

SWAP Planning meeting –July 25, 2013 at Morse Park and Beach

Attendees:

Jeff Kiefer – US Fish and Wildlife Service
Kevin Crane – IDEM
Greg Beilfuss –IDNR, Outdoor Recreation
John Shuey – The Nature Conservancy
Gary Dinkel – US Forest Service
Chris Gonso – IDNR, Forestry
Justin Harrington – IDNR, Parks and Reservoirs
Andrew DeWoody – Purdue University
Daniel Arndt – Duke Energy
Brian Nentrup -- Pheasants Forever
Dave Stratman – Natural Resources Conservation Service
Mark Reiter –IDNR, Fish and Wildlife
David Bausman – Indiana State Dept. of Agriculture
Austin Hochstetler – Eppley
Jeffrey Bransford – Eppley

Core Team from IDNR, Fish and Wildlife:

Amanda Wuestefeld
Julie Kempf
Sandy Clark-Kolaks
Steve Donabauer
Sam Whiteleather
Nate Levitte
Kent Hanauer
Brant Fisher

July 25, 2013: State Wildlife Action Plan Meeting Agenda

Introduction

Share the information on priority areas collected (partner map)

Discuss relevancy of partner map

Break into 4 themes (ecosystems, funding, partnerships, citizens)

Develop next steps and recommendations

Break

Habitats and regionalization of Indiana's SWAP

Review what the current Plan has

Why should or shouldn't the state be broken into regions for SWAP

What are the advantages and disadvantages

Share and discuss potential alternatives

Recommendation for next Plan

Wrap-up

Meeting notes begin on the next page

State Wildlife Action Plan meeting notes for July 25, 2013

The meeting started with a brief overview of where we have been and where we are going in the planning process of the State Wildlife Action Plan. The topics for the day were introduced – Partner Map and creating a new base layer to use when addressing threats and actions and setting priorities for the 2015 plan.

Group discussion began with a look at the partner map that the Core Team had pulled together with the information that was shared by the Advisory Committee and other available data. Once the group had an initial look at the Partner Map the Committee broke into smaller work groups to address the potential of using a Partner Map from the perspective of the four themes (citizens, funding, partnerships, and ecosystems)

Each smaller theme group was asked to answer the following questions during their discussion.

1. What are the positives/negatives with the current map
2. What needs to be change
3. What are the next steps that the core team needs to take to make this idea functionally for the conservation community

Citizens –Flip Chart Notes

People = Development = Conflict? -- Where could conflict exist

How could we represent citizens on the map?

Develop (+farm lands) what is the easiest -- See the white areas of the map

Using the as a way to engage our citizens

- explaining why the green areas are important

- what is okay to share

- actually could cause conflict

- *if we share this we need to be really ready to sell it

Education in doughnut counties

- also find opportunities to do conservation activities in these areas (create corridors, etc.)

- get in people's back yards

- need to create supporting white areas to get work done in the green

Citizens -- Next Steps

-Determine how to communicate the map to certain groups

Ex. Farmers, politicians, corporate exec., urban centers –indy, Bloomington, ft.wayne, Evansville, northwest Indiana

-Tailor the map/message to specific demographics -- must be prepared with accurate information/messaging during public input meetings. Misinformation and fear are best fought with open and honest accurate information.

Ecosystems –Flip Chart Notes

Positives

- Partners w/common interest (interactive map)
- Geographic gaps – might be very important but opportunities not there
- Connectivity

Negatives

- Need better representation of unique habitats and spp info

Changes or What's Next

- Add GAP data
- WRP layer
- IBI data
- Important Bird
- Indiana biodiversity (Forest Clark)
- Acres Land Trust
- Indiana Land Trust Protection Alliance
- Divide managed land from potential
- Watch out for double county (wrp/goose pond example)
- Filter focus area by habitat type groups interested

Conservation Community -- Flip Chart Notes

- Still incomplete not enough groups or projects included
 - o Nrcs initiatives
 - o USDA
 - o ISDA
- May be missing some NGO groups
- Missing IBAs/Audubon
- Good at focusing attention on areas and motivating to work on areas
- Having the graphic helps communicate
- Potential for people to feel left out
- Value to showing focus areas
- Should try to have a place for everyone on map
- Helps to focus on and identify priority areas
- Needs to identify 'why' and area is shaded on the map
- Easier to draw \$\$ to the conservation community if an area is on the map
- Easier to approach new partners if an area is on the map
- The map helps create synergy by targeting efforts and 'moving the needle'

Conservation Community What's Next

- Incomplete data (missing groups/projects)
- Share the map
- Show why and different groups are focusing on areas -- share reasons they are focusing on an area
- Separate 'apples' from 'oranges'

Funding – Flip Chart Notes

Positives

- Layering –easy to identify

What to change

- Add pheasant/quail priority areas
- Expand layers – more input from others
- Need refined – where future monies need to be spent not currently
- Separate land acquisition and habitat improvement – prioritize

Questions related to the partner map and funding

- identify areas of need
- grant eligibility
- identifying other partners
- partners – who's working where
- potential for future work

***Next steps for the Advisory Group is to ask their partners to share both where they are working and where they are interesting in working so that the Core Team can pull all this information together to create 2 maps. Map #1 will show what is currently happening in our state. Map #2 will show where the conservation community would like to extend their work. If this information could be provided to us via shape files, that would be helpful.**

Habitat/Regionalization - Base Map

The last topic of the meeting was the Base Map (habitat/regionalization of Indiana's SWAP)

- Core Team presented the 2 potential base maps to the Advisory Committee
- Advisory Group comments
 - No major concerns with the mapping divisions as long as the maps stay somewhere less than 12 divisions.
 - Do we need to have 1 map that combines watersheds and habitats? Can we have 2 separate maps, one for aquatics, one for terrestrial?
 - There were a couple comments that the watersheds should use a more detailed HUC
 - There was no strong preference for BCR over Omernik.
 - A couple suggestions to use Hoyoma's system

***Next steps for this conversation is for the Core Team to make a decision and present the decision with the reasoning behind it and the group felt like they would be able to support it.**

Next Meeting

August 19, 2013