



Fall Business Meeting Western Governors' Wildlife Council

December 5-6, 2012

Hotel Valley Ho · Scottsdale, Arizona

Meeting Objectives:

- Review progress/products of Phase II CHAT development over past 12 months and approve Phase III work plan to publicly release west-wide CHAT in 2013.
- Announce a contractor to develop the CHAT “viewer application” necessary to display crucial habitat in 2013.
- Identify steps necessary to ensure long-term funding for and updates/maintenance of CHAT.
- Continue efforts to coordinate and integrate with existing federal initiatives.
- Discuss with Stakeholder Advisory Group and others activities that support use of crucial habitat information now and into the future.

Wednesday, December 5

Discuss Application of CHATs in Federal Planning Activities

Representatives from the BLM, USFS, and USFWS described ways their agencies currently use CHAT tools and identified opportunities for increased use of CHAT within the federal government.

Ray Suazo, Director, Arizona BLM & Laura Canaca, Arizona Game and Fish Department (AGFD)

Mr. Suazo and Ms. Canaca presented on the Arizona BLM’s use of Arizona HabiMap™ data for its Restoration Design Energy Project. The project is aimed at identifying areas with low resource sensitivity that would be ideal for energy development.

Mr. Suazo stated that HabiMap™ data saved time and resources, negating the need to collect and assess new species data. This prevented the need to “remap” by BLM and allowed the agency to keep on schedule. He emphasized the important role HabiMap™ can have in improving data sharing and integration among agencies.

Ms. Canaca added that BLM used Arizona’s top three priority “tiers” of data layers. This was out of a total of six tiers of ranked species and habitat information that Arizona pre-assessed for its HabiMap™ tool. AGFD also provided BLM with site-specific data regarding corridors and population density of game species, where it was necessary.

More information is available in the [Case Study](#) on the topic provided by WGA staff.

Jeanne Higgins, Deputy Regional Forester & Bob Davis, Director of Planning, Watersheds and Air, USFS Southwest Region

Ms. Higgins said that data layers like those available through CHAT are useful in helping to start conversations early, avoiding ecosystem conflicts down the road.

Mr. Davis suggested specific opportunities for CHAT use under the new Forest Service Planning Rule. Forest planning includes a “Forest Assessment Phase” and a “Sustainability Evaluation Phase” that Mr. Davis suggested could be informed by CHAT as a coarse filter for analysis. Davis also said that restoration activities by the USFS could benefit from CHAT use like understanding cumulative effects, but that species-specific restoration efforts would require finer-scale information.

Additionally, Mr. Davis referenced an early [November letter](#) to regional foresters from Deputy Chief Weldon recommending the use of CHAT in USFS planning, as well as a schedule of upcoming forests being revised under the new planning rule. The schedule included many Western forests, including forests in Idaho, California, New Mexico, and Alaska.

Mr. Davis also noted that the Southern Great Plains CHAT (currently displaying only data for the Lesser Prairie Chicken) had already been used for a forest plan revision in the Cibola National Grasslands in New Mexico, Texas and Oklahoma.

Mr. Davis noted that the full value of CHAT to inform forest plan revisions will depend on the timing of available crucial habitat information (on schedule with forest plan revisions) and the appropriate scale of the data (1 sq.-mi hexagons might be too coarse for all uses).

Chris O’Meilia, Program Coordinator, Conservation Planning Assistance, USFWS - Region 2

Mr. O’Meilia noted that Region 2 has two CHATs currently available: the Southern Great Plains CHAT and HabiMap™. Within the FWS, said Mr. O’Meilia, there is a varying knowledge base and user base for these tools. This limited knowledge is due to the scale of FWS regulatory decision-making, which is usually site-specific and determined for a single species.

Mr. O’Meilia noted that the Southern Great Plains CHAT has been very important to FWS, supporting a five-state conservation plan and serving as a "geospatial hub for all Lesser Prairie Chicken efforts." The SGP CHAT provides biological context for species and its needs.

