

Participants:

Lee Corum	Terry Ireland	Terry Quesinberry
Ron Baxter	Apple Snider	Katie Powell
Jessie Gonzales	Jay Martini	Craig Hansen
Angela Burgess	Rox Rodgers	Dawn Davis
Pauline Hope	Jesse D'Elia	Heather Johnson
Heather McPherron	Alex Schubert	Amy Nicholas
Jennifer Siani	Jeff Berglund	Lara Drizd
Kevin Shelley	Kate Norman	

Agenda:

1. BLM chapter 2 review –
 - a. These chapters will be released (or in some cases have been released) within the next few weeks
 - b. Comments should be focused on major discrepancies from NPT guidance, standard drop-in language, or changes from in-state discussions.
 - i. Pat and Jesse developing a “field guide” to ensure consistency in the reviews (e.g. making sure the most recent agreed upon drop-in language has been used, adaptive management plans are in place, etc.)
 - ii. Field guide should be available by Monday
 - iii. format for responding will come from the federal land management agencies in each state
 - iv. Pat will request guidance on how any comments we share will be surnamed if at all.
2. State and other plan review – Craig Hansen –
 - a. 2 separate templates
 - b. waiting on review of the templates for reporting so that they can be sent to the field folks for use in review of conservation plans (approx.. 80 in the CED)
 - c. not to include the federal land management agencies (BLM/FS)
 - i. *Template 1* - do include all plans but state conservation plans
 1. review will be based on the CED criteria
 2. will include plans that were entered into the CED
 3. also plans that you may know about but were not entered into the CED.
 - ii. *Template 2* - state plans – re-visit state plans and previous letters and advise how things have changed since our last review
 - d. hope that both templates will be available next week
 - e. Question – how to refuge and partners plans fit in to this?
 - i. Craig will circle back on refuge question that but likely will be a part of the analyses.

- ii. For partner's information will be getting their assistance for NRCS projects
 - iii. R6 Partners have not been asked to help review refuge plans
- 3. Questions re: CED:
 - a. next steps on CED for projects not reviewed – formalized process to make that happen has not been identified, but will happen in some form.
 - b. for projects in the CED that were not deemed effective – if less than 500 acres may not be reviewed but decision not final.
 - c. for those actions that lacked supporting documentation for assessment of effectiveness – what do we do with any additional information received on those projects.
 - i. will be no formalized request for updates so updates will be made on a state by state basis
 - ii. information will be considered if determined to potentially contribute to a new outcome on the effectiveness of evaluation (e.g. new data added, new supporting information).
- 4. Update on the species report process.
 - a. All chapter writers should be wrapping up their chapters and responses to comments received
 - b. SLT will then take the chapters and compile into a species report throughout the month of April
 - i. will likely be reaching out to chapter authors and others for information/clarification
 - ii. will be engaging with the GIS team for any additional analyses
 - iii. Very rough draft of the species report will be completed May 1
 - iv. At that point will go to ARDs and PLs to review.
 - c. If reviews from ARDs and PLs are ongoing now, complete for any chapter for which the review has been started, but do not start reviews on any new chapters
 - d. Two meetings in May- both are still scheduled but the first will likely not include RDs. The second meeting will happen but meeting date and length of meeting may vary from current schedule.
 - e. will occur before the Director's briefing the week of June 6.
- 5. Stronghold areas – continue to be a concern across the range
 - a. our EA folks are bringing back the talking points
 - b. as a reminder the strongholds were identified at the request of BLM and DOI
 - i. intended to provide additional protections that were not considered in the land management planning efforts to key areas with the range
 - ii. do not contain non-federal lands
 - iii. not all inclusive, typically due to valid existing rights or indications of viability problems as suggested by the climate vortex model DOI requested be used

- iv. do contain areas of non-habitat if those areas were contained in the stronghold. Not being removed as this is a landscape-scale species
 - v. removal of non-habitat may result in a swiss cheese effect, with development allowed in those areas that may have indirect effects on surrounding habitats
- c. the only request made by FWS is that locatable minerals be withdrawn in those areas and that any energy development be NSO
 - i. Additional protections are not at the request/decision of FWS
- 6. Have received a Data Quality Act inquiry on the COT report (as well as NTT [BLM] and the SAB volume [USGS]).
 - a. awaiting direction from leadership and DOI on how to respond
- 7. Population trend model re-analysis – trend analysis by Dr. Garton et al will be presented to DOI next week.
 - a. incorporates 7 more years of data. model
- 8. Model discussion –
 - a. Concern was expressed about the number of models that are coming in both to us and being used elsewhere
 - b. requested consolidated outreach about what they mean and how we will be used –
 - c. we need to have good outreach both internal and external. Need to be able to defend the use of the models we actually use.

Round the lek:

SD – State will be using infra-red aerial surveys to identify new leks and number of birds on leks

CO – meeting with BLM and provided with draft of standard language for their Chapter 2
To extent possible keep state summaries on the sharepoint updated; sat in the COT consistency table for transmission corridors and energy checklist and thought it helpful
WY – Sweetwater River Conservancy signed yesterday

MT – state working on regulatory authority review relative to their executive order; state preparing a clarification memo to address our comments on their executive order; future of executive order and all parts still pending.

ID – state has developed conservation plan and we have reviewed and provided comments – waiting for response from state; Have Chapter 2 from BLM for review (hard copy only).

UT – met with BLM, State and USU re: habitat objectives and potential divergence from the Connelly et al. guidelines. Divided state into 7 different regions and have different habitat measurements for each area. Do not vary significantly from the Connelly guidelines.

NV – reviewing Chapter 2, seeing a lot of changes, because of strongholds appears that some of the allocative decisions have been relaxed in other priority habitats; mitigation agreement with Barrick- process continues to move forward.

OR – ccaa signing Mar. 17 and 18

WA – may have located a new lek of 15 males; ccaa with cattlemens association stalled a bit – trying to figure who will be leading the effort; working on the Ponomma (?) transmission line –focusing on the undergrounding option; working on translocations from OR again this year

Partners – projects starting early due to spring-like weather; NA wildlife meeting – poster presented on what the Partner's folks are doing.