
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

February 28–29, 2008

ATTENDEES

- Brooklyn Baptiste, Nez Perce Tribal Executive Committee, Nez Perce Tribe (Thursday morning only)
- Vic Coggins, Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
- Ana Egnew, Payette Forest Wildlife Biologist (Intermittent Thursday, and Friday morning)
- Craig Ely, Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
- Pete Grinde, Payette Forest Range Specialist
- Keith Lawrence, Nez Perce Tribe
- Ladale Leclair, Shoshone–Bannock Tribes (Thursday only)
- Mike Lopez, Nez Perce Tribe (Thursday morning only)
- Curt Mack, Nez Perce Tribe
- Donny Martorello, Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
- Susan Miller, Payette Forest Ecologist
- Chans O'Brien, Payette Forest GIS Analyst
- Darcy Pederson, Clearwater and Salmon River District Ranger, Nez Perce National Forest
- 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
- Dale Toweill, Idaho Department of Fish and Game
- Leander Watson, Shoshone–Bannock Tribes (Thursday only)
- Paul Wik, Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife (Friday only)

PROCESS SUPPORT

- Susan Hayman, Facilitator, North Country Resources, Inc.
- Nikole Pearson, Documentation, Peak Science Communications

MEETING OBJECTIVES

1. Discuss new information that may affect the SEIS alternatives and analysis
2. Evaluate the SEIS alternatives based on the IDT criteria
3. Develop recommendations for an IDT recommended preferred alternative

ACTION ITEMS

What	Who	When
Pattie to provide index of Hells Canyon 2 FOIA to IDT	Pattie Soucek	March 10
Pattie to provide index of Shirt's brothers FOIA to IDT	Pattie Soucek	April 1
Pattie will provide copies of signed MOUs to IDT as requested	Pattie Soucek	April 1
IDT final comments on confidentiality agreements to Pattie (Pattie will also email a copy to Carl Sheeler and Craig Ely)	IDT	March 7
IDT members to share information requests they receive	IDT	As needed
Pattie Soucek will write first draft of Forest Plan direction, including adaptive management	Pattie Soucek	April 1
Susan Hayman will send Hotel McCall information to IDT	Susan Hayman	March 3
Susan will send out FTP link to the IDT for IDFG map when Dale provides it	Susan Hayman	As available

The next meeting is scheduled for April 1–2, 2008, from 8:30 A.M. to 3:00 P.M.

Day 1

OPENING

Welcome

Suzanne Rainville welcomed participants and asked them to introduce themselves. She reminded everyone the purpose of the IDT is to help develop the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) to the *Payette National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan* (Forest Plan). Everything the team develops is building a record for how the team thinks bighorn sheep habitat on the Forest should be managed. Rainville reviewed the team's accomplishments, including developing the following: habitat model, geographic population ranges, home-range model, range of alternatives, and viability assessment agreements.

The final decision is likely a year away. After this meeting, Rainville will carefully consider the team's preferred alternative recommendation. Although Rainville must consider the short-term issue of what to do with domestic sheep grazing turnout this year, she is also looking at the long-term process—and keeping the issues separate in her mind. Rainville reminded the team to not get bogged down with the short-term issues.

Rainville reported that U.S. Forest Service (USFS) Regions 1 and 4 have agreed that the Salmon River GPR will be used as mapped.

Tim Schommer reported that the USFS will release the general technical report regarding management strategies for domestic and bighorn within the next six to eight weeks; he will provide copies to the IDT.

Pattie Soucek reported that Susan Miller has been writing the draft effects analysis that the team will use when analyzing each alternative. During this meeting, the team must look at the effects, understand the effects, and provide a reason for its preferred alternative recommendation. Once Rainville selects a preferred alternative, Soucek will develop draft Forest Plan language for the team to use as a starting point at the next meeting.

Meeting Overview

Susan Hayman reviewed the agenda (Appendix 1), including several changes that were made to the draft. The agenda was reorganized today to move the Idaho State Bighorn Sheep Interim Strategy discussion to 9:45; all other items were rescheduled accordingly.

MEETING SUMMARY

Proposed changes to the January 31, 2008, meeting summary were reviewed and discussed. The IDT agreed on the additions described below; corrected electronic copies will be provided to IDT members.

The following additions were made within the Meeting Overview section:

The Nez Perce Tribe said that the State policy generated outside of the Payette Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement process is counterproductive to the goal of changing the Payette Forest Plan to add more protection for bighorn sheep. Further, they said the attempt to compromise federal management guidelines, policies, and laws by imposition of state authorities could not compromise treaty reserved rights or responsibilities.

The State of Oregon also said that the new Idaho Policy cannot compromise their sovereign authorities and responsibilities.

The following addition was made within the Meeting Summary section:

Rainville affirmed that she will no longer be making decisions during the IDT meetings in response to IDT agreements. The record will continue to show the IDT agreements at each meeting. Any decisions made by Rainville during the process to enable IDT work to continue will be reported at subsequent

IDT meetings. Rainville reminded the IDT that her interim decisions that move the process along are subject to change as new information arises; decisions regarding bighorn sheep management will not be final until the end of the process.

The following additions were made within the Risk Model Review and Update (RO Briefing) section:

- **The risk associated with trailing routes is not considered in the landscape risk model, but is represented as a separate risk model (see paragraph below)**
- **“Islands of risk” upstream of Allison-Berg Allotment—The “islands of risk” on the map are created by applying the risk model to mapped incidental sightings of bighorn sheep. The USFS has not determined how to incorporate the 1,500 additional bighorn sightings in that same area over the last 50 years as provided through IDF&G winter trend surveys. There is a question about what to do with data that can’t be incorporated, but will affect risk rating (it will be addressed in cumulative effects).**

Trailing routes were not included in the landscape risk model because the IDT had no scientific documentation on an appropriate distance of risk from the trailing route to create a corridor/polygon with area, rather than simply including trailing routes as linear features. The Technical Report Subcommittee agreed to add them as linear features with their own risk ratings, which were routed to the entire IDT group after the October 29, 2007, IDT meeting; no additional IDT comments were received. This approach was also presented to USFS Regional Office, and the Payette was instructed to proceed with effects analysis. The Technical Report Subcommittee will reconvene to attempt to develop an acceptable methodology for including trailing routes as polygons in the landscape risk model.

ACTION ITEMS FROM LAST MEETING

Action Item 1—Provide an index of contents in response to Hells Canyon FOIA #2 (Pattie Soucek)

Not all requested items have been sent; however, the team agreed they would like an index of the items sent thus far. Soucek will provide the list by the end of tomorrow’s meeting.

The Payette National Forest (NF) has received a FOIA request from the Shirt’s brothers requesting (annual operating instructions (AOI) information, the information concerning the wildlife panel that was assembled for the risk assessment, and data tied to the science panel. The IDT requested an index of what is sent to the Shirt’s brothers by the next meeting.

Soucek asked the team members to report any information requests they receive as well.

Action Item 2—Questions/concerns of confidentiality agreement to Soucek (IDT)

Soucek received no comments concerning the confidentiality agreement, and asked that comments or concerns be submitted by Friday, March 7, 2008. Soucek would like the revised Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) signed by the April 1 meeting.

The confidentiality statement will be an amendment to the MOUs. The States of Oregon and Idaho and the Nez Perce Tribe have signed the original MOUs. All of these MOUs are identical except for the Nez Perce Tribe MOU that contains additional tribal trust responsibility language. The Shoshone–Bannock, Shoshone–Piute, and Umatilla tribes have opted to not sign an MOU, and are operating under existing treaties. They will, however need to indicate their agreement with the confidentiality agreement, as will Payette NF employees through Rainville. Curt Mack requested a copy of the signed MOUs.

