

**Summary from
Interagency Bison Management Plan Meeting
August 28-29, 2008**

**Submitted 9-1-08 by Nedra Chandler, Facilitator
Cadence, Inc. (cadence@montana.com)**

The following summary reflects key points of information exchange, points of partner agreement, and perspectives offered during the comment periods when Agency Partners invited comments from observers. The meeting was held at Mammoth School in Yellowstone National Park, from noon to 5 pm on 8-28 and 8:30 am to noon on 8-29. Sections 1-4 encompass main outcomes/results from the meeting and sections 5-9 follow the agenda sequentially.

Additional (procedural) notes from Nedra Chandler, Cadence: this summary is one work product in support of the agency partners process at this time. It is not an end in itself, but one of the elements to support partner agencies toward agreement on operational changes for the 08-09 season, and, after that, further, long-term adaptive management changes to make over time.

Given the importance of making meeting summaries timely and useful to feed next steps, and share with interested people, the summaries will be posted to www.IBMP.info as soon as possible after each meeting, unreviewed. Any errors or mischaracterizations are the responsibility of Cadence, Inc., and may be corrected, as needed, through acknowledgement in subsequent meeting summaries or through other communications if necessary.

Cadence Code of conduct: Cadence acknowledges that whatever the source of funds that pay our fees along the way, we strive to be fairly and appropriately attentive to *all* parties (governmental and non-governmental) with a stake in the outcomes -- within the real limits and opportunities that exist at the moment. We do not advocate for any particular interest or outcome and we strive to be free from favoritism or bias by word or action. We are forthright about our backgrounds and associations, and we are transpartisan. For more information about Cadence or our approach, please email cadence@montana.com.

Contents

I. Purpose of This Meeting/Partners Present/Observers.....	2
II. (New) Points of Partner Joint Agreement (from this Meeting)	2
III. Immediate Next Steps/Accountability.....	3
IV. What Stands Out for Partners in Accomplishments from Today	4
V. Remarks from Nez Perce Tribal Government	4
VI. Available Spatial/Other Data on What Has Changed Since 2000.....	5
VII. Briefing Materials/Other Data Shared by Partner Agencies.....	6
VIII. Agency Partners Joint Charting – “what are our objectives for bison in the west management area?”	7
IX. Perspectives Offered by Observers (both days)	9
Summary Attachment.....	12

I. Purpose of This Meeting/Partners Present/Observers

IBMP partners are: Jerry Diemer (APHIS), Mary Erickson (Gallatin National Forest), Pat Flowers (Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks), Suzanne Lewis (National Park Service, Yellowstone National Park), Christian Mackay (Montana Board of Livestock), and Marty Zaluski (Montana Department of Livestock). All were present. Staff members from partner organizations were present each day; and approximately 8 to 25 observers were present at various times over the two days (governmental and non-governmental observers).

Agency partners concurred with the following description of the main purposes of this meeting – the two most important success indicators for this meeting:

1. Continue to shed light on the **picture** of what has changed since 2000. Why? To make headway into what **adaptive management changes** the partners are really going to be able to make in 08-09.
2. Leave with growing sense of the potential areas where the partners can make meaningful changes in the IBMP. Near term especially. Long term too.

Agency partners also affirmed the facilitator's opening descriptions of expectations on the current process and the partners' view (as of last week's check in calls with each partner) on their shared view of "success by December 2008" (see six Cadence powerpoint slides on IBMP.info). Partners each said some version of the following three main things they want to accomplish by December:

- Agreement on changes to operational plan for 08-09 that shows how we'll measure & monitor progress toward objectives.
- Reasonable, appropriate, doable responses to GAO criticisms.
- Understand our partner approach to what is acceptable risk – then, move toward changes can we make in our tolerance for bison outside the park.

