**SESSION 1 – the “good” the “bad” and the “ugly” (what needs to change)**

**The good**

1. getting together, sharing areas, sharing resources
2. tools
3. transparent in decision making- management and scientific focus
4. Trust building and credibility that allows sharing the information
5. Relationship building through annual meetings-cross pollination
6. The critical mass of the partnership allowed to overcome the sensitives around the issues that the partnership tackles
7. Funding resources
8. Developing a shared vision of conservation planning
9. Creative approaches, new/unusual approaches- pushing the limits going beyond traditional approaches
10. Including historical and cultural aspects in the landscape conservation-the human dimension
11. A framework to downscaling the plans for nested geographical locations
12. Tools for why and what questions
13. Thinking about the bigger picture
14. NAS report results
15. High quality science products
16. Receptiveness to the full range of the needs including cultural resources
17. Functioned as a node for partners communications
18. Support future scientific development- pathways students
19. Focus on land trust organization
20. Good progress in resolving some initial friction and move forward with good staff
21. Providing channels for the partners to implement rather than LCC do things on the grounds itself
22. Professional growth of the participants
23. Trust responsibility inclusion
24. Funding for large scale conservation research and tool development was only possible through the formation of LCC

**The bad**

1. Different views in contracting research
2. Lack of money /funding
3. The leadership/ administrative core is in the northern east region but good part of the partnership is in other regions with different cultural sensibility- The diversity of the region creates challenges to get funding and political recognition- 60 percent of the land mass is outside of the administrative area
4. The lack of state agency participating
5. Conflicts on who should be in the steering committee- who is allowed
6. The top-down process of forming LCC
7. The uncertainty in fud and staffing creates some issues regarding commitment
8. The performance metric that used for reporting was limited to the tell our whole story
9. Partnership fatigue – too many partnerships rather than having a focused group-Capacity issues- Competition for the partners time
10. The disconnection between the conservation planning in macro scale and implementation in local scale
11. Implementation capacity is nonexistent in some of our region to get stuff done on the ground- because of the lack of money to use the tools

**The ugly: What needs improvement?**

1. Recognition of LCC
2. Did not realize the full potentials of the established regional identifies (all the partners; federal, state, etc.)
3. Lack of direct flow of information across the different LCCs- communicating across LCCs is challenging – needs to have continuity of information across the borders of different networks for better implementation
4. We should keep acknowledging the role of environmental justice