

Attendees:

Jessie Gonzales	Terry Quesinberry	Apple Snider	Jesse D'Elia
Alex Schubert	Jeff Berglund	Katie Powell	Kevin Doherty
Lara Juliuson	Angela Burgess	Jay Martini	Jeff Dillon
Pauline Hope	Lara Drizd	Heather McPherron	Terry Ireland
Ron Baxter	Anna Harris	Lief Wiechman	Kevin Shelley
Lynn Gemlo	Heather Johnson	Craig Hansen	Holly Friefeld

Federal Family meetings and next steps –

- As this will be one of the last time we will be able to provide overall guidance leadership pushed to make these strong regulatory, conservation mechanisms.
- Documents incomplete – Chapter 2 review –where they lay out their plans, allocations, etc. Analyses are not done so we had incomplete information on which to base recommendations.
- Format between meetings the same, and meetings were remarkably similar – overview of big issues then a state by state review of compliance with NPT guidance.
- Discussions often got “weedy” were there was uncertainty that the allocation selected provided the best conservation for sage-grouse.
- Working on fluid minerals language resolution – hope to have that done today
- Short list of remaining items from the March 14 memo to BLM/FS – will put on sharepoint, but not for distribution until approval from the RDs.
- BLM will be hosting a series of workshops with states to discuss process and status – week of Oct. 6. As of now our role in those workshops, if any, is unknown.
- Doing bi-weekly calls in the GB to coordinate internally and help roll-up the information to the species report
- Some things resolved – UT is still in a state of uncertainty
- Lek buffer table – lots of different buffers being proposed and not consistent across planning area boundaries. BLM has engaged with USGS to compile that list of buffers and determine whether or not the buffer is supported by the literature and its efficacy.
- No net unmitigated loss – applicability to RM side? - on short list
- Need to know when the spatial data are available for our use. **Pat will ask Frank.**

Genetics Workshop – Craig Hansen

Convened a group of genetics experts

Will be examining:

- Barriers to gene flow
- Areas of divergence
- Other genetic processes that influence grouse, relationship to other threats

Upcoming meetings –

- Regional Director meeting – today and tomorrow in Denver
 - How to handle CED relative to PECE – batching projects, prioritizing projects by primary threat, etc.
 - Summary of the modeling workshop and next steps forward
 - 4 models to be expanded to the entire range
 - Threat presentation relative to species distribution

- Trend analysis
 - Expert elicitation panels needed/desired
- EOC meeting – Tuesday Sept. 23
 - Listing process
 - Joint presentation on land management plan revisions and status
 - CED
 - State workshop
- State ESA workshop/webinar – not grouse specific – ESA 101 – October 2
- Sage-grouse task force meeting – Oct. 7-8 – agenda not provided yet
- Collaboration/partners meeting – Oct. 15-16 – background on how we got to here, how we can work together to maximize the efficacy of conservation
- Genetics expert elicitation workshop – Oct. 22 – 23
- Bi-state meeting Oct. 27 – 29
- Fire and sage-grouse conference (Great Basin) – November 5-7 (overlaps with the R6 biologist meeting)
- Local Working Group conference – Nov. 13 and 14 – web page: <http://sage-grouseforum.org/>

Administrative record – everything we are producing is likely to be FOIA'd so use caution when making personal comments or assessments in a foiable format. Lots of selective extraction of e-mails in the past – no doubt it will continue into the future and we don't want to be put in a difficult position in court. Discussion, debate, questions are all good as they increase our mutual understanding, but try to use off the record means to the extent possible for these simply to avoid the potential for mis-interpretation or selective representation by external parties that may not have conservation as a primary objective.

Monitoring –

Interagency monitoring team created last year to address FWS concerns that monitoring be meaningful and consistent across the range. Came to agreement on broad and mid-scale about a year ago, but have been struggling with scaling that down. Portland GB FFM determined that BLM/FS would identify BSU with input from the state and the FWS local folks. Not all FWS offices were engaged in this effort. Resulting BSUs are all different scales, so using them as a basis for calculating disturbance and fine scale monitoring is problematic. Interagency team now working together to address this – nothing final at this point but looking at a moving window based on disturbance, lek clusters, DDCT, etc. Work in progress – no final decisions at this point.

- What about using CO monitoring effort (very fine scale) – Pat will include on list for next monitoring team call
- Any summary of mapping capability/refinement by state? E.g. 1 m vs. 30 m. None known but the federal team is looking at a 1 m or less scale
- MT intends to follow the WY strategy – so will be a 1 m scale
- WA – BLM can do monitoring at the state level and want to defer to a national effort
- Some talk about if there is fine scale monitoring can we increase the disturbance cap?
 - Maybe, but need to consider other factors such as what is included in the disturbance cap, baseline for measuring disturbance, land surfaces included, etc.

Miscellaneous –

- Presentation by Anadarko Petroleum – making the rounds – is hunting the concern?
- Pinedale visit by Director Ashe – to celebrate signing of CI for CCAA

- Presentation on oil and gas development in Pinedale – Oct. 2 – Pat will attend and share any pertinent information.
- Data calls – threat data call due end of Oct. Little activity in CED to date so encourage your partners to try to enter data sooner rather than waiting. Working on messaging on whether or not CNOR data need to be re-submitted. Kate Norman is lead for this. Lynn will share the product when finalized.