II. (New) Points of Partner Joint Agreement (from this Meeting)

In addition to a list of procedural agreements listed in section III below, the partners affirmed four new substantial points of agreement between and among them during this meeting including:

- Partners have **agreement on their 9-step model for adaptive management**. It is a slightly-revised excerpt from Williams, B.K., R.C. Szaro, and C.D Shapiro. 2007. *Adaptive Management: the U.S. Department of the Interior Technical Guide*. Adaptive Management Working Group, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington DC (p. 53):

-- Set-up phase --

Step 1 – **Stakeholder involvement** (ensure stakeholder commitment to adaptively manage the enterprise for its duration)

Step 2 – **Objectives** (identify clear, measurable, and agreed-upon management objective to guide decision making and evaluate management effectiveness over time.

Step 3 – **Management actions** (identify a set of potential management actions for decision making)

Step 4 – **Expected results/Predicted outcomes** (note: this is a slightly different label than the one in the technical guide source where this step is labeled "models")

Step 5 – **Monitoring plans** (design and implement a monitoring plan to track resource status and other key resource attributes)

-- Iterative phase --

Step 6 – **Decision making** (select management actions based on management objectives, resource conditions, and enhanced understanding)

- Step 7 – **Follow-up monitoring** (use monitoring to track system responses to management actions)
 Step 8 – **Assessment** (improve understanding of resource dynamics by comparing predicted vs. observed change in resource status)
 Step 9 – **Iteration** (cycle back to Step 6 and, less frequently, to Step 1)

- Partners have **working agreement on six main action arenas – the consensus exists in how they jointly characterized the arenas for possible operations management changes they may take in 08-09 season for the west management area**. The arenas include:
 - 1) increase tolerance for bison outside the park
 - 2) population conservation
 - 3) prevent disease transmission
 - 4) utilize capable habitat
 - 5) use hunt as a management tool
 - 6) use strategies for working with landowners and others (beyond existing)

The first **three** listed -- increasing tolerance, population conservation, and preventing disease transmission -- are the ones the partners identified as “most urgent areas for changes in 08-09.”

- Partners also identified the following “**overarching tenets**” that may extend to all management areas and management objectives. They are: to “balance economic viability values” and to “maintain confidence in trading partners.” The group agreed they wanted these tenets captured, but the tenets are not yet refined for use in the new operations plan for 08-09.
- The partners **agree that a joint surveillance & monitoring plan will be necessary to address the important, long term need for sustainable research and monitoring**. The group wants to come back to discuss partner ideas for funding strategies, cost sharing, and commitments later -- after partners get agreement on the 08-09 operating plan.

III. Immediate Next Steps/Accountability

	Task/Action	Notes/Accountability	By When
1	Partners conference call to affirm their plan for their September 8-9 meeting (and adjust as needed) with Scott Bischke.	Nedra will call Scott 8-29 to let Scott know and see if he’s available. Same call-in number as last time.	Scheduled: 4 pm, 9-2-08.
2	Post summaries from first two meetings, as well as agendas for the first three to IBMP.info	Steve Merritt, Department of Livestock	As soon as possible before 9-5-08
3	Must do for partners: write objectives. Between now and Sept. 8, each partner will take the 3 most urgent arenas for action (potential changes for 08-09 season) and write specific, measurable, management objectives associated with each. Each partner agency will do this from the perspective of shared partner interests as much as possible (also remaining true to each partner agency’s most important interests and mandates that must be met).	Each partner agreed to do this. Agency partners acknowledged that ideally they would have had time to share these drafts with each other before they see each other, but given short time frame to next meeting, that won’t be likely.	9-8-08 meeting day 1.

	Task/Action	Notes/Accountability	By When
4	Provide context for risk comparisons of prevalence of Brucellosis in park bison 2000-2008	NPS will bring this to the next meeting (PJ)	Available by 9-8-08
5	Create big map(s) on plotter that show this layered information the partners need to reach agreement on 08-09 operations plan. One big need for next meeting is to map where we know bison have gone and want to be.	APHIS will be lead on this. Marty, Ryan, Becky, and Marna will get clarity about what's different about this next round of maps from what the group already has, and clear about the outer perimeters.	Central common information base for next meeting on 9-8 and 9-9.

