

# Summary Report from Interagency Bison Management Plan Meeting November 17-18, 2009

Presented 11/24/09 by Meeting Facilitator Scott Bischke,  
MountainWorks Inc. (scott@eMountainWorks.com)

The following summary report reflects activities at the November 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> meeting of the IBMP partners, held at the Best Western Motel in Livingston, and hosted by Yellowstone National Park. This report comes from the notes and flip chart records of facilitator Scott Bischke. The report contains a *Facilitator's Draft* watermark to recognize that as presented the IBMP partners have not reviewed these notes and accepted the facilitator's recollection/interpretation of events. Attendee deliberators included IBMP partners Mary Erickson (GNF), Pat Flowers (MFWP), Suzanne Lewis (YNP), Christian Mackay (MBoL), Brian McCluskey (APHIS), and Marty Zaluski (MDoL), along with tribal representatives Brooklyn Baptiste (NP), Christina Kracher sitting in for Ervin Carlson (ITBC), and Tom McDonald (CSKT). In addition to those at the deliberative table, ~20 staff members from across IBMP organizations and ~25 members of the public were present each day. Scanned attendance and speaker sign-up sheets are available from the facilitator.

## Contents

<b>Partial list of Abbreviations.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Action items identified on November 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Meeting summary notes .....</b>	<b>3</b>
Handover of Partner Leadership .....	3
Welcome to Tribal Members; Preparation of MOU.....	3
Welcome to New Lead for APHIS .....	4
Briefing on Status of RTR Fencing Operations .....	4
Winter/Spring Operations Plan North Side .....	5
Winter/Spring Operations Plan West Side .....	5
Preparations for Signing of Winter/Spring Operations Plan 2009/2010 .....	7
Informational Updates.....	7
Future IBMP Partner Meeting planning .....	8
<b>Selected comments from public.....</b>	<b>8</b>
November 17 <sup>th</sup> .....	8
November 18 <sup>th</sup> .....	9
<b>Planning for Next IBMP Meeting, including Past "Parked" Items .....</b>	<b>10</b>



## Partial list of Abbreviations

- AM—Adaptive management
- APHIS—Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
- BB—Brooklyn Baptiste
- CM—Christian Mackay
- CSKT—Confederated Salish Kootenai Tribes
- GAO—Government Accountability Office
- GNF—Gallatin National Forest
- GP—Glenn Plumb
- GYA—Greater Yellowstone Area
- ITBC— InterTribal Bison Cooperative
- JD—Jerry Diemer
- MBoL—Montana Board of Livestock
- MDOL—Montana Department of Livestock
- ME—Mary Erickson
- MFWP—Montana Fish Wildlife and parks
- MOU—Memorandum of Understanding
- MSU—Montana State University
- MZ—Marty Zaluski
- NEPA—National Environmental Policy Act
- NGO—non-governmental organizations
- NP—Nez Perce
- NPS—National Park Service
- PF—Pat Flowers
- PIOs—Public Information Officers
- RC—Ryan Clarke
- RoD—Record of Decision
- RT—Rob Tierney
- RTR—Royal Teton Ranch
- SEIS—supplemental EIS
- SK—Salish Kootenai
- SL—Suzanne Lewis
- TM—Tom McDonald
- YNP—Yellowstone National Park

## Action items identified on November 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup>

#	Who	What	By when
1	Partners	Determine who will be the lead agency for 2011-12.	At next meeting
2	Christina K	Clarify ITBC legal status	At next meeting
3	NP, SK	Provide official response to Partner invite for the record	By next meeting
4	NP, SK, ITBC	Create 1 <sup>st</sup> draft of Partner / tribal entities MOU	By next meeting
5	Pat F, Tech Comm	Finalize RTR operations and send to Partners (does not need to be signed separately from the Nov 18 signing of 2009/10 Operations Plan; see item 11)	Dec 15
6	Becky F	Interim reports on quarantine; assure that all available reports are posted to IBMP.info	Dec 15
7	Ryan C	Invite Keith Aune to present persistence paper at next IBMP meeting	By next meeting
8	YNP, APHIS, MFWP	YNP: Have IBMP zone maps available at each meeting; APHIS: have land ownership maps available at each meeting; MFWP: have elk range maps available	By next meeting
9	Mary E, Marty Z	Mary, Marty to settle on acceptable language for Op Plan pg8 regarding MDOL travel on GNF land; potentially will likely include the following concepts: "...BoL will obtain	By Nov 20

