

ACTION ITEMS FROM FEBRUARY 2013 GSG-TRI-REGIONAL COORDINATION MEETING

Communication

1. Develop a clear and concise (1 page) vision of what success looks like. Should include clear message to the States, BLM, and FS that we recommend they develop an effective strategy to conserve sage-grouse in coordination with FWS. We highly recommend that these strategies including adequate regulatory mechanisms to ensure implementation. Without regulatory mechanisms we will need to run their conservation measures through the PECE policy, adding an additional layer of analysis that will be subject to challenge. Our vision of success should reference the COT report and explain how that report should be used to help achieve success. Ultimately we need to have some reasonable assurances that conservation plans, whether regulatory or voluntary, will “Stop the Decline.” (Pat, Mike)
2. Our vision of success should indicate to BLM what we think is necessary in their preferred alternatives (e.g., NTT or better for sage-grouse unless consistent with a State planning effort that has adequate regulatory protections for sage-grouse?) (Pat, Noreen)
3. External Affairs (R6), in coordination with Pat and Mike to update national sage-grouse web portal. Assist with compiling and implementing outreach plan for COT and develop Q&As regarding differences between COT report and NTT report.
4. Communication with Tribes – follow up with 3 Regional Tribal liaisons (Pat/Jesse)
5. Sharepoint: Send link to meeting participants. Upload documents: notes, action items, roles & responsibilities, WAFWA hunting letter, COT report and talking points, BLM mitigation IM, etc. (Jesse)
6. Roles & Responsibilities – add FMT to document and other changes as discussed in the meeting. (Nicole)

Mapping

7. PAC (Priority Areas for Conservation) Map: resolve some state boundary inconsistencies. (Pat)

Mitigation Strategy

8. Develop mitigation strategy and ready-to-go mitigation options/recommendations (conservation banks, ILFs, habitat credit trading). We need to develop banking tools and credit trading tools for GrSG. Need to develop a template for consistency, but there will likely be state by state variation. Mitigation Technical Team: Paul H, Mark S, Jodi, Jeff, Jason, Pat, Jesse. However, team composition may change as sage-grouse energy coordinator and his/her team is identified.
9. OR ES Shauna Ginger to provide training, e.g., a 3-hour overview webinar. (Shauna/Paul H.)

Tracking Conservation Efforts/Science

10. How can we best plug into the LCC process – Pat will continue to coordinate with Steve Torbit (R6-ARD-SA) who is coordinating R1&R8 SA-ARDs on range-wide issues and funding. PLs coordinating with individual LCCs.
11. Develop proposal for online spatially explicit database to track conservation efforts for evaluation under PECE. This database could also be used to track impacts and roll-up both impacts and

conservation efforts. Could either be developed as a proposal for LCCs through LCmap or ECOS. (Jesse/Pat)

12. CNOR update: need to recognize major conservation efforts in the update. WY ES has the lead and will need to discuss this further on an upcoming biologists call. (Lynn/Mark S.)

BLM/FS Plan Revisions

13. UT ES will share experience and lessons learned with working with UT-BLM to help other states with process and why it has worked in UT. UT will also share BLM preferred alternative. (Larry/Laura)
14. Agenda items and issues for Federal GSG meeting in Boise (Noreen, Terry, Jesse, Pat, Nicole). There is inconsistency among the states in terms of how BLM is treating the planning process (i.e. degree of involvement of the Service varies state by state). There is also inconsistency in how BLM is drafting a suite of alternatives. FWS communicated to BLM the need for consistency across range, but the message may not be getting through to BLM.
15. Follow up with BLM/FS to determine if there is an opportunity for FWS review of "final" alternative between DEIS and FEIS/ROD?
16. Need to check on whether the purpose and need statements in BLM/FS EISs are the same.
17. Will all BLM/FS revisions and amendments have a preferred alternative? Preferred alternatives, FWS input and timely review, FWS will provide feedback to BLM re: whether there is at least one alternative that meets the conservation needs of the species. Feedback will be informal, but will likely need to be formalized in the future.

Conference Calls/Meetings

18. Field Management Team (FMT) will be reconvened. Tri-Region call will become the FMT call. PL are the principle participants, but biologists are also invited. Principle goal is to be an issue-driven call facilitating communication across the range. 2nd Thursday of each month at 2pm MT. Hosting of call will rotate between 3 regions. R6 will host 1st call on March 14. R1 will host April 11 and R8 will host May 9.
19. ARD call to brief Noreen prior to National Policy Team Call. Third Tuesday, 2pm MT. (Mike, Mike, Terry, Noreen)
20. BLM National Policy Team meeting, twice/month, 1st and 3rd Wednesdays, 2pm MT. Noreen sits on this call. Will figure out a schedule for how to communicate with Noreen prior to the NPT calls. If we have an issue in the field, we need to ensure it is raised through our FWS chain to get it on the NPT agenda. (Pat/Nicole)
21. Monthly biologist call. Scheduled for 3rd Thursday each month at 2pm MT. Pat will continue to lead. Biologists should send Pat and Jesse agenda items for these calls. (Pat/Jesse)
22. BLM Resource Management Team calls (monthly, 2nd Thursday) (Pat/Jesse)
23. Next meeting for this group: week of June 3 (Tue-Thu). Location: Boise. Project leaders and lead GrSG biologists. R1 will plan and send details.