
BIGHORN SHEEP: SUPPLEMENTAL ANALYSIS TO THE FOREST PLAN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT—COMBINED TEAM MEETING

Payette National Forest Supervisor's Office—McCall, Idaho

May 12–14, 2009

ATTENDEES

- Steven Goodson, Office of the Governor of Idaho
- Christine Bradbury, Clearwater/Nez Perce National Forests Tribal Liaison
- Cheryl Vanderburg, Northern/Intermountain Region Office (Tribal Relations)
- Vic Coggins, Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
- Ana Egnew, Payette National Forest Wildlife Biologist
- Craig Ely, Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife (Days 1 and 2)
- Keith Lawrence, Nez Perce Tribe
- Curt Mack, Nez Perce Tribe
- Pete Grinde, Payette National Forest
- Darcy Pederson, Nez Perce National Forest
- Tim Carpenter, UC Davis
- Josh O'Brien, UC Davis
- Kyle Prior, Upper Snake River Tribes Foundation (Day 2)
- Arthur Dick, Shoshone-Paiute Tribes (Day 2)
- Yvette Tuell, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes
- Leander Watson, Shoshone Bannock Tribes
- Henry Eichman, Enterprise Team (Recreation Economist)
- Dale Toweill, Idaho Department of Fish and Game
- Laura Pramuk, Payette National Forest (Days 1 and 3)
- Chans O'Brien, Payette National Forest GIS Analyst
- Suzanne Rainville, Payette National Forest Supervisor
- Carl Scheeler, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (Days 1 and 2)
- Tim Schommer, Wallowa-Whitman National Forest
- Pattie Soucek, Payette National Forest Planner/Interdisciplinary Team Leader
- Mike Lopez, Nez Perce Tribe (Day 1)
- Claire Thunes, UC Davis
- Sylvia Clark, Payette National Forest (Day 1)
- Brooklyn Baptiste, Nez Perce Tribe (Days 2 and 3)
- Paul Wik, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (Days 2 and 3)

PROCESS SUPPORT

- Susan Hayman, Facilitator, North Country Resources, Inc.
- Erica Jensen, Documentation, Peak Science Communications

MEETING OBJECTIVES

1. Review the updated operational protocol and NEPA process
2. Update the cooperating agencies and tribal representatives on new information and analysis
3. Discuss findings of the comment analysis and identify areas of agreement on the recommended follow-up actions

ACTION ITEMS

What	Who	When
Identify comment analysis contractor's expertise with tribal issues	Soucek	May 22
Calculate percent change in acres between original summer/winter habitat model and new	C. O'Brien	Resolved
Differentiate points between winter and summer use	C. O'Brien	Resolved
Provide habitat model assumptions—include with meeting summary	C. O'Brien	May 20
Check out Big Creek data	UC Davis	See information request document
Cooperating agencies and tribes will be contacted for data on social/herd information, disease, serology, zoology, etc., if needed—Mark Drew (Idaho Department of Agriculture), Caine Center, Pete Grinde, Ron Kaae (Idaho Department of Agriculture—for domestic sheep movement)	UC Davis	See information request document
Decide on modeling at 25%/50%/100% for effective contact	IDT/Rainville	June 24
Determine if assessment of risk will be for both current and future ("robust") population	IDT/Rainville	June 24
What would the tribes like to see as a more detailed economic analysis (per comments about the draft SEIS)	Eichman will send out request	Response needed by end of June
Follow up with Nez Perce, CTUIR, Shoshone-Paiute on preference for qualitative of quantitative economic analysis	IDT	End of June
Information from State of Idaho about implementation recently passed Senate Bill 1232, including management plan development and effect on the Payette bighorn sheep process (short and long)	Goodson/ Chapman	Regular update
IDT send data requests to combined team	IDT	Back to IDT by June 1
Provide combined team the list of assumptions for economic, population, and disease models for review and feedback	IDT	June 24
Provide final draft review of comment report	IDT	Report to combined team May 22, back to Forest Service May 29, final released and posted on Web June 12
Look at option for additional review of the Issue Resolution Strategy table	IDT	June 24

DAY 1—MAY 12, 2009

OPENING

Welcome

Suzanne Rainville (Payette National Forest) welcomed members of the Forest Service Interdisciplinary Team (IDT) and cooperating agencies and tribal representatives (collectively called the 'combined team'). Rainville wants to make a decision by the end of the year and expects the combined team to bring all the information they have and come prepared to each meeting. She asked participants to work a little in the evenings as needed, and be prepared for substantive discussions to bring important information to the Forest Service that will enable it to move forward.

Susan Hayman, Facilitator, (North Country Resources) asked participants to introduce themselves and answer the following questions: 1) what interests do you represent and 2) why do you care about the outcome. Participants shared their interests and concerns.

Hayman reviewed the agenda (Appendix 1) and the meeting objectives (see above).

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT: PROCESS REFRESHER

Sylvia Clark (Payette National Forest) reviewed the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process with a general presentation and Pattie Soucek (Payette National Forest) provided additional context for the specific requirements for this analysis. The Forest Service is required to address and consider all comments in the final supplemental environmental impact statement (SEIS).

