December 17, 2020 Partners Working Group Call

Attendees: Melissa Goodwin (Thriving Earth Exchange), Diana Dalbotten, Mike SanClements, Cliff Duke, Mike Dietze, Melissa Kenney, Jody Peters, Kira Sullivan-Wiley

Agenda and Notes

1. Poll to find a recurring time for Jan-May calls and Joint Partner/Social Science calls.

2. Conversations with Thriving Earth Exchange: Melissa Goodwin will represent the group, Raj Pandya, Kelly McCarthy
   a. Overview of EFI
   b. Overview of Thriving Earth Exchange
      i. Melissa helps the gears going behind the scenes. Works with partners to launch projects. Connecting projects that are already up and running, e.g., American bar Association resources to connect pro bono legal resources with TEX projects
      ii. Context: 2 modes of science
          1. Deficit model/push science/loading dock. Research does science and then decision-maker finds publication and implements it
          2. Co-production - back and forth collaboration between scientists and decision makers
             a. Community science - science and communities do science together to advance community priorities
             b. Community voice comes first
             c. AGU - mission to support and inspire global community. TEX is part of AGU and builds partnerships between communities and scientists
             d. Match.com for scientists.
             e. 152 project launched
             f. Newer role = community science fellow. Individuals trained in the TEXT approach and work with communities
   c. Approach
      i. Every project/community is different, but share the TEX approach
      ii. Starts with Scope - turn community priorities into actionable project. Projects are co-developed and co-implemented. It is not consulting
      iii. Match - find scientific expertise for the project. Looking for individuals to engage in pro bono capacity
      iv. Solve - science/community develop game plan. Develop milestones
      v. Share - happens throughout the entire process. Share highlights, milestones, results and outcomes.
Share the experiences/resources from current/complete projects with new/future projects

h. Project roles
   i. Community leader - someone who speaks for the community
   ii. Community scientist - someone who speaks for the science
   iii. Project manager - guide team through the process making sure they are communicating and coordinating together. Fellows play this role

i. Program Network
   i. Work with community-facing organizations to be findable by communities. Communities typically don't know what AGU is.
   ii. Community Science Fellows - apply to be project managers
   iii. TEX pair i and ii.
   iv. Fellows talk to fellows so there is engagement and collaborations across projects within cohorts.
   v. Have collaborations with organizations with resources/members/desire to engage in this space. TEX connects with staff
   vi. Epic - work with universities that are class-room based experiences that connect to projects.
   vii. TEX is now sharing their process with other organizations.
   viii. With NEON - will train 12 fellows from NEON staff to launch projects through the TEX process. Those NEON fellows will be integrated within the larger TEX fellows group.

j. 3 Sample Projects
   i. City of Hallandale Beach, FL - municipal staff wanting to work on climate change mitigation. Wanted staff to have a better understanding of climate science to help with planning activities and for staff that were public-facing.
      1. Hosted 1 lunch and learn and 1 full day staff training. Played Game of Floods. Generated climate change FAQ in English and Spanish to share with residents.
   ii. City of Evanston, IL - waste transfer station. Residents were concerned about how the station was affecting air quality.
1. Identified pollutants typically associated with transfer station and develop cost-effective monitoring plan
2. Took plan and the known pollutants and recommended that $300K be put behind community concerns to monitor for pollutants

iii. Carver Elementary School - Creek in community that the community walk by that had a lot of trash in it. Wanted to deal with polluted stream and bring in green space safely.
   1. Developed trash-tography. Students took pictures of trash and document.
   2. Worked with Public Lab to upload the materials which is available on their website so others can do similar things

k. Impacts can be tangible where there is policy changes. Or less tangible because city/community leaders are now able to communicate effectively.