Action Item 3—Check with regional office on appropriateness of addressing pack goats in the analysis (Pattie Soucek)

The initial reaction of the Regional Office was to not include pack goats in the analysis since pack goats were not an appeal point, nor were they addressed by the Chief in his instructions to the Payette NF.

Action Item 4—Develop an approach to model trailing routes (Technical Report Subcommittee)

This action item has been added to the agenda for the meeting today, and will be discussed at that time.

Action Item 5—Synthesize decision/evaluation criteria and finalize through email (Susan Hayman)

Hayman emailed a final list of decision criteria to the IDT; the team will finalize the list during today's meeting.

Action Item 6—Check on the ability of the effects analysis to address the evaluation criteria (Susan Miller)

This action item has been added to the agenda for the meeting today, and will be discussed at that time.

NEW INFORMATION

Idaho State Bighorn Sheep Interim Strategy

(Note: Appendix 2 contains the transcribed flip chart notes, which document key points as well as agreements captured during the January 31, 2008, meeting.)

Dale Toweill spoke on the State of Idaho interim strategy in the absence of representatives from Governor Otter's Office. In November, Governor Otter instructed Mr. Brian Oakey, Idaho State Department of Agriculture (ISDA), and Mr. Jim Unsworth, Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG), to develop a state-wide interim strategy by February 15, 2008, (prior to the 2008 domestic sheep grazing season on the national forests) for managing separation between domestic sheep and bighorn sheep. Strategy development originally included livestock industry and wildlife representatives only; however, additional ad-hoc members of the group were later added; others were invited to attend as observers (reference letter to Keith Lawrence). Toweill said that the interim strategy was ultimately written by ISDA and IDFG, and was neither collaborative nor the final product. Toweill expects this interim strategy to remain effective until the State of Idaho develops a bighorn sheep management plan. Rainville noted that if the state finalizes a bighorn management plan prior to the final SEIS, this information will need to be considered in the final SEIS.

Toweill read parts of the interim strategy and provided an explanation of items one through three. Toweill described efforts to create a map of occupied bighorn sheep range as required in the strategy. The final map is due March 1, 2008. The Governor is expected to review and approve the map early in the week of March 3, 2008. The final map will represent current occupied range, not the historic occupied range since nearly all of the recorded observations were within the past 10 years.

The final map is very similar to the map that was developed by the Payette NF. Toweill included data developed by the IDT and incorporated it into the IDFG map. The provisional map will be available by the end of next week and Toweill will provide an FTP internet link and pdf file for Hayman to distribute to IDT members.

Toweill emphasized that point 1b, which requires bighorn sheep and domestic sheep to be separated both physically and temporally, applies only on occupied domestic sheep allotments during the period of occupancy.

The interim strategy requires IDFG to work with ISDA and other agencies to develop, on a case-by-case basis, guidelines for removing bighorn sheep that stray into the defined buffer zones. Options include issuing kill permits to the permittees. However, IDFG is working with the permittees during periods of use when domestic sheep are present. Bighorn sheep known to have come in contact with domestic sheep will be

removed and either taken to a disease center or shot so they are not able to transmit disease to the rest of the herd. It is not the intent to force permittees off allotments or to jeopardize bighorn sheep restoration efforts by allowing them to transmit diseases to their herds. The IDFG will not promote bighorn sheep expansion into areas occupied by domestic sheep, even if that area is potential bighorn sheep habitat.

Permittees must cooperate in order for the policy to be implemented—the counterpoint of removing bighorn sheep is the removal of domestic sheep from the buffer zones.

Toweill illustrated examples of domestic sheep allotments within or adjacent to bighorn sheep occupied habitat. IDFG will implement management efforts to prevent bighorn sheep from entering and occupying domestic sheep allotments. However, if a domestic sheep allotment is in the middle of bighorn sheep occupied habitat, they will work with the permittees to separate bighorn sheep from domestic sheep. These individual plans will contain specific management efforts and require buffers.

Toweill said that the interim strategy represents no new changes from current State of Idaho practices regarding interactions between bighorn and domestic sheep. The policy moves from dealing on the landscape level to a case-by-case basis.

Rainville believes that the interim strategy primarily addresses short-term issues, and will be another piece of information that she will consider when working on this year's domestic sheep turnout. She is pleased the strategy acknowledges that bighorn sheep and domestic sheep need to be separated and that it sets out a process that will help bring everyone to the table to determine what is appropriate for maintaining separation. Rainville is obligated to comply with appropriate Federal laws and regulations, so this strategy will have to be considered when developing adaptive management strategies and Forest Plan language. Mike Lopez emphasized the importance of respecting the Treaty of 1855, under which the Nez Perce Tribe's access to and use of bighorn sheep is protected. Lopez appreciated the fact that the USFS would be considering Federal laws when reviewing the interim strategy. Toweill noted that the Treaty of 1855 was one of many included in the strategy's preamble; Dale Further assured Mike the interim strategy was not intended to supersede Treaties or State or Federal law. The strategy is designed to specifically deal with bighorn sheep on the landscape. If domestic sheep are grazed, the State must maintain separation with bighorn sheep.

Soucek noted that the IDT's primary concern is bighorn sheep viability, which means providing the habitat that sustains viable populations. This strategy will be considered when developing Forest Plan language. The alternatives have been developed and will not change in response to the interim strategy.

The IDT asked Toweill clarifying questions about the interim strategy, and discussed the potential ramifications at length. The following reflects the general comments expressed during this discussion:

- Adjacent states were taken into consideration; borders were mapped and the strategy will be applied in those areas as well.
- Separation via management practices won't work; the only option is exclusion, which means no domestic sheep.
- Lethal removal procedures outlined in the policy are normal protocol for the State of Washington, although this strategy may be a little aggressive and provides documentation of the policy. However, preventing natural expansion is not a policy of Washington.
- If the interim strategy reflects the current policy, the current policy is not very effective and new management techniques may be needed.
- The USFS has to protect the bighorn sheep in accordance with the Hells Canyon National Recreation Area (HCNRA), and there is uncertainty as to how this strategy will apply considering how far sheep travel within and out of the HCNRA.
- The USFS must plan across the entire forest and provide suitable habitat across the entire planning unit, regardless of whether or not bighorn sheep are present. It is important for the IDT to complete the analysis of the alternatives to see if they will be able to provide adequate habitat for viable populations and what measures will be needed within the Forest Plan to eliminate the risk of contact.
- Analyzing the interim strategy in terms of connected bighorn sheep habitat is important. Sheep traveling out of their herd are not always wayward sheep; this habitat is sustaining them and is the only place they

have to go. Removing “wayward” sheep will not prevent intermingling when domestic sheep are grazed in or immediately adjacent to occupied bighorn sheep habitat.

- This strategy may not end up being interim—it may be adopted as part of the bighorn sheep management plan. The IDT needs to evaluate the usefulness of this strategy during the SEIS process.
- An extensive discussion about the potential effects of the interim strategy on the Payette process is premature as the map of occupied bighorn sheep habitat that the State will be using is not yet available; also, the Regional and Washington Offices of the USFS have not yet weighed in on the interim strategy.
- Separation is important. In this interim strategy, the State has developed standards of contact that they feel are adequate. The strategy doesn’t change bighorn sheep habitat, and only informs the Payette process.
- This state policy “is”—whether or not we support it. Its effects will be identified in the cumulative effects analysis. We can acknowledge that it is short term.

Baptiste stated that the Nez Perce Tribe does not want to go into litigation; they don’t want anyone else to make the decision that can be made here at the table. The Nez Perce Tribe feels that the interim strategy places the burden for bighorn sheep survival on the bighorn sheep themselves, which is unacceptable to the Nez Perce Tribe.