		authorization for use of motorized vehicles on GNF lands. Authorization will include best effort to directly contact GNF personnel via the call down list. If contact is not possible, BoL is allowed to leave message stating their travel needs.”	
10	Marty Z	Incorporate language associated with item 9 into final 09/10 Operations Plan	By Nov 20
11	Marty Z	Complete MDOL change made under item 9 and route to Partners for signing (mechanics—stamp FedEx envelope “personal” to facilitate direct transfer to desired Partner signee; send first to GNF and MFWP)	Send out by Dec 1
12	Tech Committee	Potential modification of AM plan regarding AM Plan Obj 1.1/Management Action 1.1a/Management—Technical Committee to rewrite this Action in a way that adds another layer saying, effectively, “...Partners will use real time monitoring of bison movement and census to determine if trend indicates probable Horse Butte (HB) bison population of >=250 animals. If trend indicates bison populations will exceed 250, management actions to prevent the population from exceeding this threshold to stop potential zone 3 incursions will be undertaken.” Priority for this year will be 1) understand the HB populations trends and what they tell us about Zone 3 incursions, and 2) impact of management actions to GNF travel management plan (principally allowance of snowmobile access for MDOL monitoring and management actions). A third, longer term priority was also recognized—to (a) develop a strategic fencing strategy to protect private landowners and impede bison movements at key locations into zone 3 without adversely affecting other wildlife; and (b) explore opportunities for bison use of available habitat in other public land areas (See AM Plan Obj 3.2, Management Action 3.2.b)	Complete by Dec 15
13	Pat F	Talk with Tom Lemke about possibility of convening a group to look at short term habitat adjustments on the North Side before Tom retires. Pat to report to Partners on Tom’s availability. If yes, convene pertinent individuals (including Dan Tyers GNF, Mark Anderson MDOL) on the ground. If no, table until next meeting.	By Dec 15
14	Mary E	GNF takeover as lead Partner agency for 2010/11	Nov 1, 2010

## Meeting summary notes

Due to multiple facilitator activities, the notes presented are not comprehensive but hit highlights of Partner discussions. Interested parties are asked to see the IBMP web site ([www.ibmp.info](http://www.ibmp.info)) where briefings and other documents created at this meeting are posted.

### HANDOVER OF PARTNER LEADERSHIP

The Partners noted the handover of leadership from Yellowstone National Park to the Montana Department of Livestock for 2009/2010 (Nov 1-Sep 30). Leadership duties include but are not limited to production of the IBMP annual report and convening of Partner meetings. MDOL noted an intention to move the informational section from meeting start to meeting end to ensure sufficient discussion time for decision items to be addressed.

Further discussion led to the agreement by Gallatin National Forest to take on the lead Partner role for 2010/11.

### WELCOME TO TRIBAL MEMBERS; PREPARATION OF MOU

The Partners, and later the public and NGOs, welcomed three tribal entities to the deliberative table. Those entities are the Nez Perce and Confederated Salish Kootenai, two tribes with treaty hunting rights, and the InterTribal Bison Council representing 57 American Indian tribes having interest in bison issues. The Partners agreed to welcome the tribes to the table after meeting with the tribes prior to the regular August

2009 IBMP meeting. The three tribal entities are expected to take part at the deliberative table at the regular IBMP meetings from now forward.

The Partners and tribal members held a short discussion on tribal role. It was noted that the Partners operate by consensus, not by vote, so consideration of whether the tribal entities would be “given a vote” was a non-issue. It was also noted that in some instances the Partners would need to remain autonomous given their signature responsibilities under the federal ROD, (i.e., the tribes don’t share those same legal responsibilities).

Partners asked and received confirmation that the tribes would be an active part of working through issues and seeking consensus. Tom McDonald (SK), Brooklyn Baptiste (NP), and Christina Kracher (ITBC) all made positive opening remarks to the Partners highlighting their happiness at becoming part of the deliberative group for IBMP issues, and how important it was to the tribal members that they participating with the IBMP Partners.

The Partners recognized that the NP and SK had not formally responded to the Partner’s letter of invitation to join the deliberative table. Both tribes said that they would do so, thus providing a formal record of the invitation and acceptance (action item 3). The tribes also agreed to create a first draft of an MOU describing the relationship (interactions and collaborations) between the tribes and the Partners for consideration at the next IBMP meeting (action item 4).

