
BIGHORN SHEEP: SUPPLEMENTAL ANALYSIS TO THE FOREST PLAN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT - INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM MEETING

*Payette National Forest Supervisor's Office Conference Room
800 W. Lakeside, McCall, Idaho*

(Note: Green text denotes ID team areas of agreement)

August 30, 2007

ATTENDEES

- Christine Bradbury, Clearwater/Nez Perce National Forests Tribal Liaison
- Vic Coggins, Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
- Brad Compton, Idaho Dept. of Fish and Game
- Tim Dykstra, Shoshone-Paiute Tribes
- Ana Egnew, Payette Forest Wildlife Biologist
- Craig Ely, Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
- Bob Giles, Payette Forest Natural Resources Staff
- Pete Grinde, Payette Forest Range Specialist
- Keith Lawrence, Nez Perce Tribe
- Curt Mack, Nez Perce Tribe
- Tyler Mallard, State of Idaho-Governor's Office
- Susan Miller, Payette Forest Ecologist
- Chans O'Brien, Payette Forest GIS Analyst
- Suzanne Rainville, Payette Forest Supervisor
- Carl Scheeler, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation
- Tim Schommer, Wallowa Whitman National Forest
- Pattie Soucek, Payette Forest Planner/ Interdisciplinary Team Leader
- Leander Watson, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes
- Paul Wik, Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife

PROCESS SUPPORT

- Susan Hayman, Facilitator, North Country Resources, Inc.
- Roinda Plesner, Documentation, Peak Science Communications

MEETING OBJECTIVES

1. Create a shared understanding of how the following terms will be used in this analysis:
 - Viability
 - Suitability
 - Adaptive Management
2. Define the fundamental objective(s) for management related to bighorn sheep habitat and domestic sheep management on the Payette National Forest (NF)
3. Confirm the interim and final interdisciplinary (ID) team products and timeline
4. Confirm the roles, responsibilities and expectations of ID team members

DECISIONS AND OUTCOMES

Action Items

What	Who	When
1) Viability Analysis: Finalize assumptions and define viability and measurement criteria	Susan Miller, Carl Scheeler, Curt Mack, Tim Dykstra, Chans O'Brien	To the ID team by 9/18/2007
2) Check on public records requests to determine what may be subject to FOIA or other public disclosure laws	Tyler Mallard-ID, Craig Ely-OR OR, Paul Wik-WA, Pattie Soucek-FS	By 9/25/2007
3) List of Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement contents	Pattie Soucek	By 9/25/2007
4) Update database and map of distribution of Payette bighorn sheep population with additional sighting reports	All ID team members	To Chans O'Brien by 9/18/2007
5) BHS Habitat and Population Model: Read the modeling assumption and parameters papers to provide feedback on the model	All ID team members	9/25/2007

The next meeting is scheduled for September 25, 2007 from 8:30 A.M. to 3:00 P.M.

OPENING

Welcome

Pattie Soucek, Forest Planner for the Payette National Forest (NF), opened the meeting by welcoming all participants. New participants attended this meeting, so Soucek briefly described some guidelines:

- The IDT needs to function as a *team* to create ideas for the supplemental analysis to the *Payette National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan* (Forest Plan).
- U.S. Forest Service (USFS) must follow the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process in this analysis. The NEPA process is second nature for most USFS employees, so please ask for clarification if the NEPA process or acronyms are unclear.
- The interdisciplinary team (ID team) should not jump ahead to a decision at this point. The first product is a draft document; we do not need to, nor will we, get everything right for the draft. The goal is the best draft possible. Furthermore, the final supplemental environmental impact statement (SEIS) does not have to follow the draft SEIS exactly. The public and agencies at the table will be able to comment on the draft SEIS.
- This meeting is confidential. Please keep the contents of this meeting within the confines of this group or your agencies.
- At the last meeting, the USFS presented work completed to date. Some ID team members expressed confusion and concern regarding the USFS work so far. The purpose of the meeting today is to clarify definitions and try to resolve any conflicts that have surfaced.

Opening Remarks

Suzanne Rainville, Payette NF Supervisor, provided the following opening remarks:

- Rainville agreed with Soucek's appraisal of the last meeting and pointed out that as the "decision maker," Rainville usually does not participate in ID team meetings. She will attend as many as she can, mostly to listen and to play a clarification role.
- Soucek is the ID team leader, and she will work everyone through the process. When Rainville is absent, Soucek will represent her perspective.
- Susan Hayman, North County Resources, is a non-Forest Service facilitator assisting the team.
- Rainville stated that the preparation of memorandums of understanding (MOU) to establish cooperating agency status are still in progress at the Washington office.

Soucek noted that the new team members will receive the Resource Binder handed out at the August 14 meeting. She also referred team members to the new handout, *Rocky Mountain Bighorn Sheep (Ovis Canadensis): A Technical Conservation Assessment*. Although this paper was written by Region 2 of the USFS, Region 4 does not have a bighorn sheep technical conservation assessment, so this paper can serve as a reference for the ID team members.

Meeting Overview

Hayman distributed a sign-in sheet, introduced herself and described her role. Hayman then asked team members to introduce themselves.

Hayman reviewed the meeting agenda and highlighted the objectives (Appendix 1). Today, the ID team will work together to resolve previous process issues and move forward to more substantive discussions. Hayman will suggest processes to move discussions along and the ID team will have the opportunity to accept, reject, or modify those suggestions.

