

IBMP Responsibility Matrix for CWG Recommendations; Draft 082412—SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Table 1.—Summary of Partner decisions on CWG recommendations from 050112 IBMP meeting. Details for these items follow in Table 2. See [meeting report](#) on [ibmp.info](#) for discussion.

Habitat Expansion / Effectiveness		Population Management (PM)		Risk Reduction	
CWG rec# for this category	Partner Decision	CWG rec# for this category	Partner Decision	CWG rec# for this category	Partner Decision
1	Accept	1	Same as/see Habitat 3di	1	Same as/see PM 13
2	Accept	2	Same as/see Habitat 1, 3e	2	Reject
3ai	3ai) Accept Horse Butte	3a	Accept	3	Same as/see PM 14
	3ai) Reject Flats				
3aii	Reject	3b	Accept*	4	Accept (see PM 13)
3aiii	Accept as rewritten*	3c	Accept	5	Same as/see PM 15
3bi	Accept	3d	Accept*	6	Accept
3bii	Accept	3e	Accept	7	Reject
3biii	No decision, but keep alive	3f	Accept	8	Cannot make decision
	Reject				
3ci	Reject	4	Accept	9	Same as/see PM15
3cii	Reject	5a-f	Accept (remove word "analysis" from CWG statement)	10	Same as/see PM 2; Habitat 1, 3e
3di	Accept	6a	Accept		
3dii	Accept	6b	Reject*		
3e	Same as/see Habitat 1	6c	Accept*		
		6d	Accept*		
		7	Reject		
		8	Accept*		
		9	Accept		
		10	Accept		
		11	Accept*; see notes from 050112 meeting		
		12	Accept		
		13	Accept, defer further effort until SOlsen talk		
		14	Accept*		
		15	Accept		
		16	Accept		

IBMP Responsibility Matrix for CWG Recommendations; Draft 082412—SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Table 2.—Decisions on CWG recommendations by the IBMP Partners as of 050112 meeting (see [meeting report](#) on ibmp.info for discussion).

CWG rec#	Recommendation	Partner Decision	Proposed lead	Notes	Lead Personnel	Timeline
Habitat Expansion / Effectiveness (H)						
1	Identify public lands that could / should be open to bison year-round in accordance with state and federal law.	Accept	MFWP USFS	MFWP (lead) USFS (support/habitat)	Julie Cunningham Karen Loveless Jodie Canfield	As determined by MFWP
2	Systematically identify suitable, available habitat outside Yellowstone National Park in the Greater Yellowstone Area (i.e., Federal, State and Private lands)	Accept	MFWP USFS	MFWP (lead) USFS (support/habitat)	Julie Cunningham Karen Loveless Jodie Canfield	As determined by MFWP
3ai	Develop and implement strategies that manage bison as wildlife on those lands, specifically: a. <u>Hebgen Basin</u> i. Designate Horse Butte Peninsula and the Flats as year-round bison habitat by May 2012 following an adequate public process for this management change.	3ai) Accept Horse Butte	CWG	---	Rebecca Cooper	Begin EA coping in May and complete by Dec 31, 2012
3aii	ii. By the end of 2012, interview and map landowners to identify where bison are welcome, unwelcome, which landowners are on the fence and what their reservations are.	3ai) Reject Flats		---	---	---

IBMP Responsibility Matrix for CWG Recommendations; Draft 082412—SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Table 2.—Decisions on CWG recommendations by the IBMP Partners as of 050112 meeting (see [meeting report](#) on ibmp.info for discussion).

CWG rec#	Recommendation	Partner Decision	Proposed lead	Notes	Lead Personnel	Timeline
3aiii	iii. By the end of 2013, implement adequate fencing or acceptable alternatives.	3aiii) Accept as rewritten*	MFWP MDOL	3aiii: Reject as is, but Accept as rewritten to say, “Investigate and come to conclusion on feasibility of fencing or acceptable alternatives on the Flats to prevent co-mingling with private livestock.”	Julie Cunningham	
3bi	a. <u>Gardiner Basin</u> i. By the end of 2012, interview and map landowners to identify where bison are welcome, unwelcome, which landowners are on the fence and what their reservations are.	3bi) Accept	3bi) & 3bii) NGOs with MFWP support	Partially complete (see Sam S) NGOs operating under the “2012 Yellowstone Bison Coexistence Project” are Horse Butte Neighbors of Buffalo (HOBNOB), Yellowstone Basin Inn, Defenders of Wildlife, Greater Yellowstone Coalition (GYC), Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), and Sierra Club	NGOs (MFWP plays support role)	In progress
3bii	ii. By the end of 2013, implement adequate fencing or acceptable alternatives.	3bii) Accept				
3biii	iii. Following the interview process and implementation of fencing/alternative strategies, consider designating the Gardiner Basin year-round habitat using an adequate public process.	3biii) No decision, but keep alive	CWG	3biii will be kept alive pending State of MT EA outcome	pending	pending

IBMP Responsibility Matrix for CWG Recommendations; Draft 082412—SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Table 2.—Decisions on CWG recommendations by the IBMP Partners as of 050112 meeting (see [meeting report](#) on ibmp.info for discussion).

