



GREATER YELLOWSTONE COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Date: November 26, 2014

Participating Agencies

U.S. Department of the Interior

National Park Service

Grand Teton National Park
John D. Rockefeller, Jr.
Memorial Parkway

Yellowstone National Park

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

National Elk Refuge

Red Rock Lakes
National Wildlife Refuge

Bureau of Land Management

Idaho, Montana, Wyoming

U.S. Department of Agriculture

Forest Service

Beaverhead-Deerlodge NF

Bridger-Teton NF

Caribou-Targhee NF

Custer Gallatin National Forest

Shoshone National Forest

Chair:

Joe Alexander

Forest Supervisor
Shoshone National Forest

808 Meadow Lane
Cody, WY 83414

Tele: 307-578-5187
Fax: 307-587-5112

Email: jgalexander@fs.fed.us

Executive Coordinator:

Virginia Kelly

P.O. Box 130
Bozeman, MT 59771

Tele: (406) 587-6704
Fax: (406) 587-6758

email: vkelly@fs.fed.us
web: www.fedgycc.org

To: Participants of the October 28, 2014 GYCC Public Conversation

From: Joe Alexander, Chair, Greater Yellowstone Coordinating Committee

Subject: Public Conversation Summary

I am pleased to convey the summary of the GYCC Public Conversation held the afternoon of October 28, 2014 in Bozeman, Montana. My GYCC colleagues and I found the conversations robust and appreciated the many helpful suggestions and insightful observations offered by participants.

The GYCC members are discussing the many ideas heard at the meeting. We will hold the (likely) final Public Conversation in Cody, Wyoming in spring 2015. At the conclusion of the Cody meeting we will evaluate all of the comments from all three meetings and consider how to move forward.

The morning of October 28, the GYCC held its regular semi-annual public meeting. Dr. Craig Lee gave a presentation on Ice Patch Archeology in the Greater Yellowstone Area, and each of the ten GYCC subcommittee chairs presented a brief committee overview. The subcommittee presentations are posted to http://www.fedgycc.org/gycc_meetingsandevents.htm. Due to the sensitivity of cultural resources, Dr. Lee's presentation will not be posted.

The attached Public Conversation notes begin with a one-page meeting synopsis, followed by the notes recorded at the meeting. The Public Conversation summary is also posted to http://www.fedgycc.org/gycc_meetingsandevents.htm.

Let me thank you all again for your time, your ideas and your sincere interest in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. Please direct any questions to GYCC Executive Coordinator Virginia Kelly at 406-587-6704, or vkelly@fs.fed.us.

Sincerely,

/s/ Joseph G. Alexander

JOSEPH G. ALEXANDER
Chair, Greater Yellowstone Coordinating Committee

October 28, 2014 GYCC Public Conversation Synopsis

Participants Over 40 participants joined GYCC members and staff at a *Public Conversation* in Bozeman, Montana to discuss Greater Yellowstone issues. Attending were private citizens, Montana County Commissioners, Montana state legislators, Montana state agency staff, federal agency staff, staff for the US Congressional delegation, environmental, resource use, and recreation organizations, and media representatives.

Welcome and Introductions GYCC Chair Joe Alexander (Shoshone National Forest Supervisor) opened the meeting by welcoming participants. Each GYCC manager, participant and staff introduced themselves. Joe explained:

- The GYCC wants to more strategically address ecosystem-scale issues, to improve collaboration with nonfederal entities, and to increase capacity through partnerships.
- The GYCC has limited capacity to implement big changes in its operations. It can reorient its focus (e.g. priority issues) and can work in different ways with each other and the public.
- The GYCC needs to deliberate before it can come to consensus on issues it may hear at this meeting. The group will consider comments from all three Public Conversations after the spring 2015 meeting in Cody and then discuss how to move forward.

GYCC Overview GYCC Coordinator Virginia Kelly explained the GYCC mission, members, history, priorities, structure, decision making process, how the work gets done, and some notable achievements. She briefly explained the format and results of the March 2014 Jackson Public Conversation.

Meeting Procedure / Housekeeping Facilitator Steve Smutko outlined the meeting format. Participants broke into six small groups, each with one or two GYCC members, to discuss and report on three questions.

Facilitated Dialogue Questions

1. Understanding the GYCC addresses region-wide, ecosystem-scale issues that cut across agency boundaries and missions, what is the GYCC doing that you think they should continue or do more of? Where do your priorities coincide with those of the GYCC?
2. Where your priorities are aligned with those of the GYCC, where can we coordinate activities and combine resources to enhance our effectiveness? For example, what activities might you engage in, what information could you provide, or what can you contribute? Alternatively, what GYCC-compatible projects or activities are you or your organization undertaking that could benefit from GYCC engagement?
3. For any specific project or activity identified in the previous step, what actions can you or GYCC managers take to move it forward?

