

Agenda
Great Basin CESU, RMP, EP and LCC Meeting
November 1 and 2, 2010

Location: FA214 – Dean’s Conference Room, UNR campus
Date & Time: November 1, 2010: 3:00 pm – 6:00 pm
November 2, 2010: 8:00 am – 1:00 pm
Facilitator: Bobbie Antonich, Meetings in Motion, Boulder City, Nevada

November 1, 2010

3:00 – 3:15 pm	-Welcome Remarks/ Logistics	Rang Narayanan
	-Preliminary <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Introductions• Purpose of meeting• Review of agenda• Operating principles	Bobbie Antonich
3:15- 4:00 pm	-Ten Minute presentations on the framework of each organization <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What it is (purpose)• What it's not• Its uniqueness & how it differs from the other organizations	CESU: Rang Narayanan Mike Collopy GBEP: Stan Johnson Bob Alverts GBRMP: Jeanne Chambers GBLCC: Mike Pellant
4:00 -4:45 pm	-Concerns <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What's not working with the current Great Basin operational model?	-Small mixed groups -Top 3 concerns/group -Present by spokesperson -Synthesize by facilitator
4:45 – 5:00 pm	-Break	
5:00 – 5:15 pm	Welcome & Remarks	Mark Johnson Provost, UNR
5:15 – 6:00 pm	Draft Vision Statement	Bobbie Antonich
6:15 pm	Meet at Brew Brothers in the Eldorado Hotel & Casino No host social	

End Day One

November 2, 2010

8:00 – 8:15 am	-Logistics/announcements	Rang Narayanan
	-Recap of Day One	Bobbie Antonich
8:15 – 9:45 am	-Discussion by each organization on:	CESU, EP, RMP, LCC
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Where is the current duplication?• What each organization can contribute without duplication of effort?	
9:45 – 10:00 am	-Break	
10:00 – 11:00 am	-Agree upon organizational areas of collaboration	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Which can we collaborate on?	
11:00- 11:45	-Address how we will work together on these areas of collaboration or structure around these areas of collaboration	
11:45 – 12 noon	-Break (box lunch)	
12 noon – 12:45pm	-Mechanics of implementation	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• How are we going to implement (joint meetings, sub-committees, timeframes, etc)	
12:45 – 1:00 pm	-Next steps	

End Day Two

Great Basin Coordination Meeting Executive Summary

FACILITATOR	Bobbie Antonich, Meetings in Motion, LLC Phone: 702-239-9669 Email: bahabit51@cox.net
LOCATION	FA214, Dean's Conference Room, UNR Reno, NV
DATES	November 1, 2010 3:00 – 6:00 pm November 2, 2010 8:00 am – 1:00 pm
ORGANIZATIONS IN ATTENDANCE	<p>Great Basin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cooperative Ecosystem Studies Unit (GBCESU) • Environmental Program (GBEP) • Research and Management Partnership (GBRMP) • Landscape Conservation Cooperative (GBLCC)

PURPOSE	<i>"To agree upon the 'what and how' in working together as four organizations within the Great Basin."</i>											
SUMMARY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foundation for Collaboration: The four organizations established the framework for uniting their efforts by presenting each organization's established purpose, what it is not, and its' uniqueness to the membership. Please refer to the meeting notes on pages 2-4 for the presentations. • All four organizations agree that the timing is right to unite, streamline, and eliminate duplication of effort. • Draft Vision Statement: <i>"We are a consortium of partners who coordinate and collaborate on science delivery to achieve sustainable and resilient Great Basin ecosystems and human communities."</i> • Agreed upon dominant roles for each organization: <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <th style="text-align: left; padding: 5px;">GBEP:</th> <th style="text-align: left; padding: 5px;">GBCESU:</th> <th style="text-align: left; padding: 5px;">GBRMP:</th> <th style="text-align: left; padding: 5px;">GBLCC:</th> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px; vertical-align: top;"> -Lobbying (avoid any involvement or appearance of by federal agencies) </td><td style="padding: 5px; vertical-align: top;"> -Mechanism to move funding from agencies to university </td><td style="padding: 5px; vertical-align: top;"> -Cross-cutting research & management coordination -Science provider -Obtains funding through granting opportunities </td><td style="padding: 5px; vertical-align: top;"> -Landscape level focus -Science provider -Coordination </td></tr> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please see agreed upon areas of collaboration/contribution on page 9 of meeting notes. 				GBEP:	GBCESU:	GBRMP:	GBLCC:	-Lobbying (avoid any involvement or appearance of by federal agencies)	-Mechanism to move funding from agencies to university	-Cross-cutting research & management coordination -Science provider -Obtains funding through granting opportunities	-Landscape level focus -Science provider -Coordination
GBEP:	GBCESU:	GBRMP:	GBLCC:									
-Lobbying (avoid any involvement or appearance of by federal agencies)	-Mechanism to move funding from agencies to university	-Cross-cutting research & management coordination -Science provider -Obtains funding through granting opportunities	-Landscape level focus -Science provider -Coordination									
ISSUES &	<p>Duplication of efforts by the organizations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintaining websites • Same membership • Ultimate goals and objectives are the same • Reaching out to the same stakeholders • Potential funding sources 											