CWG rec#	Recommendation	Partner Decision	Proposed lead	Notes	Lead Personnel	Timeline
3ci	Develop and implement strategies that manage bison as wildlife on those lands, specifically: a. <u>Beyond the Gardiner Basin</u> i. Based on a minimum of two years of bison experience in the Gardiner Basin, and	3ci) Reject	---	---	---	---
3cii	ii. Using adequate public process, consider allowing bison to roam on Dome Mountain Ranch, Dome Mountain Wildlife Management Area and surrounding lands with landowner concurrence.	3cii) Reject	---	---	---	---
3di	Develop and implement strategies that manage bison as wildlife on those lands, specifically: a. <u>Upper Gallatin/Taylor Fk/CabinCreek/ Porcupine/ Buffalo Horn Creek, etc.</u> i. Begin a public process to evaluate opportunities for reintroduction and management of bison in this area, including within Yellowstone NP.	3di) Accept	MFWP USFS MDOL	MFWP (lead) USFS (support/habitat) MDOL (support/livestock)	Rebecca Cooper Jodie Canfield Cavan Fitzsimmons Marty Zaluski	Begin EA coping in May and complete by Dec 31, 2012
3dii	ii. Start work to amend/alter State and Federal Management Plans and other decisions to account for the presence of bison on the landscape and take responsibility/be accountable for successfully implementing those plans regarding bison.	3dii) Accept	MFWP	Same as/see Habitat 1	Rebecca Cooper	Pending outcome of EA

IBMP Responsibility Matrix for CWG Recommendations; Draft 082412—SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Table 2.—Decisions on CWG recommendations by the IBMP Partners as of 050112 meeting (see [meeting report](#) on ibmp.info for discussion).

CWG rec#	Recommendation	Partner Decision	Proposed lead	Notes	Lead Personnel	Timeline	
3e	---	Same as H1	---	---			
Population Management (PM)							
1	---	Same as H3di	---	---			
2	---	Same as H1, H3e	---	---			
3a	<p>(a) Make hunting a bigger component of bison management and consider different seasons or other opportunities to increase the impact of hunting. (b) Outside the Park, the main means for controlling bison abundance and distribution should be state-administered and tribal hunting. Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks should test new methods for dispersing hunting in time and space. (c) A late-winter hunt for yearlings only should be tested for hunter interest and public acceptance. (d) “Depredation” hunts should be available throughout the year and used to manage bison distribution. (e) Other means of population control should include fencing bison out of areas where they are not welcome, and (f) using fire, fertilizers or other habitat management to attract bison to areas where they are welcome. (b) Lethal removal by agency personnel should be a last resort. *Note: labels (a) – (e) added by subcommittees</p>	3a) Accept	<p>3(a-d) MFWP NP CSKT</p>	PAT—FOR ALL OF THESE, WHO SHOULD BE LISTED FOR MFWP; I SUSPECT WE CAN PUT IN KEITH LAWRENCE FOR NP? ALSO TIMELINES?	<p>CSKT-McDonald</p>	<p>On-going CSKT-annually</p>	
3b		3b) Accept*					
3c		3c) Accept					
3d		3d) Accept*					
3e		3e) Accept		3e) MDOL			
3f		3f) Accept	3f) USFS	Leaders of initial assessment work shown	Cavan Fitzsimmons Ron Hecker	Opportunities to be identified over the coming year	

IBMP Responsibility Matrix for CWG Recommendations; Draft 082412—SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Table 2.—Decisions on CWG recommendations by the IBMP Partners as of 050112 meeting (see [meeting report](#) on ibmp.info for discussion).