Field staff for the FWS are aware of HabiMap (ecological services staff primarily). Permit applicants use CHAT info to prepare initial contact with FWS. FWS views this as positive because it helps project developers know more about the general area where they want to work.

Mr. O’Meilia suggested that the final version of the regional CHAT should have a diverse amount of information for the planning efforts of different users. Property owners who have

access to the internet should be able to use CHAT their range planning, while consultants with highly technical GIS capabilities should be able to pull shapefiles from the CHAT tool.

Review Wildlife MOU & Efforts to Coordinate CHAT with Federal Agencies

Michael Bean, DOI

Mr. Bean spoke to the progress of implementation of the formal agreements between Western states and the DOI, including the substantial financial assistance through BLM and several Landscape Conservation Cooperatives for the development of CHATs. He also briefly discussed the inherent tension between the desire to characterize CHATs as non-regulatory and the fact that many of the FWS decisions that could usefully be informed by CHAT data are of a regulatory nature.

He suggested that the USFWS Directorate meeting on January 30-31 would present an opportunity to communicate effectively about the use of CHAT with FWS leadership, and noted that WGWC members are already on the agenda for that meeting.

Chris Iverson, USFS

Mr. Iverson discussed the ways in which the USFS might use the CHAT for land management planning. At the national level, Deputy Chief Weldon has sent a letter to regional foresters in the West encouraging regional offices to utilize CHAT. He recommended that regional leadership team meetings bringing together regional foresters, deputies, and forest supervisors could provide an opportunity to better inform the foresters about CHAT. Mr. Iverson also noted that the USFS has formed a Federal Advisory Committee to recommend opportunities for implementing the new national planning rule, and suggested that as an appropriate forum for communicating the value of CHAT.

Mr. Iverson also noted that more specific data would be useful from the CHAT, in addition to the coarse-scale overview. WGWC members offered that the CHAT is intended to provide a coarse assessment, then direct the user to the state for necessary finer scale data.

Opportunities to Partner with DOT/FHWA

Guest speakers offered insight on opportunities for the WGWC to engage in transportation planning, both under the new transportation bill and with the FHWA.

Rob Ament, Western Transportation Institute, WGWC SAG Member

Mr. Ament presented an overview of the 2012 federal transportation bill, MAP-21, which includes significant provisions for wildlife, including a focus on corridors and collision reductions. Specific provisions included the surface transportation program, the highway safety improvement program, the federal lands and tribal transportation programs, transportation alternatives, metropolitan transportation planning and statewide and nonmetropolitan transportation planning.

Specifically, Mr. Ament suggested the WGWC take advantage of MAP-21's allowance of programmatic mitigation plans, which can target a particular species, geography, or basin that is multi-state. The program is completely new and state DOTs can apply for funding for a multi-state mitigation plan. Mr. Ament encouraged WGWC members to bring multi-state ideas to their state DOTs.

Greg Costello, Western Environmental Law Center, WGWC SAG Member

Mr. Costello pointed out that Western states were already exhibiting leadership in partnering with wildlife and transportation agencies working on wildlife crossings and related projects in a number of key states. Additionally, said Mr. Costello, existing projects in states like Utah, Wyoming and Montana should be highlighted by state wildlife agencies to encourage state DOTs to seek federal funding available through MAP-21 (the 2012 federal transportation bill) to protect wildlife.

Mary Frye, Environmental Protection Specialist, FHWA

Ms. Frye discussed how CHAT could promote the priorities of FHWA's EcoLogical program, simultaneously advancing the ecological perspective and the highway perspective. She also stressed the connection between transportation and energy development, noting that energy development requires transportation corridors to access those new energy opportunities.

