

Review and Revision

In accordance with the 2007 FWS–AFWA Guidance for Wildlife Action Plan Review and Revisions (2007 Guidance), the Idaho Department of Fish and Game will review and revise the entire action plan by 2025 October 1. Prior to the intent-to-revise notification, we will create a project management chart that identifies milestones, timelines, resources needed, deliverables, and staff roles. Upon submitting the plan, the Department will also include a summary of significant changes, where in the plan those changes can be found, and documentation that describes how the revised version of the action plan adequately addresses the eight required elements, including an up-to-date public review process specified in elements 7 and 8; we will also include a “road map” to assist the reviewer in locating revisions in the action plan.

In the meantime, and within the constructs of the 2007 Guidance, the Department intends to incorporate new information and changing circumstances (including responding to emerging issues) into the action plan to ensure that it becomes a dynamic and adaptive document.

The 2012 SWAP Best Practices Voluntary Guidance explicitly recommended the use of the *Open Standards for the Practice of Conservation* <http://cmp-openstandards.org/> as a best practice. The *Open Standards* represents a cyclical process of review and revision that transforms ordinary management into true adaptive management, which is called for in element 5 of the eight required elements, i.e., “. . . and for adapting these conservations actions to respond appropriately to new information and changing conditions.” To accomplish this, we will maintain a dedicated dialogue with federal, state, and tribal agencies, nongovernmental organizations, private consultants, and the public—thus maintaining an adaptive community-based approach to conservation and management; and we will reconvene at least annually each ecological section adaptive management team to discuss successes, challenges, and opportunities for implementing SWAP.

We also intend to update the underlying data that informs the plan. For example, the [Idaho Fish and Wildlife Information System](#) (IFWIS), housed within the Department, is a comprehensive information system for standardizing data on fish, wildlife, and plants in Idaho. The Idaho Species Diversity Database—the most comprehensive repository for site-specific data on Idaho’s fish, wildlife, and plant diversity—is maintained by IFWIS under the stewardship of the Wildlife Diversity Program at the Idaho Department of Fish and Game. Data acquired through SWAP implementation (in particular SWG-funded projects) and monitoring will likewise be entered into the database. IFWIS is readily accessible via the Web and these observational data will continue to inform ongoing SWAP development, particularly with respect to distributional data on SGCN, which will be used to inform the range and area of occupancy factors in the conservation status assessments. With respect to status under other agency authorities (e.g., ESA, US Forest Service Northern Region and Intermountain Region, Bureau of Land Management, IDAPA classification, NatureServe global ranks), we will likewise report the most current status in the revised SWAP and endeavor to keep these updated in our SWAP as they change.

Scientific and English common names of vertebrates and invertebrates, including species of greatest conservation need, will be updated to reflect the most current taxonomy of the respective taxonomic groups, e.g., American Fisheries Society, American Ornithologists' Union

(soon to be American Ornithological Society effective late October 2016), Society for the Study of Amphibians and Reptiles, Checklist of North American Mammals North of Mexico, etc.

We will continue to use the World Conservation Union (IUCN)–Conservation Measures Partnership (CMP) Threats and Actions Classification and update SWAP to reflect any changes in the classification. The use of such a common nomenclature not only facilitates cross-project learning but also allows us to create general summaries for broader organizational purposes. As new information becomes available on threats and conservation actions, we will update relevant sections of SWAP to reflect these changes.

We will evaluate annually the conservation status of species as new information becomes available on the 8 core factors (range extent, area of occupancy, population size, number of occurrences, number of occurrences or percent area with good viability/ecological integrity, overall threat impact, long-term trend, and short-term trend). In 2015, NatureServe released an updated version of the Conservation Status Rank Calculator (the Calculator) (NatureServe 2015c), used to assess conservation status of species and ecosystems. However, we were already well underway with our status assessment and so used Version 3.1 from July 2012 (with default weighting) in the current plan. We plan to use the new version for future status assessments.