CWG rec#	Recommendation	Partner Decision	Proposed lead	Notes	Lead Personnel	Timeline
4	Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks and the Tribes hunting Yellowstone bison should work more closely together to set collective hunt targets and to document the hunting success numbers.	Accept	MFWP NP CSKT	---	Pat Flowers CSKT-McDonald	On-going CSKT-annually
5a-f	<p>5a-5f*.—Agree on and establish a target population range that is biologically and ecologically acceptable and accounts for a variety of public interests. As Interagency Bison Management Partners, agree on criteria for evaluating and determining a population range and appropriate management tools, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Winter range outside the Park (target population range could change to reflect changes in habitat availability), b. Risk factors, c. Individual agency management mandates, constraints and responsibilities (such as the NPS’s mandate to manage its resources unimpaired for future generation and its natural regulation policy), d. Genetic diversity, population structure and demographics, reproduction, and distribution, e. Realistic opportunity for addressing private land owners’ concerns, and f. Hunting and wildlife viewing opportunities. 	Accept (remove word “analysis” from CWG written statement in 050112 meeting)	Partners	<p>(5a-f) Accept as rewritten to say, “The Partners will use 5(a-f) in future population number determination using 3000 as a guideline, not a target.”</p> <p>050112: Partners: We have interest in this concept and support a peer reviewed study of literature of bison population and genetic viability. The Partners explicitly stated that they were supporting a literature review, not an “analysis” as described in the CWG note shown directly above.</p>	CSKT-Gillin	

IBMP Responsibility Matrix for CWG Recommendations; Draft 082412—SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Table 2.—Decisions on CWG recommendations by the IBMP Partners as of 050112 meeting (see [meeting report](#) on [ibmp.info](#) for discussion).

CWG rec#	Recommendation	Partner Decision	Proposed lead	Notes	Lead Personnel	Timeline
6a	When bison have to be removed because of high migration numbers, management constraints, safety, etc., the priorities should be (in order):	6a) Accept	6a) MFWP	On-going	Pat Flowers	On-going
6b	a. Hunting outside the park,	6b) Reject*	6b) ---	---	---	---
6c	b. Moving them to nearby appropriate available lands,	6c) Accept*	6c) NPS MDOL APHIS	---	NPS-R Wallen APHIS-Clarke, Frey	NPS-1 yr to develop plan
6d	c. Translocation from the Yellowstone area (capture, quarantine, transport and release), and	6d) Accept*	6d) MDOL	---		
	d. Lethal removal by managing agencies.					
7	Quarantine should be economically justified in comparison with other means of producing Brucella-free Yellowstone bison for conservation purposes.	Reject	CWG	---	---	---
8	In order to locate bison to lands elsewhere, Montana should develop and implement a translocation process for bison leaving quarantine. The quarantine process should minimize infrastructure requirements for places receiving bison.	Accept*	MFWP MDOL APHIS NPS	Accept with the following modification to the second line: “The quarantine process should use the minimum containment infrastructure necessary for places receiving bison.”	NPS-R Wallen APHIS-Clarke, Frey	NPS-1 year to develop plan (implementation will take longer)
9	Determining where bison completing quarantine will go and <i>how</i> they will be restored and conserved on the landscape, with the highest priority on managing them as public and tribal wildlife, must precede capturing bison and implementing quarantine. Recipients of quarantined bison must be identified and an acceptable, appropriate translocation	Accept	MFWP NPS	---	NPS-R Wallen	NPS- at least 3 years (until Montana State-wide bison plan is completed)

IBMP Responsibility Matrix for CWG Recommendations; Draft 082412—SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Table 2.—Decisions on CWG recommendations by the IBMP Partners as of 050112 meeting (see [meeting report](#) on [ibmp.info](#) for discussion).

CWG rec#	Recommendation	Partner Decision	Proposed lead	Notes	Lead Personnel	Timeline
	process must be in place prior to quarantining Yellowstone bison. This determination of where bison will go should be integrated with all Fish, Wildlife and Parks or other assessments of relocation possibilities for wild bison in Montana.					
10	Bison translocation and bison movement should not include moving seropositive animals outside the current DSA, and may preclude relocating seropositive animals to new areas within the DSA with the intent of establishing new herd ranges. The intent is to avoid establishing new sources of disease and new disease risks to cattle.	Accept	MDOL			
11	Hazing of bulls should be minimized, unless there are issues with property damage or safety, because they are not a factor in the issue of brucellosis transmission. Hazing of newborn calves should be minimized for humane reasons.	Accept*	MDOL MFWP	See notes from 050112 meeting for discussion on this recommendation	Sam Shepperd	On-going
12	Discuss expected adverse weather events (similar to fire management) and work with involved entities (public and private) to develop and agree on contingency plans.	Accept	Partners	---	Partner Lead CSKT-McDonald	On-going
13	Develop and work with the livestock industry to implement an effective cattle vaccine and protocol to reduce the risk of transmission and make bison presence/translocation more acceptable. Support/secure funding for ongoing vaccine research.	Accept, defer possible action/further discussion until Steve Olsen talk	APHIS MDOL	Ryan Clark to invite Dr. Olsen to give talk; this item becomes part of the IBMP meeting following Dr. Clark's talk	Ryan Clark	ASAP given Dr. Olsen's availability