Primary Theme from Participants: Improve Communication

Participants commented on numerous topics including ecosystem management, natural resources, recreational opportunities, visitor use, land and resource use, transportation, GYCC priorities, GYCC membership and partnering opportunities. The most prevalent theme emerging from the meeting was a request for more communication from GYCC. Participants suggested more frequent meetings, use of social media especially Facebook, TV, radio and print media, website, community liaisons, and one-on-one engagement.

Recorded Comments The following pages contain the notes recorded at the meeting. The notes were modified to correct spelling. Some small groups recorded individual commenter names while others did not, so all individual commenter names were removed from the public summary.

Breakout Session 1

	What is the GYCC doing that you think they should continue or do more of?	Where do your priorities coincide with those of the GYCC?
TABLE 1	<p>What is the GYCC doing for Forest health? WBP – quite a bit of work / linked back to grizzly bears – keeping a WBP population healthy. Forest Health subcommittee is not doing a good enough job for fire-resistant forests. In the last 10 years 110,000 acres have burned in Park County and only 750,000 acres of harvest. Concern = A town with a mill in it, people who work in the forest, live in the forest, so impacts not being addressed. FS is so concerned about being appealed, FS is spending millions of dollars making projects appeal-proof. More conservation groups in Bozeman than “the rest of the world”.</p>	<p>The non-profits can convene disparate groups and can bring info together with people. Coordinating and trying to consider all of the stake-holders is a common priority.</p>
	<p>There is an interagency approach to fire.</p>	<p>The landscape level approach to the GYE coincides with theirs, i.e. wildlife / climate. Perhaps energy development is missing.....this could be its own subcommittee, given the interest in energy development- oil and gas to wind.</p>
	<p>The integration among subcommittees somewhat addresses Forest health. But it is more important to look on an ecosystem level - i.e. the GYA in general. i.e. air quality</p>	<p>When the GYCC meets, are there discussions about the policies to try to coordinate the policies. (explanation – Virginia explained that is not the goal of the GYCC)</p>
	<p>Erosion from forest fire, i.e. all the things that can impact the ecosystem. Wildlife habitat loss / tourism lost due to fires/ so fire-resistant forests are important.</p>	<p>Fire subcommittee doesn’t include counties, and only talks about putting out fire.</p>
	<p>Suggest that the climate change adaptation might be addressed by the GYCC subcommittee, i.e. adaptation – to address some of the big picture issues.</p>	<p>3 messages:</p>
	<p>The paradigm is emerging – it would be appropriate to consider adding the ecosystem health, broader than forest health, it is an emerging paradigm. So the GYCC should address how all of the subcommittees address the health of the ecosystem as a whole, (communities, counties, people....) add the health paradigm.</p>	<p>1. Communication: The public does not know the GYCC priorities or even who the priorities are. Suggestion – better public info.....better press release. Use social media or provide links to website to provide upfront information. The press release implied that the public was only welcome in the afternoon – which created an unfortunate awareness/ information gap on the part of participants.</p>
	<p>Doesn’t know a lot about the GYCC. More public education and outreach increase needed, in terms of agency collaboration.</p>	<p>2. Ecosystem/ landscape-level approach: The GYCC should break down boundaries and take an ecosystem approach (involving health of the communities, attributes of the land, air, water). What is the agenda of the GYCC? To coordinate Federal agencies or to manage ecosystem health.</p>
	<p>Works with the GYCC. But has a limited knowledge....but did see the press release. Much cheaper than radio or TV.....use social media. There are numerous media outlets....use them. What are we doing well?? It was good that the press release went out.</p>	<p>3. Prioritization: knowing that there is limited resources, finding the highest priorities, and then finding the funding and ways to accomplish that priority work.</p>
	<p>Questions about if the subcommittee power point presentations will be on-line? Answer – yes.</p>	
<p>What is the agenda of the GYCC - to serve the agencies.....or to make the “world a better place” and to serve the larger ecosystem. If it is the latter, then you need more involved. The focus might be somewhat narrow.</p>		

Breakout Session 1 (cont.)