The Final SEIS and Record of Decision (ROD) are expected in December 2009; no additional comment periods on the Final SEIS are planned at this point. Since this is an amendment to the Forest Plan, there are two different paths that Rainville could choose: 1) regular appeal process—release decision and those who commented can appeal or 2) objection process—release a Final SEIS, which allows people to object to parts and no final decision can be made until she has addressed all objections. For the objection process, people have 30 days to object. For appeals to a Forest Plan, the appeal period is 90 days, and then the Forest Service has 45 days to respond. In the regular appeal process, the ROD can take effect before the appeal period is over, but in the objection process no decision can be made until all objections are addressed. These processes are mutually exclusive.

It is acceptable to have conflicting science in an EIS and significant effects, as long as these are disclosed in the EIS and ROD.

UPDATED OPERATIONAL PROTOCOL REVIEW

Hayman reviewed the updated operational protocol and distributed it to the combined team. The protocol has changed since the last meeting. The Nez Perce Tribe noted a wording issue on page 2 of the protocol and wants it to be clear that all sovereigns are cooperators. **Hayman will insert a footnote to the protocol that the Nez Perce Tribe has cooperating agency status through a memorandum of understanding.**

COMMENT ANALYSIS OVERVIEW

Pattie Soucek (Payette National Forest) distributed the comment analysis report and explained how it was created. The initial concerns and questions on the comment analysis are contained in Appendix 2, Transcribed Flipchart Notes.

ISSUE RESOLUTION STRATEGY OVERVIEW

Soucek distributed the preliminary "Issue Resolution Strategy" table. This table was prepared by Soucek, based on the findings described in the comment analysis report. Soucek explained how it was set up,

including the different coding options. For some issues, Soucek broke the comments down at a finer scale than in the comment analysis report. Initial feedback from the combined team on the Issue Resolution Strategy was captured on flip charts and is contained in Appendix 2, Transcribed Flipchart Notes.

ASSIGNMENT

Team members were assigned the following regarding the content analysis report and the preliminary Issue Resolution Strategy. Rainville asked them to focus on “fatal flaws” rather than “minutia.”

- 1) Content Analysis
 - Read thru document
 - Identify if any key comments missing (tell us what is missing and where it belongs)
- 2) Issue Resolution Strategy
 - Read thru document
 - Is anything missing?
 - Is the resolution strategy correct? If not why
 - Explanation, analysis, indicator suggest?

Soucek added that the raw comments are available on CD, and made CDs available to those combined team members requesting them.

REVIEW DAY 2 AGENDA AND ADJOURN

Hayman reviewed the agenda for day 2 and the meeting adjourned at 4:55 PM.

DAY 2—MAY 13, 2009

OVERVIEW OF DAY 2

Hayman reviewed the agenda for Day 2.

Rainville requested that participants bring forth all of their information so that the team can add value to the analysis. She would like to hear feedback on the analysis and frank discussions so she can have a sense of the group's reaction before she accepts the analysis and moves forward.

INFORMATION UPDATE

Habitat Model

Chans O'Brien (Payette National Forest) reviewed the updates made to the habitat model after the draft SEIS. The habitat model was refined for accuracy last summer after field reviews. The model includes seasonal habitat and does not account for connectivity habitat. The draft model over-mapped winter habitat, but C. O'Brien used Jeff Copeland's (Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station) work on wolverine habitat as a basis to remove the persistently snow-covered areas from the model. The original summer model had 92% compliance with the telemetry points and the revised summer model has 90%.

C. O'Brien then displayed the winter source habitat model. Areas with persistent snow throughout the winter were excluded. The telemetry points were very compliant with the winter data.

The original winter habitat model was identical to summer except that it restricted habitat to southern aspects above 4,800 feet and all aspects below 4,800 feet. Initial concern with the draft winter model was that winter habitat was vastly over-mapped, which is why the original wasn't used.

C. O'Brien has also been working with Pete Grinde (Payette National Forest) to examine habitat quality within the model to develop carrying capacity. C. O'Brien and Grinde broke habitat into 4 categories: 1) sparse or barren, 2) tree dominated (10–30% canopy), 3) shrub dominated, and 4) grass-forbs dominated. They used ruggedness categories to refine the categories further. C. O'Brien will write out these model assumptions to be included with the meeting summary.

Comments from the combined team on the habitat model are included in Appendix 2, Transcribed Flip Chart Notes.

Population Model

C. O'Brien also provided an update on the population model. The herd home range used for the draft had the most up-to-date herd telemetry data. They used the same or very similar parameters for the revised model. An update to the home range extension tool caused some changes in the model. For Hells Canyon, they've recalculated and mapped the home ranges but haven't made any manual modifications to these. They did lump the data the same way as in the draft. The herd home range is a little smaller compared to the draft because the tool correction pulls the outer 100% contour in slightly. The model includes the latest March 2009 telemetry data. For the Salmon River, the model is slightly different from the draft because they received a lot more data. C. O'Brien also developed a method for describing the inherent buffer. The focal point for the inherent buffer work was set at the centroid of all points.