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-messaging to Agency leaders • Supportive to get funding; however, credit is taken by one organization and not shared • Multi-level structures • Same geographical boundaries • Agency/University partnerships • Greater overlap between GBRMP and GBLCC • Regional focused workshops <p>Collective concerns to be addressed in the future:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>1. Confusion</th><th>2. Internal Process</th><th>3. Communication</th><th>4. Funding</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>-For political and agency leaders -Internally, staff do not understand where to go for information</td><td>-Priorities -# of meetings -Communication -Role clarification -Competition -Single website for information -Sustainability plan</td><td>-Public -Political and agency leaders -Website -Internal</td><td>-Lack of money -Leading to or causing competition of resources</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	1. Confusion	2. Internal Process	3. Communication	4. Funding	-For political and agency leaders -Internally, staff do not understand where to go for information	-Priorities -# of meetings -Communication -Role clarification -Competition -Single website for information -Sustainability plan	-Public -Political and agency leaders -Website -Internal	-Lack of money -Leading to or causing competition of resources
1. Confusion	2. Internal Process	3. Communication	4. Funding						
-For political and agency leaders -Internally, staff do not understand where to go for information	-Priorities -# of meetings -Communication -Role clarification -Competition -Single website for information -Sustainability plan	-Public -Political and agency leaders -Website -Internal	-Lack of money -Leading to or causing competition of resources						
DECISION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restructuring: After much discussion about possible restructuring, members concluded that it was pre-mature to come to a decision without thoroughly exploring options. • Overarching name: Members agreed upon an overarching name of the collective 4 organizations: “Great Basin Consortium”. • Pilot committee appointed and will conduct first meeting mid-December 2010: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Primary</th><th>Backup</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RMP Jeanne Chambers • CESU Mike Collopy • LCC Mike Pellant • EP Rang Narayanan <p>Meeting Convener: Nat Frazier</p> </td><td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nat Frazier • Nat Frazier • Joe Tague • Chuck Gay </td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Primary	Backup	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RMP Jeanne Chambers • CESU Mike Collopy • LCC Mike Pellant • EP Rang Narayanan <p>Meeting Convener: Nat Frazier</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nat Frazier • Nat Frazier • Joe Tague • Chuck Gay 				
Primary	Backup								
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RMP Jeanne Chambers • CESU Mike Collopy • LCC Mike Pellant • EP Rang Narayanan <p>Meeting Convener: Nat Frazier</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nat Frazier • Nat Frazier • Joe Tague • Chuck Gay 								
NEXT STEPS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pilot committee will coordinate development of long/short term goal statements, communication strategy, internal talking points, and address internal streamlining and concerns from this meeting. • GBRMP will facilitate needed actions for a coordinated web-based clearinghouse. • Each organization will write a narrative on their website referencing the collective organization “Great Basin Consortium”. • Begin plans for conference to be held in 2011 to include a business meeting and professional information exchange. 								

Note: Although not formally included in the current discussions about basin-wide groups/initiatives, Mike Pellant noted that the program that he is the coordinator for, Great Basin Restoration Initiative (GBRI), should be in the mix as discussions go forward on the Great Basin Consortium. GBRI is the oldest basin-wide initiative (since 1999) and although it serves more of an internal agency role, it is an important player in Great Basin issues, science, and technical support for project implementation on public lands.