TABLE 1	What is the GYCC doing that you think they should continue or do more of?	Where do your priorities coincide with those of the GYCC?
	When he worked for the county, there was a lot of coordination among county, federal, state agencies. Weeds are a good example of coordination.	
	Rangeland ecologist for the WY state, deals exclusively with BLM issues. Encourages ecosystem-health attitude, instead of agency approach. - encouraging more partnership between agencies. Example: YNP is not doing anything for WBP inside the Park, that will be a big hole.....current approach is an agency approach. Need to look at work that is across boundaries. The #1 purpose of the GYCC should be an ecosystem approach.	
	Suggest that there is a delay between the subcommittee reports and this public session, to allow for the information to report out.	
	The press release was geared toward only participation in the afternoon.....NOT this AM, which is a big hole.	
	There is good work going on, but the agenda needs to be geared towards an ecosystem approach – not just each agency.	
	Perhaps the GYCC needs to explain better – the intent is to look at broad, overarching ecosystem/ cross boundary approaches.	
	Recognizes that 15 minutes per presentation is only a short amount of time	
	Suggest taking the boundaries out of the process. Is there a prioritization process to focus staff time? (GYCC member reply- yes there is a broad look at what gets funded). It comes down to management decisions. There needs to be a fair amount of outside input into the GYCC decisions (GYCC member reply- that is the role of the GYCC).	
	How the BLM might contribute to the process.....and what role will the BLM play in the GYCC processes. (BLM says that the BLM has looked at where it makes sense)	
	Each agency is managing the wildlife differently. Shouldn't the goal be to manage wildlife all of the same across the ecosystem? With all of the different agency management actions, how can the wildlife thrive? Treat wildlife on an ecosystem level, not on an agency level.	
	Wildlife belong to the states. The issue is complex. Wolves for example. BLM/ FS – manage the habitat, not the wildlife.	
	What can the GYCC do to encourage wildlife management in the ecosystem.....as opposed to each county, each state?	
	An example of trying to coordinate across boundaries is the bison management plan.	

Breakout Session 1 (cont.)

	What is the GYCC doing that you think they should continue or do more of?	Where do your priorities coincide with those of the GYCC?
TABLE 2	Public has no information about the GYCC. Hard to align priorities when the public has no knowledge of the GYCC accomplishments. Need improved communication and coordination.	
	Information needs to be more readily available. Communication is the key.	
	GYCC needs to connect with state, county, and local agencies, which will improve local knowledge.	
	Increased sensitivity to the GYE issues and relating it to the local level. GYCC needs to speak more holistically.	
	GYCC should consider the scale of issues.	
	Have an outward focus on communication related to recreation opportunity.	
	Being proactive to future recreation trends, to help clarify management of future opportunities and possibilities.	
	Refocus the recreation committee to a visitor use committee. Need to address and anticipate the varying visitor use preferences. How do we make ourselves relevant to new communities? Proactively improve and encourage new participation and use.	
	GYCC should continue it's work on water management issues and further develop this focus. GYE has impacts on many downstream users.	
	Wildlife connectivity is important and requires coordination across agencies and boundaries.	
	Continue focus on human wildlife coexistence.	
	GYCC should coordinate across jurisdictions on climate change issues.	
	Need to communicate inconsistencies along with management consistencies.	
	Work on improved data sharing and data analysis across. GYCC could be a clearing-house for GYE data.	
	Key Issues:	
1. Improved communications and improved engagement with local communities and state agencies. Additional public meetings and outreach.		
2. Proactive approach to anticipating recreation trends, identifying what issues are GYCC level issues. Focus on visitor use and future interest. Make the GYE relevant to new communities and new opportunities.		
3. Improved data sharing. Could the GYCC be a clearing-house for GYE data?		

Breakout Session 1 (cont.)

	What is the GYCC doing that you think they should continue or do more of?	Where do your priorities coincide with those of the GYCC?
TABLE 3	Emphasis on sustainable operations. Look at what has worked with other large landscapes in raising their profile and developing a constituency.	Coordinated messaging regarding the complexity of ecosystem function and current/future threats.
	Stakeholder participation in the subcommittees and annual meetings needs to increase. This leads to relationship and trust building.	Sustainable operations as a priority.
	GYCC priorities and activities are not well publicized so not well understood. Need more sharing so stakeholders can identify where they can engage. Explore other entry points for the public/stakeholders besides the subcommittees.	Increasing the visibility of the GYE and increased engagement with stakeholders and the public.
		Increasing the resource knowledge base (and sharing that information) that will help with assessing effects of various types of development -- making connections with subcommittees.
TABLE 4	Are there other priorities that the GYCC should focus on?	Guardians of the Range - They coincide with the management of invasive species, management of public access, and enhanced management efficiencies
	Protecting greater Yellowstone landscape integrity - I'd like to see GYCC do more at looking at inhibitors of addressing invasive weeds. I don't think the National Parks should opt out of addressing some things that multiple use agencies are doing. The parks should embrace using chemicals to help address some of their weed problems. Explore agency mandates that may be an impediment to addressing landscape-scale problems. The Park Service needs to address their agency impediments (e.g. legal mandates) to address landscape issues.	Former Yellowstone employee/interested member of the public - Enhancing collegiality and establishing a focus that would transcend all of the different factions, facilitate the ability to communicate in light of conflicting mandates
	I'd like to see 4 meetings a year instead of 2 - and more face-to-face meetings. If the agencies on GYCC spent more time together that would enhance collaboration and cooperation	Former Yellowstone employee/interested member of the public - Communication in its various forms seems to be fundamental
	GYCC should do more to address levels of human use - I would like to see the issue raised that land cannot absorb whoever wants to come. I don't see this as being explicitly addressed on a broad, general level; this issue underlies many of the other resource issues. We need increased awareness about capacity limits.	Member of the public - The care and feeding of the ecosystem. GYCC should continue to exist! Landscape scale communication and coordination is incredibly important.
	GYCC should consider investigating the potential of administrative consolidation among surrounding national forests, which are currently divided amongst 3 different FS regions. In 1993, there was a proposal to consolidate into a single GYA administrative unit (see Don Bachman's email to the committee) - suggest examining Lake Tahoe model. Three separate regions with different personnel, strategies, priorities, and budgets create different priorities - these different interests are good but we need a region that addresses larger, landscape-level priorities. This would allow more efficiency of time and project commitment, and a consistent theme or interest.	Invasive species action network - very aligned. Personally supportive of the sustainable operations of the GYCC - just wish they would communicate this better.