Comments from the combined team on the population model are included in Appendix 2, Transcribed Flip Chart Notes.

Refined Approach to Population Model and Relationship to Risk Assessment

Josh O'Brien (University of California, Davis [U.C. Davis]) presented information about taking a different approach to population modeling, and how that would affect the risk assessment and disease model. Their team will focus on defining the core home range, and then characterizing how frequently some individuals

wander outside of that. When correcting for autocorrelation, area increases, which is important to consider as other models are examined.

J. O'Brien asked if it would be valid to use data from Hells Canyon herds to help estimate bighorn sheep dispersal in the Salmon River area since so much more data exists for Hells Canyon. Several participants agreed their movements might be similar since many of the Hells Canyon bighorn sheep were transplants from the Salmon River area.

The following points were discussed:

- When estimating risk, model should use the greatest probability of movement for exploratory behavior, not the average.
- Best not to use data from the first couple years for transplants due to uncharacteristic behavior.
- If sheep are dispersing, they're going to disperse across non-habitat, so the habitat model may not be a good predictor of wandering sheep.
- Looking at habitat corridors and connectivity would be possible in Hells Canyon because so much data exists. Information would not apply to dispersal of transplants or to individual movements of dispersing rams, but routine corridors could probably be incorporated. These elements should be addressed in the document.
- Translocation data is only important if translocations are going to continue
- The populations are currently stressed, except for Asotin Creek
- As the population expands, bighorn sheep will expand their range very slowly until they reach capacity, then they'll make a quantum leap in terms of expansion.
- Overall, the lower Hells Canyon population is as stable a population as you can find over the last 2 or 3 years. The Oregon population has been around 600 for the last 8 years.
- Sexes use habitat differently and the longer the population has been established, the more likely it is to include seasonal movements.
- Providing future opportunities for recovery is important.

C. O'Brien and J. O'Brien will be working together next week at U.C. Davis to see how the old and new population models fit together and how to proceed.

Risk/Disease Analysis

Tim Carpenter (U.C. Davis) presented information on the risk analysis. Since modeling for this population hasn't been completed yet, he discussed the Sierra Nevada bighorn sheep study for example purposes.

The following concerns were discussed:

- As the population grows, so does the risk.
- Viability is the minimum to consider; the tribes are interested in having a harvestable surplus.
- The U.C. Davis team will be modeling risk based on multiple population levels, not just the minimum.
- The Forest Service will have to determine how many herds the U.C. Davis group will be modeling.
- Heterogeneous mixing is safe to assume if you break the herd up into the 6 social groups. Good data exists for that in the Salmon River.
- It is not uncommon for the permittees to replace sheep, and the Forest Service doesn't know where they originate from.
- Straying occurs during the season and outside the season. Some of that data would be at Washington State University (WSU).
- Determining the probability of transmission will be an important step. Input from the combined team for that estimation is welcomed.
- Adequate contact refers to 2 individuals getting close enough to cause transmission, while effective contact actually results in transmission. The models are built around adequate contacts and they are run to calculate the effective contacts.

- Two scenarios exist for infections: 1) a single point infection where one sheep gets sick and dies, but more commonly 50–80% die off, or 2) in a larger population, a single point infection travels throughout the population with a small number of survivors, and then comes back and hits them again.

The IDT is aiming for the analysis to be complete in a month so models can be presented at the June meeting, including the effects by alternatives. Any input for the models needs to be provided in the next week.

At Rainville's request, Hayman went around the table and asked each participant to voice their opinions on whether or not the Forest Service should move forward with the U.C. Davis work (quantitative vs. qualitative models), and to identify any associated concerns.

Following the round robin, there was discussion about the importance of modeling for the current population, and for a more robust, recovered population. Rainville reminded participants that the Forest Service doesn't manage the numbers; they need to make sure they have suitable habitat for a viable population.

Economic Analysis

Eichman presented information about the work he will be doing for the additional analysis that considers the economic impacts of recreation. Eichman noted that since bighorn sheep hunting doesn't occur within a small community, a broader county level analysis is more appropriate for recreation economics. Eichman's identified impact area is the 13 counties encompassing the GPR and he asked for feedback on the impact area.

There was discussion about the inclusion of areas beyond the Payette National Forest because analysis of disease impacts hadn't extended beyond the Forest borders. The Interdisciplinary Team (IDT) might have to grapple with the difference in sizes of the impact areas for direct effects. In the draft, the Forest Service had wanted to keep the level of analysis similar. Eichman noted that the bigger effects could also be handled in cumulative effects. Eichman will talk to the tribes about how best to evaluate tribal interests since tribal harvest occurs in the area as well.