Today's first agenda item, "Defining the Framework for the Analysis," includes a discussion of definitions and applicability of terms introduced, but not finalized, at the last meeting. Chans O'Brien, Payette NF GIS Analyst, has the analysis parameters available for review and will present the information today if time allows.

The rest of the agenda was reviewed and accepted by the ID team.

An ID team member asked for the opportunity to address some residual concerns with the August 14 meeting summary. Hayman reiterated that the process support personnel are neutral and are not content experts. The process support personnel will do their best to summarize the key points of the discussion as it occurred. They will rely on the ID team to validate meeting notes. She will provide time in future agendas for this purpose.

Three changes to the August 14, 2007 meeting summary were requested.

1. Page 4, Purpose and Need, first paragraph, second sentence: Some team members felt that since no viability analysis was initially conducted for the Forest Plan FEIS, and the Risk Assessment does not contain a viability analysis, the reference to "revisit the viability analysis" was inappropriate. **Agreement:** The ID team agreed that it would be best to quote the language used in the Chief's appeal decision (USDA Forest Service 2005a) in order to keep the wording consistent:

The Regional Forester is instructed to do an analysis of bighorn sheep viability in the Payette NF commensurate with the concerns and questions discussed above, and amend the SW Idaho Ecogroup FEIS accordingly. Changes to the management direction of the Payette NF LRMP for MA#1 (Hells Canyon) and adjacent areas shall be evaluated, and adopted as necessary to ensure bighorn sheep viability. (USDA Forest Service 2005a, page 15, paragraph 3)

- Page 4, Purpose and Need, first paragraph, third sentence: There was some concern over the description of the contents of the Notice of Intent. **Agreement:** The ID team agreed that it would be best to quote language from the SEIS Notice of Intent (FR 72:18197-18198) in order to keep the wording consistent:

The Forest Service will prepare a supplement to the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Southwest Idaho Ecogroup (SWIEG) Revised Land and Resource Management Plans and may amend the Payette Revised LRMP. This supplement is being conducted in

order to comply with the Chief's appeals decision of March 9, 2005. It is intended to present additional information for the Payette National Forest portion of the SWIEG concerning: 1) the viability of Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep (bighorn sheep) at the planning unit scale; 2) compliance with the Hells Canyon National Recreation Area Act (CNRA); 3) 36 CFR 292.48; 4) compliance with the National Forest Management Act (NFMA); and 5) 36 CFR 219.19. The amendment would add direction to the Payette Revised LRMP to address the viability concerns for bighorn sheep. (FR 72:18197-18198, Summary, page 1).

2. Page 8, first bulleted item ("Adaptability language needs..."): An ID team member raised a concern that the adaptability language as captured in this bullet would indicate that the same language would apply to both the Hells Canyon and Salmon River populations. Other ID team members felt that the discussion as captured was not intended to be conclusionary but, rather, captured the initial discussion of this topic. Essentially, it was a discussion of adaptability, no decisions were made, and examples were given as different ways to look at adaptability. **Agreement:** The ID team agreed that changes to the summary in this section were not needed.

Hayman said that the changes as noted would be made in the final meeting summary. She reiterated that team members will always have the opportunity to modify the meeting notes to ensure a reasonable and accurate representation of the discussion that occurred.

PROPOSED APPROACH

(Note: Appendix 2 contains the transcribed flip chart notes document key points and agreements captured during the August 30, 2007 meeting.)

Hayman said that in reviewing the bin items from the last meeting (Appendix 2), and the key points of discussion from the August 14 meeting, it appeared that questions/future discussion points could be sorted into the following categories (Appendix 2 contains these as individual flip charts with questions/discussion points listed under each):

- Framework
- IDT Function
- Data Analysis
- Developing management options (*alternatives*)
- Adaptive management

Hayman proposed that the ID team utilize this outline as a roadmap for future meetings. Framework and IDT function would be addressed today. Data analysis would be discussed at the next meeting. After that, the team would tackle developing management options and adaptive management.¹ The items listed under each category heading would be reviewed prior to the next meeting, with additions, deletions and modifications of topics, as needed. **Agreement:** The ID team agreed to use Hayman's outline as a sequential roadmap, and to focus on framework and IDT function today.

During this discussion, questions arose again about the nature of alternative development. Rainville reminded the group that NEPA requires a reasonable range of alternatives, and that it would be a problem for the analysis if the group narrowed their initial scope to only two alternatives (e.g. no action and action). Hayman reiterated that developing alternatives was not the end product discussion today. She stressed that once the team felt comfortable with the framework and ID team expectations, they could move on to more substantive discussions.

¹ Though the meeting minutes generally adhere to the chronological development of the meeting, information for any subject covered at different times is organized by subject matter.

DEFINING THE FRAMEWORK OF THE ANALYSIS

Hayman suggested that the following people introduce the following topics for group discussion: Soucek–viability; Pete Grinde–suitability; Soucek–adaptive management. The team asked to begin the discussion with an agreement of the fundamental objectives for this project.

Fundamental management objective

Soucek opened the discussion with a review from the page 15 of the Decision for Appeal. The Decision for Appeal states that the Regional Forester is to conduct an analysis of bighorn sheep viability for the Payette NF, and develop Forest Plan language to ensure viability. Based on the 1982 implementing regulations of NFMA (1982 Rule), the viability determination may be different from a typical viability analysis; it may be much more qualitative than quantitative. The ID team needs to discuss viability at the Payette NF level.