Breakout Session 1 (cont.)

	What is the GYCC doing that you think they should continue or do more of?	Where do your priorities coincide with those of the GYCC?
TABLE 4	GYCC needs to do a better job of communicating the structure of public engagement with the GYCC member agencies and how decisions are made. Decision-making process differs across agencies, so members of the public don't understand what the decision-making process is in each of the units, and the role of the GYCC should be to help with this. E.g. Glacier national park AIS program - Yellowstone did not have a similar policy. Is that a decisions made at the NPS level or at the park level? The public is confused about where the parks are made.	Report out to the group: Organizational structures need to be examined so they can be improved. GYCC needs to continue its work providing leadership in this arena. Configuration for effectiveness and efficiencies. Understanding legal mandates and the ability to address issues of the future - this includes "impairment." Landscape scale problem solving needs to be incorporated into agency structure.
	I would like to see the GYCC Better communicate the peer-reviewed science decisions that are made.	Communication as a broad concept of what the GYCC is, how its structured, how decisions are made, communicating science, communicating to the public, and issues of relevancy.
	Outreach, attracting, and communicating with racial and cultural minorities that may not be aware of or understand public lands to increase relevancy. Engaging diverse populations	
	There should be more recognition of the unique mandate of the NPS for maintaining an unimpaired resource for the use and enjoyment of the people. There is too little understanding of what an unimpaired resource really means. This is especially important in this ecosystem. It should be a priority to better understand the non-impairment mission and how all of the entities of the GYCC contribute to that and can better understand that.	
	Pollution is an important issue across the ecosystem	
TABLE 5	Would like to see more illustration and discussion of priorities and how public can help facilitate education of public on these priorities	All of the priorities are well directed. Coordination at the scale of the GYCC is intact with the WCS priorities.
	When it can happen involve locals as they have the most local knowledge.	Winter landscape change across ecosystem over time is important for Winter Wildlands Outdoor Alliance; allowing for connected wildlife habitats is in line with priorities.
	Doesn't feel involved; so GYCC should consider outreach vs. Facebook and Twitter as well as face to face or individual conversations using media.	Personal 1 on 1 engagement; we need to influence human beings to make decisions that influence the landscape for the better. We need to use social nuances to influence people to support what the GYCC is doing. How can the GYCC be involved at influencing people and behavior at the local or grass roots level beneath the political level.
	Using non-profit and county government to educate public especially around concrete/tangible goals and accomplishments as opposed to greenhouse gas reduction. Tap into additional networks of nonprofits. Important to share with the public that the agencies view GYA as an entire entity landscape) irrespective of agency jurisdictions.	

Breakout Session 1 (cont.)

	What is the GYCC doing that you think they should continue or do more of?	Where do your priorities coincide with those of the GYCC?
TABLE 5	Wildlife do not recognize boundaries and that the need for coordination at the large scale is very clear. Pronghorn migration is a great example of the need for coordination. Greater Yellowstone is the headwaters of the U.S. and is an example of the need for increased coordination at a large scale especially with limited water resources.	
	Stress on consistency across state and agency lines and even within subdistricts of agencies. Science should direct management decisions. Sheep grazing is an example of how some units don't allow sheep grazing while others do (more consistency).	
	GYCC doing a good job of getting the science together but more work needs to be done to distribute science to managers.	
	GYA is split across several regions	
	Social change often comes with opportunity. Lack of consistency may result due to social pressure and opportunities	
	GYCC has been good at taking agencies that have not been perceived at considering public opinion and coming together to talk and then involve constituents such that social influence is integrated into decisions. GYCC is integral in that	
	GYCC is a defined area but portions of some units extend beyond the GYCC. These areas outside of the GYCC may have their own priorities.	
	Highest priority for the ecosystem (native fish as an example). How do we talk about our highest priorities in a way that isn't compartmentalized. Non-profits can be the bridge between agencies and local governments. Specific areas have their own specific issues but non-profits can help communicate the big picture.	
	GYCC is a clearing house. We need to see better dissemination of information to the public in a way that is readily accessible. If people have questions on issues, they will start going to the GYCC.	
	GYCC provides a big picture look at the priorities in a coordinated fashion: Priorities are in-sync.	
	Big Hole arctic grayling restoration work has excelled due to a grass roots coalition that has become "contagious."	