The following are additional points during this discussion:

- The problem is where to draw the boundaries, but for a productive analysis the scope needs to be as small as possible.
- It may be useful to run Economic Modeling Specialists Incorporated's (EMSI's) numbers through this impact area.
- The Code of Federal Regulations says that use of qualitative analysis to evaluate effects of nonmarket values is acceptable. There is a lot of controversy over estimation. Some of these nonmarket values are already discussed in other portions of the draft SEIS. (e.g., ecosystem services).
- Putting an accurate value on the tags is controversial and difficult, which is why a qualitative analysis can be more useful.

Eichman discussed the environmental justice issues for the SEIS. Subsistence uses and first food will be discussed in the tribal relations section.

- The environmental justice section addresses all nationalities that live in the affected area, regardless of citizenship.
- Tribal hunt information will be hard to quantify since they don't have a permit system.

Feedback from the combined team on the economic analysis/model was recorded on flipcharts and is contained in Appendix 2 – Transcribed Flipchart Notes.

Opportunity for Cooperating Agencies, Tribes to Share Additional Information

Idaho

The State of Idaho shared information regarding the recently passed Senate Bill 1232, as amended, signed into law on May 7, 2009, with an emergency clause. Specifically, Goodson pointed participants to the bottom of page 3, item E. IDFG is working on establishing best management practices (BMPs). The domestic sheep

allotments on the Payette National Forest will probably be the first addressed and should provide for some degree of geographical and temporal separation between the two species. Certification will be based on the best biology that the IDFG has available. Goodson hopes that the permittees will be willing to enter into these BMPs. The permittee will only be certified if he agrees to the BMPs.

- The Idaho Governor's bighorn sheep strategy group is still moving forward to develop a management plan for the state.
- Rainville noted that the Forest Service has to look at what to do with this new information and how it is incorporated into the current process.
- Concern remains from the combined team about any domestic sheep grazing in bighorn sheep source habitat, which seems to be a conflict between State directives and Federal standards.
- The Governor's Office representative was unable to answer questions on how this bill was going to be implemented or how it conflicted with federal laws and regulations. Team members requested that these questions be addressed at the next team meeting.
- IDFG and the Governor's Office representatives will continue to keep the combined team apprised on the progress of the management planning effort.

Oregon

The State of Oregon sent around a sample of the brochure they use to inform private, domestic sheep ranchers of the risks of their operations to bighorn sheep populations. Copies are available to combined team members on request.

REVIEW DAY 3 AGENDA AND ADJOURN

The evening assignment was carried over from the previous day.

Christine Bradbury (Forest Service tribal liaison) clarified the comment analysis process in light of earlier questions about tribal expertise.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 PM.

DAY 3—MAY 14, 2009

OVERVIEW OF DAY 3

Hayman reviewed the agenda for the final day.

THOUGHTS FROM DAY 2 – DECISION ON THE MODELS

Rainville shared her thoughts after meeting with the IDT last night. She reflected on some things she has heard over the last couple days: 1) we need to provide for recovered populations for the future generations, 2) we need to find solutions that will work for everyone and mitigate impacts, and 3) we definitely need to look at the best science available as we move forward. Rainville also reiterated that the Forest Service is working toward supplementing an existing EIS, so it is necessary to narrow the focus. She still has to look at the widest range of beneficial uses without degrading the resources and illustrate the significant effects and recognize the conflict in the science. The Forest Service has to look at the whole range of alternatives and document each so they're not being arbitrary and capricious. People need to be aware of the assumptions.

For the habitat model, Rainville has decided to move forward with the revised model, which is appropriate for the forest planning level. The Forest Service needs to be able to show that the problem isn't habitat. The model shows that habitat that is well distributed across the forest and the revised model is more appropriate than the draft, even though it did decrease habitat slightly.

For the population model, Rainville believes the Forest Service has to move to the quantitative model. Model inputs will be key to the process and the Forest Service wants everyone to know the assumptions going into the model. She is relying on the team to look at the model to balance it with best professional judgment. Although this does mark a fundamental shift in the direction of the analysis, it is really the only choice based on comments received on the qualitative model.

FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS FOR THE COMMENT ANALYSIS

Comment Analysis Report

The team identified concerns regarding the comment analysis report. These are listed in Appendix 2, Transcribed Flipchart Notes.

Issue Resolution Strategy

The group was asked to provide feedback regarding the Forest Service's proposed actions in response to comments (based on the "Issue Resolution Strategy" table). Comments were captured on flipcharts that are contained in Appendix 2, Transcribed Flipchart Notes.

- Soucek noted that the IDT will be analyzing the existing alternatives and developing any needed new alternatives, and if they don't result in an acceptable risk level they'll be changing the Forest Plan direction to get down to the acceptable level of risk
- Rainville said that all comments are equally considered, regardless of how many are received advocating a particular point of view.

NEAR TERM ACTIONS—BETWEEN NOW AND JUNE 24 MEETING

- 1) Finalize the contractor comment report and send certified to combined team by Friday, May 22. The IDT will need comments back by May 29. The final will be sent to the combined team first and then posted to the website by June 12.
- 2) Refine the Issue Resolution Strategy table—next version available June 17
- 3) Develop and run model. All data for disease model should be collected by June 1. The GPR model results will be available May 28 from 10:00 AM–1:00 PM MDT during a video conference.