Great Basin Coordination Meeting Notes

FACILITATOR	Bobbie Antonich, Meetings in Motion, LLC Phone: 702-239-9669 Email: bahabit51@cox.net
LOCATION	FA214, Dean's Conference Room, UNR Reno, NV
DATES	November 1, 2010 3:00 – 6:00 pm November 2, 2010 8:00 am – 1:00 pm

AGENDA TOPIC	Preliminary – 11/1/10			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Introduction – Your name, title, and group that you are primarily representing (GBEP, GBRMP, GBCESU, GBLCC)• Purpose of Meeting: “<i>To agree upon the ‘what and how’ in working together as 4 organizations.</i>”• Operating Principles:<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Silence means agreement.2. Agreement is by consensus. Defined: Consensus is not that everyone agrees with everything. Consensus means everyone is able to support the conclusions reached. “I can live with this.”3. Focus on the issue at hand; not on personalities.4. Respect “time”.				
Review of Agenda (see attached copy)				
CONCLUSIONS	Laying ground work			
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE		
None	--	--		

AGENDA TOPIC	Framework of each Organization - 11/1/10 Ten Minute Presentations from GBEP, GBCESU, GBRMP, GBLCC on What the organization "is", "is not", and its' uniqueness.		
	Purpose:	What it is not:	Uniqueness:
GBEP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First terrestrial based long-term environmental initiative, somewhat similar to the Chesapeake Bay aquatic initiative. • To engage a broad constituency, including NGOs and private sector. • To focus on invasive plant species and six related sub-themes. • The six themes related to invasive species are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wildfires • Water Resources & Conservation • Urban, Rural Wildland Mosaic • Sustainable Communities and Culture • Biodiversity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A duplicate of other Great Basin programs, organizations or initiatives. • Not meant to address all Great Basin science and management issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on invasive plant species and six related sub-themes and to support the western Governors' "War on Cheatgrass". • Governance to be lead by Governor Appointed Commission including representation for land grant universities, agencies, and NGOs. • Board to include federal partners, universities, NGOs and private sector. • Has capability to procure funds via lobbying. • 70% of funds will go to on-the-ground projects; 25% for research and monitoring, and 5% for administration and communication. • Funding will be distributed to university and federal partners utilizing GB-CESU mechanism. • Will rely on GBRMP website for data sources, maps and literature. • Will work with GBLCC on prioritizing issues, coordination and providing faculty expertise. • Will establish appropriate metrics to measure project impacts on annual basis and will disseminate this information to the public.

<p><u>GBCESU</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A cooperative/joint venture agreement between 14 universities and 8 federal agencies. • Program of research, education and technical assistance involving biological, physical, social and cultural aspects of the ecosystem to address resource and management issues in the Great Basin. • Encourages multi-institutional, interdisciplinary approach to problem solving in an ecosystem context at the local, regional and national level. • Offers an efficient mechanism for transferring funds between agencies and partner institutions to accomplish its objectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A substitute for grants and contracts. • A funding mechanism for projects that are not cooperative/joint ventures. • Not to be used when scope of projects are different from the stated purpose or mission. • An organization for lobbying for funds. • Replacement for other Great Basin organizations doing valuable work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only organization that has an efficient funding mechanism for cooperative/joint venture projects. • Low indirect cost rate to keep project costs low. • Emphasis in collaboration as opposed to competition for project funding. • Specifically allows federal agency managers and scientists to use the knowledge and expertise residing at the universities.
<p><u>GBRMP</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An integrated science and management organization that promotes comprehensive & complementary collaborations, and provides leadership, commitment and guidance to ensure that the collaborations are effective. • Information clearinghouse – <i>Syntheses, Web-based clearinghouse with collaborators and expert's databases, research catalog, regional bibliography, upcoming meetings & links, data basing capacity.</i> • A mechanism for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A regional organization being developed by the DOI under a federal mandate. • A mechanism for generating new public funding from state and federal governments. • A mechanism for funding research projects for the agencies. • Aided by professional support. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information clearinghouse – <i>Syntheses, Web-based clearinghouse with collaborators and expert's databases, research catalog, regional bibliography, upcoming meetings & links, data basing capacity.</i> • Existing regional working groups – <i>Web-based clearinghouse of Information, Invasive Species (cheatgrass dieoff), Monitoring, Science delivery.</i> • A stable network of researchers and managers focused on collaboration that is not dependent on federal