Breakout Session 1 (cont.)

	What is the GYCC doing that you think they should continue or do more of?	Where do your priorities coincide with those of the GYCC?
TABLE 6	Outside entities add capacity and can help foster coordination between federal, state, county, and private.	GYC work areas and priorities overlap greatly through a variety of wildlife issues to include bears and bear food storage. The more functional the GYCC is the better off the ecosystem, county, and communities can address at larger/ecosystem scale. There are ways to improve working across boundaries and working at the larger scale to all be on the same page.
	Utilize your media appropriately to get communication out about meetings but also to tell the stories of the GYA and what the GYCC is doing to conserve it. While there is debate on the species, the stories of grizzly bears and wolves becoming an active part of the ecosystem once again.	Funding is an issue with the process and legislature holds that control. Their entire system is business and financial based vs what is best for the majority of the people and the are itself. Believes it is inappropriate for legislative members to be in control of funding for things they have no background in.
	Greater ongoing conversations with those not actively involved in GYCC or its subcommittees. This would help with education on what the GYCC does and what it is. Integrating more NGOs and state/local entities to gain additional input and increase collaboration (seconded by others).	Thinks it is a priority to bring the correct people to the table to have conversations with non-federal land management groups; to include the lands within the GYA that are non-federal lands
	Wildland Urban Interface is something that GYCC needs to take into account; federal lands blend into private lands/ranches, so they can't be completely separated.	
	Talking across boundaries can be hugely beneficial; having counties, or others, involved in well can be a huge help and if not included they could become a road block in the future.	
	Need to continue educating the public, not just nationally but also locally, about what we have right here in the GYA and the proper ways to act when recreating in it. This may mean using various methods to reach the public. Messaging and education needs to increase and improve.	
	Continue to strive towards factual science to properly manage the GYA resources.	
	Get more community involvement and buy-in to foster better relationships and increased understanding.	

Breakout Session 2

	Where can we coordinate activities and combine resources to enhance our effectiveness?	What GYCC-compatible projects or activities are you or your organization undertaking that could benefit from GYCC engagement?
TABLE 1	Is there a way for the GYCC to offer the opportunity for a community liaison? To better connect to the communities.	PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS to accomplish common goals.
	(Forest Supervisor) is supposed to be the community liaison from the GYCC.	Grizzly bear-people safety
	Having a community-member-at-large – so that the public feels somewhat empowered. Ultimately, the GYCC will still have to make their decisions as they. It would make for a more transparent process to have an at-large member.	Bison co-existence fencing
	The County Commissioners could provide a venue for getting information out to the public. Some of the local county commissioners could provide suggestions as to how the FS could accomplish some of its jobs.	Carnivore "" "" "" (private, state, Federal)
	In terms of fuel reduction projects, that are always litigated,but if we can get broader support from groups, then perhaps our projects would not get litigated as much. To get projects from proposal to reality.	Range-riders
	The Counties and the GYCC essentially have similar goals, but as you get higher in the "food chain" the bureaucracy may be broken.	AB Wilderness Foundation
	What could community partners take on?	Joint cooperative monitoring – to help do part of the job.....wildlife / rangeland/ water quality / citizen-scientists
	By getting some non-Federal participation in the GYCC process. If there are priorities that the GYCC identifies, there are probably projects that partners could find some funding for.	GYCC identifies the need. Private side then could help with funding.....to ID people to help out.
		Likewise, if the private side is doing something that coincides with GYCC work and the GYCC could help promote it. i.e. a citizens' working group, that the agencies helped to publicize.
		Needs to be some non-Fed participation to facilitate this
		Instead of public affairs officers, perhaps the agencies need public relations officers. There needs to be someone who is assigned to be the liaison with the communities, stakeholders, other agencies. ...to do outreach, how does the GYCC hear what the communities are saying.
		It would be helpful to have a place where the working groups and subcommittee reports are available and publicized.
	Better communication is needed.....so that members in the community who are working on a topic can know what to be in touch with. Need a proactive person to get the information out as to what the GYCC is doing.	
	Opportunity - Transportation: there is an initiative that DOT has "Ecological" = an ecosystem approach to developing infrastructure projects. It looks at a much larger region to pool mitigation measures across the ecosystem, i.e. where to target the highest priorities for largest projects. i.e. for habitat / high priority easements / Grants are available for feasibility studies and the process to determine locations that are appropriate for this approach – at an ecosystem level approach.	

Breakout Session 2 (cont.)