Soucek reiterated the goal of the ID team—to analyze viability of bighorn sheep and document this in a Supplement to the Final Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS). The team will then develop, if needed, additional direction for the Payette Forest Plan. The Forest Plan is the overarching document that will guide the USFS for the next 15 years and implements the final decision of the Payette Forest Supervisor, after consideration of the results of the ID team collaboration.

ID team members asked if the team could assume that there is one, large bighorn sheep population or if different management could be proposed for different areas. Soucek replied that the Forest Plan has two levels of direction from the same analysis: Forest-wide direction is applied across the forest, while management area direction is specific to certain management areas (there are 14 management areas in the Payette NF). Generally, if an issue is relevant to three or more management areas, management direction can be added to the forestwide goals, standards, and objectives. Even though bighorn sheep populations extend beyond the Payette NF, the write-up of the viability analysis will only address the Payette NF. The effects from and to other lands (including other national forests, state and tribal lands) will be addressed in the cumulative effects analysis contained in the SEIS.

Fundamental Goals (Areas of Agreement)

The team agreed to the following text defining the fundamental goals of their work:

1. To conduct a viability analysis (as defined per the 1982 Rule) and...
2.develop new Forest Plan direction* that ensures viability of bighorn sheep on the Payette NF

*Analyzed in SEIS. Analysis includes alternatives and adaptive management. Looks at ways to reduce risk to viability.

Rainville stated that the ID team needed to conduct an analysis, develop alternatives, and then document those actions in the SEIS. Proposed forest plan direction would only be developed for the preferred/selected alternative(s).

Viability

The ID team viewed the handout, “Definitions for Discussion–Viability.Supplemental Analysis to the 2003 Forest Plan FEIS,” which illustrated the direction the USFS has taken for viability. Viability is addressed in the 1982 implementing regulations of NFMA (1982 Rule). The entire 1982 Rule is available online. A 2007 draft Rule has been released, but the Forest Plan was developed under the 1982 Rule, as will be the SEIS. Important excerpts were highlighted in bold in the handout. Soucek read the first bold paragraph to the group and noted the importance of the planning area language. The team needs to ensure viable populations and the USFS needs to discuss viability at the forest scale. A team member asked if state and tribal population objectives would be (a) factor(s) considered in the decision-making process. Rainville replied that those influences are important and affect the Payette NF.

The following points were discussed concerning viability:

- Four components generally addressed in viability analyses were discussed 1) Number of animals, 2) Amount of habitat, 3) Long-term persistence, and 4) Well-distributed population across the forest. The

group discussed that viability is usually measured in terms of items 1 and 2 and result in items 3 and 4. This description of viability works best with discrete populations, which is not the case with most wildlife populations, including the bighorn sheep on and adjacent to the Payette NF. Subpopulations (herds) are connected via movements (as displayed through the telemetry data at the last meeting). Some ID team members believe that some level of interaction occurs between bighorn sheep in the Hell's Canyon metapopulations and bighorn sheep in the Salmon River metapopulations (note: Curt Mack provided a drawing on the whiteboard to illustrate these points).

- On the Payette NF, domestic sheep allotments overlap or occupy 1) known bighorn sheep range or 2) modeled bighorn sheep habitat. One occurrence of contact and disease transmission could be felt throughout the entire metapopulation of bighorn sheep. The numbers of animals and the amount of habitat cannot be examined without considering the entire metapopulation.
- Bighorn sheep in Hells Canyon were translocated, but the Salmon River population is native and never extirpated. Genetic mixing of the two metapopulations (native and transplant) could be occurring. Some ID team members believe two metapopulations exist, while others believe it is one large metapopulation. As both native and transplanted bighorn sheep populations grow, more mixing between the two metapopulations is anticipated. It was suggested that the team should focus on recovering both metapopulations and realize that the principles of viability apply to one, large metapopulation as well as two discrete metapopulations.

The following points were also noted in the discussion:

- One metapopulation or two metapopulations of bighorn sheep, with the notion that in the future, as the metapopulations grow, the metapopulations will mix.
- From a temporal standpoint, you cannot eliminate the risk of lost domestic sheep (strays), which may interface with bighorn sheep.
- It was suggested that we cannot define bighorn sheep habitat as well distributed, useful or available if it overlaps with domestic sheep grazing because of the implications of contact leading to disease transmissions.
- The ID team needs to look at suitability based on assumptions of risk.
- The ID team cannot consider degrees of risk, because we cannot determine how much the risk of contact is changed by different buffers or management practices.
- The team should identify levels of risk to viability. These could lead to a range of alternatives to determine what viability risk the decision maker wants to take.
- The reasonable range of alternatives needs to be based on alternatives that support viable populations of bighorn sheep.
- The range of alternatives does not have to be reasonable, workable, or legal.
- Population impacts are the same for different contact scenarios: the risk of contact can be different, but not the population impact. The goal recognized by the Science Review Panel was to separate domestic sheep from bighorn sheep.
- Managers will do what they can to prevent contact in order to maintain viability.
- It is important to include in the risks to viability analysis the actions that occur on private lands and other jurisdictions. The team concluded that this would be addressed in the cumulative effects analysis
- Because of the difficulties in analyzing "viability" on a National Forest, viability is often described in terms of risk to viability. This is often described qualitatively, rather than quantitatively.
- Should a traditional, quantitative viability analysis be used and would defined numbers of animals and defined habitat be needed for this assessment?
- A risk analysis was conducted in December 2005. Risk to bighorn sheep is not caused by habitat, but by disease. The ID team should address disease by risk of contact (not a traditional viability analysis).
- Viability was roughly defined through the 1982 Rule.
- Ana Egnew, Payette Forest biologist, recommended a paper by Fred Samson published in 2002, which discusses viability analysis techniques and methods. Egnew offered to provide the paper to anyone who was interested.