Partners noted that for the most part being part of the group did not entail large expenditures or budgetary set asides. The group discussed the need to begin considering how to integrate tribal expertise into the IBMP Technical Committee, as well as the potential for having future IBMP meetings hosted by the tribal entities.

#### **WELCOME TO NEW LEAD FOR APHIS**

The Partners welcomed Brian McCluskey as new lead for APHIS due to the pending retirement of Jerry Diemer. All thanked Jerry for his excellent service to the group, and wished him well with future endeavors.

#### **BRIEFING ON STATUS OF RTR FENCING OPERATIONS**

Pat Flowers provided an update, which included the following points:

- Bids went out for the fencing operation last spring; MFWP hoped to have the infrastructure in place this fall
- Pat met with the Park County (PC) Commission in Aug 09; he had also met with them on the ground previously.
- PC Commission had three concerns regarding building cattle guards on county roads: 1) liability, 2) road maintenance issues, 3) that the bison coming out of the Park must all be tested and sero-negative for brucellosis
- MFWP and the PC Commission decided an MOU was needed and decided that they could find agreeable language to #1 and #2. However, Pat was unable to sign the agreement for #3 due to MFWP responsibilities under the IBMP.
- MFWP met with the RTR and came up with a new solution that did not require building cattle guards in the right-of-way for county roads. That solution includes fencing construction only on RTR and GNF land. For the new solution, bison movement beyond Yankee Jim Canyon or at Corwin Springs will be managed by people rather than cattle guards.
- New solution addresses RTR safety and property concerns. New plan for fencing protects RTR ranch offices and structures and includes a fence along the Cinnabar Road. There will no longer be a fence along the county road, nor cattle guards at Yankee Jim Canyon or the Corwin Springs bridge.
- Contract has been let. Completion is expected ~the first week of Dec.
- Marty Malone of the PC Commission was in attendance and added several comments: the PC Commission was not aware of the free-ranging bison goal in step 3 of the IBMP; all bison leaving YNP should be tested sero-negative; every producer in PC must be tested so so should the bison; and a statement/question—why aren’t the counties represented at the deliberative table?

## WINTER/SPRING OPERATIONS PLAN NORTH SIDE

### WINTER/SPRING OPERATIONS PLAN WEST SIDE

The Partners held lengthy discussion regarding upcoming operations on the West side. Discussion began Nov 17<sup>th</sup> and then were tabled and continued on the 18<sup>th</sup>.

BoL/MDOL stated that last year's West side operations, while ultimately successful, had many difficulties including repeated breeches into Zone 3. MDOL suggested that for animals >250 on Horse Butte and >20 on the Flats that they were unsuccessful at stopping Zone 3 breeches, and that with the 08/09 Operations Plan (i.e., increased tolerance) the result was more breeches in greater numbers with more animals going more deeply into Zone 3 than in past years.

MDOL requested a change in the AM Plan under *Obj. 1.1, Management Action 1.1a, Management responses*. That change would entail changing two trigger numbers in the AM plan as shown below (note gray highlighted cross out areas):

#### Management responses:

- Groups ( $\geq 1$  animal) of female/mixed bison will not be allowed in the following areas at any time of year: north of the Narrows; west of Corey Springs; or south and west of the Zone 2 boundary. Bison attempting to enter these areas will be hazed to the Horse Butte peninsula, other available habitat, captured, or if necessary, lethally removed.
- During the period from November 15 through April 15, up to ~~30~~ female bison (or a mixed group of ~~30~~ males and females) will be allowed in Zone 2 on the Madison Arm. After April 15, up to ~~30~~ female/mixed group bison will be allowed east of the Madison Arm Resort. After May 15, no female/mixed group bison will be allowed on the Madison Arm.
  - If female/mixed group bison exceed ~~30~~ animals or breach the Zone 2 perimeter on the South Fork two or more times before April 15, then this will trigger management actions to reduce risk that may include hazing, capture, testing, or lethal removal at the discretion of the State Veterinarian.
  - If female/mixed group bison exceed ~~30~~ animals or breach the Madison Arm Resort two or more times between April 15 and May 15, then this will trigger management actions to reduce risk that may include hazing, capture, testing, or lethal removal at the discretion of the State Veterinarian.
- Allow up to 40 female bison (or a mixed group of 40 males and females) north of Duck Creek and east of Corey Springs during November 15 through May 15 before management actions are instituted. The number of bison tolerated in this area may be adjusted at the discretion of the State Veterinarian based on bison behavior, environmental conditions, and other considerations.
  - If female/mixed group bison breach the perimeter described above ~~two or more~~ times before May 15, then this will trigger management actions to reduce risk that may include hazing, testing, or lethal removal at the discretion of the State Veterinarian.
  - If female/mixed group bison cross the Narrows two or more times before May 1, then this will trigger management actions to reduce risk that may include hazing, testing, or lethal removal at the discretion of the State Veterinarian. After May 1, any crossing may trigger management action.

