



DATE: October 25, 2002
 TO: Wildlife Committee (WC)
 FROM: Carl Scheeler *Franklin R. Young* for
 SUBJECT: Action Notes for October 18, 2002 Wildlife Committee Conference Call

**Wildlife Committee Conference Call
 CBFWA Office, Portland Oregon**

Action Notes

Attendees: Frank Young (CBFWA)

By Phone: Carl Scheeler (CTUIR), David Rockwell (CTSK), Peter Paquet and Robert Walker (NWPPC), Loren Kronemann and Angela Sondenaa (NPT), Gregg Servheen and Mary Terra-Bern (IDFG), Scott Soultz (KTOI), Mike Livingston (YN), Bruce Marcot (USFS), and Alison Squire (IMP Coordinator).

Time	Objective 1. FY 2003 Renewal Process	0%
Allocation:	Objective 2. Rolling Province Review and Subbasin Summaries	0%
	Objective 3. FY 2002 Adjustments	0%

ITEM 1: Discussion of How to Assure Regional Consistency for Terrestrial Assessment Outputs for Subbasin Planning.

Discussion: An emergency conference call was held from 10 a.m. to noon October 18, 2002 to solicit input from the regional wildlife managers on terrestrial assessment status and needs for NWPPC subbasin planning scheduled for discussion at the October 22 Subbasin Planning Regional Coordination Group Meeting. Following a summary of the last NWPPC meeting by members of the Kootenai and Clearwater technical teams and a summary of the Oregon TOAST efforts to hybridize the Northwest Habitat Institute's IBIS data modeling tools with The Nature Conservancy's Conservation by Design/Sites modeling and planning tools, the group shared thoughts on suitable outputs for consistent regional, provincial and subbasin assessments.

Discussion continued: These thoughts could then support Bruce Marcot's efforts to develop regionally consistent "canned queries" for the IBIS system that would provide the basis for necessary minimum assessment outputs for use in subbasin, provincial and regional planning. These discussions covered secondary and out-of-basin impacts as well as effective inclusion of disturbance regimes in terrestrial assessments.

NEED

Source/Model/Status

Secondary and Indirect Impacts:

Identify all salmon affected species	Existing IBIS
Identify significant functional losses in affected species	Existing IBIS
Identify habitats that support affected species and those most functionally impacted due to loss of salmon. <i>(This was suggested as a means to quantify the rough magnitude of secondary impacts by referencing the percent of the subbasin containing such impacted habitats. NOTE: This would benefit from enhancing IBIS database to include higher resolution habitat layer.)</i>	
Existing IBIS	

General Assessment Needs:

Identify historic habitat extent and condition	Existing IBIS
Identify current habitat extent and condition	Enhanced IBIS
*Required for effectiveness at subbasin level	
Identify historic species distribution	Existing IBIS
Identify current species distribution	Existing IBIS
*Subbasin teams should review current data in IBIS and update ASAP	
Identify limiting factors	
*recommend aggregating limiting factors Scott, help me here!	
Identify structural condition of habitat	Enhanced IBIS only
*IBIS currently has no structural data and would require significant input from subbasin teams to be able to create such a data layer.	
Identify disturbance regimes	
	IBIS "management activities" and Sites
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fire frequency and extent • Human disturbance/ development / transportation • Abiotic: flooding, hydrologic, geologic, geomorphologic. • Disease • Exotics • Fragmentation 	

Out-of-Basin Effects and Between Basin Coordination Needs: There is a clear need to compile key provincial issues and to develop strategies with provincial and regional applications. To some extent, this must take place prior to development/completion of subbasin strategies as subbasin actions may need to aggregate to meet larger scale needs.

Biotic:

Since the terrestrial assessment is greatly constrained by limited population data for terrestrial species, the primary focus would be on the limited species having good trend data and creating a tie to trends in their associated habitats within a subbasin. This could include managed species where management units or managed populations cross subbasin boundaries requiring multiple subbasin consideration in development of strategies.

*Recommendation to consistently use the Partners in Flight database and priority species in each subbasin. This could greatly enhance basin-wide M&E

Priority habitats may require consideration at a multiple subbasin level to effectively achieve goals and therefore must **first** be planned for at a provincial or greater level to assure integration in individual subbasin strategies.

*Recommend using existing state or regional habitat priorities to guide Sites modeling for provincial planning.

Abiotic**Climate****Source/model??? Help!**

Many of the outputs identified above are presently available or can be made available consistently, timely and at a reasonable cost from the existing IBIS and Sites capabilities. We need assistance with developing these and other assessment tools for Subbasin planning and future M&E capabilities. Please share other assessment tools that might have a use at the regional level now or in the future to meet our joint needs.

ACTION: WC Members were asked to respond by noon October 21, 2002 with comments on the above notes.

ITEM 2: Date and Location of Next Meeting

ACTION: The next meeting will be a workshop on regional wildlife assessment approaches to be held November 19-20, 2002 in Spokane. A preliminary meeting will be held October 29, 2002 in Boise with Bruce Marcot and Kootenai and Clearwater rivers representatives to develop an example using IBIS in preparation for the November 19-20 workshop.