- In the future we could “find a cure” for the diseases that affect bighorn sheep that would allow overlap between domestic sheep and bighorn sheep.

Viability Assumptions

Following much discussion, the ID team agreed upon the assumptions and wording regarding viability below:

1. Look at it as a system. If either population has a high susceptibility to disease, it could affect the other over time.
2. Recognize that all domestic sheep may not be removed when flocks leave allotments (strays).
3. The SEIS will include a comprehensive cumulative effects analysis.
4. The Hells Canyon area is a series of connected herds that was re-populated by transplanting efforts. The Salmon River area is a series of connected herds, which consists of native bighorn sheep. Currently, there are limited interactions between bighorn sheep in the Hells Canyon and Salmon River areas. However, as populations expand in the future, more interactions between the Hells Canyon and Salmon River areas are expected.
5. When bighorn sheep habitat is overlapped by domestic sheep grazing, bighorn sheep habitat is no longer available source habitat for bighorn sheep.
6. Even limited direct contact with domestic sheep can result in high risk to bighorn sheep viability due to disease transmission.
7. Managers will do what they can to prevent contact in order to maintain viability.
8. Risk of disease transmission through contact with domestic sheep and goats is the primary obstacle to viability on the Payette.
9. Currently bighorn sheep populations are depressed. Implementing management direction to ensure viability will result in increased bighorn sheep population numbers and expanded range.
10. Bighorn sheep habitat is contiguous throughout the Payette NF, though not all of it is currently occupied.
11. Use the 1982 Rule for definition of viability. When applied to the Payette NR, recognize more qualitative description in recognition of the interconnectedness of the populations.

Hayman posted the assumptions on flip charts on the wall (Appendix 2). The team agreed that it would be useful to assign a small work group to take the assumptions and create a statement defining viability and its application in this analysis (see the table of action items on page 2 of this summary).

Suitability

Grinde reviewed the handout, “Definitions for Discussion—Capability/Suitability,” which refers to grazing and capability within the Payette National Forest Plan. The handout describes capability modeling process. Suitability is driven by other values and needs and can vary by alternative.

Grinde read a section from page 2 of the handout.

At the allotment level, the USFS uses the Forest Plan to guide site-specific analysis. The Forest Plan determines whether domestic sheep and bighorn sheep are incompatible on the Payette NF.

The team felt they were clear on how suitability would be defined and applied. The team agreed that no further discussion was needed on suitability.

Adaptive Management

The handout, “Definitions for Discussion—Adaptability” was discussed. Soucek defined adaptability and adaptive management as being able to learn and adjust from management decisions in the Forest Plan. Forest Plan management direction regarding bighorn sheep needs to stay current as more information is gathered, or as situations change. Examples of adaptive management language used by the USFS are in the handout and the Forest Plan.

The following adaptive management concepts were discussed by the ID team (Appendix 2):

1. If more bighorn sheep, more bighorn sheep will come onto the Payette NF (as the population grows in Hells Canyon, more will come on the Payette NF).
2. Management actions could relate to class of livestock, season of use, Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA) criteria, etc.
3. Only design adaptability language for the preferred or selected alternative(s).
4. Reevaluate and reassess management as more BHS habitat is occupied.
5. Adaptability language could go both ways...e.g. for increasing domestic sheep, if appropriate.
6. Monitoring/Triggering mechanisms may vary depending on the situation.
7. Would need to disclose effects from adaptive management—triggering mechanisms and management response.

The adaptive management discussion was completed and the above points were agreed upon by the ID team.

DEFINING ID TEAM ROLES, RESPONSIBILITIES AND EXPECTATIONS

Hayman introduced the discussion by reminding team members that they had discussed these topics at the August 14 meeting, but had not had an opportunity to finalize them. The purpose of this discussion, then, was to reach agreement on the roles, responsibilities, products and team expectations.

Roles

Hayman displayed flip charts with the roles of the different ID team members (Appendix 2), distilled from the discussion at the August 14 meeting. The team added “document reviewer” to the states/tribes roles, and agreed to the following list of roles:

Forest Service:

1. Decision maker
2. Technical expert
3. Process expert
4. Policy expert
5. Document author

States/Tribes

1. Technical expert
2. Process expert
3. Policy expert
4. Document reviewer

The team noted that “Technical Expert” means that agencies and tribes bring wildlife biology expertise to the table. They also may bring a variety of other expert information (e.g. social, economic). The Forest Service agreed that it would accept any “expert” information from agencies and tribes and would evaluate its usefulness with the ID team.

Responsibilities

Hayman displayed flip charts with the different ID team member responsibilities (Appendix 2), distilled from the discussion at the August 14 meeting. The team added a reference to the responsibility for formal consultation to the Forest Service list of responsibilities. References to decision-making, monitoring and comment analysis were added to the lists of responsibilities, as well.

The team agreed to the following lists of responsibilities:

Forest Service Responsibilities

Note: The USFS will consult with tribes in a government to government relationship. The ID team is not a substitute for formal consultation.