MDOL's initial request was to change the trigger point of "30" to "0", and perimeter breeches of "two or more" to "0" and, along with these changes, allowing unlimited/untested number of bison on Horse Butte. The reasoning for this requested change was due to the a) proximity of the Flats to Zone 3, b) lack of forage in Flats area pushes bison to Zone 3, and 3) difficulties moving bison in Flats due to dense timber. MDOL provided three options for managing bison on the Flats: 1) capture and relocate; 2) haze east to YNP; 3) haze N/NE to Horse Butte.

Partner discussion included several counterpoints: 1) surprise at MDOL's request; 2) that MDOL had signed the Annual Report without this request for this AM change, 3) that some believed that MDOL already had the authority to do what they wanted. MDOL responded that this West side issue has long been under

discussion and that they did not believe that while this statutory authority exists under Montana Code Annotated, the current AM Plan does not specifically provide this option. MDOL stated a belief that that current trigger points are too lenient—i.e., by the time MDOL can act, it is too late to stop Zone 3 incursions—and thus limit their management options.

Many questions were presented and discussed regarding the issue: 1) the potential for tribal hunts on the Flats beyond February 15<sup>th</sup>, 2) the date of cattle turn out in Zone 3 areas, 3) the type of cattle (i.e., steers, cow/calf) turned out, 4) the difficulty in trying to force a migratory animal to move against desired migration patterns, 5) the recognition by all that snow conditions, overall YNP bison population, green-up date, and any number of parameters change year-to-year, and 6) recognition that carrying capacity for bison on Horse Butte is unknown but clearly not infinite.

A recurrent discussion centered on the concept that AM is supposed to be a process of learning from data and then making changes based on it versus whether 1 year of data was sufficient to make changes in the AM Plan. A statement was made that the burden of change or adaptation is always placed on the bison not on the cattle industry. A counter statement was made that MDOL had taken a major leap of faith with the Partners by going to unlimited, untested bison on Horse Butte for the 08/09 season with limited or no data. A second counter statement was made that if 1 year does not equal a trend, does 2 years? Three years? The questioner further stated that measured action to mitigate risk is appropriate.

Several scoping questions were put forth reflecting back to the intent of the IBMP: Was risk of transmission increased? Did transmission occur? Did Partners actions allow for free-ranging bison? Also, several questions were posed regarding if MDOL's request was allowable in the Operations Plan, or whether the change meant a change to the AM Plan (to later then be translated into the Operations Plan).

Further Partner discussion led to the agreed statement that MDOL's goal ultimate goal was not so much a specific trigger point(s) or dates but was to maintain Zone 3 boundary at 0 breeches.

Two compromises were presented to the MDOL proposal:

- Alternative 1—stepwise modification: Amend AM plan to replace “30” with “15” animals (in the highlighted areas above); if we continue to see > [TBD] animals breach Zone 3 then that limit will go to 0 the following year
- Alternative 2—proposed date change: Push date back from Apr15 to Apr1

Discussion of West Side Operations were tabled and then resumed on day 2. MDOL presented a new alternative (refer to excerpt from AM plan above): no change of date, replace “30” with “15”, and change “two or more” to “0”. Based on data in the 08/09 Annual Report (see chart on page 7), MDOL believes an earlier trigger date may not help Zone 3 breeches. However, MDOL (and the Partners) recognized that one possible help would be to track the trend of the bison population on Horse Butte and allowing management action before the 250 threshold was met, thereby potentially halting the cascading effect of pushing animals to the Flats and then Zone 3.

A question arose regarding MDOL's need to use snowmobiles in the Flats area if it is to be successful in monitoring and driving bison out of that area. Snowmobile use conflicts with the GNF Travel Use Plan and would require an exception to the Travel Use Plan.