Ms. Frye acknowledged the pending cooperative agreement between WGA and FHWA, and outlined the objectives of that agreement. This work will allow WGA to hire a technical consultant to be guided by an advisory board inclusive of relevant SAG and state agency members. The goals of the collaboration include:

Phase 1 (supported by pending WGA-FHWA cooperative agreement)

- Identify specific ways in which CHAT can support efficient and environmentally sound transportation planning.
- Build a collaborative approach to advancing implementation and application of CHAT to transportation planning and project implementation

Phase 2 (to be determined based on Phase 1)

- Advance both WGA and FHWA priorities through application of crucial habitat and corridor information to transportation planning among member states.
- Incorporate CHAT information into relevant transportation screening portals for federal, state and regional planning authorities.
- Develop on-going support for CHAT improvement and application by western states and federal wildlife and transportation agencies to aid in avoiding, minimizing and mitigating wildlife impacts from transportation projects.

Ms. Frye also noted that many people in FHWA do not yet know about CHAT. She emphasized the opportunity to outreach to state DOTs and state FHWA offices that is planned under the pending cooperative agreement between WGA and FHWA.

Opportunities with USFWS Region 6 LEAP

Mike Thabault, USFWS Region 6

The LEAP (Landscape-scale Energy Action Plan) tool being developed by Region 6 of the USFWS is an online mapping tool intended to inform planning for energy projects. It is currently in pilot phase in Wyoming, but is expected to extend to all states within Region 6.

Mr. Thabault presented to the WGWC about the LEAP product previously at the May 2012 meeting in Denver. After that introduction, Mr. Thabault consulted with Steve Ferrell and John Emmerich in Wyoming to more clearly delineate the differences between LEAP and CHAT.

LEAP is meant for non-regulatory pre-planning processes. The adjusted resource value map available through LEAP will provide to the user data on federal trust resources and birds of conservation concern. The tool, which currently focuses only on Wyoming, has a link to the WISDOM tool at the bottom of the page, emphasizing that the user can and should access WISDOM to obtain information for their project planning for state trust resources.

Mr. Thabault also said at a later time that Region 6 is asking for feedback from other states if they want USFWS to direct entities to the state CHAT tools now through ECOS/IPAC, regardless of the status of LEAP. Additionally, Region 6 will work with individual states on the exact language for how to direct users to state CHAT tools.

Mr. Thabault offered to consult directly with other states as they expand LEAP to all of Region 6. He requested points of contact from the WGWC to ensure FWS communicated with state staff for data inputs, and to coordinate with work conducted through CHAT development.

Outreach In Support of Implementation – WGWC Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG)

SAG members advised Council members on outreach strategies for the CHAT, specifically focusing on a Speaker's Bureau for the energy industry and private landowners.

Spencer Kimball, Manager of Government Affairs, Western Energy Alliance

Mr. Kimball presented a plan for engaging in the Speakers' Bureau that was first proposed at the May 2012 WGWC meeting in Denver. As proposed by this plan, WGWC, state wildlife agency officials, SAG members, and others would appear at industry events to describe the purpose, utility, functionality, and methodology of state CHATs and to build momentum for the regional CHAT. A list of proposed events for the energy and landowner sectors was presented to WGWC members.

Mr. Kimball identified the need to target both upper-level administrators as well as technical staff with these industry events. He suggested that state agency staff brief those in the Speakers' Bureau on some of the more technical details related to the input biological data and planned GIS functionality of the CHAT. In addition, WGA staff will provide a stock PowerPoint presentation for use that would evolve over time based on feedback from speakers.

Mr. Kimball also referenced two fact sheets: one targeting CHAT for the energy industry and one for landowners. These factsheets were developed with input from multiple SAG members and will be available on the WGA website, and distributed at speaking events and other promotional opportunities.

Kirk Robinson, Executive Director, Western Wildlife Conservancy

Mr. Robinson acknowledged that the conservation community could be better informed about the status of CHAT. He offered to develop an email list-serve to distribute information about CHAT to his contacts in the conservation community, and to inform them on how to become engaged in supporting its use. Mr. Robinson and WGA staff will further explore this possibility.