1. Meaningfully consider input and recommendations from the ID team and individual members
2. Provide timely and meaningful input as leaders and members of the ID team
3. Finalize:
 - Data analysis
 - Management options/alternatives
 - Effects analysis
 - Adaptive management strategies
 - Response to comments on the draft SEIS
 - Amendment language (as necessary)
 - Documentation
 - Monitoring plans
 - Decision (Forest Supervisor)

States/Tribes Responsibilities

1. Provide timely and meaningful input and recommendations for:
 - Data analysis
 - Management options/alternatives
 - Effects analysis
 - Adaptive management strategies
 - Response to comments on the draft SEIS
 - Amendment language (as necessary)
 - Monitoring plans
2. Advise the ID team of specific authorities, obligations, and plans relevant to this bighorn sheep analysis
3. Optional: Provide written "specialist" reports

Guiding Principles

Hayman proposed a list of guiding principles (Appendix 2), based on discussion at the August 14 meeting. This list was modified slightly, with the following agreed upon by the ID team:

1. The USFS has been in the process of analysis and option (alternative) development for several months prior to convening the states and tribes in the ID team process.
2. The ID team is providing pre-decisional information and recommendations to the USFS, including analysis and management option (alternative) development (as identified in Principle #1).
3. The ID team will seek to reach consensus recommendations. Where consensus cannot be reached, areas of agreement and disagreement (with rationale) will be clearly documented.

4. USFS decisions made contrary to consensus ID team recommendations will be explained to the ID team and documented in the administrative record (option: through a summary of recommendations with USFS response).

5 The USFS is not required to incorporate the recommendations of the ID team, nor of any individual ID team member, into the final decision.

It was discussed that Principles 4 and 5 might be reversed.

6. All official notes and work products of the ID team are part of the administrative record.

7. ID team members will have the opportunity to review, provide comments, and approve meeting summaries before they are considered final. In instances of irresolvable disagreement in the summary, viewpoints will be clearly documented.

8. ID team members will hold the ID team interim and final products, and ID team conversations, in confidence until the information is "officially" made public. (Note: the legal ability of ID team members to do this is being investigated prior to the September 25, 2007, meeting).

9. No surprises.

10. The USFS will continue to be responsible for formal consultation (agencies, tribes).

This process is a large investment of time and resources for the ID team. It is important for team members to understand how their investment of time affected the final decision. Soucek and Rainville will likely be the only direct interface between the ID team and the Regional and Washington D.C. offices. Because influences outside the ID team will impact the situation, the team would like the rationale for decisions at any level (Forest, Regional, or Washington Office) that would vary from ID team consensus recommendations.

Products

Based on discussions held on August 14 and earlier today, the following were agreed to represent the ID team products:

1. SEIS to the FEIS for the Forest Plans specifically addressing bighorn sheep (includes response to comments)
2. Amendment (as necessary) to the Payette National Forest Plan to ensure bighorn sheep viability
3. Evaluation of compliance/compatibility with the Hells Canyon NRA Act
4. Administrative Record/Project Record

NEXT STEPS

Bin Items (carried from previous meetings, with noted additions from this meeting)

1. Risk assessment/viability-fit together
2. Bighorn sheep management goals for forest instead of statewide (there is a goal for Hells Canyon)
3. What is the ID team interested in making recommendations on? (issues?)
4. Opportunity to update veg. data/model to reflect fire information? Supplementing?
5. Update cycle for data (e.g. 2007 telemetry points)
6. Ability to apply WAFWA criteria to model
7. Question of not including outliers in adjusted fixed kernel analysis. Is it appropriate to exclude them for outlier purposes (analysis of home range)
8. ID team discussion of:
 - Analysis of home range
 - Habitat/veg.-changing the model (meeting NFMA requirements)

9. Compare first year movements to “after they are settled” movements
10. Definition of contact - what are we using?
11. Parameters for “bright line” of non-suitability
12. Incorporating benefits of outfitter/guides and hunting into economic analysis
13. Incorporating cost of administering grazing permits into economic analysis
14. Opportunity to expand conversation to discuss the issue more broadly across landscape
15. Need to check on state public records request

Bin items 14, and 15 were added to the Bin during today’s meeting.

DATA/ANALYSIS (INFORMATION NEEDED/QUESTIONS TO ADDRESS)

Consistent with the agreement at the beginning of the meeting, the team will undertake discussions about data/analysis at the next meeting. The following topics were identified in discussion on August 14 and today as information that is needed or questions that ultimately need to be addressed in the analysis:

1. How much habitat exists?
2. Number of bighorn sheep the Payette NF is expected to carry, based on how much habitat exists
3. Opportunity to update/supplement data (fire information, 2007 telemetry data, etc.)
4. Application of WAFWA criteria to model (note: criteria needs interpretation)
5. Modeling assumptions/parameters (outliers, home range, use of LandFire, etc.)
6. Including movements of “unsettled” animals vs. “settled” animals
7. Economic analysis
 - Inclusion of benefits from bighorn sheep (outfitter/guides, hunting, etc.)
 - Inclusion of cost of administration for grazing permits
8. Effects Analysis
 - Risk of contact
 - Risk to population
9. What do we know about habitat and its distribution?
10. Define what is a viable population
11. Assumptions of how Hells Canyon is used—can these assumptions be applied to the Salmon River?
12. Is there something else to look at; e.g. travel corridors, trailing areas, etc.?