As discussions continued four important ideas emerged:

1. that a critical piece of information missing is an understanding of the relationship between the # of bison on Horse Butte and the number of bison on the Flats (i.e., the likelihood that bison react to high numbers on Horse Butte by disbursing onto the Flats) (see AM Plan *Obj. 1.1, Management Action 1.1a* and *Obj. 2.1, Management Action 2.1a*);
2. a recognition that the Hebgen Basin has a limited carrying capacity—thus if the Partners choose to allow greater numbers of bison to migrate out of the Park, increased allowable habitat for bison residence will need to be identified;
3. per #2 that the need to work constructively with landowners and to consider additional protective fencing options remained (see AM Plan *Obj. 3.2, Management Action 3.2b*); and
4. the need to continue to expand the use of AM monitoring data in a non-conflict manner.

These four points led to a turn in the discussions to possibly 1) allowing MDOL to limit Flats accumulation earlier than Apr 15 (again recognizing potential need for snowmobile use in conflict with GNF Travel Management Plan); and 2) for the Partners to develop a goal of not letting the Horse Butte population grow as large as last year (due to subsequent Zone 3 incursions). The Partners agreed to charge the Technical Committee to continue the discussions based on these four points—see action item 12—with a decision on MDOL’s original and now modified proposal by Dec 15.

### **PREPARATIONS FOR SIGNING OF WINTER/SPRING OPERATIONS PLAN 2009/2010**

Operations Plan discussion began on Nov 17<sup>th</sup> but was tabled until the 18<sup>th</sup> pending Partner review of the “track changes” version of the Plan. On the 18<sup>th</sup> MDOL and YNP agreed on several minor changes that would be made to language that did not require discussion. Two changes to the Operations Plan were discussed: 1) a request from GNF to modify wording regarding the necessity and method for MDOL contact of GNF for travel onto forest land, and 2) the previously described request for AM Plan modification (and resulting Operations Plan change) by MDOL on the West Side. These two items turned into action items 9/10 and 12, respectively. Additionally, MFWP requested that on page 10 #5 to strike out that FWP will provide sampling kits for bison—thus delete #5 and renumber.

The completed Operations Plan is expected to be routed to Partners for signature by YNP by Dec 1 (action item 11).

### **INFORMATIONAL UPDATES**

Short (generally <5 min) updates were provided on a number of issues pertinent to the IBMP partners, tribal members, NGOs, and general public, as follows.

#### ***Stockgrowers Lawsuit***

No additional news available. Parties to the lawsuit are still awaiting decision on two motions: 1) summary judgment on behalf of the plaintiffs; 2) motion to dismiss on behalf of the defendants.

#### ***Environmental Organization Lawsuit***

A lawsuit was filed Nov 9 against a subset of the Partner organizations (NPS, USFS). Based on one news article, plaintiffs in the case are the Buffalo Field Campaign, Gallatin Wildlife Association, Native Ecosystems Council, Tatanka Oyate, Western Watersheds Project, the Yellowstone Buffalo Foundation, Daniel Brister, Meghan Gill, and Charles Ireston. Partners that are party to the lawsuit recognized that because the lawsuit is in active litigation their ability to interact/converse/share information with the groups suing will be severely curtailed.

#### ***USAHA Brucellosis Resolutions***

Marty Zaluski described five resolutions put forward at the US Animal Health Association meetings held in late October (resolutions can be found at <http://www.usaha.org/committees/bru/bru.shtml>):

1. A resolution supporting the federal concept of a disease surveillance area in the GYA
2. A resolution requesting that wildlife agencies of ID, MT, and WY standardize their brucellosis testing methods for elk.
3. A resolution to create a UWY research association for brucellosis.
4. A resolution to ask USDA to commit more dollars to swine brucellosis in cattle (an issue in southern states)
5. A resolution to remove brucellosis from the terrorist list.

#### ***Citizen’s Working Group (CWG) Status***

Three options were discussed for potential CWG: 1) formally charter under FACA; 2) create another government process through the state or county; 3) self-convened CWG that brings forth issues and solutions to the Partners based on common ground they have discovered.

