

Natalie- What capacity can future funding bring? Additional funds help to talk to other experts, and database management and data building (easy access to data, additional modeling).

Subject matter expert surveys (Natalie)

Natalie provided a refresher on the subject matter surveys – they were intended to correct any issues they see as subject matter experts in regards to the conceptual models, to help identify threats and key indicators, and to get additional data. Thanks to the leadership team for the connections!

Results have been great, with over 50 responses. The total experience between the participants is about 1,000 years! Incredible wealth of knowledge, diverse spatial coverage. Excited by the participation – thanks!

Analysis team adjustments (Natalie)

The tech team then scoped out the survey results, refined the conceptual models previously built based on suggestions, and gathered what data had been suggested.

Tech team input tie in (Natalie)

From the refined conceptual models, Primary threats, key ecological attributes, and indicators (metrics) were derived, and build out tables were constructed (based on the conceptual models) showing those threats, key ecological attributes, and indicators –

Question is how do we turn the metrics into something quantitative? Relative condition needs to be reckoned (quantified) from the indicators (with help from subject matter experts)

Build out tables and conceptual models are still in draft phases.

Chad – Build out tables - Roads and vehicle traffic – road density is not necessarily the problem- the bigger impact is presence of humans and vehicles, more likely from the avoidance of the areas with human presence. Same with rec access – stress of noise and human presence is more stressful than direct mortality from trains or ski lifts.

Can we address intensity of use? Connie

If leadership has time can they go over the build out tables (after we spruce them up first) and provide feedback. Lihn

Kelly suggested creating a Google doc for the whole leadership team to view and edit.

Chad – land conversion – lumping both natural disturbance and human disturbance is not the best strategy, need to separate those.

Social, cultural, economic update (Natalie)

SCE team met before the holidays and need to schedule a new meeting. The group so far has decided on water access (quality, quantity, headwater health, land back/water treaties) and air quality (smoke, particulates).

Pending: land access, recreation, bison range/herd. Invasive species?

Slow and iterative process – building knowledge together, and are looking forward to meet to flesh these out further.

Comments:

Connie- Social cultural economic part is hard – would love to hear from the leadership team. How should we look at these, together or separate?

Chad – it is challenging for sure, especially when at odds with environmental indicators. Rec has benefits but impacts as well...

Is land access considered from indigenous and non-indigenous? Answer- yes. Lots of issues with indigenous non-rec access

Natalie - Most conversation has been around access, thanks for flagging the level of complexity!

Kelly – we subject matter experts come with our own priorities – how do we find the voice who will be constructive without those who drown out the progress?

Chad – economic side – what is the current thinking on how it gets incorporated? Is it future economic potential or current day expenditure? Economic shifts to tourism, move away from non-renewable resources towards renewable.

Natalie - We haven't had a good chance to delve into all of this but still settling on which features we want to focus on. Trying to find out what is the main umbrella and how to we flesh these out?

Opportunities for carbon credits (alisa)

Connie – is social economic is hardest part. Funding is there for conservation layers and GIS work, but is there an appetite to find future funding for subject experts to discuss LCDs?