The ID team reached agreement on the following points:

- Data/analysis will be discussed at the next meeting.
- The ID team discussed risk assessments and viability analyses (qualitative rather than quantitative), habitat needs, and viable population numbers. The ID team will review the risk assessment language at the top of page 15 in the Risk Analysis of Disease Transmission Between Domestic Sheep and Bighorn Sheep on the Payette NF. The team will review this language before the next meeting to discuss the issue.
- The ID team’s style of viability analysis would involve habitat distribution of animals across the forest and the risk of contact.

O’Brien has metadata for input layers for habitat modeling and for population herd modeling. This data is available for ID team review. O’Brien has modeling documentation, U.C. Davis information, and a Rogers and Carr paper available for the ID team review as well. Finally, O’Brien also compiled a list of modeling assumptions and parameters available for peer review before the next meeting.

Objectives for the Next Meeting

The team agreed that there is more on the data/analysis list than can be addressed in a single meeting. The following five objectives for the next meeting were identified by the team:

1. Agreement on the habitat model (is modeled habitat the “real and suitable” habitat present?)
2. Agreement on population (geographic population range) modeling and edits
3. Agreement on Salmon River geographic population range – determine occupied habitat for the Payette
4. Validate viability, assumptions and measurement criteria
5. Determine if there is other available data (that should be included in the analysis)

Tasks/assignments

See the table of action items on page 2 of this summary.

Meeting schedule

The next meeting is scheduled for September 25, 2007, and will start at 8:30 A.M. and adjourn at 3:00 P.M.

CLOSING

The meeting adjourned at 3:12 P.M.

HANDOUTS

1. Agenda
2. Beecham, J. J., C. P. Collins, and T. D. Reynolds. *Rocky Mountain Bighorn Sheep (Ovis canadensis): A Technical Conservation Assessment*. 2007. Prepared for the USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Region, Species Conservation Project. TREC, Inc., Rigby, ID. 107 p.
3. “Definitions for Discussion–Viability. Supplemental Analysis to the 2003 Forest Plan FEIS.” Handout from Patty Soucek, dated August 30, 2007. 2 p.
4. “Definitions for Discussion–Adaptability. Supplemental Analysis to the 2003 Forest Plan FEIS.” Handout from Patty Soucek, dated August 30, 2007. 1 p.
5. “Definitions for Discussion–Capability/Suitability. Supplemental Analysis to the 2003 Forest Plan FEIS.” Handout from Patty Soucek, dated August 30, 2007. 7 p.
6. Two handouts from Chans O’Brien, Payette Forest GIS Analyst, (9 p and 33 p) to be discussed at the next meeting.

APPENDIX 1—AGENDA

Bighorn Sheep: Supplemental Analysis to the Forest Plan Environmental Impact Statement

Interdisciplinary Team Meeting

Thursday, August 30, 2007 ♦ 8:30 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Payette National Forest Supervisor’s Office Conference Room

800 W. Lakeside, McCall, Idaho

Meeting Objectives:

- 1) Create a shared understanding of how the following terms will be used in this analysis:
 - Viability
 - Suitability
 - Adaptive Management
- 2) Define the fundamental objective(s) for management related to bighorn sheep habitat and domestic sheep management on the Payette NF
- 3) Confirm the interim and final ID team products and timeline
- 4) Confirm the roles, responsibilities and expectations of ID team members

Agenda

Time	Topic	Process / Product
8:15 a.m.	Refreshments available in meeting room	
8:30 a.m.	Opening <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome and introductions – Pattie Soucek, Payette Forest Planner • Opening remarks – Suzanne Rainville, Payette Forest Supervisor • Meeting overview – Susan Hayman, Facilitator 	Information
8:45 a.m. <i>(A 15-minute break will be taken at 10:00 a.m.)</i>	Defining the Framework of the Analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Viability • Suitability • Adaptive Management • Fundamental management objective(s) • Analysis parameters <i>(if time allows)</i> 	Discussion, decision <i>Product: List of terms with definitions and descriptions that will be incorporated into the ID team protocol</i>

Time	Topic	Process / Product
12:00 p.m.	LUNCH (brought in)	Break
12:30 p.m.	ID Team Products/Process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interim • Final • Timeline 	Discussion, decision <i>Product: List of products and projected timeline that will be incorporated into the ID team protocol</i>
1:15 p.m.	ID Team Roles, Responsibilities and Expectations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • States • Tribes • Forest Service 	Discussion, decision <i>Product: List of roles, responsibilities and expectations that will be incorporated into the ID team protocol</i>
1:45 p.m.	Break	
2:00 p.m.	Next steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bin Items • Tasks/assignments • Meeting schedule • Evaluation 	Discussion, decision <i>Products: List of assignments for the next meeting; projected meeting schedule with tentative objectives; group evaluation of meeting/process to date</i>
2:45 p.m.	Closing remarks – Suzanne Rainville	Information
3:00 p.m.	Adjourn	

APPENDIX 2—TRANSCRIBED FLIP CHART NOTES

(Note: Facilitator additions to clarify the text are italicized. Green text indicates areas of agreement.)