- 4) At the next meeting, the combined team will see findings from the model, at least for the alternatives in the draft SEIS.

At the next combined team meeting, the goal is to see where there is agreement on the alternatives, including Forest Plan direction.

U.C. DAVIS GROUP MODELING PRESENTATION (ADDITIONAL AGENDA ITEM)

Overview of Model Process

J. O'Brien gave an overview of the model steps and welcomed feedback. The following points were discussed:

- The model will include a straying component and U.C. Davis will need data from team members.
- Nez Perce National Forest information will be used for cumulative effects, as will Bureau of Land Management information.
- The Forest Service can provide on-allotment domestic sheep counts.
- Straying information will be based on best knowledge.
- The model will account for trailing, which is addressed in some alternatives.
- Feedback on preliminary lifecycle information and probability of contact will be useful.
- This model takes the relative risk for each alternative and then looks at the chance of taking the disease back to the herd and having it spread.
- The analysis may attempt to model BMPs effect on reduction of the risk of contact.
- Some qualitative information will be used in this quantitative model, and assumptions will be noted in these instances.
- The model will simulate the spread of disease within herds. Modeling the spread of disease throughout the population is helpful to evaluate the cumulative effects of grazing on the Payette National Forest.

Data/Information Needs

The IDT is looking for data in two areas: health parameters and demographic population information. Carpenter has identified people who might be able to provide some of that data. He noted on-screen other people who might be able to provide data, as suggested by the combined team. He will send out this list to the combined team for additional input.

REPORT ON ACTION ITEMS

C. O'Brien reported that in the summer model, 90% of points fall within the model. For winter, 80% of the points fall within the winter habitat.

In terms of carrying capacity, C. O'Brien took 10–15,000 individuals as a high point for the Hells Canyon population and looked to see how much winter habitat is available to support those individuals. Based on this calculation, the Salmon River area could support 3,300–5,000 individuals.

NEXT STEPS

Soucek distributed an overall project timeline. The Forest Service is still hoping to have a decision by December. A pre-decisional release has not been decided on yet.

Round-robin Meeting Evaluation

Participants were asked to evaluate the 3-day meeting. The following concerns were raised:

- Off-site participants had trouble with not having some of the documents.
- Some people were concerned with the next meeting being only one day, especially since informal evening meetings were quite helpful.

- The conference call was a negative for one participant, making it hard to hear those on the phone and have any sort of meaningful dialogue.
- It was difficult to assimilate and digest so much information and respond so quickly. Participants requested that information be distributed prior to the meeting as early as possible.
- Cooperators are doing everything they can to help the process along and stay with the timeline.
- It would be helpful to have EMSI involved in the next meeting, since they are still involved in the economic work on the grazing side.
- One participant reminded people to be aware of group think, which can be both a positive and negative. The focus of the group needs to be on making a strong product, not influencing the decision.

CLOSING REMARKS

Rainville expressed her appreciation for those who participated in the meeting until the very end. The process has changed and is on a faster track, so she appreciates people understanding and being patient. Her goal is to make the work as open and transparent as possible. She trusts that this group won't use this draft information inappropriately and distribute it prematurely, as the Forest Service still has lawsuits pending. She reminded participants that she is there to get input from the group and asked them to remember the bigger NEPA process. Rainville was willing to extend subsequent meetings to a second day if people feel that it would be helpful. She asked participants to look at their schedules for June 25 and think about whether or not they would like to meet that morning, in addition to the full day on June 24th.

BIN ITEMS

Bin items were noted during the meeting (see Appendix 2) and will be addressed as action items.

WRAP-UP

The meeting adjourned at 1:05 PM

HANDOUTS

1. Agenda, 1 p.
2. Revised Operational Protocol, 3 pp.
3. "Summary of Public Comment" document, 46. pp.
4. "Issue Resolution Strategy" table, 75 pp.
5. Senate Bill 1232, as amended, 7 pp.
6. Timeline, 1 p.

APPENDIX 1—AGENDA

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

Combined Team* Meeting

May 12-14, 2009

Payette National Forest Supervisor’s Office Conference Room

800 W. Lakeside, McCall, Idaho

Meeting Objectives:

1. Review the updated operational protocol and NEPA process
2. Update the cooperating agencies and tribal representatives on new information and analysis
3. Discuss findings of the comment analysis and identify areas of agreement on the recommended follow-up actions

Day 1 Agenda:

Time	Topic	Process / Product
1:00 p.m.	Opening <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome, introductions and opening remarks – Suzanne Rainville, Payette Forest Supervisor • Combined team: What interests are represented by the combined team? • Meeting overview, group agreements – Susan Hayman, Facilitator 	Information
2:00 p.m.	National Environmental Policy Act: Process Refresher – Pattie Soucek, Project Team Leader	Information; Discussion/Q&A
2:45 p.m.	BREAK	
3:00 p.m.	Updated Operational Protocol Review – Susan Hayman, Facilitator	Information; Discussion/Q&A
4:00 p.m.	Comment Analysis Overview <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment analysis process – Pattie Soucek • Cooperating agency and tribal representatives’ impressions of the comment analysis report (round robin) • Assignment regarding the IDT recommended follow-up actions (mitigation, new alternatives, new forest plan language, additional analysis, etc.) – Pattie Soucek 	Information; Discussion/Q&A