The IDT expressed the desire to comment on the Idaho Interim Strategy. The Facilitator offered each team member the opportunity to offer one concern and one positive comment about the Idaho Interim Strategy in connection with the Payette NF SEIS effort:

CONCERNS:

- Minimizing bighorn sheep expansion is inconsistent with the Hells Canyon MOU
- We’ve (BHS Managers) tried maintaining separation through techniques described in the interim strategy, and found them ineffective in maintaining separation
- Does not appear to be consistent with the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAWFA)
- Process—incorporating strategy into effects analysis
- How could herders be allowed to conduct lethal control on Federal lands under Federal authority?
- Do not feel the Idaho interim strategy would meet Federal and State laws and Tribal trust obligations
- Implementation of the State strategy, through development of no-sheep buffers and best management practices as identified, will not provide effective separation or maintain bighorn sheep viability within the context of the Payette NF, but will continue the status quo concerns over contact and disease transmission
- Has no contingency when there is no agreement with the permittees—issue because of Federal lands and Federal permittees. What about the larger constituency?
- The perception from permittees that the interim strategy is going to change current livestock management on the forest
- The interim policy is inconsistent with the State of Idaho’s MOU that it signed when it agreed to become cooperators in this (SEIS) process
- The burden for achieving separation is completely placed on the bighorn sheep. Species viability is threatened, which negatively affects a treaty resource.
- BMPs identified in the interim strategy were considered by the Payette NF in 2007 when the AOI’s were challenged in court, and were determined to be ineffective in creating separation where overlap exists
- The policy appears to be inconsistent with Idaho’s trust responsibility to “preserve, protect and perpetuate” Idaho bighorn sheep as required by the Idaho Constitution and Code
- #2c won’t allow for expansion into domestic sheep areas, which conflicts with the Chief’s direction to expand into Hells Canyon and Salmon River Canyon as needed to comply with Federal law
- The Idaho interim plan fails to either acknowledge that viable bighorn sheep populations are a minimum standard of management on public lands and fails to provide a mechanism to achieve viability on public lands

POSITIVE COMMENTS:

- The lethal removal of bighorn sheep after known contact with domestic sheep is an approach that is consistent with Idaho, Washington, and Oregon
- The States of Idaho, Washington and Oregon acknowledge a disease problem exists
- The State of Idaho acknowledges that separation is necessary to manage disease transmission
- The interim policy clearly establishes what practices are in place and provides a framework by which to assess their effectiveness in maintaining separation
- Policy will work best on “the fringes” as opposed to the core habitat

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS UPDATE

Miller noted that pack goats were not included in the analysis. Miller displayed the landscape risk model for each alternative, including the trailing route closures determined during the January 1, 2008, meeting. The Technical Subcommittee decided to include trailing routes as a separate linear feature to prevent an additive effect that may not represent actual risk. The subcommittee assigned a width of ¼ mile and assigned risk values to each trailing route as follows: high (10), moderate (5), low (1), no risk (0). Any trailing route that intercepted a GPR had a rating of high; moderate risk was assigned to those routes not on allotments, but within the GPR and the National Forest; and low risk was assigned to trailing routes outside of the GPR, but within the National Forest. Trailing routes will be addressed in the SEIS using narratives. In the Forest Plan, trailing route management and guidance could be included separately from allotment management.

Miller highlighted the following:

- The risk assessment is qualitative not quantitative, based on the goal of approaching a risk of 0% of contact.
- The risk of contact is not equivalent to viability since other factors could affect viability.
- The table comparing relative risk removed displays a ratio of risk removed to risk remaining—the higher the ratio, the lower the risk remaining.
- The alternatives will be renumbered as 7a–7e because of the numbering convention already within the Forest Plan. Alternatives 1b, 2, 5, and 7 are the existing conditions and will be re-evaluated in the SEIS.

Rainville noted that IDT members should make a preferred alternative recommendation as a functional team member. Each team member is here as a cooperator and will be able to submit comments as their agency or Tribal representative later. She reiterated that a reasonable range of alternatives exists, even though the alternatives are not a “step-down” process.

The IDT will analyze the full range of alternatives tomorrow and select a recommended preferred alternative.

REFINING EVALUATION CRITERIA

The IDT reviewed and further refined the list of evaluation criteria developed at the last meeting. A complete representation of the document, including added and deleted text, as displayed on-screen is included in Appendix 3.

CLOSING

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 P.M.

HANDOUTS

1. Agenda, 3 p.
2. “Bighorn Sheep: Supplemental Analysis to the Forest Plan Environmental Impact Statement— Interdisciplinary Team Meeting” [meeting summary]. Handout provided by Susan Hayman, dated 02.18.2008. 14 p.
3. “Interim Strategy for Managing Separation between Bighorn Sheep and Domestic Sheep in Idaho.” Idaho Department of Fish and Game and the Idaho State Department of Agriculture, Boise, ID. 3 p.
4. “IDT Evaluation Criteria.” Handout provided by Susan Hayman, dated 2008.2.25. 1 p.

Day Two

OVERVIEW

Soucek opened Day 2 by reviewing the agenda.

EVALUATE THE SEIS ALTERNATIVES BASED ON THE IDT CRITERIA

Participants had approximately one hour to ask clarifying questions about the draft affects analysis. Chans O'Brien distributed new maps that illustrated each alternative superimposed on an annotated base of geographical reference points.

Soucek reminded participants to carefully consider each alternative and to provide a rationale for his or her recommended preferred alternative. The alternatives cannot be changed at this time, but may be changed in response to public comments between draft and final SEIS.

USFS team members provided the following statements:

- The model does not pick up spatiality, which can be analyzed with the maps.
- The analysis does not include a discussion about specific allotments.
- The risk assessment does not include risks outside the Payette NF.
- Risk is listed as overall risk over the entire Forest.
- Risk is a unit-less measure; all risk units are weighted by area and level of risk (total area within a total type of risk area).

In addition to the comments included on the flipcharts in Appendix 2, the IDT asked the following questions and provided the following feedback:

- Distribution should be included in the last paragraph on page 7.
- The team would like to know which tables are most important for each evaluation criteria (table titles and the data they present were determined through discussion and noted by Miller).
- Looking at the maps provides a better visual of where the risk remains.
- The team needs to discuss if the goal of 0% risk of contact should be included in the analysis. Including the goal may limit the possible alternatives.

Vic Coggins made several suggestions during the discussion and will provide a narrative concerning bighorn sheep die-offs to be cited as a personal communication within the SEIS.

IDT RECOMMENDED PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

The IDT analyzed Alternative 7J as a group. A complete transcription of the comments captured onscreen is included in Appendix 4. After much discussion, the group decided to analyze each alternative remaining based on three criteria: 1) risk and viability; 2) habitat and restoration; and 3) livestock. The IDT then split into the following teams to analyze the alternatives assigned to them:

- Team 1 analyzed Alternatives 3, 4, and 6 and 7H—Donny Martorello, Dale Toweill, Carl Sheeler, and Pattie Soucek
- Team 2 analyzed Alternative 7K—Vic Coggins, Pete Grinde, Darcy Pederson, and Paul Wik
- Team 3 analyzed Alternatives 7E, and 7G—Craig Ely, Curt Mack, Tim Schommer, and Susan Miller

Each smaller team presented its analysis to the IDT (Appendix 5); the IDT then identified the pros and cons of each alternative, which were captured on flipcharts and are included below and in Appendix 2.

