

Participants:

Jodie Delavan	Jeff Berglund	Jay Martini	Ron Baxter
Mark Sattelberg	Jeff Everett	Lynn Gemlo	Pat Deibert
Terry Ireland	Jessie Gonzales	Drue Deberry	Jesse D'Elia
Kevin Shelley	Terry Quesinberry		

1. Additions to the agenda
 - a. Conservation efforts database
 - b. MTT
2. BLM/FS planning effort – All the RIDT meetings have been completed and we are now going through the final round of RMT meetings. BLM is holding tight to those deadlines so that they can get all the DEIS on the street by the end of September
 - a. Will be 90-day comment period and we can submit comments during that time
 - b. How BLM would like our feedback is a topic of discussion at the upcoming Federal Family meeting in September
 - c. We have consistently made BLM aware of our concerns with not being able to see the “final” document that goes to their WO. In some cases BLM has allowed us to see the draft and assist with changes in the two weeks they have between the RMT and the WO pass-on.
 - i. They are aware of our concerns and continue to promise that they will address our comments.
 - ii. Preferred alternatives have not been identified in the GB plans
 - d. We need to have consistency in our comments/feedback to BLM/FS. We may need to use this call, and add calls, to discuss our comments/concerns as we do our reviews and draft our letters.
 - i. O.K. to have localized differences, but our overall messaging needs to be consistent.
 - ii. Using COT report as the template
 - iii. Need to make sure that the BLM is developing an adequate regulatory mechanism for sage-grouse conservation
 - iv. MT has sent 2 sets of comments, working on a third; SD comments due early September.
 1. With BLM concurrence, MT is commenting outside the public comment period simply due to volume
 - v. Post all comment letters on the sharepoint
 - vi. Share letters with other biologists within your region before sending to help with consistency (maybe also PLs)
 - vii. Is there a way to book end the EISs to focus on specific alternatives that are likely to be carried forward? Perhaps use the COT table prepared for RIDT to identify holes in the preferred or other alternatives.
 1. Worries about the effectiveness of the review – how do we evaluate the sufficiency of this effort on a range-wide basis? BLM is planning on this evaluation, but does not absolve us of our responsibility to guide those efforts. We need to connect the dots of population, habitat and management regime. Sense of scale, perception of risk, and assurance that the offset is reached. Needs to be happening earlier rather than later. BLM is developing a landscape scale report – need to tie together the efforts across administrative boundaries, not simply duplicating the efforts.
 2. We need to develop an internal coordination process to address this issue. Need to have common metrics for success and a way to evaluate BLM regulatory mechanisms to sustain these metrics.
 3. Start at the state level, role it up to adjacent states, then MZ, then range-wide.

4. Kevin will jot down ideas/concepts, circulate, and set up a doodle poll to have a more in depth discussion. Contact Kevin if you want to play. Terry I., Ron B., Terry Q. and Jodie D. are starters.
 - e. Federal family meeting in September – Dates are 9/25-27 in Denver at the Stapleton Renaissance Hotel. Its piggy-backed on the next Governor’s Sage-grouse task force meeting.
 - f. Two full days, and one half day. BLM and FS have some agency specific agenda items and we have encouraged them to put those at the end of the meeting so maybe we can leave early.
 - g. Will have many position/white papers – we have been on a two conference calls in the last two days to discuss the agenda. The intent is to lay a clear path and reach a process consensus to move from the DEIS to the FEIS and proposed alternative.
 - i. Many teams – if you were on a team before (e.g. adaptive management) expect to continue on that team until issues are resolved.
 - ii. New teams have been formed (or will be) to address additional emerging issues. To date Pat and Jesse are covering, but its early in development and we may need to reach out for assistance from others. We will definitely be reaching out for advice and intel.
 - iii. Are identified tasks between draft and final:
 - iv. Cumulative effects analyses
 - v. Finish adaptive management, invasives/fire, mitigation
 - vi. Refine the monitoring framework
 - vii. Will be an update on road inventories
 - viii. Edge mapping – maps
 - ix. Edge mapping – adjacent management prescriptions
 - x. Public outreach
 - xi. Consistency in comment review/response
 - xii. Interface with the FWS PECE policy
 - xiii. FWS Conservation effects database
 - xiv. FS viability analyses
 - xv. Implementation plans
 - xvi. Also a team that is addressing the disparate components of getting from DEIS to FEIS – focusing on the two “edge” items above, as well as a process for working from the draft range of alternatives to a proposed alternative, process for documenting how changes interface with the COT report, and looking at the need for any other process changes (e.g. RIDT/RMT review).
 - xvii. White papers are due by the end of August
 - xviii. Inquire funding support for our travel – flag if need funding support by Aug. 23 to Pat and Jesse
3. NRCS meeting next week – send in list of questions to Pat by 2:00 Monday Aug.19.
 4. Conservation efforts database – metrics – provide list that will help us understand that threats have been ameliorated. Use the threats identified in the COT report
 - a. What fields are going to be in database, and what pull down menus will contain for those fields
 - b. Will be a spatially explicit tool so should help with scaling up threats
 - c. LC map call scheduled to explore that option.
 - d. Please send metrics to Jesse after he provides some feedback on the process – timeline to come.
 - e. Straw man idea based on COT report has been developed by Paul Henson and Jeff Everett
 5. MTT update – mini-MTT is developing framework that provides sidebars for mitigation efforts so that we have a way to view the programs and communicate to our partners what we are looking for.
 6. Round the lek:
 - a. OR – No report

- b. WY – No report
 - c. ND – in holding pattern with BLM as they run their plan through their Washington Office; Kevin will be meeting with State management plan
 - d. SD – Will be December before see state plan
 - e. MT – issued comments on BLM EISs – working on 2 others; working with state sagebrush council – question about population goals/targets – will we be providing the goals?
 - f. NV – BLM anticipating comments from their WO today; working on administrative review for NV
 - g. UT – Still in holding pattern with BLM; tour in N. Utah on Sept. 3 and 4
 - h. WA – meeting with WDFW on 9/10 on how to engage on sage-grouse management issues and updating the state recovery plan. Jesse D. is also attending. New information on new transmission in southern population – may be some new wiggle room with that project that will be a plus for conservation.
 - i. CO – NW CO DEIS coming out tomorrow – BLM has developed talking points with our review; are on our sharepoint
7. Next call: September 19, 2013 at 2 p.m. mountain time.