	Where can we coordinate activities and combine resources to enhance our effectiveness?	What GYCC-compatible projects or activities are you or your organization undertaking that could benefit from GYCC engagement?
TABLE 2	On a resource by resource basis we develop a GYCC database where the public can contribute data and information.	
	Bike community could benefit from additional bear awareness information from the land managers. This could be through community-wide presentations by subcommittees (agency employees), actively reaching out at bike club meetings.	
	Partnering with federal agencies to increase education and public outreach opportunities.	
	Target and invite interest groups when GYCC has subcommittee meetings. Make the subcom meetings more accessible and available. Joint subcom meetings (maybe a 2 or 3) with public involvement.	
	Network, access, and capacity can be provided by local interest groups. What scale are the interest groups and the GYCC comfortable working at?	
	Horse-bike desensitizing clinics is an opportunity to collaborate. This can drastically improve trail maintenance volunteering by the bike community, with help from both horse and bike use access volunteers.	
	Look for local initiatives that could be scaled up to the GYE level for GYCC relevance.	
	Key issues: 1. Access to networks and stakeholders, 2. reach out to the GYCC and provide local expertise, 3. provide examples of local initiatives that could be scaled up.	
GYCC can bring 1. watershed level coverage or operation, 2. data integration, 3. provide summary of subcom projects and involvement, 4. GYCC can provide local buy-in for agency level projects.		
TABLE 3	AIS preparedness workshop and other AIS coordinated activities. Create a clearinghouse of sharable information. Creation of a recreation subcommittee as many of the cooperators/concessions are invested in the ecosystem and have a lot of contact with the public. How can the agencies and the stakeholders help each other engage the public and share in messaging. Concerns about user capacity.	
	Priority to attempt to balance wilderness character with user needs. Create an environment where you can have a sustained conversations with competing entities so they can gain understanding of each other's issues.	
	Concern for large landscapes and assisting communities/stakeholders with engagement in the process. Is the GYCC an interagency coordination organization or is it a larger ecosystem function advocate. Need clarity of GYCC vision/mission.	
	Common link is desire to "care for the land". 80/20 concept = 80% in agreement regarding how to care for the landscape; 20% hard conversations. Find ways to partner with external organizations to implement the 80%. Leverage non-government groups ability to function with less "red tape". Utilize the agencies strengths in other areas.	

Breakout Session 2 (cont.)

	Where can we coordinate activities and combine resources to enhance our effectiveness?	What GYCC-compatible projects or activities are you or your organization undertaking that could benefit from GYCC engagement?
TABLE 4	<p>In the interest of connecting people to lands and youth with public lands - this really breaks down a lot when it comes down to connecting with you. Invasive Action Network does a lot of in-classroom engagement. But they don't always know who from the agency to even contact. (1) Employees need to be encouraged to get out of the office and go to a school if that's truly important (2) need better access to who the people truly are who would be available to go out to the public. People could do more to engage the public if the agencies could do a better job of offering and lending their expertise and engagement.</p>	<p>IBMP - interagency group works primarily with bison and the state of Montana - GYCC should consider engaging in the bison discussion and across bison historic range. GYCC agencies as a whole should engage more in the broader issues and opportunities for expansion.</p>
	<p>Guardians of the Range can most identify with Connecting people to the land. The voice of GYCC should connote to the public the diversity and multiple use nature of GYE. The messaging can be at risk when people perceive that as just Yellowstone National Park. We can work together on messaging. Missions and mandates of all agencies should all be equally important.</p>	<p>Strategic communication - whether we're communicating different issues of the agencies,</p>
	<p>I see the agencies surrounding the park needing to understand the uniqueness of Yellowstone Park, and the agencies around the park can help facilitate a "buffer" around Yellowstone - e.g. hunting of wolves. The agencies could work together more effectively to protect the unique values of the park.</p>	
	<p>With regard to the bison issue, agree with comment about greater collaboration across the broader ecosystem.</p>	<p>Much of the communication to the public is under the assumption that if we communicate better and increase public's awareness of our issue, then the public will change their behavior to be more aligned with our position. GYCC needs to be more strategic about communication. We need to be cautious about assuming the public understands the differences among agencies, and GYCC communications needs to use their communications to better inform the public about the differences amongst the agencies otherwise it creates a conflict and misunderstanding - "intellectually light-weight spitball conversations" that create conflict. An example: one of the biggest concerns is invasive species - the invasives communities talk about reaching people before they leave their home. The GYCC can do more to assist with that initial, at home messaging before they even travel.</p>
	<p>Invasive Action Network are already heavily involved with many of the subcommittees.</p>	
	<p>More, continuing communication on all of these issues. Use all the forms of media for promotion and communication. Questions remain about how large of a group of constituents we can possibly engage. There seems to be a lot of communication at the subcommittee level - is it possible to communicate more amongst agencies? The limit is not interest, the limit may be more an issue of capacity, and the question of what you're trying to achieve - communicating with the masses can get chaotic and make it difficult to achieve a specific goal without sufficient education. Sometimes the communication with the public can be too "politically correct" and not get directly at the difficult issues.</p>	

Breakout Session 2 (cont.)