Time	Topic	Process / Product
5:00 p.m.	Review Day 2 agenda and adjourn for the day	

* Combined Team = Forest Service Interdisciplinary Team plus the cooperating agencies and tribal

Day 2 Agenda

Time	Topic	Process / Product
8:00 a.m.	Refreshments available in meeting room	
8:30 a.m.	Overview of Day 2	Information
8:45 a.m.	Epiphanies from Day 1?	
9:00 a.m. (15 minute break at 10:00 a.m.)	Information Update – Pattie Soucek; Chans O’Brien, GIS Analyst <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Model (habitat and population) • Risk assessment-disease model 	Information; Discussion/Q&A
12:00 p.m.	LUNCH	
1:00 p.m. (15 minute break at 2:30 p.m.)	Continue Information Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic analysis (attributes, constituent parts of the analysis) • Other Forest Service analysis • Opportunity for cooperating agencies, tribes to share additional information 	Information; Discussion/Q&A
4:00 p.m.	Review Day 3 agenda and adjourn for the day	

Day 3 Agenda

Time	Topic	Process / Product
7:30 a.m.	Refreshments available in meeting room	
8:00 a.m.	Overview of Day 3 – Pattie Soucek	Information
8:15 a.m.	Epiphanies from the Day 2?	Discussion
8:45 a.m.	Follow-Up Actions for the Comment Analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and discuss IDT recommended actions ((mitigation, new alternatives, new forest plan language, additional analysis, etc.) • Identify areas of agreement among the combined team for follow – up actions 	Discussion; <i>Product: Areas of agreement on follow-up actions</i>
11:45 a.m.	Next Steps – Susan Hayman <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting Schedule <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dates - Objectives • Round-robin meeting evaluation 	Discussion;
12:15 p.m.	Closing remarks – Suzanne Rainville	Information
12:30 p.m.	Adjourn	

APPENDIX 2—TRANSCRIBED FLIPCHART NOTES

<p style="text-align: center;">Feedback on Comment Analysis</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Concerned the comment analysis does not adequately capture breadth of Tribal comments 2) Also that there will be follow-up actions tied to the Tribal comments 3) Some typos, misuse of quotes <p style="text-align: right;">1</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Feedback on Comment Analysis (cont)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4) Would like more demographics on comments 5) Would like to know how many people weighed in on each “unique” comment (i.e. where was the expression of interest?) might be helpful to know for Tribal consultation 6) Looks like Tribal only commented on trust and treaty issues-doesn’t feel that the Tribal voice is coming thru. <p style="text-align: right;">2</p>
--	---

<p style="text-align: center;">Feedback on Issue Res Table</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) “Dismiss as issue-“irrelevant”-use of this word may offend some people 2) Table numbering is off “one” after intro the document. PC2/abc’s may also be further split 3) Think about use of term “significant” in document 4) Think about use of term “issue” in document <p style="text-align: right;">3</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Fatal Flaws Assignment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Content Analysis Read thru document Identify if any key comments missing (tell us what is missing and where it belongs) 2) Issue Resolution Strategy Read thru document Is anything missing? Is the resolution strategy correct? If not why Explanation, analysis, indicator suggest? <p style="text-align: right;">4</p>
--	--

<p style="text-align: center;">Comments on HAB Model</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Do we need a way to model/account for BHS movement corridors/areas? <u>Issue to address</u>-Characterize non-traditional habitat used to move between patches of summer/winter range 2) Concern about the number of points now <u>outside</u> modeled source summer habitat ...Reduction in “compliance” <p style="text-align: right;">5</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comments on HAB Model (Cont)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2) Assumptions of high quality habitat may not be supported by location of points 3) Increase/change in population may affect habitat use-may change acres egg. Currently driven by security, larger forage may be the driver 4) Are “quality factors” the right ones to use? 5) Maybe separate forage from escape <p style="text-align: right;">6</p>
--	--

<p style="text-align: center;">Comments of HAB Model (cont)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6) Need to be careful and deliberate about determining the carrying capacity- lots of people will use this number for different things 7) Step back and look at approach from habitat to numbers? 8) What are questions we want the model to answer? 9) Scale of analysis needs to be considered with questions we are trying to answer <p style="text-align: right;">7</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comments on HAB Model (cont)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10) Look at literature for how to determine C.C. 11) Look at forage production and appropriate allocation—from Forest Service handbook/manuals 12) Look at what is limiting factor and develop C.C. based on this (in absence of disease) 13) Fundamental question for State of Idaho is where, not how many <p style="text-align: right;">8</p>
---	--