The methodology and literature on prioritizing species for conservation action (i.e., that can be used to inform the selection of species of greatest conservation need), continues to evolve. We intend to stay abreast of current methodology for consideration in revising our criteria and process for identifying SGCN.

We expect that in the next 10 years, land cover data will continue to improve. For example, in early 2015, the National Gap Analysis (GAP) and Landscape Fire and Resource Management Planning Tools (LANDFIRE) programs announced they are teaming up to deliver detailed land cover maps that support wildland fire and species conservation planning for the nation. The 2016 National Terrestrial Ecosystems Dataset for the United States will be a comprehensive mapping effort that uses new satellite imagery (Landsat 8), point and field data to create a new base map data suite that represents contemporary conditions. This effort will leverage changes and advancements in data and science to support the development and production of the next generation vegetation layer.

In September 2016, the 2 programs collaborated to form a Remap Strategy Team (RST). The RST is researching improvements in land cover mapping methodology and has selected 7 prototype areas representing the major ecosystems across the country to test a variety of modeling methods to determine the best strategy for implementing Remap. The complete remap of the US vegetation to 2016 conditions is projected to be completed by 2019. Once available, we will use this new GAP–Landfire National Terrestrial Ecosystems land cover data to update SWAP.

In addition, currently underway in Idaho is a project to use existing spatial data and remote-sensed data layers combined with ground surveys to develop a prototype fine-scale vegetation map that can ultimately be used to predict nutritional conditions for a variety of wildlife. We also plan to use this fine-scale vegetation map to inform SWAP revisions.

Finally, to ensure that the general public has ample opportunity to review and comment on the revised plan, and in the spirit of continual improvement, we plan to post the newly approved plan on the Department's Web site and include an online comment form where anyone can post comments on the plan. This will give us an interactive and ongoing platform for incorporating new information into the plan. The Department also has a subscription service on its Web site that notifies subscribers when changes have been made to content. Currently underway is a project to increase the usability and accessibility of the Idaho SWAP by creating a Web-based, interactive, and database-driven application that allows the user to access information in SWAP based on the user's particular interest, e.g., a given section, species, threat, conservation action, etc. Prior to submitting a comprehensive review and revision in 2025, we will provide a formal public review process over a 30–60 day period.

Coordination

Extent of coordination

The Idaho Department of Fish and Game engaged a broad array of federal, state and local agencies, Indian tribes, nongovernmental organizations, and others in the SWAP revision. Members of the entire SWAP team are listed at the beginning of the document under the heading "Idaho State Wildlife Action Plan Core Team." In addition, individuals and organizations who directly contributed to the SWAP are acknowledged under the heading titled "Other Contributors." For a list of section team members, see each section plan under the heading titled "Section Team." In addition to engaging external partners and stakeholders, we integrated the revision effort throughout the Department including multiple bureaus, programs, and regions. A list of agencies, organizations, and entities that we coordinated with during the SWAP revision follows:

- Boise State University, Intermountain Bird Observatory
- Bureau of Land Management (US)
- Bureau of Reclamation (US)
- Defenders of Wildlife
- Ducks Unlimited
- Eastern Idaho Aspen Working Group
- Essig Museum of Entomology
- Foundations of Success
- Gonzales–Stoller Surveillance, LLC
- Greater Yellowstone Coalition
- Hancock Forest Management
- Idaho Army National Guard
- Idaho Bat Working Group
- Idaho Bird Conservation Partnership
- Idaho Cattle Association
- Idaho Department of Environmental Quality