	Where can we coordinate activities and combine resources to enhance our effectiveness?	What GYCC-compatible projects or activities are you or your organization undertaking that could benefit from GYCC engagement?
TABLE 5	<p>Interagency Grizzly Bear Study Team is a model: if partners know priorities of agencies numerous groups can coordinate and contribute toward a common goal: Coordinated plans to address a priority (bear resistant containers).</p>	<p>Publicizing to the individual using social media may be a way to interact with a greater constituency.</p>
	<p>Making sure people recreating on public land are engaged in management of public land. Citizen scientists can collect information to supplement surveys for managers in a way that meets agency requirements. This could be done in a variety of ways including comment boxes or via training on data collection for a specific project.</p>	<p>Happy to do Facebook page. Facebook subcommittee. A communication subcommittee may be the proper way to address communication issues.</p>
	<p>It's important to give credit where credit is due, and recognize those that provided funding, and along those lines it's important to communicate in a variety of ways to prevent 11th concerns from the public. Synergy in funding projects (leveraging funds) can be generated through partnerships and acknowledging partnerships. Effectiveness would be improved through early communication.</p>	
	<p>Priorities are set by consensus of land managers and partners respond from the standpoint of a call to action. Missions of certain user groups may be in alignment with GYCC priorities.</p>	
	<p>Yellowstone Lake Lake trout suppression and native fish conservation objectives align with fish and AIS subcommittees. Would like specifics for opportunities to contribute. GYCC needs to determine where gaps in addressing priorities lie and where partners can contribute. GYCC is a forum for synthesizing science and also drives opportunities for managers to drive research priorities based on information gaps. Partners may see gaps that GYCC agencies may not be aware of and may have expertise or information on how to fill gaps.</p>	
	<p>Agencies may not have the capacity to learn from what is working on neighboring units whereby the public or NGO's may help to facilitate some information exchange in terms of what is working or not working</p>	
	<p>Membranes between organizations can be more permeable in both directions and that this may be facilitated by various NGO's or the public. We need to take the conversation to the individual that is less likely or inclined to participate through 1 on 1 conversation.</p>	
	<p>Facebook page would help engage public.</p>	
	<p>A communications sub-committee.</p>	
	<p>Asking questions and then asking someone else to answer it. You can click on a post and contact the individual.</p>	

Breakout Session 2 (cont.)

	Where can we coordinate activities and combine resources to enhance our effectiveness?	What GYCC-compatible projects or activities are you or your organization undertaking that could benefit from GYCC engagement?
TABLE 6	GYC's collaboration with GYCC for improving campgrounds for bear safety is a prime example of an outside entity increasing effectiveness by doing it GYA wide vs forest by forest. Climate research with relation to water supply (BOR rep). Research on treatment on aquatic invasives and the like use of chemicals vs other ways.	Updated State of the Ecosystem report from GYC that will include data and research from previously developed federal entities and others. They can be the voices of advocacy for the area in ways that federal agencies cannot
	Coordinated clearing house for funding for projects. Youth engagement and involvement in our public lands and within the GYA.	Fence removal and migration route rehab/improvement at ecosystem level
	Connectivity monitoring data from Center for Large Landscape Conservation.	
	How do we increase and change the work done by the GYCC subcommittees? How do we enlighten the employees to see how important their work is?	
	Collaborating with communication to improve getting information out in different avenues from differing voices. Recommend a new subcommittee just to focus on communication.	

Breakout Session 3

What actions can you or GYCC managers take to move it forward?

TABLE 1	In Gardiner, the newsletter is the best medium for communication. That is a great example
	Park County, NPS, sewer and water district have weekly phone meetings to communicate on-going projects. The Gateway project in Gardiner is a great paradigm to communicate....i.e. Steve lobst's and Dan Wenk's communication is great! ...to talk with local communities. Use that as an excellent example - face to face is always best. Public meetings are also good.
	What help does GYCC need from the public:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for community members who work with sewage and solid waste management. All the poop that is pumped from toilets has to go off Federal land to be processed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Help with social media
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social media.....Congressional rep's office can help forward out information
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NGOs do a great job of communicating among their members – with incredible mailing lists and can help us get our word out . So if there is better coordination between the Feds and the private NGOs = advantage
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When someone receives a communication from an NGO with whom they associate, that member of the public might be more receptive to the message. ...sometimes referred to as a “gatekeeper”
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feds needs to know what the “schedulers” are for the Congressional delegates so that we can best communicate with them
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication is its own specialty – there is a lot to it to do it well.
Would it be beneficial to sit down with Fed Highways to look at the idea of advanced mitigations for upcoming projects (i.e. climate adaptation projects, culverts “Ecologic”. “Mitigation-banking”.	
On almost any subject matter, an NGO might get the job done more efficiently. The NGOs could also serve as the “gatekeepers”	

Breakout Session 3 (cont.)