Alternatives 3, 4, 6 (Hells Canyon - from original Forest Plan EIS)

PROS:

- Maintains the most livestock grazing

CONS:

- Does not meet IDT risk/viability or habitat/restoration criteria
- Does not provide well-distributed habitat across planning unit
- Doesn't meet Chief's Directive (per appeal decision 2005)
- Inconsistent with the Payette Principles

Alternative 7e (no suited acres for domestic sheep grazing)

PROS:

- Meets the legal requirements
- Provides for habitat well-distributed across the planning unit
- Meets the IDT objectives for risk/viability and habitat/restoration
- Highest probability of maintaining the risk/viability and habitat/restoration criteria
- Removes some risk by removing all domestic sheep grazing from drainages with known bighorn sheep sightings

CONS:

- Most impact to sheep producers
- The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) may not be able to graze their Marshall Mountain allotment

Alternative 7G (based on geographic population range)

PROS:

- Removes 100%¹ of domestic sheep grazing on Payette NF lands, and reduces associated risk from Hells Canyon and Salmon River GPR
- No trailing in GPR
- Distributes the risk of contact outside of the GPRs
- Removes some risk by removing all domestic sheep grazing from drainages with known bighorn sheep sightings

CONS:

- Some moderate and low risk remains on the landscape
- Still provides grazing adjacent to occupied bighorn sheep habitat (GPR)
- Would require trucking to access domestic sheep grazing units
- Substantial impacts to domestic sheep operators
- Would require significant monitoring outside GPRs
- BLM may not be able to graze their Marshall Mountain allotment
- Does not meet the viability goal of 95% for 200 years

¹ This percentage may not be accurate, and will need to be verified by Susan Miller.

Alternative 7H (based on geographic population range + 9 mile buffer)

Pros:

- Retains 6%² of existing allotments for domestic sheep
- Meets legal requirements
- Provides for well-distributed habitat across the planning unit
- Meets IDT objectives for risk/viability and habitat/restoration
- Highest probability of maintaining the risk/viability and habitat/restoration criteria
- Maintains a large separation between known occupied and domestic sheep allotments
- Implements the Idaho Interim Strategy
- Removes some risk by removing all domestic sheep grazing from drainages with known bighorn sheep sightings

CONS:

- Only retains 6% of existing domestic sheep allotments
- Does continue some grazing on a minimal amount of bighorn sheep source habitat
- May need some Forest Plan direction for grazing that is still allowed on Forest land

Alternative 7J (based on watersheds)

The team did not analyze the “habitat and restoration” or “livestock” criteria when they discussed this alternative; Susan Miller will consider these criteria as she completes her analysis of the alternatives.

PROS:

- Removes some risk by removing all domestic sheep grazing from drainages with known bighorn sheep sightings
- Domestic sheep management advantage from the basis of watersheds—more clearly defined boundary

CONS:

- Doesn't take off Lick Creek area in Hells Canyon
- Leaves domestic sheep grazing in occupied bighorn sheep habitat
- Does not meet the IDT criteria for risk/viability and habitat/restoration
- Inconsistent with the Payette Principles
- Does not adequately address the Chief's Direction (appeal decision 2005)

Alternative 7K (modified current season's use)

Note: the stippling does not accurately reflect the current year's grazing plan, which provides a misleading map of where domestic sheep are actually occurring. Pete Grinde will visit with O'Brien and Miller to rectify any concerns. Concern remained that the Frank Church Wilderness Area may mislead some readers.

PROS:

- Makes Hells Canyon moderately safer for bighorn sheep
- Maintains the most domestic livestock grazing of all “7” alternatives

CONS:

² This percentage may not be accurate, and will need to be verified by Susan Miller.

- Does not meet State and Tribal goals for bighorn sheep
- Does not meet IDT criteria for risk/viability and habitat/restoration
- Inconsistent with the Payette Principles
- Doesn't meet Chief's Direction
- Retains risk associated with trailing routes
- Maintains domestic sheep grazing within and adjacent to occupied bighorn sheep habitat

Note: There was insufficient time in the meeting for IDT members to go back through the Pros and Cons to ensure consistency among the alternatives. The team acknowledged that the pro/con evaluation and small group reports in Appendix 5 were intended to provide information and rationale for the IDT's recommendation, and should not be considered a formal work product.

IDT Recommended Preferred Alternatives:

Each IDT member was offered the opportunity to recommend which alternative they believed should be the preferred alternative of the SEIS, and their choice was documented on flip charts (Appendix 2). Alternative 7H was recommended by nearly all IDT members who expressed a recommendation. One IDT member recommended Alternative 7J on the basis that it provided greater opportunities for domestic sheep grazing.

The two compelling factors for most of the IDT were 1) the need to include a buffer to effectively separate bighorn and domestic sheep in adjacent areas and 2) the need to prevent domestic sheep grazing within occupied bighorn sheep habitat. Further, the IDT recognized only option 7H and 7E (as currently described and mapped) would reduce the risk of contact between bighorn and domestic sheep below 2% per year (which was the threshold the IDT adopted to indicate the likelihood of maintaining viable bighorn sheep populations). The IDT asked the Team Leader if the Forest Supervisor could select an alternative that did not ensure viable bighorn sheep populations. The IDT Leader said the Forest Supervisor could choose an alternative that did not ensure bighorn sheep viability if the alternative also contained mitigation measures that would ultimately ensure the viability of the bighorn sheep.

The IDT agreed that including a buffer between bighorn sheep and domestic sheep grazing was critical and the only alternative that provided any buffer was Alternative 7H. Two IDT members, when choosing alternative 7H, said they would have chosen Alternative 7G if it prohibited grazing domestic sheep in areas adjacent to occupied bighorn sheep habitat. A discussion ensued about whether the IDT could pursue modification of the alternatives already developed and analyzed. The IDT discussed the buffers in 7H. A buffer of uniform width was recognized to sometimes exclude domestic sheep grazing from some areas that do not contain modeled bighorn sheep habitat and therefore may not need protection to support bighorn sheep viability. It was discussed whether it would be better to develop a series of mitigation measures for existing alternatives such as: buffers, monitoring plans, a series of specific plan standards such as a "no contact" rule and an adaptive management strategy that would allow further opportunities for needed bighorn sheep restoration by maintaining separation as bighorn sheep expand into and recolonize historic habitat. Another option was to develop a new alternative based on 7H that would use a variable width buffer to custom fit the buffer to the terrain, habitat and mapped bighorn sheep habitat. The delay in release of the draft SEIS based on analyzing a new alternative was discussed. The IDT did not conclude what would be the best strategy to recommend to the Forest Supervisor.

CLOSING COMMENTS:

Soucek will provide draft Forest Plan language at the April 1-2, 2008 meeting for the team to review. If she is able to send it out for IDT members to review prior to April 1, she will do so.

NEXT STEPS

Bin Items

NO items were added to the BIN.

Meeting Schedule

The next meeting is scheduled for April 1–2, 2008, at 8:30 A.M. in McCall, Idaho.

CLOSING

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 P.M.

HANDOUT

1. "IDT Evaluation Criteria." Handout provided by Susan Hayman, dated 2008.2.28. 1 p.
2. "Excerpt from the Final BHS Meeting Summary—Viability Analysis: Definition, Assumptions, and Measurement Criteria." Handout from Susan Hayman, dated 2007.9.25. 2 p.
3. Allotment head months. Handout from Chans O'Brien, dated 2/28/2008. 6 p.

