

Attendees:

Drue DeBerry	Jeff Everett	Kate Norman	Lief Wiechman
Pat Deibert	Jeff Dillon	Terry Ireland	Lynn Gemlo
Jay Martini	Creed Clayton	Ron Baxter	Alex Schubert

1. Introduction of Kate – as project manager for listing – at HQ – starting in January
2. Adaptive management – the national language is not yet complete, but hopeful it will be completed soon. WY has developed their own version, which currently is consistent with the draft national language (but will see after the national language is finalized). Each planning effort can tailor their adaptive management strategy to fit their needs, but we need to try to get to some consistency in adaptive management across the range (or at least document why its o.k. to be different).
3. Metrics – have received comments from the Task Force and States via the RISCT. Are working with the USGS person actually constructing the database. Hope to have all the metrics wrapped up in early February and then beta-test the database.
4. Disturbance caps – in those plans that have a choice of disturbance caps between alternatives recommend the lowest where that makes sense. It is a recommendation only and BLM has been advised that this is an opportunity to provide the justification as to why the higher disturbance is allowable.
 - a. Baseline for calculating disturbance caps – may want to establish a baseline and all disturbances prior to that baseline being classified as unsuitable habitat. There must be a biological justification as to the date of establishment of the baseline.
 - b. How do we track disturbance? What scale should we be measuring disturbance? Difference of footprint vs. footprint plus project buffer? Think about this for future discussion on calls. – keep as an agenda item for further discussion and thought.
5. Future life of the stoplight table and consistency in review (Jeff B.'s great idea) - As we move from draft to final we will be using the stoplight table to inform BLM/FS on the efficacy of the proposed alternative relative to the COT objectives. Jeff has suggested that we provide a comment column in this table with information as to why that particular item was assigned a color. He suggested we develop some consistent language explaining our review (e.g. (e.g. this is yellow because of reasons 2, 3, 4). Other examples – the measure was applied for applicable programs so final color is green, or the measure option was partially applied but the threat was localized so final color being yellow is o.k., or measure was not applied but threat widespread – so still red.
 - a. Intent is to minimize the variability of the responses between planning efforts and to not have to re-create the wheel.
 - b. Jeff B, Terry I, Jesse D. and Jason P and Ron B will work on suggested language. Need to write the terms carefully. Team will function as an

independent unit – can set up their own calls. Pat will send an e-mail reminder.

- c. Consider not only how met the COT objective, but the degree of threat as well (for the proposed alternative)
 - d. Can do the spotlight table for preferred alternative if there is value in your planning effort, but it isn't necessary.
6. Proposed regional consistency meetings – BLM has proposed a meeting for the Great Basin and Rocky Mountain to examine consistency between different planning units, and how to best document where inconsistencies facilitate conservation, or at least don't preclude conservation.
- a. Tentative dates are end of January or early February
 - b. Plan on attending
 - c. Will help us determine how to most effectively document supportable differences between planning efforts, but we may need to do more
7. Calls – will have them bi-weekly for now due to the intense workload. But do to the holidays the next call will be on the third Thursday of January
- a. Jan. 16, 2014 is next call. Will start the 2 week schedule then.