Framework
(information needed/questions to address)

- 1) Fundamental objective for management
- 2) Define/describe how applied:
 - Viability
 - Suitability
 - Adaptive Management

1

IDT Function
(information needed/questions to address)

- 1) Roles
- 2) Responsibilities
- 3) Products
- 4) Timeline

2

Data/Analysis
(information needed/questions to address)

- 1) How much habitat ~~is needed~~ exists?
- 2) Number of bighorns the Payette is expected to carry, based on how much habitat exists ~~the Payette is trying to support (viable population?)~~.
- 3) Opportunity to update/supplement data (fire info, 2007 telemetry, etc.)
- 4) Application of WAFWA criteria to model (note: criteria needs interpretation)
- 5) Modeling assumptions/parameters (outliers, home range, use of LandFire, etc.)
- 6) Including movements of “unsettled” animals vs. “settled” animals
- 7) Economic analysis
 - Inclusion of benefits from BHS (outfitter/guides, hunting, etc.)
 - Inclusion of cost of admin for grazing permits

3

Data/Analysis (cont’d)
(information needed/questions to address)

13. Effects Analysis
 - Risk of contact
 - Risk to population
14. What do we know about habitat and its distribution?
15. Define what is a viable population
16. Assumptions of how Hells Canyon is used – can these assumptions be applied to the Salmon River?
17. Is there something else to look at; e.g. travel corridors, trailing areas, etc.?

4

Adaptive Management
(information needed/questions to address)

- 1) What would trigger action?
- 2) How would “triggers” be monitored?
- 3) What actions would be taken? (e.g. scenarios – if this, then that)
- 4) Who is responsible for:
 - Monitoring
 - Taking action

5

Fundamental Objectives Goals
(Areas of Agreement)

- 1) To conduct a viability analysis *(as defined per the 1982 rule) to end and...*
- 2) **...develop up with new forest plan direction*** that ensures viability of bighorn sheep on the Payette NF

* = Analyzed in SEIS. Analysis includes *alternatives* and adaptive management. Looks at ways to reduce risk to viability.

6

Forest Plan and Analysis

- 1) Forest-wide: applies across the Payette
- 2) Management Areas: Specific for certain areas/conditions. May be different in Hells Canyon vs. Salmon River

7

Viability

(discussion points)

- 1) Specifies at least minimum viability in the 1982 Rule
 - How do state population objectives fit in? Part of a key to determining Payette viability
 - State population objectives could also be part of cumulative effects analysis. i.e. how this project would impact them

8

Viability (cont'd)

(discussion points)

- 2) Should populations be considered one large herd?
 - Hells Canyon transplants
 - Salmon River – native
 - As two metapopulations grow, there will be more mixing
- 3) Look at it as a system. If either population has a high susceptibility to disease, it could affect the other over time

9

Viability (cont'd)

(discussion points)

- 4) Recognize that all domestic sheep may not be removed when flocks leave allotments (strays)
- 5) A cumulative effects analysis will include effects from private lands, other jurisdictions, etc.
- 6) Need to define assumptions in analysis
- 7) Cannot define BHS habitat as well-distributed or useful or available if there is overlap in BHS habitat with domestic sheep range/where they occur

10

Viability (cont'd)

(discussion points)

- 8) Recognize that while there are two separate metapopulations (HC and SR), they will interact to a degree
- 9) When bighorn sheep habitat is overlapped by domestic sheep grazing, bighorn sheep habitat is no longer available source habitat for BHS
 - Not a “bright line”
 - Gray zones, buffers

11

Viability (cont'd)

(discussion points)

- 10) Even limited, direct contact with domestic sheep can result in high risk to BHS viability due to disease transmission
- 11) Maintain contact low enough to allow for at least minimum viable populations
- 12) Managers will do what they can to **minimize prevent** contact in order to maintain viability
- 13) To add to Tim D.’s suggested language:
 - Hells Canyon is a series of connected herds
 - Salmon River herds are connected
 - In the future, expect more interchange between Salmon River and Hells Canyon herds

12

Viability Assumptions
(Areas of Agreement)

- 1) Look at it as a system. If either Hells Canyon or Salmon River population has a high susceptibility to disease, it could affect the other over time
- 2) Recognize that all domestic sheep may not be removed when flocks leave the allotment (strays)
- 3) The SEIS will include a comprehensive cumulative effects analysis

13

Viability Assumptions (cont'd)
(Areas of Agreement)

- 4) The Hells Canyon area is a series of connected herds that was repopulated by transplanting efforts. The Salmon River area is a series of connected herds, which consist of native bighorn sheep. Currently, there are limited interactions between BHS in Hells Canyon and the Salmon River area. However, as populations expand in the future, more interactions between the Hells Canyon and Salmon River areas are expected.

14

Viability Assumptions (cont'd)
(Areas of Agreement)

- 5) When BHS habitat is overlapped by domestic sheep grazing, BHS habitat is no longer available source habitat for BHS (not a bright line, gray areas with buffers)
- 6) Even limited, direct contact between BHS and domestic sheep can result in high risk to BHS viability due to disease transmission
- 7) Managers will do what they can to prevent contact in order to maintain viability

15

Viability Assumptions (cont'd)
(Areas of Agreement)

- 8) Risk of disease transmission thru contact with domestic sheep/goats is the primary obstacle to viability on the Payette
- 9) Currently, BHS populations are depressed. Implementing management direction to ensure viability will result in increased BHS numbers and expanded range

16

Viability Assumptions (cont'd)
(Areas of Agreement)

- 10) BHS habitat is contiguous through the Payette NF, though not all of it is currently occupied

17

Viability Assumptions (cont'd)
(Areas of Agreement)