<p>developing regional working groups – <i>Web based clearinghouse of Information, Invasive Species (cheatgrass dieoff), Monitoring, Science Delivery.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A mechanism for effectively leveraging existing resources, obtaining grants and seeking funds from foundations, etc. • All inclusive organization: <i>Federal – State – Local – Tribal – Private – NGO- Universities</i> • An established organization with a charter and MOU that is comprised of committed individuals and that has a proven track record. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • mandates or public funding. • Broader scientific base, i.e., include individuals from NIFA, NASA, Western Regional Climate Center.
<p><u>GBLCC</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To serve as a hub to enhance understanding of the effects of climate change and other natural and human disturbances across the region. • To promote coordinated, science-based actions to enable human and natural communities to respond and/or adapt to climate change and disturbances. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A replacement for other collaborative partnerships. • A prescriptive or regulatory body. • A mechanism to fund or implement on-the-ground projects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brings resources (staff and funds) to assist partners in meeting common objectives. • Linked to a national network of LCCs and regional Climate Science Centers.
CONCLUSIONS	Laying ground work	
ACTION ITEMS	None	-- --

AGENDA TOPIC	<p>Concerns – 11/1/10</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broke into 5 groups • Assignment: List 3-5 top concerns about what is not working with the current Great Basin operational model <p>Present to large group</p>
--------------	--

Concerns as written by the groups

Group 1:

- Sponsors are confused about which organizations to fund – all are similar.
- Small pot of funds leading to perceived competition.
- Lack of communication to the broader public (i.e., how organizations' missions differ).
- It's perceived that different federal agencies are pushing their agenda without regard to others.

Group 2:

- Partner fatigue: Time/efficiency/over-meeting/financial drain. If you're not engaged, you don't care or don't support or will lose out when resources are made available.
- Confusion over entities: Political, academic, agency leaders – re: similarity of effort in each organization.
- Perceived competitiveness: Lack of trust inhibits endorsement/progress/action.
- Cross messaging confuses agency leaders & politicians.
- Perception that research agencies and academic researchers come across as flaky and not particularly effective. Inhibits customer interest/support.

Group 3:

- Too many groups competing for same resources and doing similar things instead of building on what each individual group is doing and individual strengths.
- Too many groups and meetings with a lot of overlap in membership. Large commitment of staff and resources.
- Bewildering array of bureaucracy, confusing.
- Limited resources – how to not compete with each other?
- Too many groups for technical staff in agencies to track what is going on. Again, confusing about what is going on and where to go for information.

Group 4:

- Lack of common list of priorities.
- Lack of a single go to website for information.
- Number of meetings with the same individuals.
- Confusion for politicians/public created by plethora of Great Basin organizations.
- Lack of money.

Group 5:

- Communication among ourselves: 1) We are not all doing the same things; 2) With evolving CESU and LEE potential to identify and fill gaps.
 - Same individuals attend meetings; Need new and younger people.
 - Need joint meetings; leverage efforts; Annual meeting.
 - Agree that we are all working together – clarify roles.
 - Need a plan for sustainability for effective cooperation in Great Basin.
- =====

Concerns were grouped by facilitator into four categories for quick reference:

1) CONFUSION

- Group (G) 1: Organizations are so similar that sponsors are confused on which organizations to fund.
- G1: Different federal agencies are pushing their own agenda without regard to other on-going efforts.
- G4: Politicians/public confused about the plethora of GB organizations.
- G2: Similarity in each organization that political, academics, and agency leaders are confused on where to go and which organization to go to.
- G2: Cross messaging for agency leaders and politicians.
- G3: Bewildering array of bureaucracy.

2) INTERNAL PROCESS

- G4: Lack of common list of priorities.
- G4, 3, & 5: Number of meetings with a lot of overlap large commitment of time, staff and resources; need new members; joint meetings; annual meeting; partner fatigue.
- G3 & 2: Competition among the organizations.
- G5: Communication among ourselves
- G5: Clarify roles.
- G5: Plan for sustainability
- G4: Lack of single “go to” website for information.

3) COMMUNICATION

- G1: With broader public on different organizations’ missions
- G2: Messaging with politicians and agency leaders.
- G5: Internal communication.
- G4 – Website – single “go to” for information.