IBMP Responsibility Matrix for CWG Recommendations; Draft 082412—SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Table 2.—Decisions on CWG recommendations by the IBMP Partners as of 050112 meeting (see [meeting report](#) on ibmp.info for discussion).

CWG rec#	Recommendation	Partner Decision	Proposed lead	Notes	Lead Personnel	Timeline
14	Lobby for removing the significant barriers that exist for <i>Brucella abortus</i> research because of the select agent listing.	Accept*	MFWP (Lead Partner)	On-going, letter drafted to Congressional delegation	Pat Flowers	ASAP
15	Develop and implement a strong, factual education component so an informed public is involved in the discussions.	Accept	MFWP (Lead Partner)	On-going, but not certain of form this should take	Andrea Jones	Begin May 2012
16	Outside the Park, hazing and removals should be minimized in selected, suitable areas to establish year-round populations of Montana bison. This approach should be pursued incrementally in a “learn as we go” fashion. This will be a public process that identifies the boundaries of the area and a contingency plan if bison leave that area.	Accept	MDOL MFWP USFS	USFS—we are not really part of this decision on hazing/ removals only on aspects of suitable habitat (covered under habitat expansion recommendations)		
Risk Reduction (RR)						
1	---	Same as PM 13	---	---	---	---
2	Work with livestock industry to work toward adoption of mandatory statewide Official Calfhood Vaccination (OCV).	Reject	---	---	---	---
3	---	Same as PM 14	---	---	---	---
4	(a) Strongly encourage continued funding and research to develop a practical test on live animals to distinguish between infected and resistant animals. (b) Given the epidemiological importance of building ‘herd immunity,’ it is important to develop the tools to allow us to stop managing animals as if seropositive is equivalent to ‘infectious.’ * Note: labels (a), (b) added by Partners	Accept (see PM 13) but defer possible action/further discussion until Steve Olsen talk	4a) --- 4b) APHIS, NPS (secondary lead)	Partners originally rejected (a) and accepted (b). At the 050112 meeting they agreed to defer this recommendation until Dr. Olsen’s talk. Ryan Clark to invite Dr. Olsen to give talk; this item becomes part of the IBMP meeting following Dr. Clark’s talk	b) NPS-R Wallen	NPS-up to 3 years

IBMP Responsibility Matrix for CWG Recommendations; Draft 082412—SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Table 2.—Decisions on CWG recommendations by the IBMP Partners as of 050112 meeting (see [meeting report](#) on ibmp.info for discussion).

CWG rec#	Recommendation	Partner Decision	Proposed lead	Notes	Lead Personnel	Timeline
5	---	Same as PM 15	---	---	---	---
6	Reduce livestock/wildlife interactions at key seasons. This will include building upon and improving techniques already in use as well testing and application of other innovations (e.g. strategic hazing using low-stress animal handling methods; targeted fencing; guard dogs to keep wildlife off feedlines/haystacks/calving areas; trained dogs to locate fetal material to enable cleanup, and so forth).	Accept add elk to discussion re: state elk/bruc outcomes	CWG	Partners accept this recommendation but state that they cannot be the lead for the work. USFS—agree conceptually to looking for more creative approaches; need for private partnerships that might include NGOs (e.g., WCS)		
7	Reduce artificial concentrations of animals (elk or bison) that may be exacerbating transmission. This principle applies to a variety of locations, and will require a variety of implementation strategies (e.g. at Stephens Creek where bison are intermittently confined; on private lands with restricted hunting where elk congregate; bison crowding in/near the Park; Wyoming feed grounds).	Reject artificial concentration concept (St. Creek) Accept add elk to discussion re: state elk/bruc plan outcomes	CWG			
8	Remote vaccination of wild bison using the current vaccine and delivery method as a means of reducing risk of transmission should not be a priority at this time.	Cannot make decision	In progress	EIS is in progress. Partners cannot make a declaration of intent on this CWG Recommendation as it would be pre-decisional to the EIS.	In progress	Pending
9	---	(See PM15)	---	---	---	---
10	---	Same as PM 2; H1, H3e	---	---	---	---