Thursday, December 6

Present Progress on West-wide CHAT Development

Key representatives of the state CHAT technical leads presented on regional products and processes developed during Phase II (targets Steps 1 & 2 in WGWC's CHAT White Paper). This work, and the testing of common methodology by every state, created a draft, preliminary map of crucial habitat across 16 states that debuted at the meeting.

At the WGWC meeting in November 2011, WGWC adopted a collaborative process to ensure every Western state would be able to meet the 2013 deadline for publically available crucial habitat information in a regional CHAT. Through this process, the state technical leads split into workgroups; at this meeting, some of the technical leads presented the outcome of those workgroups.

States developed innovative products and processes to ensure every state was able to meet the minimum Tier 1 data requirements for identifying crucial habitat as outlined in the WGWC's White Paper. Where individual states have more refined data for categories in the White Paper those were used over modeled workgroup products.

- *Habitat for Species of Concern: Lead by Audrey Hatch, consultant to WA Department of Fish and Wildlife*
The HSOC workgroup created a prioritization scheme for every state to use to determine the value of habitat for species of conservation need as consistently as possible. Important criteria for the species of concern product include confirmed locations of the SOC, how

many of the SOC are in a location, how valuable the habitat is to the SOC, and the level of certainty of their existence in a specified habitat. A general prioritization scheme was offered and then modified by states (for example, to include state-level concerns and data sources). Data for species locations were provided by each state, and the workgroup offered guidance and GIS tools to facilitate the mapped product.

The workgroup utilized USGS GAP models for terrestrial vertebrates by establishing a strong working relationship with the GAP program, and providing as much time as possible for state expert review.

For aquatic crucial habitat, the workgroup evaluated several data products produced under the National Fish Habitat Action Plan, and recommended a coarse-level fish habitat assessment that is available for all WGA states.

- *Landscape Integrity and Connectivity: Lead by John Pierce, WA Department of Fish and Wildlife*
Reflecting the Council's guidance from the White Paper, the LI workgroup created regional data layers to reflect areas of the least human disturbance, regional connectivity, and ecological systems of concern. Members of the work group included leading connectivity experts from around the country. The following unique, regional datasets were developed through this process and screenshots of the layers will be made available to the public in early 2013.

- Native Unfragmented Landscapes (Large Intact Blocks or LIBs)
- Major Connectivity Zones (associated with LIBs)
- Ecological Systems of Concern

States are able to use the modeled data the workgroup developed or build upon it to create their own layers. In states where a state-specific connectivity analyses has been conducted, that more refined data layer will be utilized over the workgroup product.

- *Species of Economic and Recreational Importance: Lead by Carmen Bailey, Utah Department of Wildlife Resources and Chet Van Dellen, Nevada Department of Wildlife*
The SERI workgroup was tasked with evaluation of (1) currently available range-wide maps and (2) processes that may assist determining habitat important for species of economic and recreational importance (game and sportfish). Ultimately, the group determined that most states have very specific data for game and sportfish and do not need range-wide maps to fill data gaps. They recommended that states without more specific data utilize three base layers for terrestrial game:

- WAWFA Mule Deer Habitat Map
- RMEF Elk Range Map
- USFS Bighorn Sheep Range Map

States also developed a series of approaches to determine how best to “roll up” multiple input datasets into a prioritization of crucial habitat, as guided by the WGWC White Paper.

- *Approaches to weighting data to reflect crucial habitat priorities: Lead by Laura Canaca, AGFD*
The workgroup was tasked with (1) developing examples/guidelines to promote consistency in ranking methodology among states and (2) expedite a states’ ability to identify crucial habitat.

The group explored three main approaches to the aggregation and weighting of data (which factored in definitions provided in the WGWC White Paper). After testing the approaches states determined that each has benefits and drawbacks.

- **Categorical Approach:** Uses a predetermined, non-mathematical set of rules to combine Tier 1 layers into overall crucial habitat layer. Identified as the easiest method to explain to users.
- **Weighted Approach:** Uses a mathematical equation to combine Tier 1 layers. Does not require predefined categories (rule sets) for all possible combinations of data layers used in Crucial Habitat calculations.
- **Fuzzy Sum Approach:** May be considered ‘hybrid’ between categorical and weighted approach. Uses a mathematical equation to combine Tier 1 layers. Only a handful of states had time to test this approach so more work is needed to understand the potential of this approach.