- Idaho Department of Fish and Game
- Idaho Department of Lands
- Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation
- Idaho Fish and Game Commission
- Idaho Governor's Office of Energy Resources
- Idaho Governor's Office of Species Conservation
- Idaho Lands Resource Coordinating Council
- Idaho Mining Association
- Idaho Partners in Amphibian and Reptile Conservation
- Idaho Power Company
- Idaho Soil and Water Conservation Commission
- Idaho State Department of Agriculture
- Idaho State University
- Idaho Sustainable Forestry Initiative Implementation Committee
- Idaho Transportation Department
- Kootenai Tribe of Idaho
- Latah Soil and Water Conservation District
- Montana State University
- National Park Service
- Natural Resources Conservation Service (US)
- Nez Perce Soil and Water Conservation District
- Nez Perce Tribe
- Northwest Nazarene University
- OdonataCentral
- Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Owyhee County
- Pacific Northwest Moths
- Potlatch Forest Holdings, Inc.
- POWER Engineers, Inc.
- Shoshone–Bannock Tribes
- Shoshone–Paiute Tribes
- Sitka Technology Group
- Stimson Lumber Company
- Teton Regional Land Trust
- The College of Idaho
- The College of Idaho Orma J Smith Museum of Natural History
- The Field Museum
- The Lepidopterists' Society
- The Nature Conservancy in Idaho
- Trout Unlimited
- Trumpeter Swan Society
- University of Idaho
- University of Idaho William F Barr Entomological Museum
- US Army Corps of Engineers
- US Department of Defense
- US Department of Energy

- US Department of the Interior, Northwest Climate Science Center
- US Fish and Wildlife Service
- US Fish and Wildlife Service, Great Basin Landscape Conservation Cooperative
- US Fish and Wildlife Service, Great Northern Landscape Conservation Cooperative
- US Forest Service Intermountain Region (R4)
- US Forest Service Intermountain Region (R4), Boise National Forest
- US Forest Service Intermountain Region (R4), Caribou–Targhee National Forest
- US Forest Service Intermountain Region (R4), Payette National Forest
- US Forest Service Intermountain Region (R4), Sawtooth National Forest
- US Forest Service, Moscow Forestry Sciences Laboratory
- US Forest Service Northern Region (R1), Idaho Panhandle National Forests
- US Forest Service Northern Region (R1), Nez Perce–Clearwater National Forests
- US Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station
- US Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Missoula Fire Sciences Laboratory
- USGS Forest and Rangeland Ecosystem Science Center
- US Navy Acoustic Research Detachment
- Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Western Washington University
- Xerces Society

As we began the SWAP revision effort, we pilot-tested an approach to revising the plan using two of the state's 14 ecological sections: Owyhee Uplands and Bear Lake. The Department hosted an expert/stakeholder review meeting for these initial pilot sections on 2014 August 25–27 at the Idaho Department of Fish and Game Headquarters office in Boise (23 attendees). This meeting provided a chance for key experts and stakeholders from each of these sections to provide review, feedback, and input into these draft plans as well as our overall process. The target audience for the workshop was key experts and stakeholders who could provide input into the plans for at least one of the pilot ecological sections and who would be important for us to work with in implementing the final plan. The meeting objectives were to:

1. Provide an overview of the proposed process for 2015 revision of Idaho State Wildlife Action Plan
2. Begin to get feedback/input from key experts and stakeholders on draft plans for 2 pilot sections
3. Get input on proposed plans for completing the 2015 Idaho State Wildlife Action Plan revision and ongoing adaptive management of this work (ideally participant commitment to work with us)

Subsequent to this initial workshop, we held other in-person workshops as well as Webinars and face-to-face meetings with key partners and stakeholders. We held a half-day Owyhee Uplands Adaptive Management Team Meeting on 2014 December 16 (11 attendees). We held another expert/stakeholder review meeting for the southern sections (Snake River Basalts, Yellowstone Highlands, Overthrust Mountains, Northwestern Basin & Range, Owyhee Uplands) on 2015 January 26–27 in Pocatello (49 attendees). The Department hosted an expert/stakeholder

review meeting for the central sections (Blue Mountains, Idaho Batholith, Challis Volcanics, Beaverhead Mountains) on 2015 Jan 28–29 (28 attendees). Finally, we hosted an expert/stakeholder review meeting for the northern sections (Okanogan Highlands, Flathead Valley, Bitterroot Mountains, Palouse Prairie) on 2015 February 2–3, in Coeur d'Alene (20 attendees).