<p style="text-align: center;">Comments on POP Model</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) By using the center of points, you minimize the ray distance. As a result, amount of area is minimized when calculating percentage 2) Need to look at migratory corridor habitat in analysis 3) Again, need to know how model will be used/applied. Translocations vs. existing population growth <p style="text-align: right;">9</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comments on POP Model (cont)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4) Looking at stressed pop, except for Asotin ck.- differences in response. 5) Mark Vekasy - Josh should contact regarding model. 6) Significant further expansion can be expected as capacity is approached. 7) Overall thought- keep future pop recovery in mind (risk assess.) <p style="text-align: right;">10</p>
--	--

<p style="text-align: center;">Comments on Risk/Disease</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Need to separate analysis for lambs from other age groups <p style="text-align: right;">11</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comments on Econ Model</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Impact Area – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broaden to include counties w/ Shoshone-Bannock Tribes • IDT needs to resolve what may be perceived as inconsistency with “Payette-boundary” effects for other resources (“impact area”). • Good to broaden area to include where jet-boaters and other people enter area. • There are some limits, though to how big an area to include <p style="text-align: right;">12</p>
--	---

<p style="text-align: center;">Comments on Econ Model (cont)</p> <p>2) Can't compare BHS contributions to economy to grazing permittees- opportunities for BHS not fully realized at this point.</p> <p>3) Shoshone-Bannock Tribes would prefer qualitative econ analysis/EJ</p> <p>4) Treaty right protection would/should be different than other minorities</p> <p style="text-align: right;">13</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comments on Econ Model (cont)</p> <p>5) 2002 NVUM visitor use figures did not include Tribal use.</p> <p>6) Still not seeing cost of admin of grazing permits, and lost of opportunities for hunting due to depressed pops, effects of grazing on native plants ("cultural costs")</p> <p style="text-align: right;">14</p>
--	---

<p style="text-align: center;">Suzanne's Decisions</p> <p>1) Habitat model is good and meets purpose of Forest Plan-level analysis <u>moving ahead with this</u></p> <p>2) <u>Moving ahead with quantitative model</u>. Believe we have capacity for analysis and data availability</p> <p style="text-align: right;">15</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Report Comments (Comment Analysis Report)</p> <p>1) "I see bighorns in the forest" in the table, but not in the report</p> <p>2) Do not see comments about impact of decision on other states.</p> <p>3) Comments I know of are not in the draft report. Not in summary or in individual comments.</p> <p>4) Some of comments misquoted/interpreted. Suggestion: review more "extensive" comments (e.g. 20 pages)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">16</p>
---	--

<p style="text-align: center;">Report Comments (cont'd)</p> <p>5) Vaccine references: need to respond that none are available. (Schommer/Coggins can help with response[DEIS])</p> <p>6) 1997 Letter/Agreement- need to address (Schommer/Coggins help with response [DEIS])</p> <p>7) Under alternatives, no reference to 7J, which Idaho supports for geographic boundaries and known animal behavior</p> <p style="text-align: right;">17</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Report comments (cont)</p> <p>8) Tribal comments overall need a closer look. Misrepresentations, omissions</p> <p style="text-align: right;">18</p>
---	---

<p style="text-align: center;">NPT Comments¹ <i>(Facilitator Note: Compares Report to comments submitted on 2/27/2009)</i></p> <p>3 Important Principles</p> <p>1) No Contact Standard –zero risk of contact Section 2.3 page 10 summary-“No contact policy” Section 2.3 page 29 –“establish standard is no contact” Section 5.4 page 12 Summary-“no contact” page 43-“enact tough no contact standard”</p> <p>2) Separation Standard- No grazing in occupied habitat. Section 2.3 page 10-“completely separate” PC 24 page 29-“should not graze DS in occupied BHS habitat.” Section 5.4 pg 12 _____ pg 43 _____ (in heading only)</p> <p>“By enacting a separation <u>or</u> no contact standard and no grazing buffers”</p> <p style="text-align: right;">19</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">NPT Comments (cont'd)</p> <p>3) No Grazing buffers between occupied BHS range and DS allotments Section 2.3 page 10- “along side buffer zones” 2.3 pg 29- “leave separation w/o buffer” “create a buffer” Section 5.4 pg 12 _____ Pg 43 _____ Buffer mentioned in heading</p> <p>4) Recalculation of GPR's Only expand over time summary 2 _____ 5.4 _____ PC1-pg 15-“Disallow reduction in GPR” “GPR built non-viable pop.” PC21 pg 28-plan for expansion outside GPR</p> <p style="text-align: right;">20</p>
--	---