All three approaches allow state-specific layers to be incorporated, and allow states to identify what is important to them based on conservation objectives set in strategic planning documents such as State Wildlife Action Plans. The CHAT technical leads continue to explore methodology for identifying a relative ranking of crucial habitat.

Each state spent the fall of 2012 utilizing products and processes developed by the workgroups referenced above. The output of this “test” phase is a draft, preliminary west-wide CHAT map which was presented at the meeting. Two states presented their specific process for “testing” the identification of crucial habitat, and how it advanced their ability to meet the Governors’ goal of a public West-wide CHAT in 2013.

- *Chet Van Dellen, Nevada Department of Wildlife*

Mr. Van Dellen presented on Nevada’s process of crucial habitat identification. Nevada did not have the advantage of advance GIS data collection that some other western states have, but was able to benefit from the experience of the states that went before them.

Mr. Van Dellen noted that in the process of “rolling up” Nevada’s data, it was difficult to create an even distribution of habitat values -- the first few iterations of the roll-up process lumped nearly all of the habitat data into a high-priority class. Eventually Van Dellen was able to finesse the data to be more evenly distributed.

The CHAT workgroup products helped NDOW develop its state wildlife data at a more rapid pace than they originally anticipated. With only one GIS staff member working in NDOW, the state had limited capacity to create aggregated data layers. With the help of the workgroup products and processes, Nevada had the capacity to identify crucial habitat in this “test” Phase, and to improve the data for public release in 2013.

- *Gary Vecellio, Idaho Fish and Game*

Mr. Vecellio gave the perspective of a state that at the start of this project considered itself a “have-not” – a state lacking detailed GIS data and technical capacity to identify crucial habitat in the given timeframe. With the work of the workgroups, said Mr. Vecellio, Idaho – and other states – was able to become a “have” state.

Mr. Vecellio said that Idaho Fish and Game had huge amounts of data within the agency, but housed that data in different ways. With the help of the workgroup products, and with significant internal commitment, the agency has better organized its data and developed new data layers from the workgroup products and processes. Becoming a “have” state instilled a sense of pride and new purpose in Idaho Fish and Game staff. Mr. Vecellio also noted an improvement in how agency staff have begun to talk to each other about fish and wildlife priorities in the state, thanks to the availability of geospatial data.

Announce Contractor to Develop the CHAT “Viewer Application”

The WGWC officially selected a developer for the West-wide CHAT Regional Viewer Application (RVA) at this meeting (targets Step 3 in the WGWC White Paper). The competitive RFP for the project received a total of 13 bids from a wide range of private sector consultants, non-profits and academic institutions.

Jeff Hamerlinck, Wyoming Geographic Information Science Center

Mr. Hamerlink represented the RVA workgroup which reviewed RFP applications and ultimately recommended a winning bidder to the WGWC and WGA’s Executive Director. The WGWC approved that recommendation, selecting the team formed by **Applied Geographics, Inc. (Boston, MA), GreenInfo Network (San Francisco, CA) and GIS Solutions (Springfield, IL)** to enter into a contract with WGA for the application’s development.

Previously, AppGeo and GreenInfo Network partnered in developing a similar multi-state viewing application for species range and habitat distribution at a national scale for the USGS National Gap Analysis Program. The team developed two related applications for GAP on landcover and for the US Protected Areas Database.

The RFP review team was particularly impressed with the AppGeo team’s proposed strategy for collecting stakeholder input for finalizing the conceptual design of the RVA. An important first step in this process will be a kick-off meeting in late January or early February with WGWC

representatives, state technical leads, and stakeholders. With the winning selection made, WGA will begin to negotiate a contract with AppGeo.