Because not all of our key partners and stakeholders were able to attend the initial workshops, we held additional meetings and workshops for some. For example, because the Caribou–Targhee National Forest is the major landowner in the Yellowstone Highlands, and therefore has the greatest capacity for implementing conservation within that section, we held a 1-day Workshop on 2015 February 13 to get their input on the Yellowstone Highlands Section Plan (9 attendees).

We met with the Idaho Department of Fish and Game Operations Team during its 2015 April 17 meeting to discuss the status of the SWAP revision and to ensure that SWAP would be aligned with existing Department management plans.

We held a working session with the Nez Perce Soil and Water Conservation District (NPSWCD) during its Board Meeting on 2015 May 21 in Lewiston to get the Board's input on the draft Palouse Prairie Section (10 attendees). Conservation districts are legal subdivisions of state government that direct and administer local conservation programs to conserve natural resources. There are 51 conservation districts in the state of Idaho and approximately 3,000 districts in the US. The mission of the NPSWCD is to coordinate technical and financial resources for the implementation of conservation practices and projects that enhance and conserve Idaho's natural resources.

To get input from the forest industry, we held a 1-day expert/stakeholder review meeting in Lewiston on 2015 May 22 (6 attendees). We followed that with a 1-day SWAP coordination workshop 2016 June 1 with Idaho Department of Lands, Forest Action Plan staff, to work in Miradi to identify and rate threats to forest systems, primarily focused on the northern Idaho sections, as well as identify appropriate strategies and actions to address them.

In June 2015, we conducted a 1-month internal Department review of the initial draft SGCN list, species assessments, and Miradi section plans. This led to the Department's Operations Team creating an Executive SWAP Oversight Committee comprised of Deputy Director Kiefer, 3 regional supervisors (Panhandle, Magic Valley, and Upper Snake regions), Wildlife Bureau Chief, Wildlife Diversity Program Manager, and State Wildlife Action Plan Coordinator. The Committee's vision for SWAP was that it serve as a work plan of prioritized species, threats, and strategies, focused on very high, high, and medium threats. The Committee also wanted to see a focus on precluding species from becoming listed as threatened or endangered under ESA.

To ensure the support of the Idaho Fish and Game Commission (Commission), and to keep the Commission apprised of the SWAP revision process, we provided briefing materials and regular updates at the Commission's quarterly and special meetings. On 2015 May 20, we provided an information-only SWAP update to the Commission recommending that we proceed with the SWAP revision for submission later that year. We followed up by providing an update on SWAP development and an outline for further review during the 2015 November 19 Commission

meeting. On 2015 November 30, we provided draft SWAP materials to the Commission for review and over the next 2 weeks, held one-on-one meetings with each of the Department's 7 commissioners and regional staff to address any questions or concerns they might have with respect to SWAP. To obtain consensus from the Commission for the Department to proceed with the public review of the draft SWAP, we held a special meeting with the Commission on 2015 December 14. Finally, during the 2016 Jan 28 meeting, we provided an update summarizing the results of the public comment period as well as other significant updates to the SWAP since the Commission's review of draft materials in early December. We also described the next steps for submitting the final draft SWAP to the US Fish and Wildlife Service for Regional Review Team review.

Although not required to address coordination with neighboring states in the revision process, throughout the SWAP planning process, we participated in periodic coordination conference calls among adjacent northwest states (Oregon and Washington) and the US Fish and Wildlife Service (R1) Regional Office including an in-person meeting hosted by FWS in Portland, OR. In addition, we coordinated with Utah with respect to our Miradi section planning efforts.