APPENDIX 1—AGENDA

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

Interdisciplinary Team Meeting

February 28-29, 2008

Payette National Forest Supervisor’s Office Conference Room

800 W. Lakeside, McCall, Idaho

Meeting Objectives:

- 1) Discuss new information that may affect the SEIS alternatives and analysis
- 2) Evaluate the SEIS alternatives based on the IDT criteria and analysis findings
- 3) Develop recommendations for an IDT preferred alternative

Day 1 Agenda

Time	Topic	Process / Product
8:30 a.m.	Refreshments available in meeting room	
9:00 a.m.	Opening <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome and opening remarks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Suzanne Rainville, Payette Forest Supervisor – Pattie Soucek, Payette Forest Planner • Meeting overview, group agreements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Susan Hayman, Facilitator 	Information
9:20 a.m.	January 31, 2008 Meeting Summary – Susan Hayman <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Framing the discussion • Proposed changes • January 31 action item review 	Discussion; IDT action <i>Product: Finalized January 31 meeting summary; Update on action items not on today’s agenda</i>

9:45 a.m. (includes a 15-minute break at 10am)	Analysis and Findings Update – Susan Miller, Chans O’Brien Review changes to alternatives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pack goats - Trailing routes Review status of the analysis Review findings to date	Information; Discussion/Q&A <i>Product: Areas of agreement/disagreement with any changes to the alternatives, or analysis findings</i>
11:45 p.m.	LUNCH (on your own)	
1:00 p.m.	Idaho State Bighorn Sheep Interim Strategy	Information; Discussion <i>Product: List of concerns (if any) and potential resolution</i>
2:00 p.m.	BREAK	
2:15 p.m.	IDT Evaluation Criteria – Susan Hayman <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final refinement • Weighting 	Facilitated task
4:15 p.m.	Wrap-up – Susan Hayman <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and confirmation of today’s IDT agreements • Review agenda for Day 2 • Closing comments – Pattie Soucek, Suzanne Rainville 	Discussion; ID team decision <i>Products:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Written confirmation on any IDT agreements</i> • <i>Any revisions to Day 2 agenda</i>
4:30 p.m.	Adjourn Day 1	

Day 2 Agenda

Time	Topic	Process / Product
8:00 a.m.	Refreshments available in meeting room	
8:30 a.m.	Overview of Day 2 – Pattie Soucek	Information
8:45 a.m.	Evaluate the SEIS alternatives based on the IDT criteria	Facilitated task
11:30 a.m.	LUNCH (pizza on-site!)	
12:15 p.m.	IDT Preferred Alternative – Susan Hayman <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas of agreement and why • Areas of disagreement and why 	Discussion Decision <i>Products:</i> <i>IDT Recommendation for the preferred alternative, or areas of agreement/ disagreement with rationale</i>
2:00 p.m.	Next Steps – Susan Hayman <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and confirmation of today’s IDT agreements • Bin Items • Next meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Date - Objectives - Assignments 	Discussion; ID team decision <i>Products:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Written documentation of IDT agreements</i> • <i>List of bin items and disposition;</i> • <i>Date for next meeting</i> • <i>Preliminary objectives for the next meeting</i> • <i>Assignments for the next meeting;</i>
2:30 p.m.	IDT and Process Evaluation	Round-robin
2:50 p.m.	Closing remarks – Pattie Soucek, Suzanne Rainville	Information
3:00 p.m.	Adjourn	

APPENDIX 2—TRANSCRIBED FLIP CHART NOTES

<p>Specific Concerns for Payette Situation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) #2c-Is minimizing expansion consistent with Hells Canyon MOU 2) We've tried maintaining separation thru techniques specified in interim strategy and found them ineffective in maintaining separation 3) Does not appear to be consistent with WAFWA <p style="text-align: right;">1</p>	<p>Specific Concerns for Payette Situation (cont'd)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4) Process-incorporating strategy info effects analysis 5) How could herders be allowed to conduct lethal control on Federal lands under Federal authority 6) lethal removal of BHS after mingling (known contact) with domestic sheep is an approach consistent with ID, WA, OR. <p style="text-align: right;">2</p>
---	--

<p>Specific Concerns for Payette Situation (cont'd)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7) Do not feel Idaho interim strategy would meet Federal & State laws & tribal trust obligations 8) Finally state of ID & OR acknowledges disease problem exists 9) Implementation of interim state strategy thru development of no-sheep buffers & BMPs as identified will not provide effective separation or maintain BHS viability w/l context of PNK but will continue status quo concerns over contact & disease transmission <p style="text-align: right;">3</p>	<p>Specific Concerns for Payette Situation (cont'd)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10) No contingency when no agreement with permittees-issue because of Fed lands/Fed permittees. What about the larger constituency 11) Perception from permittees that I.S will change current L.S. mgt on forest 12) Interim policy is inconsistent the state of Idaho's MOU as a cooperative in this process. <p style="text-align: right;">4</p>
--	--

<p>Specific Concerns for Payette Situation (cont'd)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 13) Acknowledgement that separation is necessary to affect disease transmission 14) Burden is completely on BHS. Species viability threatened which negatively affects treaty resource. 15) BMP's identified in I.S. were considered by Payette in 2001 and were determined to be ineffective in creating separation where overlap exists. <p style="text-align: right;">5</p>	<p>Specific Concerns for Payette Situation (cont'd)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 16) Policy appears to be inconsistent with Idaho Trust responsibility to "preserve protect and perpetuate" Idaho BHS as required by Idaho constitution and code 17) Interim policy establishes clearly what processes are in place and provides a framework by which we can assess their effectiveness in maintaining separation. <p style="text-align: right;">6</p>
---	---

<p>Specific Concerns for Payette Situation (cont'd)</p> <p>18) #2C:-won't allow for expansion into DS areas Conflict with Chief FS direction to expand into Hells Canyon and Salmon River Canyon as needed to comply with Federal law</p> <p>19) Policy will work best on "the fringes" as opposed to core habitat</p> <p>20) Idaho I. Plan fails to acknowledge that viable BHS populations are a min std on public land and failed to provide a mech to achieve viability on public lands</p> <p style="text-align: right;">7</p>	<p>Analysis Feedback</p> <p>1) Trailing: Discuss why it is a risk activity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timing/season • Duration • #herders/dogs • etc. • topography • Forested (faster easier to lose) vs. grasslands (slower to keep together) • Predators (scattering) <p>2) Talking about trailing routes...risk is greater than what is represented in the model, due to items listed above</p> <p style="text-align: right;">8</p>
--	---

<p>Narrative Analysis Suggestions</p> <p>1) Helpful to have maps to make low/very low "calls"</p> <p>2) Make a "likely impacts on viability" section for each alternative. Use biologists advice from IDT to do this</p> <p>3) Look at ability to develop "thresholds" to standardize viability comparisons.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">9</p>	<p>Narrative Analysis Suggestions (cont'd)</p> <p>4) "Bright Line"—Is this the juxtaposition of risk with occupied habitat? the spatial considerations are important.</p> <p>5) Simplify tables and narrative for clarity to public</p> <p>6) May be confounding factor between allotments risk & GPR?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">10</p>
---	--

<p>Analysis Suggestions</p> <p>1) Would be helpful to clarify what comprises a "risk unit"-need to define what this is</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • mathematical modeling info & assumptions will be in the tech report <p>2) Clarify that we are talking about 2 kinds of risk: Risk Model, and Payette Risk Assessment.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">11</p>	<p>Analysis Suggestions (cont'd)</p> <p>3) Would be helpful to clarify table headings to improve understanding</p> <p>4) Consider using grazing opportunities (e.g. viable from an allotment) rather than acres?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better to refine in AMPs • making estimate per evaluation criteria <p>5) Still a question about describing low/very low risk as not providing viability</p> <p style="text-align: right;">12</p>
--	---

<p style="text-align: center;">Analysis Suggestions (cont'd)</p> <p>6) Change “probability” to “potential” in analysis. “Probability” is a mathematical term</p> <p>7) May be able to make “rules of thumb” for risk e.g. depending on how much high/mod risk areas remain.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • may be able to mitigate risk thru FP direction <p>8) Question about scale-dividing by 1000. may be a problem with zero.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">13</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Alternative Evaluation</p> <p>1) DS Grazing within and/or immediately adjacent to occupied range violates Payette Principle #1C</p> <p style="text-align: right;">14</p>
---	--

<p>Team 1 Donny Dale Carl Pattie</p> <p>Team 2 Vic Pete Keith Darcy Paul</p> <p>Team 3 Craig Curt Tim Susan M</p> <p>Group—Watershed (7J)</p> <p>Chans floated between teams.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">15</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Alternatives</p> <p>7E: No Suited (3)</p> <p>7G: GPR (3)</p> <p>7H: Buffer(3)</p> <p>7J: Watershed</p> <p>7K: Modified Current Use/Season's (2)</p> <p>Alt 3,4,6: Hells Canyon (1)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">16</p>
--	---