- 11) Use the 1982 Rule for definition of viability. When applied to the Payette NF, recognize more qualitative description in recognition of the interconnectedness of the populations

18

Adaptive Management

(discussion points and Areas of Agreement)

- 1) As the BHS population grows in Hells Canyon, more BHS will come onto the Payette NF
- 2) Management actions could be related to class of livestock, season of use, WAFWA criteria, etc.
- 3) Only design adaptability language for preferred/selected alternatives(s)

19

Adaptive Management (cont'd)

(discussion points and Areas of Agreement)

- 4) Re-evaluate/re-assess management as more BHS habitat is occupied
- 5) Adaptability language could go both ways...e.g. for increasing domestic sheep, if appropriate
- 6) Monitoring/triggering mechanisms may vary depending on the situation
- 7) Would need to disclose effects from adaptive management – triggering mechanisms and *management* response

20

Roles <i>(Areas of Agreement)</i>
FS: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Decision maker2) Technical expert3) Process expert4) Policy expert5) Document author
States/Tribes: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Technical expert2) Process expert3) Policy expert4) Document reviewer
21

FS Responsibilities <i>(Areas of Agreement)</i>
NOTE: The FS will consult with tribes in a government to government relationship. The IDT is not a substitute for formal consultation.
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Meaningfully consider input and recommendations from the IDT and individual members2) Provide timely and meaningful input as leaders and members of the IDT3) Finalize:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Data analysis• Management options/alternatives• Effects analysis• Adaptive management strategies• Response to comments on the draft SEIS• Amendment language (as necessary)• Documentation• Monitoring plans• Decision (Forest Supervisor)
22

State/Tribes Responsibilities <i>(Areas of Agreement)</i>
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Provide timely and meaningful input and recommendations for:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Data analysis• Management options/alternatives• Effects analysis• Adaptive management strategies• Response to comments on the draft SEIS• Amendment language (as necessary)• Documentation• Monitoring plans2) Advise the IDT of specific authorities, obligations and plans relevant to this BHS analysis3) Optional: Provide written "specialist" reports
23

Products <i>(Areas of Agreement)</i>
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Supplemental EIS to the FEIS for the Forest Plans, specifically addressing bighorn sheep (includes response to comments)2) Amendment (as necessary) to the Payette NF plan to ensure bighorn sheep viability3) Evaluation of compliance/compatibility with the Hells Canyon NRA Act4) Administrative Record/Project Record
24

IDT Guiding Principles
(Areas of Agreement)

- 1) The FS has been in the process of analysis and option (*alternative*) development for several months prior to convening the states and tribes in the IDT process.
- 2) The IDT is providing pre-decisional information and recommendations to the FS, including analysis and option (*alternative*) development (as identified in Principle #1).

25

IDT Guiding Principles (cont'd)
(Areas of Agreement)

- 3) The IDT will seek to reach consensus recommendations. Where consensus cannot be reached, areas of agreement and disagreement (with rationale) will be clearly documented.
- 4) FS decisions made contrary to consensus IDT recommendations will be explained to the IDT and documented in the administrative record (*option*: through a summary of recommendations with FS response).

26

IDT Guiding Principles (cont'd)
(Areas of Agreement)

- 5) The FS is not required to incorporate the recommendations of the IDT, nor of any individual IDT member, into the final decision.
- 6) All official notes and work products of the IDT are part of the administrative record.

27

IDT Guiding Principles (cont'd)
(Areas of Agreement)

- 7) IDT members will have the opportunity to review, provide comments, and approve meeting summaries before they are considered final. In instances of irresolvable disagreement in the summary, viewpoints will be clearly documented.
- 8) IDT members will hold the IDT interim and final products, and IDT conversations, in confidence until the information is "officially" made public. (*Note: the legal ability of IDT members to do this is being investigated prior to the August 30 meeting*)

28

IDT Guiding Principles (cont'd)
(Areas of Agreement)

- 9) NO SURPRISES!
- 10) The FS will continue to be responsible for formal consultation (agencies, tribes)

29

Objectives for Next Meeting

- 1) Agreement on habitat model (is modeled habitat the “real and suitable” habitat present).
- 2) Agreement on population (geographic population range) modeling and edits.
- 3) Agreement on Salmon River geographic population range – determine occupied habitat for Payette.
- 4) Validate viability, assumptions and measurement criteria.
- 5) Determine if there is other available data (*that should be included in the analysis*)

30

BIN

- 1) Risk assessment/Viability-fit together
- 2) BHS mgt goals for forest instead of statewide (there is a goal for HC0)
- 3) What is IDT interested in making recommendations on? (issues?)
- 4) Opportunity to update veg data/model to reflect fire info? Supplementing?
- 5) Update cycle for data (e.g. 2007 Telemetry pts.)
- 6) Ability to apply WAFWA criteria to model
- 7) Question of not including outliers in adjusted fixed kernel analysis. Is it appropriate to exclude them for out purposes (Analysis of home range)
- 8) IDT discussion of:
 - Analysis of home range
 - Habitat/veg-changing the model (meeting NFMA requirements)
- 9) Compare first year movements to “after they are settled” movements
- 10) Definition of contact- what are we using
- 11) Parameters for “bright line” of non-suitability
- 12) Incorporating benefits of outfitter/guides and hunting into economic analysis
- 13) Incorporating cost of administering grazing permits into economic analysis
- 14) Opportunity to expand conversation to discuss the issue more broadly across landscape
- 15) Need to check on State public records request

31