	What actions can you or GYCC managers take to move it forward?
Table 2	Have the subcoms hold meetings that involve groups involved in the subcom's area of work. "Listening sessions" at the smaller scale. Interest groups see value in attending subcom meetings. Understand the value of being involved. The external focus is on the subcom work. Recreation or visitor use subcom would be valuable and is connected to many of the other resource issues and subcoms. Actively engage the subcom chairs in meaningful ways - public meetings with different levels of engagement. Clarify when the public is invited and identify the value of attending. Continually update our contact list to reach more of the public. Look for opportunities to further involve members of the public in the subcoms, such as Resource Advisory Councils to provide insight and context. Develop processes at the subcom level to scale up local issues of regional importance. Interest groups can take information back to their interested public from the GYCC subcom meetings. Use the subcom meeting to discuss local issues and then work on how to look at those at the GYE level. Use social media to outreach and provide information.
TABLE 3	Committees examine their strategic plans for opportunities to engage stakeholders. What activities would the agencies be good at and what activities would be better suited for stakeholders. Look at expanding committee membership.
	Pilot collaborate projects between agencies and stakeholders i.e. CFLRP.
	Information outreach to communities and stakeholders. Broaden meetings to be more inclusive? If so, do it in an organized manner. Interagency vs. ecosystem approach. Committees are getting work done on the ground but it has an "in-house" feeling. Could more be accomplished by opening it to a broader group. Create a sense of ownership for more groups than the agencies. Synergy vs. empowerment for stakeholders
	Huge competition among landscapes and the broader the group the more competitive it is for scarce resources (feds, states, local communities, NGOs, etc.)
TABLE 4	What actions can you or GYCC managers do to improve access to the appropriate agency people?
	Create an app to communicate about agency differences and to contextualize resources and agency projects. This app would be interactive, time relevant, and perhaps spatially tied.
	We need a more scholastic outreach – meet kids and the voting public where they are and through the tools and media platforms that they are currently using.
	We need to identify our audience and focus on our surrounding communities and communicating key messages about our priority to our local communities.
	For bison, the GYCC needs to do an inventory of each agency's management strategies for bison and their level of reception to bison across the landscape more broadly than outside the boundaries of Yellowstone and in Montana
	We need a recreation inventory of all recreation opportunities – e.g. X number of waterfalls, X miles of trails. The GYCC should reframe how it presents itself
	More multi lingual communication - can diverse visitors read the signs when they get here?
	Stop feeding elk in Jackson
	Real discussion on the consolidation of FS units either into one administrative unit or into one region Continue lake trout efforts in Yellowstone Lake Continue grant funding to subcommittee projects
	Be careful of accidentally giving the perception that GYCC is overriding agency decisions – learn from the vision exercise.
	Suggestion to develop consistent language in our routine communication that would show that units are part of a larger context. For example, our press releases could say something like, "X unit is part of the X acre Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem."

Breakout Session 3 (cont.)

	What actions can you or GYCC managers take to move it forward?
TABLE 5	Action items for getting some things done on the ground or working together.
	Liked idea of communication liaison that serves as the point of contact and conduit of inflow and outflow of information using tools such as social media. Communicating science would be one of the objectives. GYCC needs to engage the conversation at multiple levels. Setting priorities or working towards how we can gain more ownership and insight into what the GYCC does.
	Identifying specific projects. Subcommittee's may need to reach out to the public for financial or person needs. Focus on issues that are uniting and not divisive. Catalyst may be getting the specific things being done around an issue. Let people know what has been funded for a given year.
	Non-profits, if aware of funded projects can use this seed money for going after additional funds. Communicating successes would improve public perception about the effectiveness of agencies at managing public lands
	How doing specific projects benefits the larger Greater Yellowstone and all those who benefit from it. Make those bigger picture connections from smaller scale projects. Weeds are coming in due to larger issues. Communicate why the public should care. Why should people off the GYA map care. We need to connect people to the lands even those not living within the GYA. Focusing on the 80% type issues that most agree on.
	Shared responsibility and group successes diminishes the lightning rod of any one agency.
	A broad coalition immunizes the often initial negative response toward federal agencies.
TABLE 6	Messages don't have to come from the agency but from partners. Lightning rod issues for one agency many not be lightning rod issues for a different group or if presented in a certain manner from an outside group. Having a communication subcommittee
	A work group that would develop a communication framework that could be proposed at the next GYCC meeting. This would include communicating different roles, etc. over each agency involved in land management within the GYA.
	Need to add capacity for networking and collaboration as well as for partnership.
	Does there need to be a NGO coordinating group that sits beside the GYCC?
	What is the mechanism to keep the momentum form today going forward? How do we hold each other accountable to accomplish things set forward today?
	Need to keep a public comment/forum for each GYCC meeting. Important to look into having non-federal entities on subcommittees in some form or fashion.