Review and Approval of CHAT Development Phase III Workplan

Laura Canaca, Arizona Game and Fish

Ms. Canaca presented the technical workplan for Phase III in CHAT development, concluding with a public launch of the West-wide CHAT in December 2013. Specifically, the CHAT technical leads from each state will:

- Continue to develop and improve product/processes from Habitat for Species of Concern Workgroup to support needed state and regional crucial habitat Tier 1 data inputs.
- Continue state CHAT and West-wide CHAT development, improvement and sharing both on a state-to-state and a regional basis on topics including edge-matching, explanation of displayed and modeled data, customer/user feedback and other topics as determined.
- Continue crucial habitat roll-up model analysis (individual states and collectively through technical group) in 2013 to better understand model performance, defensibility, and complexity.
- Continue to strive for consistency in identifying crucial habitat, while ensuring flexibility to most appropriately meet state, WGA, and user needs.
- Assist with development and roll out of the West-wide CHAT in 2013, ensuring that it contains crucial habitat information from each state that is accurate and current, and utilizes compatible methods and approaches across all western states.
- Implement WGWC direction regarding protocols, partnerships and processes to update/improve crucial habitat data inputs and to secure additional funding to help ensure state CHATs and the West-wide CHAT are maintained beyond the 2013 roll out.
- Continue to undertake CHAT development/improvement in a transparent fashion and consider partnerships to accomplish the objectives of this work plan with federal agencies, local governments, tribes and other stakeholders.

Long-term CHAT Maintenance & Data Integration

A WGWC discussion with invited experts was designed to begin to outline the challenges and actions necessary to ensure long-term use of the West-wide CHAT.

Allan Cox, Montana Natural Heritage Program

Cox discussed the steps that the Montana Natural Heritage Program has taken to integrate its data with the Montana FWP's data. The two agencies have an MOU pertaining to data uses, data products, dissemination of information, and coordination of efforts. The MOU clearly states which entity is responsible for which types of data collection; clarifying roles and expectations and creating workflow efficiencies based on the priorities of each organization.

Mr. Cox emphasized the joint value of improved data sharing to MFWP and the heritage program. The MOU between MNHP and MFWP encourages coordination of efforts and gives the agencies the power to make decisions and move forward.

Mary Klein, NatureServe

Ms. Klein described NatureServe's strategic plan and encouraged states to enhance their relationships with NatureServe, which is striving to improve communication between natural heritage programs and wildlife agencies within states. Ms. Klein stated that NatureServe's mission aligns with the objectives of the CHATS, and its existing products are aimed at the same user base. Ms. Klein emphasized how NatureServe can help states improve long-term data integration and engage more in co-development of underlying data inputs for improved consistency. Benefits of collaboration include efficiency, shared capacity and ability to manage information in the Biotics data system.

Ms. Klein noted that some of the pitfalls for cooperation between NHPs and wildlife agencies include competition, ambiguity of roles, inconsistency in data management, and limited resources. But these challenges could be addressed through establishing a more formal relationship between the WGA and NatureServe, as well as MOUs at the state level, similar to the agreement described by Allan Cox of Montana.

Ms. Klein indicated that NatureServe is interested in an explicit, understood role with WGA regarding CHAT, at both the regional level and between its member natural heritage programs and the state agencies leading CHAT development. NatureServe would like to engage in co-development and bringing more consistency to the project. Ms. Klein also invited the state wildlife agencies to provide feedback in the development of NatureServe's Biotics database so that it better supports management and delivery of CHAT data from the states.

Jim Strittholt, Conservation Biology Institute

Mr. Strittholt emphasized the importance of data integration. The WGWC has several useful data products, said Strittholt, but the method of delivery matters greatly.

CBI hosts a website called DataBasin which holds over 10,000 datasets produced by various conservation groups. Having the data available in one location allows users to integrate the data they need to inform their decisions, and to foster engagement with partners and CHAT users.