IV. What Stands Out for Partners in Accomplishments from Today

+ What went well	▲ What could be improved in future
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good brainstorming – organized lots of thoughts into workable categories. ▪ Helps us see the same issues are on our minds – this breaks down barriers between us, shows our shared interests. ▪ We understand there will be unintended consequences of some actions – we share concern about these. ▪ We recognize some accommodations need to be made to recognize Horse Butte is no longer populated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We STILL have to do the dive. We keep getting up to the edge of the board, know what kind of dive, have to execute it. ▪ There's no real new information here.

V. Remarks from Nez Perce Tribal Government

Mike Lopez, legal counsel for the Nez Perce, offered opening remarks (the first of several from each Nez Perce attendee) to the partners focused on three main points:

- 1) Buffalo have been essential to bands of Nez Perce for subsistence and spiritual purposes. The Nez Perce have treaty rights (from 1855) and the ability to harvest buffalo here.
- 2) The Nez Perce are here today (the Tribal Chairman, the Chair of Fish and Wildlife Commission, and a conservation chief) to foster a relationship with the partner agencies – perhaps a moderate, phased approach to integrate the Nez Perce voice in the deliberative approach -- commenting on the efficacy of the partners work over time. Tribal involvement could improve the problem solving and the transparency.
- 3) The Nez Perce are pleased with the harvest, grateful for the ship and slaughter program (although the tribe would rather hunt these animals), and appreciative of the opportunity to address the partner agencies today.

VI. Available Spatial/Other Data on What Has Changed Since 2000

Marna Daley and Marion Cherry of the U.S. Forest Service Gallatin National Forest led this segment with assistance from other partner agency staff present, especially Dr. Ryan Clark, APHIS and P.J. White, NPS Yellowstone Park. Segments were organized under four areas including:

- a) Landscape changes
- b) Bison biology
- c) Land management/direction changes
- d) The disease

In addition, several brief reports out were given by agency partners on what each agency monitors and tracks. These reports are all on the IBMP.info site by name.

Please see especially:

1) IBMP Changes 2000-2008

(a few user notes: Cc means “cow/calf.” Definitions Forest Service uses: “Capable” bison habitat means biological capacity of the land. “Suitability” is determined by ownership, social/political acceptance and other factors.)

2) Surveillance Plan for Bison – Yellowstone National Park

Overview of partner and staff questions and comments:

- Very little ownership change, but land ownership percentages among private and public land is about the same since 2000
- How long are those active permits for? (10-year permits.)
- West side – snapshot: 8 operators in 2000, 6 in 2008
- Royal Teton Ranch changes are tentative and on the horizon
- What’s the expected publication date for study on pathogenesis? Soon, and it will be a peer reviewed journal article
- Regarding the study, we found expectations for how long after you set out fetuses you can still culture for bacteria – varies a lot and has to do with UV light and temperature gradation
- Fair amount of uncertainty regarding sterility, if you get into permanent sterility, there are ethics concerns
- No contraception going on in the park, and not something that’s part of the IBMP. Don’t leave here thinking there’s contraception on bison in the park or Yellowstone bison adjacent to Yellowstone
- What’s sero conversion? What are you looking for in that research? (Ryan responded, e.g., these animals are tested, blood sample taken, the animals not killed, component of blood is taken, then battery of tests performed.) Those tests measure other small components of the antibody reaction. Those supplementary tests show when we may have infected animal. Culture done when pregnant bison are calving. After they calve, we immobilize them and swab from vagina, eyes and milk. The other way to get culture samples is the way we did it this winter – went to slaughter house and took tissues. If infected with Brucellosis abortus, tissue is one place where infection hides out
- What are the herd management practices in place? E.g., many don’t realize how many producers DO vaccinate with RB 51. (Those producers in zone 2 are the ones APHIS has had the most interaction with, all those vaccinate their calves. They are offered adult vaccination, some have taken us up on it, some not.) Basically their operations are cow calf, generally they don’t run steers, for the most part, they are producing a calf every year
- Their willingness to change the way they raise cattle seems to be based on factors such as pastures, family tradition, cattle market price, and willingness to change and look at new avenues