<p style="text-align: center;">Criteria</p> <p>1) Risk& Viability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • <p>2) Habitat& Restoration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • <p>3) Livestock</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • <p style="text-align: right;">17</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Alt 3,4,6</p> <p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintains most domestic LS grazing • minimizes impact to livestock permittees <p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent with PP • Does not meet IDT risk/viability or habitat/restoration criteria • Does not provide well distributed habitat across planning unit • Doesn't meet chief's directive. <p style="text-align: right;">18</p>
---	---

<p>7E</p> <p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets legal requirements • Provides for well dist hab across planning unit • Meets IDT R/V, H/R criteria • Highest probability of maintaining R/V, H/R <p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • maximum impact to sheep producers • <p style="text-align: right;">19</p>	<p>7G</p> <p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removes 100% if LS grazing and assoc risk • No trailing in the GPR • Distributes risk outside of GPR <p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some mod & low risk remains on L.scape • Still provides grazing adjacent to occup BHS • Would require some trucking of DS to allotment • Subst impacts to sheep operators • Would require sign monitoring outside GPRs • BLM may not be able to graze Marshal Mt. (also 7E, 7H) • Does not meet viability goal of 95% over 200 years <p style="text-align: right;">20</p>
--	---

<p>7H</p> <p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retains 6% of existing allotments for domestic sheep • 7E "Pros" • Maintains a large separation between known occupied and DS allotments • Implements the Interim strategy <p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only retains 6% of existing allotments • Significant impact to permittees • Continues some grazing on BHS source habitat • Retains limited DS grazing adjacent to BHS • Need FP direction for grazing that is allowed <p style="text-align: right;">21</p>	<p>7J</p> <p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removes all DS grazing from drainages with known BHS sightings • DS management advantages from the basis of watersheds-more clearly defined boundary <p>Con</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doesn't take of lick creek are in Hells Canyon • Leaves DS grazing in occ range • Did not meet IDT criteria for R/V, H/R • Not w/ PP, or chiefs direction <p style="text-align: right;">22</p>
--	---

7K	IDT PA
<p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Makes Hells Canyon moderately safer for BHS Maintains most DS grazing of all "7" alts <p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not meet state & tribal BHS goals Does not meet R/V & H/R Does not meet PP & CD Retains risk assoc with trailing routes Maintains DS grazing W/I adjacent 	<p>Vic: 7H (would have picked 7J if Lick ck. would have been included for Hells Canyon Side)</p> <p>Craig: 7H</p> <p>Paul: 7H</p> <p>Curt: 7H</p> <p>Pete: 7J (maint. of some of the grazing)</p> <p>Tim: 7H (because of "BOR" for viability) (7G will require extensive mit & monit)</p> <p>Keith: 7H (addresses BHS grazing adj to BHS OH)</p> <p>Dale: 7H (7J if Lick ck included) Boundaries more definable and defensible</p> <p>Carl: 7H</p>
23	24

PA Discussion	Assignments
<p>Critical Feature for IDT is inclusion of buffer (not "wedded" to 9 mile). E.G. Alt G could be acceptable If a buffer was included Case-by Case basis</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Pattie to provide index of Hells Canyon 2 FOIA (3/10) Pattie to provide index of Shirts Bros. FOIA (4/1) Pattie will provide copies of signed MOUs of IDT as requested (Curt wants them) (4/1) IDT Final comments on confid. agreements by Friday March 7. to Pattie (email to Craig and Carl) IDT members to share information requests they receive
25	26

Assignments (cont'd)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Pattie will draft first cut of Forest plan direction incl. adaptive mgt. (4/1) Susan to send Hotel McCall info to IDT (3/3) Susan will send out FTP link for IDFG map (Dale gets to her)
27

APPENDIX 3 REFINED EVALUATION CRITERIA

IDT Evaluation Criteria

(for determining a recommended preferred alternative)

Implementation

How does each alternative affect management at the boundary with other administrative units?

How long will it take to fully implement each alternative?

~~Does the alternative address all domestic livestock that can impact BHS viability, i.e. sheep and goats?~~

Risk

What is the potential risk of contact between BHS and domestics under each alternative?

Cultural

How would the implementation of each alternative protect treaty reserve resources and affect cultural and spiritual sustainability for Tribal nations?

Economic

(this criterion was not evaluated by the IDT today, but will be factored into the decision)

How would the implementation of each alternative affect economic sustainability for ~~individual permittees, local communities and Tribal nations?~~

Legal

How does each alternative address the following laws, regulations and authorities?

- Federal trust responsibility to tribes
- Hell's Canyon NRA Act
- ~~— State wildlife management authority~~
- NFMA (BHS long term viability)
- NEPA
- President's Executive order to provide for harvestable populations of big game of BHS?

Livestock

What effect does each alternative have on permitted domestic livestock ~~numbers head months?~~

Science

(this criterion was not evaluated by the IDT today, but will be factored into the decision)

Does the analysis utilize best available science?

~~Is the analysis process "fair" (i.e. unbiased)?~~

~~Does the analysis address data gaps that may exist for one or more alternatives?~~

Population

How does each alternative affect long-term BHS viability? [Comment: All Forest Plan activities?]

Does each alternative result in a Hells Canyon and Salmon River BHS population that is healthy, reproducing and occupying most available habitat? [Comment: Set aside.]

How does each alternative promote BHS restoration opportunities above minimum viable population levels, providing for range expansion and distribution of BHS across historic source habitat?

How does each alternative comply with the Hells Canyon Bighorn Sheep Initiative (Tri-State)

APPENDIX 3 (CONTINUED) REFINED EVALUATION CRITERIA

Habitat

To what degree does each alternative maintain viable BHS habitat?

To what degree does each alternative establish/maintain connectivity between blocks of suitable BHS habitat (regardless of whether it is occupied)?

APPENDIX 4. ON-SCREEN, GROUP ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVE 7J

ALTERNATIVE 7J—WATERSHED

CRITERION: HOW DOES EACH ALTERNATIVE AFFECT MANAGEMENT AT THE BOUNDARY WITH OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS?

1. Is there a relevant quantitative measurement for this criterion for this alternative? If so, what is it?
 - Acres of adjacent Federal allotments (FS and BLM)
2. Based on the relevant quantitative measurement (if any), and in consideration of juxtaposition, trailing routes and/or other factors, what is your qualitative evaluation of this alternative for this criterion?
 - Wallowa Whitman NF and HCNRA—this alternative reduces but does not minimize risk of contact between the Wallowa Whitman NF, Payette NF, Oregon, and Washington
 - If grazing is not allowed in the Payette NF, management of the Allison-Berg and BLM allotments may be affected
3. What is the rationale for the qualitative evaluation?
 - This alternative would affect future BHS viewing and hunting (Oregon—11 tags, 3 CTUIR; opportunities in the metapopulation of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho)

ALTERNATIVE: 7J—WATERSHED

CRITERION: WHAT IS THE POTENTIAL RISK OF CONTACT BETWEEN BHS AND DOMESTICS UNDER EACH ALTERNATIVE?