#### ***Draft EIS for Remote Vaccination***

A draft EIS to decide whether to proceed with the implementation of remote delivery vaccination of bison within YNP has been prepared. It has three alternatives: 1) no action (i.e., hand vaccination of young, non-pregnant bison during capture operations at Stevens Creek facilities); 2) hand and remote delivery

vaccination of young non-pregnant bison, and 3) hand and remote delivery vaccination of young and adult female bison. The draft EIS has been briefed up to the Asst. Sec. of the Interior. It is expected to be released for public comment ~late winter of 2010.

One Partner made the statement that this EIS process could be a place to build a Citizens' Working Group around. The remote vaccination is one step toward moving to the IBMP step 3 and much work would then need to be done regarding future habitat opportunities.

#### ***Transfer of Quarantine Animals***

There are approximately 90 bison in the Quarantine Feasibility Study at Corwin Springs that need to be transferred by March 2010 (cohort 1) and another 40-75 bison (cohort 2) that will need to be transferred in autumn 2010 or autumn 2011 (depending on when the bison become pregnant and calve). The Quarantine Bison RFP Review Committee recommended to the Director of MFWP that 8-14 bison from cohort 1 be transferred to Wyoming State Parks (Guernsey State Park) and the remainder of the bison in cohort 1 be transferred to Turner Enterprises, Inc. These bison will be placed on the west side of the Flying D Ranch to complete the quarantine study (4-5 years), after which TEI will send the original quarantine bison plus 10-20% of their offspring to American Indian tribes (e.g., Ft. Belknap) or public lands. The remainder of the bison will be retained by TEI and could be used to increase the genetic diversity of TEI's Castle Rock bison herd in New Mexico. Cohort 2 of bison from the Quarantine Feasibility Study would be transferred to Ft. Belknap contingent on them completing adequate infrastructure for quarantine, dispensing of their current herd (if necessary), and agreeing to accept the bison.

#### ***Discussion on Permit Request for Bull Semen Study***

A proposal was made by Jack Ryan of APHIS to find if bull bison can shed Brucella. This study will be done at Horse Butte and the National Elk Refuge; not in the park.

#### ***Discussion on Short Term Habitat Opportunities***

This meeting did not happen so there was nothing to report on. The Partners turned this into action item #13.

### **FUTURE IBMP PARTNER MEETING PLANNING**

The following these dates were reserved for 2010 IBMP meetings:

- April 14/15, 2010; in Bozeman; host MFWP
- Aug 11/12, 2010; in Helena; host MDOL
- Nov 30/Dec1, 2010; in Polson; host SK

All meetings will take place between noon of the first day until noon of the second day.

## **Selected comments from public**

---

The notes on comments are not intended to be complete, but rather reflect the facilitator's best effort to capture key statements.

### **NOVEMBER 17<sup>TH</sup>**

- Statement in support of PC Commission
- Request that Partners change AM for RTR bison to say tested sero-negative
- Statement that a bison departing YNP to the north will not stop but continue north onto other ranchlands
- Statement that the first brucellosis meetings were held in 1951 and that they had real management practices back then and were within 3 years of eradicating brucellosis
- Statement that the AM plan is no plan
- Question—what will happen if we have a winter like that in 1947-8 when all the animals came out of the Park?
- Statement that meetings should be held in Emigrant because those folks have a lot at stake.
- Concern stated that all of these American \$s are being lost worrying about 1 or 2 animals.



- Statement that a father had undulant fever and that it was shocking.
- Statement that taking the Flats population of bison to 0 will not solve the problem.
- Question—with hazing where will the animals go? If the answer is capture and slaughter we will lose much.
- Question—are quarantine research interim papers available?
- Question—How much is an animal worth? What is the cost of the quarantine program?
- Welcome to tribal members.
- Disappointment in removal of the persistence discussion from the agenda as this is critical to the discussion.
- Statement that we also need to consider livestock beyond cattle (mules, horses, etc)
- Statement that the Partners' goal should be transmissions = 0, not 0 breeches into Zone 3.
- Request that maps always be displayed at IBMP meetings, including showing how many livestock owners there are in affected regions.
- Statement about diverting budgets to give to landowners.
- Statement that brucellosis came from European cattle and is not a bison issue but a cattle issue.
- Welcome to tribal members who have thousands of years of bison experience.
- Main issue is habitat, habitat, habitat. Make Zone 3 the ranches and open up GNF—there is plenty of available habitat because of fire. Then put manpower around these Zone 3 cattle.
- Statement that Bar N (?) Ranch does not have cattle and wants bison.
- Statement that the Partners are still not letting bison be bison. They need quiet when having babies.
- Request to submit future comments visually.
- Welcome to tribal members.
- Thanks for discussion on the West Side.
- Statement that there are lots of variables and thus Partners should not make decisions based on one year's data.
- Statement that in 08/09 the IBMP goal of no transmission was met and request that Partners should put more focus on goal of wild, free-ranging bison.
- Statement that there is fertile ground for Citizens' Working Group to operate in and that three topics of great interest might be: 1) interest in bison on the RTR; 2) planning for cattle type on lands adjacent to Zone 2; 3) methods for preventing transmission

