

NCSCP Reserve Design working group/ Land Protection working group joint-meeting minutes

October 25, 2010 Weymouth Woods State Park

Present: Laura Gadd, Paul Tomacelli, Bill Parsons, Joe MacDonald, Scott Pohlman, Candace Williams, Ryan Elting, Sara DiBacco, Brenda Johnson, Nick Haddad, Brian Ball, Pete Caldwell, Pete Campbell, Jeff Marcus, Neville Handel

Action Items

- 1) Current reserve design information should be made easily accessible to all NCSCP members via the NCSCP FTP site. Also, the interactive map viewer website needs to be shared with all NCSCP members.
- 2) The NCSCP website has a members only section where partners can post (via Susan Miller) and access other relevant information. All meeting minutes etc. should be posted.
- 3) A follow-up analysis to identify and prioritize the parcels of unprotected lands that contain Tier 1 Resources should be conducted as a follow-up to the already completed 'Unprotected Resources' analysis.
- 4) The existence of a restoration layer should be determined, and if appropriate, it should be added to the Reserve Design.
- 5) The Reserve Design WG should work with the LPWG and other on-the-ground partners to assess/update the on-the-ground status of the 'Potential Areas' layer and to assess/update the 'Restoration' layer.
- 6) Communication needs to be increased between RDWG and LPWG. This is currently beginning to happen with cross-pollination at working group meetings, but should be enhanced with formal reports from meetings presented during working group sessions.
- 7) At least once a year the RDWG and LPWG should hold a joint meeting.
- 8) Revisit the idea to conduct a threat analysis for the Sandhills to demonstrate potential for habitat loss. This idea has been worked on in the past but never completed due to technical limitations with data/software/expertise. It will be important to consider what exact information is necessary to properly represent 'threats' such that it can inform land protection activities.

Notes

-Review of purpose and goals of the RDWG and LPWG.

-Description of typical LPWG meetings: Discussion of recent land protection closings; upcoming land protection opportunities; land protection strategies; agency interest in particular parcels; final ownership and management.

-LPWG meetings are very straight to the point, held quarterly. Reserve design is always in the back of their minds, but a clear understanding of the reserve design big picture is needed by LPWG.

-RDWG is not meeting quarterly right now. They did for a while but have not since completing the data updates for the purposes of the Green Growth Toolbox. They recognize the need to get their info to the LPWG and other WG's.

-Review of NCSCP Survey results reviewed, with highlights below. NCSCP needs to learn from the results of this survey and build off past successes/learn from past shortcomings. This survey was meant to provide info to base next steps off of, e.g. annual work plans.

All review results are provided in the executive and detailed reports emailed to all members by Sara DiBacco. Highlights include:

- 78% of surveyed thought the MOU and Charter were effective organizational structures for the NCSCP
- 61% thought steering committee meetings were useful
- Common response is that communication between WG's needs to increase
- The goals of each WG should be revisited
- 57% believe good progress has been made by NCSCP, but that there is a need and opportunity to expand beyond RCW protection.
- The 10 year mark is a good point to reassess the original goals of the NCSCP, make sure these are still relevant and are being achieved.
- How do we measure success? Many mention metrics, but many were unsure.
- Limits to highlighting our progress include lack of funding, unclear measures of success, people issues, and exposure
- Challenges the NCSCP will face in the future include development pressures, funding, momentum, and turnover.

-The idea of having a Research WG and increasing research as part of the partnership was discussed.

-Reserve design schemes have not necessarily been the guiding force behind land protection.

What can the RDWG and LPWG do to work together better?

- The RDWG bases their maps on the ideal land protection schemes and then they look at what is useful for actual land protection priorities.
- LPWG needs to use RDWG maps more in their land protection actions, but they also need to give more feedback on why they take particular actions and about the quality of lands they see on site visits.
- Reports from each WG meeting being read at the other will help with communication issues.

- The concepts of the NCSCP are good, but it is in the execution where we are lacking. Lack of communication between groups has been the biggest problem.
- RDWG should have their list of “top 10 or top 50” priority areas available to LPWG
- Any WG site visits in these areas need to update RDWG on site information

-Overview of layers in the RDWG target analysis was given.

-Landowner outreach discussion:

- We need to identify the property owners in the priority 1 and 2 areas and begin dialogue with them about their conservation interests.
- We should not expect huge successes by doing this, but we should be glad with any jewels we can uncover in the process.
- We may be able to help them by answering many questions they may have (i.e. taxes, easements, etc) and steer them towards the right people.
- We also need to be very careful about how we approach these individuals and use/share their information

-We need to add a restoration layer to the RDWG map and continually update it with site visit data.

-NHP is now adding wildlife habitat to its’ significant NHA’s

-Threat analysis needs to be conducted for Sandhills landscape, along with an analysis of habitat loss effects.