c. How does Melissa recommend that EFI engage community science. We envision the push and pull. But the push and pull is different from TEX frames it. We have a particular tool kit and we are looking for opportunities where forecasts can be useful within decision making processes. Want to design forecasts to enable a wider use by people more than scientists. How do we start with engagement if we want to work with community members?
   i. Wanting forecasts to be useful and have a broader reach. Talk with intended users and ask them what they would find useful. Make initial connections can be tough if they are not made yet.
   ii. Background on what EFI is doing. We have a Partners team and EFI network that have experience working with stake holders/partners. Most traction are working with decision makers, particularly federal agency producers of forecasts and data products and users. People who can provide wide dissemination and use through their agency.
   iii. Colleagues in VA work with reservoir managers to allow their water forecasts to be operationalized.
   iv. We haven’t dived into what TEX does - working with people on the ground and engaging with people who are marginalized or communities that are disenfranchised. We started where we felt we had the greatest leverage and where we felt we could promote partnerships. Want to think about ways to engage with communities.
   v. TEX approach is very hyper local so not much experience working at the large federal agency scale.
   vi. TEX worked with Global Research Exchange and ASAP to develop resilience dialogues. There are lots of resources available about climate
science - so much that it is a flood of information, but communities have a need for someone/something to serve as a translator and to help direct them to the right resources. Here is a community dialogue project that came out of connecting community leaders with climate science experts to help facilitate a dialogue about resilience in the face of climate change: https://www.resiliencedialogues.org/

vii. For TEX it has not been about figuring out how to connect with communities directly, but connecting with groups that are community facing.

viii. Who are the decision makers we are trying to reach already working with and how can we connect with those organizations?

d. 2 things to help each other with
i. Help TEX recruit EFI scientists to be science leaders
   1. Anyone interested in participating can sign up for the Network here: https://thrivingearthexchange.org/scientist-network/

ii. TEX Training - perhaps we can get some of the training that TEX provides.
   1. TEXT training will be ready to share by March
   2. Will have info about how TEX works and the adapting and translating to other organizational context. Can take and run with what they have or could have a larger dialogue with TEX on different ideas for the TEX approach
   3. Melissa will share this with Jody to share with the further group

e. Scoping for projects question. Inclusion/exclusion criteria. Have they been approached by communities that are skiing for things TEX doesn’t do? Or have they dealt with over promising or having a flood or requests that cannot be accommodated? Lessons learned.
   i. Have more communities than they can handle, even those with ideas that are a good fit. This helped to
   ii. Scientists that don’t have a good fit for was also influential for
   iii. For scientists that don’t want to be project manager or fellow - still working on this
   iv. For overpromising - try to be very clear with the communities and find ways that are feasible (fracking example)
      1. Make a conversation about what alternatives there are.
   v. Frame projects as short term and exactly what you can do.
   vi. Very careful to not over promise in conversations and frame it as a first step.
   vii. Diana has done the scoping and first conversations so can share those experiences later
   viii. EFI will need to determine what we can offer and be up front about what we can offer. Do this on our end before doing outreach and connection.

f. TEX handbook is very helpful. Diana can share it with the group. It clarifies the pathway from moving from interest to actual action.
g. The NEON TEX projects could be one way that EFI could engage more directly
h. What process does Thriving Earth Exchange use to bring scientists together with communities
i. How can our grassroots community do community based research projects?
j. Do they have tips about how to organize and connect with communities?
k. How did they come up with their process of generating partnerships?
l. Ask them about their community partners that develop community projects - this goes along with the museum partnership that Diana mentioned
m. TEX is collaborating with NEON starting in 2021

3. Partners/Social Science Joint Call Ideas
   a. Thought from the Social Science group for this call:
   b. Take time to have a round of introductions then focus the call on actionable science, a topic Cliff Duke from the Partners group recommended and has experience with. See if Cliff will provide some input about actionable science to start a discussion. On a future joint call, we will plan on having a discussion around Cindy's question about what the biggest obstacles or roadblocks are for partners/decision makers to use early forecasts.

4. Work Plan - want people to continue to look over Work Plan to refine/edit tasks for the Core Functions and to add their names to things they are most interested in or add notes to tasks they think are important but may not have time/interest to participate on
   a. Core Function 1: Foster a Collaborative Community
      i. Follow up with Melissa about point 3
   b. Core Function 3: Research to Operations
      i. How do we share and communicate the Technical Readiness Levels already in place?
   c. Core Function 2: Promote the Co-Development and Use of Resources and Tools