1. Is there a relevant quantitative measurement for this criterion for this alternative? If so, what is it?
 - Moderate (282; 9%) and low risk (612; 35%) remain on the landscape (Table C)
 - Ratio of relative total risk remaining on the landscape to risk removed from the landscape—1:4.92 (Table B)
 - Percent of acres that remain open for potential domestic sheep grazing—15% of Hells Canyon GPR and 5% of Salmon River GPR (Table E)
2. Based on the relevant quantitative measurement (if any), and in consideration of juxtaposition, trailing routes and/or other factors, what is your qualitative evaluation of this alternative for this criterion? (So what?)
 - Moderate (9%) and low risk (35%) remain on the landscape compared to existing conditions (Table C)
 - The area of moderate risk to the Hells Canyon population may be higher risk to viability than reflected by the model numbers because of its location in proximity to bighorns
 - This alternative still allows domestic sheep grazing within and adjacent to BHS occupied range, which violates 1c of the Payette Principles
 - This alternative would need Forest Plan direction to decrease the risk for contact in the GPRs that are domestically grazed
 - The remaining moderate risk may pose a higher risk than is modeled because of the source habitat on both sides of the GPR

- High, moderate, and low risk trailing routes were left operational, which does not reduce the risk of contact

ALTERNATIVE: 7J—WATERSHED

CRITERION: HOW DOES EACH ALTERNATIVE AFFECT LONG-TERM BIGHORN SHEEP VIABILITY?

1. Is there a relevant quantitative measurement for this criterion for this alternative? If so, what is it?
 - The quantitative measurements were listed under the risk of contact criterion
2. Based on the relevant quantitative measurement (if any), and in consideration of juxtaposition, trailing routes and/or other factors, what is your qualitative evaluation of this alternative for this criterion? (So what?)
 - This alternative still leaves some moderate risk on the landscape, which may not meet our criteria for viability
 - This alternative still allows domestic sheep grazing within and adjacent to occupied bighorn range, which does not meet the viability criteria of approaching a 0% risk of contact
 - This alternative would require extensive effective mitigation (including no-grazing buffers) for areas adjacent to occupied bighorn range
 - This alternative would require extensive monitoring
 - At this time, no effective mitigation for domestic sheep grazing occupied bighorn sheep habitat exists
 - This alternative still has a threat to viability because of operational trailing routes
 - This alternative diminishes the risk of contact across the planning unit, but still does not meet the viability goal of 95% for 200 years because of the risk to healthy, reproducing bighorns occupying most available habitat

APPENDIX 5. ON-SCREEN PRESENTATIONS FOR ALTERNATIVES 3, 4, AND 6; 7E; 7G; 7H; AND 7K

ALTERNATIVE: ALT 3, 4, 6 – HELLS CANYON

CRITERION: RISK AND VIABILITY

1. Is there a relevant quantitative measurement for this criterion for this alternative? If so, what is it?
 - Very-high and high 13% (56/421), Moderate 96% (3,008/3,130) and low risk 95% (1,643/1,737) remain on the landscape (Table C)
 - Ratio of relative total risk remaining on the landscape to risk removed from the landscape—1:0.12 (Table B)
 - Percent of acres that remain open for potential domestic sheep grazing—68% of Hells Canyon GPR and 100% of Salmon River GPR (total 93%; Table E)
2. Based on the relevant quantitative measurement (if any), and in consideration of juxtaposition, trailing routes and/or other factors, what is your qualitative evaluation of this alternative for this criterion?
 - This alternative still allows domestic sheep grazing within and adjacent to BHS occupied range, which violates 1c of the Payette Principles
 - High, moderate, and low risk trailing routes were left operational, which does not reduce the risk of contact or provide long-term viability.
3. What is the rationale for the qualitative evaluation?
 - These alternatives do not come close to approaching zero risk of contact or meeting population viability criteria.

ALTERNATIVE: ALT 3, 4, 6 – HELLS CANYON

CRITERION: HABITAT AND RESTORATION

1. Is there a relevant quantitative measurement for this criterion for this alternative? If so, what is it?
 - Increases suitable BHS habitat by 4% (82,002/2,300,253) by decreasing percent allotments open by 5%.
2. Based on the relevant quantitative measurement (if any), and in consideration of juxtaposition, trailing routes and/or other factors, what is your qualitative evaluation of this alternative for this criterion? (So what?)
 - The 4% increase in suitable BHS habitat does not reflected a real increase in habitat because there is likely no decrease in risk of contact or increase in long-term population viability.
 - Because the increase in BHS habitat is so low, it does not establish or maintain connectivity between blocks of potential suitable BHS habitat.

ALTERNATIVE: ALT 3, 4, 6 – HELLS CANYON

CRITERION: LIVESTOCK

1. Is there a relevant quantitative measurement for this criterion for this alternative? If so, what is it?
 - o These alternatives result in loss of 15,329 acres of identified suitable grazing opportunity for domestic sheep.

2. Based on the relevant quantitative measurement (if any), and in consideration of juxtaposition, trailing routes and/or other factors, what is your qualitative evaluation of this alternative for this criterion? (So what?)
 - o Corresponds to a 5% decrease in allotments remaining open.

ALTERNATIVE: 7E NO DOMESTIC SHEEP

CRITERION: RISK AND VIABILITY ON PAYETTE NF NO EFFECT

1. Is there a relevant quantitative measurement for this criterion for this alternative? If so, what is it?
 - o No relative risk remaining across the planning unit
 - o No domestic sheep would be allowed to graze within or adjacent to occupied BHS range across the planning unit
 - o All BHS source habitat is removed from domestic sheep grazing
2. Based on the relevant quantitative measurement (if any), and in consideration of juxtaposition, trailing routes and/or other factors, what is your qualitative evaluation of this alternative for this criterion? (So what?)
 - o This alternative would minimize the risk of BHS and maximize BHS viability on the Payette NF
 - o Management actions of neighboring jurisdictions may affect BHS populations on the Payette NF

ALTERNATIVE: 7E

CRITERION: HABITAT AND RESTORATION

1. Is there a relevant quantitative measurement for this criterion for this alternative? If so, what is it?
 - o All source habitat is protected for BHS
2. Based on the relevant quantitative measurement (if any), and in consideration of juxtaposition, trailing routes and/or other factors, what is your qualitative evaluation of this alternative for this criterion? (So what?)
 - o This alternative would provide maximum BHS range expansion and restoration potential
 - o This alternative would maximize population distribution and habitat connectivity

ALTERNATIVE: 7E

CRITERION: LIVESTOCK

1. Is there a relevant quantitative measurement for this criterion for this alternative? If so, what is it?
 - o This alternative would eliminate all domestic sheep grazing across the Payette NF
2. Based on the relevant quantitative measurement (if any), and in consideration of juxtaposition, trailing routes and/or other factors, what is your qualitative evaluation of this alternative for this criterion? (So what?)
 - o No further comments are necessary

ALTERNATIVE: 7G

CRITERION: RISK AND VIABILITY

1. Is there a relevant quantitative measurement for this criterion for this alternative? If so, what is it?
 - Moderate (556; 18%) and low risk (519; 30%) remain on the landscape (Table C)
 - Ratio of relative total risk remaining on the landscape to risk removed from the landscape—1:3.92 (Table B)
 - Percent of acres that remain open for potential domestic sheep grazing—0% of Hells Canyon GPR and 0% of Salmon River GPR (Table E)

2. Based on the relevant quantitative measurement (if any), and in consideration of juxtaposition, trailing routes and/or other factors, what is your qualitative evaluation of this alternative for this criterion? (So what?)
 - This alternative still leaves some moderate risk on the landscape, which may not meet our criteria for viability
 - This alternative would remove all domestic sheep grazing within occupied bighorn range, but would allow continued domestic sheep grazing adjacent to occupied BHS range.
 - This alternative would require extensive effective mitigation (including no-grazing buffers) for areas adjacent to occupied bighorn range
 - This alternative would require extensive monitoring
 - This alternative still has a threat to viability because of operational trailing routes
 - This alternative diminishes the risk of contact across the planning unit, but still does not meet the viability goal of 95% for 200 years because of the risk to healthy, reproducing bighorns occupying most available habitat
 - Although this alternative leaves some moderate risk on the landscape the distribution of that risk is outside of occupied BHS range, reducing overall risk.
 - Overall retained risk is likely lower than modeled because a portion of the moderate risk is retained within the Frank Church Wilderness