- Is it accurate to say of private livestock in zone 2, 100 percent are vaccinated? (yes, female calves)
- Is it law? No, it's voluntary. At least there's no state law to do it, but the IBMP says there is always the option of state veterinarian saying it's necessary (if no compliance) – so could be required through state veterinarian
- On the west side: what about the ones in zone 2 or within 2 miles of zone 2? They are cow calf operations for the most part, but generally standard Montana cow producers -- bringing in cow calf pairs to summer pasture and leaving them there. For various reasons they didn't participate in adult vaccination. The calves are vaccinated, but understand: if born in spring, may not be vaccinated until fall because at the time they were handled (in the spring), they may have been too young
- Say more about the public allotments north and west. Generally allotments were out of zone 2, generally out of zone 2, except for Horse Butte. Now those public allotments that are not closed, are outside zone 2
- When Horse Butte was active, was there a requirement for vaccination on those? Yes, coming from Idaho
- So nothing has changed regarding official vaccination since 2000 regarding vaccination for age eligible animals? No

Some of the partner and staff questions and comments on Surveillance Plan for Bison:

- We (NPS) saw extensive sets of work we feel we need to be carrying out. We don't get funded to do this kind of work. This will require sustainable funding and commitment from all of us. Thirteen factors to survey here
- One reason Rick Wallen's presentation was so good and so well-received at the last meeting was because it contained 8 years of data – it was rich
- Challenge – getting adequate funds to do this over the long term
- This plan is more about looking at effects and effectiveness over next 30 years. We need a decision on vaccination, but our surveillance plan doesn't deal with specific actions on Horse Butte or RTR

VII. Briefing Materials/Other Data Shared by Partner Agencies

The first two listed below were presented by staff. The rest (in no particular order) were shared with partners and all observers primarily via the welcome/sign up to speak and information table in the meeting room.

- 1) IBMP Changes from 2000-2008 (powerpoint presentation and accompanying wall maps by Marna Daley and Marion Cherry, USFS Gallatin National Forest, with assistance from other partner agency staff)
- 2) Surveillance Plan for Bison Yellowstone Park (powerpoint slides by P.J. White, NPS)
- 3) Briefing statements:
 - a) from USDA APHIS Veterinary Services on monitoring
 - b) from Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks on bison hunt monitoring
 - c) from Yellowstone National Park re: bison population status
 - d) from Yellowstone National Park re: winter severity indices before and after 2000
 - e) from Yellowstone National Park re: bison monitoring and surveillance plan
 - f) from Yellowstone National Park re: adaptive management criteria in the federal and state IBMP Records of Decision
 - g) on cattle infection in the Greater Yellowstone Area (source not listed)
- 4) Office memo from Montana FWP's Tom Lemke to Pat Flowers re: bison habitat evaluation east of the Yellowstone River from Dome Mountains to YNP

- 5) Memo to the Northern Yellowstone Cooperative Wildlife Working Group from P.J. White on the 07-08 annual winter trend count of northern Yellowstone elk
- 6) Briefing statement Memo to Glenn Plumb re: abundance and distribution of Yellowstone bison, July 2008
- 7) United States Animal Health Association News Release on how Russian Brucellosis vaccine studies could benefit greater Yellowstone area

VIII. Agency Partners Joint Charting – “what are our objectives for bison in the west management area?”

In joint answer to the focus question (which they revised and edited to their satisfaction), “what are our objectives for bison in the west management area?” partners have agreement on six main action arenas.

Important note: the consensus among partners is about how they jointly *characterized* these six categories shown in grey at the top of the next page, not on the individual ideas listed below each arena – which were offered by each agency caucus and jointly discussed and clarified as possible.

The partners also easily agreed the first three listed are the ones “most urgent areas for changes in 08-09” – increasing tolerance, population conservation, and preventing disease transmission.