4) FUNDING

- G4: Lack of money
- G1: Such small pot of money that it’s leading to competition

CONCLUSIONS	SUMMARY OF CONCERNS:			
1. <u>Confusion</u>	2. <u>Internal Process</u>	3. <u>Communication</u>	4. <u>Funding</u>	
-For political and agency leaders -Internally, staff do not understand where to go for information	-Priorities -# of meetings -Communication -Role clarification -Competition -Single website for information -Sustainability plan	-Public -Political and agency leaders -Website -Internal	-Lack of money -Leading to or causing competition of resources	
ACTION ITEMS	Concerns to be used by assigned pilot committee to begin addressing internal streamlining.		PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
			Pilot committee	On going

AGENDA TOPIC	Draft Vision Statement – 11/1/10 and 11/2/10
Members agreed upon the basic benefits and characteristics of a collective vision statement as:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Useful science • Management options • Integrated research and management partnerships • Improved conditions of the land • Benefit people 	
Vision statement answers “Where are we headed? What do we want to create?”	
Process used to draft the initial vision statements:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each member write a draft vision statement • Combine the statement with one other person • 2-3 pairs of people combine their collective statements into one. 	
The following 4 draft vision statements were created:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Working together for sustainable systems in the Great Basin by cooperation and coordination of resources and infrastructure. 2) Develop a framework of cooperation and collaboration that is entrusted with effectively and efficiently delivering science support tools and funding that results in a Great Basin that is sustainable and resilient with respect to its ecosystems, people and resources. 3) A coordinated, communicating and collaborative network of partnerships that build on strengths to leverage resources, to address common priorities and issues to deliver sound science in the Great Basin. 4) A tri-partite organization engaging people in addressing landscape level environmental and economic issues in the Great Basin. (additional discussion add: social & cultural issues...) 	

A proposed structure:

Lobbying Consortium **GB Research Founding** **GBLCC/GBRMP**

Mechanism (CESU)

Note: **The bolded words** in the 4 vision statements above indicate the key elements to be considered in the creation of final draft.

CONCLUSIONS	Laurie Averill-Murray, Lee Turner and Deb Finch consolidated the four draft vision statements in the following statement that was subsequently agreed upon by the membership.	
<i>"We are a consortium of partners who coordinate and collaborate on science delivery to achieve sustainable and resilient Great Basin ecosystems and human communities."</i>		
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
It was agreed upon that the draft vision statement would be revisited in the future.	All	On Going

AGENDA TOPIC	Discussion by each organization on current duplication of effort and areas of contribution/collaboration – November 2, 2010
--------------	--

List of Duplication As Viewed by GBEP, GBCESU, GBRMP, and GBLCC:

- Maintaining websites
- Same membership
- Ultimate goals and objectives are the same
- Reaching out to the same stakeholders
- Potential funding sources
- Cross-messaging to Agency leaders
- Supportive to get funding; however, credit is taken by one organization and not shared
- Multi-level structures
- Same geographical boundaries
- Agency/University partnerships
- Greater overlap between GBRMP and GBLCC
- Regional focused workshops

Agreed upon areas of contribution or collaboration:

*Note: * areas have not met full potential to date*

<u>GBEP:</u>	<u>GPCESU:</u>	<u>GBRMP:</u>	<u>*GBLCC:</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -*Funding -Ability to lobby -Reaching out to NGO/private sector/state agencies -*Setting up metrics & annually communicating to public -*70% funding goes to on-the-ground projects -*Cooperation of state governors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Funding mechanism -*Educational model -Formal cooperative agreement process -Building alternative partnerships -National network -Staff positions (vacant, but need to be filled) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Web-based clearinghouse -Existing operational working groups & grant writing -“Open” (no constraints) for collaboration with partners. Infrastructure draw for new members -Flexibility – greater variety of researchers and managers -Ground-up research component and direct communication with scientific community within Great Basin -Proactive approach/rather than reactive -Regional focused workshops 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Focused on landscape scale -Salaried positions dedicated to collaboration -Funding for travel and administrative support -Connection to national network – breadth of partnerships -Infrastructure and role in climate change -Data set coordination -Monitor long term landscape level issues/climate change/other related issues -Accessibility of data management and data integration tools

CONCLUSIONS	Agreed upon areas of collaboration		
ACTION ITEMS		PERSON RESPONSIBLE	
Duplication of effort to be addressed by pilot committee	Pilot committee	First meeting of pilot committee – Mid-December 2010	

AGENDA TOPIC	Roles, structure, and mechanics of implementation – November 2, 2010
--------------	--

- **Dominant role of each organization:**

<u>GBEP:</u>	<u>GBCESU:</u>	<u>GBRMP:</u>	<u>GBLCC:</u>
-Lobbying (avoid any involvement or appearance of by federal agencies)	-Mechanism to move funding from agencies to university	-Cross-cutting research & management coordination -Science provider -Obtains funding through granting opportunities	-Landscape level focus -Science provider -Coordination

- **Structure Discussion**

After much discussion about possible re-structuring, members concluded that it was pre-mature to come to a decision without thoroughly exploring options.