Continued coordination

Some of the public comments we received on the draft SWAP will require additional coordination with key partners and stakeholders to ensure that we appropriately address their concerns with respect to how information is characterized in SWAP. This level of coordination will also build capacity for implementing SWAP. For example, as participants in the Sustainable Forestry Initiative, Potlatch Forest Holdings, Inc., is obligated to support the wildlife conservation efforts identified in the SWAP. Potlatch is a major forest landowner in the state and committed to supporting wildlife management on its 791,000 acres in north and central Idaho. In reviewing the draft SWAP, Potlatch expressed concern that the actions identified reflected a general lack of understanding of forest management in Idaho and emphasized the importance of accurately stating the role and effects of forest management in wildlife management. Potlatch noted that all Idaho stakeholders are faced with limited resources for research and management action, and therefore emphasized the importance of effectively allocating these resources. From Potlatch's perspective, inaccurate statements on the role of forest management on species in SWAP invites lawsuits and regulation that further reduces the resources available for sound wildlife management. Consequently, Potlatch encouraged IDFG to partner with its sister agencies the Idaho Department of Lands (IDL) and Idaho Department of Environmental Quality, the University of Idaho, and external partners such as Potlatch to start a continuing education effort toward better understanding of forest management in the state of Idaho. We plan to work with Potlatch and others in this regard.

Likewise, similar issues were expressed by the Idaho State Department of Agriculture (ISDA) with respect to agriculture and livestock. ISDA recognizes that wildlife management has broad implications to the state of Idaho and suggested that references to agriculture and livestock should be based on the best available science and appropriately balanced taking into consideration the multiple natural resource goals important to Idaho. ISDA recommended that the Department continue to engage partners to ensure that viable conservation actions for species are implemented in the SWAP. Accordingly, we plan to continue to coordinate with

agencies/entities such as the ISDA, Idaho Soil and Water Conservation Commission, Soil and Water Conservation Districts, Owyhee County, and Idaho Cattle Association—all have proven invaluable to the SWAP revision process.

The Idaho Governor's Office of Species Conservation (OSC) encouraged the Department's continued engagement of all stakeholders in collaborative efforts such as SWAP and its importance in ensuring that appropriate strategies to conserve fish and wildlife species are balanced with predictable levels of land-use activities. OSC acknowledged that the revised SWAP will be a valuable reference document for OSC as it begins to refocus and complete a Rare and Declining Species Policy for the State of Idaho. With these planning tools, the State of Idaho will be better equipped to further the conservation of fish and wildlife in Idaho balanced with the economic vitality of the state. We share OSC's desire for continued collaboration on these important species conservation planning efforts.

Another recommendation from key stakeholders was that we consider adding additional criteria to our process for selecting SGCN. We plan to follow up with these stakeholders to discuss ways to improve the existing process. We had initially considered other approaches and criteria for selecting SGCN, including more quantitative approaches. In moving forward, we will continue to explore better ways to prioritize and work with our partners to find a system that works for Idaho. Central to this will be coordination with the US Fish and Wildlife Service (Idaho Fish and Wildlife Office) in prioritizing species for its Strategic Habitat Conservation Initiative. In addition, coordination with the Bureau of Land Management Idaho, and US Forest Service regions 1 and 4, on their sensitive species designations will contribute to more consistency among our respective species lists. The more aligned we are in Idaho in terms of setting conservation priorities, the more effective we can be at achieving mutual conservation goals.

Another important need is to continue to coordinate with the IDL on revisions to the Idaho Forest Action Plan (FAP) and to find ways to align both the FAP and SWAP. IDL was instrumental in assisting with the revision of SWAP in identifying threats to forests and in developing appropriate objectives, strategies, and actions.

Finally, through the SWAP revision effort, we have gained support from a broad array of partners and stakeholders including federal, state, and local agencies, tribes, applied partnerships, industry, and conservation groups. We will continue to ensure that we address the concerns of partners and stakeholders as we continue to refine SWAP and look forward to working together to implement the plan.