A secondary purpose of using this method was that the group had jointly decided the day before to try it and learn from the experience of this group dialog and decision method – wondering if it could be one useful way for the group to address a range of questions they have in front of them for possible 08-09 operations management changes they may take in the 08-09 season and beyond.

For this practice, the group chose the west management area because since Horse Butte is now depopulated of cattle, it’s on all partners’ minds as an area for possible management changes.

After completing the listings, finding pairs, grouping and categorizing, and labeling the key intention in each category of action, the group decided that rather than moving on to address the next questions about how to make some of these into shared, measurable objectives, or identifying what’s blocking the agencies from making changes in these arenas (in order to begin to clearly identify what the barriers are that may be removed or addressed or not), the group decided to have a less structured dialog about barriers to increasing tolerance for bison outside the park.

Partners also generated a few “overarching tenets” that extend to all management areas and management objectives to: “balance economic viability values” and to “maintain confidence in trading partners.” The group wanted these tenets captured, but these are probably not yet refined or agreed to for use in the new operations plan (or new addendum) for 08-09.

INCREASE TOLERANCE (this one noted by partners to be among the most urgent arena for change in 08-09)	POPULATION CONSERVATION (this one noted by partners to be among the most urgent arena for change in 08-09)	PREVENT DISEASE TRANSMISSION (this one noted by partners to be among the most urgent arena for change in 08-09)	UTILIZE CAPABLE HABITAT	USE HUNT AS MANAGEMENT TOOL	USE STRATEGIES FOR WORKING WITH LANDOWNERS (BEYOND EXISTING)
More flexible haze back dates	Threshold below which removals cease (central herd)	Prevent commingling bison-cattle	Retire public grazing allotments	Increase geographic hunt opportunity	Strategies for working with landowners
Tolerate bulls	Minimize trap and slaughter	Spatial separation between bison/cattle	Expand bison based on suitable habitat	Manage population numbers with tribal/state hunters	Minimize property damage through strategic fencing
Tolerance per changed conditions		Prevent transmission bison-cattle	Allow/promote year-round bison in Taylor Fork	Emphasize harvest management	More conservation easements
Allow for year-round bison on Horse Butte		Maintain bison in west management area within established perimeter	Expand Zone 2 to West Yellowstone basin		
Tolerate untested animals		Temporal separation between cattle/bison			
Minimize hazing and removal of bulls		Maintain sufficient temporal separation			
Establish limits on bison population numbers		Sero negative bison on Horse Butte			
Minimize necessary hazing/haze to habitat					
DATA:	DATA: abundance presentation	DATA: persistence, on/off dates, etc.	DATA:	DATA:	DATA:

IX. Perspectives Offered by Observers (both days)

8-28-08

Tim Stevens and Amy McNamara (National Parks Conservation Association and Greater Yellowstone Coalition on behalf of larger coalition of partner groups – see list below):

- Great to hear rich dialog, getting somewhere
- Brief overview of *Practical Solutions – A New Vision for Managing Yellowstone Bison* (August 2008) from the Bear Creek Council, Defenders of Wildlife, Greater Yellowstone Coalition, Montana Wildlife Federation, National Parks Conservation Association, National Wildlife Federation
- Have a couple million members between us
- Put lots of thought and time into this, lots of outreach
- There's the accountability piece
- Involving the public
- Assessing the risk, what risks of transmission
- We went through areas in the park in this to look at how you can manage bison outside the park as wildlife
- Looked at larger Hebgen basin
- Did same thing with Gardiner basin
- Happy to share this map data, all public information
- Looked at upper Gallatin drainage
- Have a hunting district in upper Gallatin – encourage a discussion
- Should be transition to more sustainable way to do population management
- Temporal and spatial separation
- There are ways through fencing, small herds, turn on turn off dates, easements etc.
- Discusses science based decision making
- Clear you're taking these meetings seriously, so are we, please take time to consider this and we hope to have dialog on these