## NOVEMBER 18<sup>TH</sup>

- Statement that the deck is stacked at the deliberative table against the livestock industry and that it appears that AM only goes one way.
- Statement that County Commission representatives should be added to the deliberative table.
- Question: How many Native American bison traps are there in YNP (inference that there are none)? Though there are 3000 there today. How did that happen if no bison traps?
- Statement that I own the land and managers are the leasee.
- Statement that the #1 goal is to take care of YNP which has not been done in the last 41 years.
- Statement that it is ludicrous to ignore the larger issue, which is elk.
- Question—how large a landscape is needed to preserve a wild bison herd in SW MT?
- Request that maps for future meetings include winter range areas of three game management areas: Wall Creek, Dome Mtn, Gallatin.
- Statement that article in Bugle Magazine 2009 has a workable roadmap to solutions including phasing out feed grounds in WY since there is an unbroken chain from there to winter feed grounds elsewhere.
- Statement that after transfer of quarantined bison to the Wind River reservation fell through there was surprise in the limited interest for these animals. Statement of concern that what we learned from this process be applied to future years.

- Statement that NRDC would love to help on fencing to help create a solution on the Flats. This is an incredible opportunity!
- Statement that NRDC really wants to be involved in the Citizens' Working Group with desire that they be some sort of "official" sanction to legitimize the process.
- Statement of confusion about management actions on the south side.
- Statement that if you let MDOL use snowmobiles the public will follow these tracks.
- Statement that BFC would help with fence scoping and building.
- Thanks to SL and ME for talking about other options in CWG.
- Statement to keep twin goals of IBMP in mind and recognition that fencing could help this process.
- Statement that bison in MT is a bigger issue than just YNP and statewide focus is also important.
- Statement that until you treat the buffalo as buffalo, nothing will be solved since buffalo don't know about corridors, that they will go to the south side for new growth.
- Question—why can't we bring in cattle later? Why won't the stockmen budge an inch?
- Statement that IBMP Partners only represent that cattle industry.
- Statement that quarantined bison should not go to Turner.
- Statement that American public wants wild buffalo.
- Statement that the IBMP is already failed due to focus on bison not elk.
- Welcome to Native Americans.

### **Planning for Next IBMP Meeting, including Past "Parked" Items**

---

The following items are expected to be part of the agenda for the next meeting of the IBMP Partners on Aug 11/12, 2010:

- Results of action items from Nov 17/18, 2009 meeting
- Report from Keith Aune on a paper describing the re-analysis of persistence data
- Concept of adding County Commissioners to the deliberative table at each IBMP meeting and/or for County Commissioners to head up Citizens' Working Group
- Status of state-chartered (or otherwise) Citizens' Working Group
- Setting agenda for Aug 11/12 meeting
- Discussion of the next RFP (timing, cost, making process easier, determining barriers if no adequate proposals are submitted) for quarantined bison and potentially helping groups with their proposals
- Public suggested that the Partners invite a MFWP talk on elk movements in SW MT.
- Public suggested a presentation on the status of the MT State Bison Plan.

The following items were "parked" by the Partners to be considered during future meetings:

- From previous meetings:
  - How can Partners reach out more effectively to communicate the requirements and timing of RFP opportunities for tribes and other entities to take possession of quarantined bison? APHIS may be able to help groups write their proposals.
  - Partners need to have a discussion on their authority to transfer bison to the tribes (statement made during discussion of August 11<sup>th</sup> ITBC meeting).
  - Formalize revised Zone 2 map on the North Side as developed by Partner staff on a field visit November 20, 2008. This is to be part of next year's AM plan—i.e., moving Zone 2 line to more reasonable on-the-ground conditions.