

NEAEB Nexus Café

Table 3: Emily Brunkhurst Moderator Working with your state's Wildlife Action Plan

Participants:

Round 1

Donald Chandler

Chris Duerring

Paul Currier

Dave McDonald

Jeffrey Ojala

Molly Michaud

Round 2

John Little

Ethan Swift

Paul Woodworth

Ben Jessup

Joan Milam

Gerald Szal

Round 3

Leon Tsomides

Doug Burnham

Katie DeGoosh

I've combined the notes for the three rounds as there were ideas that come together. I also included some of the panel discussion on Protection of High Quality Waters on Friday as they pertained to this topic.

DATA:

Data needs to be open source, available to all.

Issues of data storage and maintenance and communication between users.

Overlay priority layers from multiple agencies

Use in creating biological condition gradients – use of biological data to drive understanding and motivate action

ME has PEARL database, shared by everyone – multi-agency and public access.

SUCCESSFUL COLLABORATIONS:

MA watershed teams: DEP provided staff to head team for each major watershed. Team included DEP, DCR, Fish and Wildlife and other agencies working in that watershed.

Worked on projects together. Had pot of funding and decided together which projects to fund. After 5 years, program abandoned but some teams still working together anyway.

NH Natural Resources Outreach Coalition (NROC) is a collaboration among 10 state, private non-profit, local, and regional organizations. NROC assists coastal watershed

communities with a natural resource-based planning approach to managing growth pressures and minimizing impacts. (<http://www.nhep.unh.edu/programs/community-assistance.htm>)

Dam reviews: DEP licensing and removal. Good review with Dams person at F&W.

PROJECTS:

Regulatory revisions – cooperative efforts for stream crossing guidelines, wetland and riparian buffers, wetlands mitigation

303 Criteria, TMDL: MA DEP and F&W defining temperature criteria. F&W to add more streams ecology to DEP standards.

VT rapid habitat assessment for both agencies use. More intensive instream and riparian. An evolutionary change

Nutrient and other criteria could also be developed with F&W agency

Sensitivity of various rare species

Floodplains: look for rare species

Fish contaminants - risk to wildlife

Permits: land Use permits, FERC dam relicensing, Stream alteration and shoreland encroachment

Aquatic Community classification – DEP and F&W

Watershed management plans, regional planning

Eastern Brook Trout Joint Venture, Atlantic Salmon restoration, and other species specific restoration efforts. Monitoring programs combined.

CREATING RELATIONSHIPS:

Need to consider who in which agency to include in cooperative projects. Not all Fish and Wildlife Biologists do work compatible with DES/DEP/Etc. priorities and needs, and vice versa.

Watershed groups - education and outreach, local knowledge, corridors and riparian areas

Cooperative Extension Conservation Districts

Develop processes for working together even if goals don't match. Becomes a transferable process between agencies – development of criteria is a process.

ME managing game vs. all fish even within their department. F&W sample for rare species as well as game. DEP database has all species collected and F&W has asked for that information on specific species, and their opinion on rarity.

VT worked together on creating Wildlife Action Plan but now is not. Provided information on fish and invertebrates – were on technical groups for these taxa. Both track rare species in natural heritage database.

CONFLICTS BETWEEN AGENCIES:

Disconnect between monitoring and planning, even in one agency

Communication issues

Public conflict between fisheries managers and others

Habitat and riparian corridors – disconnect between F&W and DEC

Personal conflicts at staff level

OTHER:

Funding is an issue

Sometimes even when Fish and Wildlife department is in same agency as other environmental agencies, their plans do not mesh. Example: CT Forest Resources Plan and Wildlife Action Plan. Had no cooperation or discussion.