<p style="text-align: center;">NPT Comments (cont'd)</p> <p>5) Monitoring –use base GPR's and no-grazing buffers to reduce monitoring needs. use standard –no monitoring no grazing (reduce need or reliance on monitoring) Section 2.2 pg 9-“rigorous monitoring plan” PC19 pg 27-“include rigorous monitoring track changes in BHS pop” include rigorous monitoring plan. Pg 28-“monitor movements of BHS outside GPR to ensure contact is detected.”</p> <p>6) Standards-Proposed 13 standards (only 1 of 13 were ident. In report) ch1 pg 8-some feel standards inadequate ch 5.4 pg 12 _____ PC1-pg 16-Includes one standard proposed ch 5.4 pg 43 _____</p> <p style="text-align: right;">21</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">NPT Comments (cont'd)</p> <p>7) Alternative Selection Tribal comments Ltr. Pg 2- 7G provides solid starting point 7G does not establish no grazing buffers Attach Pg 7 Alt 7G fails to provide adequate separation Pg 8 Alt 7G fails to ensure viable populations Failure to provide for BHS recovery and range expansion</p> <p>Section 5.4 Protect Treaty Rights by: Pg 44- by choosing Alt 7G-NPT Missed concept of strengthening Forest Plan direction</p> <p style="text-align: right;">22</p>
---	--

¹ These flipcharts were prepared by representatives of the Nez Perce Tribe and presented to the combined team during the discussion of feedback on the comment analysis report.

<p style="text-align: center;">Table Comments (Issue Resolution Strategy)</p> <p>Significant issues that may be missing</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Strengthening Forest plan direction (see 13 items from NPT) base GPR, reduced req., buffers 2) See Report comments 3) Read Gov office letter in particular, private land 4) Summarize state's comments from all 3 states and respond accordingly. <p style="text-align: right;">23</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Table Comments (cont'd)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5) Lots of "see 5a"- seems to miss recovery issue, 1997 Letter issue, etc. Need to look to see if this is too generic a reference 6) Notion that we are not addressing disease issues. Shouldn't these comments about disease be addressed as outside scope? 7) P.52-31b. Better explanation needed <p style="text-align: right;">24</p>
--	--

<p style="text-align: center;">Table Comments (cont'd)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8) P.5 (PC1-m)-Are we really doing a cost benefit analysis? 9) Lots of call for more protection for BHS, how does FS deal with fact that more substantive issues/comments on BHS protection? Should take into account. 10) Science review-Can you use the summaries of science (egg. Schommer/Woolover) <p style="text-align: right;">25</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Table Comments (cont'd)</p> <p>P54 (c) (45 [2])- Statements of fact. Probability not "significant issues"</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: right;">26</p>
--	--

<p style="text-align: center;">Forward</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Need to be sure that state and Tribal issues addressed clearly in response/outcome 2) "Heavy Lifting" needed on FP direction and monitoring, mitigation, in response to comments 3) Caveat- Davis trip may yield new responses/new alts. <p style="text-align: right;">27</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">"NPT Principles"</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) No grazing in occ range 2) Buffers 3) Opp for recovery <p style="text-align: right;">28</p>
--	---

Next Steps– (before June 24 mtg.)	Actions/Follow up
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Finalize report Back to team C by 22nd (send “certified”) To FS by 29th Final by June 12 2) Refine Table Next interaction by June 17 3) Develop and Run modeling (Pop Model) Collect by June 1 May 28 10am-1 pm MDT-videoconf 4) Findings From model 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Identify comment analysis contractors expertise w/ Tribal issues. <i>Pattie May 22</i> 2) Calculate % change in acres between original summer/winter model and new. <i>Chans Wed night Done</i> 3) Differentiate points between winter and summer use. <i>Chans Wed night Done</i> 4) HAB Model assumptions-include w/meeting summaries. <i>Chans May 20th</i> 5) Check out Big Creek data (see contact list)
29	30

Action Items/Follow up (cont)	Action Items/Follow up (cont)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6) Cooperating agencies/Tribes will be contacted for information on social/herd info, disease info serology, zoological, etc, if needed. <i>Check w/ Mark Drew, Dept Ag., Caine Center, Pete G. FS, Ron Kaae DoA (Dom. Sheep Movement), addressed in data/info requests.</i> 7) Decide on modeling at 25%/50%/100% for effective contact-June 24-IDT/FSUP 8) Determine if assessment of risk will be for both current and future (“robust”) Pop. –<i>Suzanne w/ team June 24</i> 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9) What would the Tribes like to see as more detailed Econ analysis (per DEIS comments). <i>Henry will send out data request respond by end of June</i> 10) Follow up with Nez Perce, CTUIR, Shoshone-Paiute on pref for qual/quant. <i>end of June</i> 11) Information on implementation of Idaho Law (Senate Bill 1232) incl mgt plan develop. And effect on the Payette BHS process (short and long term). <i>Steve John-update at each IDT mtg.</i>
31	32

Action Items/Follow up (cont)	BIN
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 12) IDT send data request to combined team. back to IDT by June 1 13) Provide combined team the list of assumptions for each model (econ. Pop. Disease) for review and feedback. IDT June 24 14) Provide final draft review of comment report. Team 22nd FS 29th Final June 12 15) Look at option for additional review or the table. June 24-next review 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) More on comment analysis-how sovereigns (state and Tribes) comments are treated. FS consideration as report refined-FSEIS 2) Number of herds being modeled. Question in demographic questions 3) Scope of effects analysis related to Tribal treaty rights. Address in letter back to Tribes.
33	34