Decision Point: Members agreed upon an overarching name of the collective 4 organizations:
“Great Basin Consortium”

- **Mechanics of Implementation**

Decision Point: Due to time constraints, members appointed a pilot committee to focus on streamlining internal operations/process of the collective 4 organizations. The pilot committee will bring their recommendations to the next annual meeting. The committee consists of:

Primary Pilot Committee Member	Backup Committee Member
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RMP Jeanne Chambers • CESU Mike Collopy • LCC Mike Pellatt • EP Rang Narayanan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nat Frazier • Nat Frazier • Joe Tague • Chuck Gay
Meeting Convener: Nat Frazier	

CONCLUSIONS	Pilot Committee members will conduct their first meeting by mid-December 2010.
-------------	--

	Members will begin referring to the overarching title “Great Basin Consortium” immediately.
--	---

Next Steps:

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pilot Committee members will conduct their first meeting by mid-December 2010. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Coordinate development of long-term/short-term goal statements -Coordinate development of communication strategy -Develop internal talking points -Address concerns from this meeting 	Pilot committee	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Web-based clearinghouse: GBRMP will facilitate needed actions for the organizations • Each organization will write a narrative on their website referencing “Great Basin Consortium” • Begin plans for conference to be held in 2011 (business meeting plus professional meeting) 	<p>GBRMP 4 organizations</p>	

Note: Although not formally included in the current discussions about basin-wide groups/initiatives, Mike Pellatt noted that the program that he is the coordinator for, Great Basin Restoration Initiative (GBRI), should be in the mix as discussions go forward on the Great Basin Consortium. GBRI is the oldest basin-wide initiative (since 1999) and although it serves more of an internal agency role, it is an important player in Great Basin issues, science, and technical support for project implementation on public lands.

End of Meeting Notes

Attachment to Meeting Notes

Agenda
Great Basin CESU, RMP, EP and LCC Meeting
November 1 and 2, 2010

Location: FA214 – Dean’s Conference Room, UNR campus
Date & Time: November 1, 2010: 3:00 pm – 6:00 pm
November 2, 2010: 8:00 am – 1:00 pm
Facilitator: Bobbie Antonich, Meetings in Motion, Boulder City, Nevada

November 1, 2010		
3:00 – 3:15 pm	-Welcome Remarks/ Logistics	Rang Narayanan Bobbie Antonich
	-Preliminary <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Introductions• Purpose of meeting• Review of agenda• Operating principles	
3:15- 4:00 pm	-Ten Minute presentations on the framework of each organization <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What it is (purpose)• What it's not• Its uniqueness & how it differs from the other organizations	CESU: Rang Narayanan Mike Collopy
		GBEP: Stan Johnson Bob Alverts
		GBRMP: Jeanne Chambers
		GBLCC: Mike Pellant
4:00 -4:45 pm	-Concerns <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What's not working with the current Great Basin operational model?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-Small mixed groups-Top 3 concerns/group-Present by spokesperson-Synthesize by facilitator

4:45 – 5:00 pm	-Break	
5:00 – 5:15 pm	Welcome & Remarks	Mark Johnson Provost, UNR
5:15 – 6:00 pm	Draft Vision Statement	Bobbie Antonich
6:15 pm	Meet at Brew Brothers in the Eldorado Hotel & Casino No host social	

End Day One

November 2, 2010

8:00 – 8:15 am	-Logistics/announcements	Rang Narayanan
	-Recap of Day One	Bobbie Antonich
8:15 – 9:45 am	-Discussion by each organization on:	CESU, EP, RMP, LCC
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where is the current duplication? • What each organization can contribute without duplication of effort? 	
9:45 – 10:00 am	-Break	
10:00 – 11:00 am	-Agree upon organizational areas of collaboration	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which can we collaborate on? 	
11:00- 11:45	-Address how we will work together on these areas of collaboration or structure around these areas of collaboration	
11:45 – 12 noon	-Break (box lunch)	
12 noon – 12:45pm	-Mechanics of implementation	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How are we going to implement (joint meetings, sub-committees, timeframes, etc) 	
12:45 – 1:00 pm	-Next steps	

End Day Two