LCD Technical Team Meeting
7/14/2020
Attendees: Sean, Phil, Natalie, Ken, Matt, Aubin, Adam Collingwood, peggy

Brief overview of last leadership meeting (Sean)

- Leadership team is prepared for selection process
- Provided a breakdown of mgmt plans that we evaluated - looked at 60 different reports to select draft list of candidate features - a huge proportion were from MT - only 4 were explicit to British Columbia - members of the LT sent additional reports we should look at - we will incorporate them - hoping they don't upend the list of features we are looking at

Selecting Focal Features (Natalie)

- After we compiled a list of nearly 200 potential features from different management plans, we now need to narrow that list to 10-20 features (both coarse and fine features)
    - There is no objective way to do this, but our process so far is to send the leadership team a survey to complete ahead of the meeting
    - First, they will select 5 coarse features (habitat type and ecological processes) that are, for them and their agencies, the most important to include
    - Next, they will select 8-10 finer features (species) that they believe are the most important to include AND they are not captured under the coarse features
        - Ie. bull trout is captured under the coarse feature of riparian, because they don't walk around on land...whereas a grizzly relies on many different coarse features during its life
- To aid in these selections, we've created a table with info on the importance, protection, data availability, monitoring, and holisticness of each feature - survey takers will have access to this table as they complete their surveys

Step 1: Review candidate coarse features and select features using the poll.

Potential Feature	Relative Concern (Plans)	Relative Protected Status	Published Conservation Status	Available Data Evaluation	Ongoing Monitoring	Ease of Monitoring	Inclusive of Finer Targets ?	Finer Target useful as Indicator?	Source of Information
COARSE FILTER									
Habitat/ Ecosystem									
Riparian	26	8.5*		POOR			20	5	MT MSDI (MT only)
Wetland	26	2.5		POOR			20	2	CEC Landcover – North America (30 m)
Grassland	23	7.1		POOR			17	1	
Forest	21	14.3		GOOD			13	2	
Aquatic (lake)	16	7.9		POOR			9	2	
Shrubland/Rangeland/ Sagebrush-steppe	6	12.1		GOOD			11	1	
Lodgepole Pine and White Spruce Forests	2			POOR				1	
Alpine Tundra	2	22.8		POOR			6	2	CEC
Ecological Process									
Connectivity/Corridor	15			FAIR			18	5	
Wildfire	10			GOOD			13	2	
Climate Refugia	7			POOR			18	6	
Invasive Plants	6			FAIR			11	0	
Diseases	5			POOR			16	7	
Human Dev/Habitat Loss	5			GOOD			28	9	
Ecosystem Services	3			POOR					
Geodiversity	2			GOOD					
INFORMATION SOURCE	Mgt Plan Review (This document)	World Database on Protected Areas; CEC							

Relative Concern: Number of management plans we reviewed (n = 63) that the feature is prioritized in.
Relative protected status: proportion of Habitat/Ecosystem in IUCN Protected status Ia (Strict Nature Reserve), Ib (Wilderness Area) or II (National Park)
All other data derived from internal evaluation

-

<u>Suggested Changes to the Process</u>

- What about watershed integrity?
    - 6 functions of the watershed - Connectivity, sedimentation, hydrologic regulation, habitat
    - In addition to focusing on habitat type, we also include features relating to ecological processes (ie. connectivity, ecosystem services, etc)
- Ask the question: what matters? - digs into the heart of the issue
- Use MIRO - a platform where you can brainstorm with a team on the web
- Some of the ecological features and habitats are too vague
    - Ie. when looking at “forests”, it’s important to know age and type for habitat needs of a particular species
        - Solution: put in definitions of what each of these mean
        - Aubin offered to help write the definitions
- Allow survey takers to filter the options (ie. filter the table to only see features with lots of data available)
- Add a “don’t know” option to the survey
- Allow survey takers to suggest their own features in a comments section