Glenn Hockett, Gallatin Wildlife Association

- Like Christmas, I have a plan here too and would like feedback on it (see: *Brucellosis, Livestock, and Wildlife Solutions in Southwest Montana*)
- First showed you elements of this at December 2007 meeting
- Upper Gallatin – I appreciated PJ' presentation –have we already removed already some important genetics?
- Very pleased about objective looking for safe space outside the Park
- Still very concerned about bison hunt
- Encouraged with your comments today and your willingness to come forward and ask questions

Karrie Taggart, HOBNOB (Horse Butte neighbors)

- With all the changes that have occurred, you (agency partners) remind me of cartoon character. Come to a stop, with everything that's changed, it's not just time to revisit – it's time to scrap the whole IBMP
- Retiring allotments permanently would help with this
- Glad to see changes in adaptive management
- we'd like to be more active in that process
- We'd like to participate

8-29-08

Ariel Overstreet, Montana Stockgrowers:

- thanks for transparency, this was a good meeting
- This is not responsible without a concrete plan for disease suppression.
- Manage bison infected with brucellosis in a way that protects the cattle industry and conserves bison
- Can't afford to take it lightly
- There are lots of diseases that cause cattle to abort. But if even a single one found with Brucellosis, it would be devastating and can force a rancher out of business

Glenn Hockett, Gallatin Wildlife Association:

- Shares interest in reducing sero prevalence. Note that feed grounds in WY are significant vector for disease transmission. The APHIS rules need to be updated and revised. They are so draconian now and need to show more concern about elk than bison.
- The *Practical Solutions* was one report at this meeting. A label for this one might be "*inconvenient science*" – science has to be displayed then policy makers make decisions, concern here that the politics are ahead of the science
- The process continues to be disenfranchising
- There's no mention of large winter range for ungulates that occurs in Madison valley to wall creek management area, and Sun Ranch largely under easement
- Concerns re maps on capability. And the labeling is either incorrect and insufficient – e.g., we know bison have migrated down to Three dollar bridge (fishing access on Madison River)
- Re-initiate an EA process for upper Gallatin
- Would like feedback on my proposal here

George Nell (affiliated/works with whoever has same interests):

- Local resident, works with anyone who will listen, key to break down the pieces like you did today and use common sense solutions that could be implemented but are being ignored
- E.g., with proper fencing and vaccination – USE these, work on controllable elements
- Birthing materials are out there from Feb. to June
- Split status could be implemented by APHIS and other agencies (obviously people in Miles City shouldn't have to take a hit)
- These animals are not the big nasty beasts we put them out to be, when they bust fence lines is when they are being moved – aggressively moved. That's a big problem

Tim Stevens, National Parks Conservation Association:

- This issue is maddening, seems so easy, then so complex, so confounding
- Reality: group didn't agree on process to come out with final product – figuring out a process is a key need
- A couple things: possible way to look at it
- Take a look at the west side (defined acreage, about 10,000 acres)
- Get to Marty's question, how many bison are we talking about, what is the ecological carrying capacity of this land, what is the number? (you ARE the rocket scientists of bison)
- Say it's 700 or so, then we have a number
- Then, what's the real threat here?
- Marna laid out where that potential is on public lands, have 6 allotments outside zone 2
- Where is the potential for intermingling? Let's pinpoint. Is it Red creek? How do we maintain that spatial separation?
- If need to fence, then, that's x dollars

- We're raising a million bucks to do RTR deal, come to us
- Let's figure this out

Amy McNamara, Greater Yellowstone Coalition:

- Regarding the overall process, I haven't lost hope but am very discouraged
- You said you'd have 7 meetings, here we are at the end of 2
- You had good discussion but then you digressed – e.g., when you talked re tolerance for bulls, you agreed no disease risk but you still had a strong push back, I heard unwillingness to put cattle management tools on the table, (talking about a handful of producers and allotments on public land, those need to stay on the table)
- Seems like already defaulting to the status quo
- You're failing to nudge the boundary for free-ranging bison
- We've worked hard to honor your risk management goal – we've honored the risk transmission problem that needs to be managed
- I have to express the disappointment that I feel, I'm leaving discouraged

Agency Partners Parting Thoughts

- What we can strive for is evolutionary change, we see what we're comfortable with, we're building greater trust and comfort, with that will come greater and greater flexibility as we go forward.
- This process is slow and maybe too slow, but may be some benefit to this.
- We're just getting started – it's tough stuff.
- Grounding ourselves in common information is so important – there is data we've put on the table, and we will want to go back and stay/get grounded in that data.
- Thoughts for our preparation as we go forward: could we ask our facilitators to map out this process, if we knew the process maybe we could get through it.

