

## Wrap Up, Thursday, April 10, 2014

In preparation for “next steps,” Kate Norman shared tasks identified from the prior two days. The task list was amended. [Please see below for task list.](#)

## NOTES – Friday, April 11, 2014

### Modeling Work – Kevin Doherty

Kevin presented previous work relating to waterfowl and Sprague’s pippet to seed conversation about modeling for greater sage-grouse.

Kevin also shared work done relating to fire impacts on sagebrush habitat.

Kevin, Sarah, and Dave discussed options and concluded that multiple methods relying on spatially explicit data would be most robust.

### *Discussion of Fire*

The relationships between fire and invasives was discussed and the potential outcomes were described as follows (others may also exist, but these were the outcomes identified).

- Pinyon-Juniper, comes back as Sage-brush = Beneficial
- Sagebrush, comes back as sagebrush = Wash, but with lag
- Cheatgrass, comes back as cheatgrass = Wash, but with lag
- Sagebrush, comes back as cheatgrass = Negative

The issue might be described as an invasives problem more than a fire problem. However, it was noted that removal of habitat may be detrimental even if native species return due to the lag time associated with habitat recovery.

### Next Steps – Dave Smith

Given the ideas that we’ve shared with the “workshop.”  
Here’s the vision that’s emerging:

### *Workshop 1: Model Building (thoughtful of FACA issue)*

Anticipating ~ 12 individuals

- Authors of relevant model components
- Sage Grouse Sages (fire, sagebrush, etc)
- Added Value experts from modeling world
- FWS Observer (management)

### *Workshop 2 or 3: Expert Elicitation*

Anticipating ~ ??

- Experts as needed

### *Workshop 2 or 3: Review of Model*

Folks who weren’t involved in Workshop 1