ALTERNATIVE: 7G

CRITERION: HABITAT AND RESTORATION

1. Is there a relevant quantitative measurement for this criterion for this alternative? If so, what is it?
 - This alternative would leave 31% of summer and 29% of winter BHS source sheep habitat open to domestic sheep grazing

2. Based on the relevant quantitative measurement (if any), and in consideration of juxtaposition, trailing routes and/or other factors, what is your qualitative evaluation of this alternative for this criterion?
 - This alternative would provide opportunities for restoration and enhancement of BHS within the Hells Canyon and Salmon River GPR's
 - This alternative could provide for BHS range expansion in areas not grazed by domestic sheep, but precludes range expansion in areas grazed by domestic sheep

ALTERNATIVE: 7G

CRITERION: LIVESTOCK

1. Is there a relevant quantitative measurement for this criterion for this alternative? If so, what is it?
 - o Percent of current allotment remaining open is 39%

ALTERNATIVE: 7H – GPR PLUS 9 MILE BUFFER

CRITERION: RISK AND VIABILITY

1. Is there a relevant quantitative measurement for this criterion for this alternative? If so, what is it?
 - Zero high and moderate risk and 11% low risk (199/1,737) remain on the landscape (Table C)
 - Ratio of relative total risk remaining on the landscape to risk removed from the landscape—1:25.63 (Table B)
 - Percent of acres that remain open for potential domestic sheep grazing—0% of Hells Canyon GPR and 0% of Salmon River GPR (Table E)
2. Based on the relevant quantitative measurement (if any), and in consideration of juxtaposition, trailing routes and/or other factors, what is your qualitative evaluation of this alternative for this criterion?
 - This alternative removes domestic sheep grazing within GPR, but allows grazing adjacent to BHS range in the Salmon River GPR (see map).
 - This alternative removes all trailing routes from within the GPR (see map).
3. What is the rationale for the qualitative evaluation?
 - This alternative reduces the risk of contact to near zero and likely meets population viability criteria.
 - Some forest plan standards and guidelines may be needed to ensure long-term population viability in Jug handle Mt. (apply to adaptive management).

CRITERION: HABITAT AND RESTORATION

1. Is there a relevant quantitative measurement for this criterion for this alternative? If so, what is it?
 - Increases suitable BHS habitat by 89% (2,039,586/2,300,253) by decreasing percent allotments open by 94%.
2. Based on the relevant quantitative measurement (if any), and in consideration of juxtaposition, trailing routes and/or other factors, what is your qualitative evaluation of this alternative for this criterion? (So what?)
 - The increase in suitable BHS habitat decreases the risk of contact to near zero and likely meets the long-term population viability criteria.
 - This alternative establishes and maintains connectivity between blocks of potential suitable BHS habitat.

CRITERION: LIVESTOCK

1. Is there a relevant quantitative measurement for this criterion for this alternative? If so, what is it?
 - These alternatives result in loss of 94,231 acres of identified suitable grazing opportunity for domestic sheep.
2. Based on the relevant quantitative measurement (if any), and in consideration of juxtaposition, trailing routes and/or other factors, what is your qualitative evaluation of this alternative for this criterion? (So what?)
 - Corresponds to a 94% decrease in allotments remaining open.

ALTERNATIVE 7K – CURRENT SEASONS **NOTE: THE STIPPLING DOES NOT ACCURATELY REFLECT THE CURRENT YEARS GRAZING PLAN, WHICH PROVIDES A MISLEADING MAP OF WHERE DS (DOMESTIC SHEEP) ARE ACTUALLY OCCURRING.**

CRITERION: RISK AND VIABILITY

1. Is there a relevant quantitative measurement for this criterion for this alternative? If so, what is it?
 - Tables A through E reflect changes proposed in Option K. Table C displays a reduced risk from the “Existing Condition” alternative, but the amount of risk in the Very High and Moderate still remain relatively “high”
 - Table E. DS grazing will continue with the GPR’s, at a rate of 73% in Hells Canyon and 94% in the Salmon River GPR’s. In total, 90% of the GPR’s remain open to domestic sheep grazing.
 - A reduced, but still present, risk of contact from driveways exists by keeping “high” and “medium” risk driveways open with GPR’s.
 - Domestic sheep grazing is available in 93% of summer source habitat and 92% of winter source habitat.
 - Table B indicates a relative risk reduction of approximately 28% from the “No domestic sheep” alternative.

2. Based on the relevant quantitative measurement (if any), and in consideration of juxtaposition, trailing routes and/or other factors, what is your qualitative evaluation of this alternative for this criterion?
 - High, Very High (5%), Moderate (~60%) and low risk (100%) remain on the landscape compared to existing conditions (Table C)
 - Because 90% of the total GPR’s remain open to DS grazing, the risk of contact remains relatively high (Table E).
 - This alternative still allows domestic sheep grazing within and adjacent to occupied BHS range, summer and winter range, and very high/high and medium relative risk units, resulting in an alternative that will not provide for BHS viability as defined within the SEIS.
 - This alternative also violates 1c of the Payette Principles
 - Mitigation measures that would be required with this alternative would be very expensive, extremely difficult, and likely unattainable.
 - High, moderate, and low risk trailing routes were left operational, which does not reduce the risk of contact

HABITAT AND RESTORATION

1. Is there a relevant quantitative measurement for this criterion for this alternative? If so, what is it?
 - Hells Canyon Initiative, State of Oregon, State of Washington, and the state of Idaho have management objectives for their respective management authorities. Tribes have population goals to be able to harvest BHS across all age and sex classes throughout the historic range of BHS.
 - Table D shows that 93% of summer and 92% of winter source habitat remains open to DS grazing.

2. 2) Based on the relevant quantitative measurement (if any), and in consideration of juxtaposition, trailing routes and/or other factors, what is your qualitative evaluation of this alternative for this criterion?

- Tribes have population goals to be able to harvest BHS across all age and sex classes throughout the historic range of BHS.
 - Summer and winter source habitat open DS grazing is thereby made unavailable to BHS.
 - This alternative does not allow for population restoration outside of the existing, reduced population levels, distribution. No room for population expansion from a suppressed level.
 - Connectivity is not provided with this alternative between the Salmon and Snake River populations, and between occupied and unoccupied habitat within each meta population.
3. What is the rationale for the qualitative evaluation?
- Continued DS grazing of occupied and unoccupied BHS habitat disrupts connectivity within and between the metapopulations.
 - This alternative continues to compromise restoration goals within Hells Canyon population.
 - Since 1986, Salmon River populations have declined by 70%, maintenance of the status quo does not support restoration, expansion, and recovery of those populations.
 - This alternative would require extensive effective mitigation (including no-grazing buffers) for areas adjacent to occupied bighorn range
 - This alternative would require extensive monitoring
 - At this time, no effective mitigation for domestic sheep grazing occupied bighorn sheep habitat exists
 - This alternative diminishes the risk of contact across the planning unit, but still does not meet the viability goal of 95% for 200 years because of the risk to healthy, reproducing bighorns occupying most available habitat

LIVESTOCK

As noted at the top of this Alternative, there is a large portion of the Snake River GPR (South End) not available to DS grazing that is not stippled, cattle grazing not affected.

1. Is there a relevant quantitative measurement for this criterion for this alternative? If so, what is it?
- Table A shows a reduction 13,000 head months of DS with this alternative from existing conditions.
2. 2) Based on the relevant quantitative measurement (if any), and in consideration of juxtaposition, trailing routes and/or other factors, what is your qualitative evaluation of this alternative for this criterion?
- This alternative results in a reduction of economic opportunity for 2 livestock operators.
 - One operator is reduced approximately 50% from past opportunity.
3. What is the rationale for the qualitative evaluation?
- This alternative reflects the results of the negotiated settlement of a court action (litigation) rather than BHS management goals and objectives.