Staff question: as we get deeper into this, have you communicated with the Montana Governor's office? Will they accept changes you negotiate here?

Summary Attachment

Wall chart offered by **observers** on the aspects of presentation of data (see section VII. above)

Landscape changes	Bison biology	Land management/direction changes	The disease	Other
Why is public or private land that is free of conflict mapped as zone 3?	Has genetic loss been significant? How do you know?	Any allotment management plan revisions needed?	How effective are RB51, Strain 19 and other Brucellosis vaccines in livestock?	How does the Nez Perce request compare to the CUT (Church Universal Triumphant) role in the IBMP?
Why are some areas with cattle conflicts mapped as zone 2?	How many bison are immune? Immunity in bison needs addressing.	Retire Horse Butte grazing allotment permanently.	What is the burden of class A status on a typical cow/calf operation?	Surveillance important: -- tracking bison numbers crossing YNP boundary (dates, time of days, groups/individual numbers)
How is Cedar Creek RTR area managed? Why mapped zone 3?	How can the agencies take lethal actions in Nov-June without up-to-date population estimates?	Allow bison on private property that has no cattle, no conflict	Where are the citations for the disease science cited?	Is P.J. White's presentation available to the public?
How is Dome Mountain Ranch managed? How is R & D Ranch managed?	Does the state veterinarian understand why we need more than 400-500 bison?	Can you imagine doing what we do to bison under IBMP to elk?	Did persistence study show no brucellosis after June 15?	Where is the summary of the last meeting?
How is Dome Mtn wildlife mgt are managed?	What is the biggest threat to the bison?	Can you imagine doing what we do for elk for bison?	Is June 16 turn out date sufficient protection against Brucellosis transmission?	Serious consideration of revising IBMP even better: let's scrap it altogether and go home

Landscape changes	Bison biology	Land management/direction changes	The disease	Other
How is the Gallatin WMA managed?	Are bison fulfilling their conservation in Montana?	Could bison live year round in the upper Gallatin?	What about Dr. Bob Garrott's study about bison and elk?	Montana Brucellosis status has changed. Why aren't you addressing this?
How is the Sun Ranch managed? How is the Olliffe Ranch managed?	How will quarantine & vaccination affect natural immunity to Brucellosis in bison?	Do the partners know about conservations easements for wildlife and agriculture in SW Montana?	Why isn't adult cow vaccination required given what you know?	Can science be available from the website?
How is Wall Creek wildlife mgmt area managed?		Why is Dome Mtn wildlife management area shown as state land rather than WMA?	Why would someone want Q bison vs. other bison source? For example Wind Cave bison?	Where are the scientific citations and papers?
Where is the map for the FWP 2/14/06 habitat memo?		Why are the only replacement cow heifers vaccinated? Is that usually 10-20% of herd?	Is Yesinia ent. 0 (?unreadable) a reportable human health risk?	Re-consider letting public do Q & A as meeting goes along
How is key habitat on the Bridger-DeerLodge National Forest managed?		How is effective is strain 82 vaccine in cattle?	When/where is public review of quarantine research project? Citations?	Public address system needed? Microphones on partners so public can hear better
		What other diseases causes cattle to abort?		This (sticky board) was a good idea
				Would you go to all this trouble for elk?

Landscape changes	Bison biology	Land management/direction changes	The disease	Other
				Can we let private landowners lead and limit bison conservation in some areas?
				Native American representation is necessary

END