Next Steps

WGWC members asked Greg Servheen, Idaho Department of Fish and Game, and Audrey Hatch and WGA staff to define the needs for long-term CHAT maintenance, and what specific solutions with valuable partners like Natural Heritage Programs (i.e., MOU) and NatureServe could support efficient workflow.

WGA staff and CHAT technical leads will develop a proposal for the WGWC on possible “solutions” to long-term CHAT maintenance and data management working with key expert partners.

Attachment A: Agenda

Fall Business Meeting Agenda Western Governors' Wildlife Council

December 5-6, 2012
Hotel Valley Ho
Scottsdale, Arizona

Meeting Objectives:

- Review progress/products of Phase II CHAT development over past 12 months and approve Phase III work plan to publicly release west-wide CHAT in 2013.
- Announce a contractor to develop the CHAT “viewer application” necessary to display crucial habitat in 2013.
- Identify steps necessary to ensure long-term funding for and updates/maintenance of CHAT.
- Continue efforts to coordinate and integrate with existing federal initiatives.
- Discuss with Stakeholder Advisory Group and others activities that support use of crucial habitat information now and into the future.

Wednesday, December 5 - Valley Ho Ballroom

1:00 pm	Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review – John Harja, WGWC Chair
1:30	Discuss Application of CHATs into Federal Planning Activities <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ray Suazo, Director, Arizona BLM & Bob Broscheid, AZGFD• Jeanne Higgins, Deputy Regional Forester & Bob Davis, Director of Planning, Watersheds and Air, USFS Southwest Region• Chris O’Meilia, Program Coordinator, Conservation Planning Assistance, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service - Region 2
2:30	Review Wildlife MOU & Efforts to Coordinate CHAT with Federal Agencies – Michael Bean, DOI & Chris Iverson, USFS
3:00	Opportunities to Partner with DOT/FHWA <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Rob Ament, Western Transportation Institute, WGWC SAG Member• Gregg Costello, Western Environmental Law Center, WGWC SAG Member• Mary Frye, Environmental Protection Specialist, FHWA
3:30	BREAK
4:00	Opportunities with USFWS Region 6 LEAP – Mike Thabault, USFWS Region 6
4:30	Outreach In Support of Implementation – Stakeholder Advisory Group

	<p>Members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation outreach plan(s) & products for the energy industry – Spencer Kimball, Western Energy Alliance
5:15	Wrap Up & Adjourn
5:15 – 6:30 pm	Light Reception w/ Cash Bar

Thursday, December 6

7:30 am	Breakfast Provided
8:30	Recap Day 1 & Review Agenda – John Harja, WGWC Chair
8:45	<p>Present Progress on West-wide CHAT Development – Key representatives of the state CHAT technical leads will present on regional products and processes developed during Phase II (targets Steps 1 & 2 in WGWC’s CHAT White Paper).</p> <p><u>Phase II Innovative Products/Processes</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Audrey Hatch (WA/OR) John Pierce (WA) Carmen Bailey (UT) <p><u>Crucial Habitat “Roll Up” Approaches</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Laura Canaca (AZ) <p><u>State Specific Processes</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chet Van Dellen (NV) Gary Vecellio (ID)
10:00	Announce Contractor to Develop the CHAT “Viewer Application” – Jeff Hamerlinck, Wyoming Geographic Information Science Center, will review the process by which a contractor was selected to develop the West-wide CHAT Viewer Application, and planned actions for 2013 (targets Step 3 in WGWC’s CHAT White Paper). WGWC members will announce the winning bidder.
10:15	BREAK
10:30	Review and Approve CHAT Development Phase III Workplan – Key representatives of the state CHAT technical leads will present the technical workplan for Phase III in CHAT development – concluding with public launch of West-wide CHAT in December 2013.

11:00	<p>Discuss Long-term CHAT Maintenance & Data Integration – WGWC discussion with invited experts will begin to outline the challenges and actions necessary to ensure long term use of the West-wide CHAT.</p> <p>Expert panelists are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alan Cox, Montana Natural Heritage Program • Mary Klein, NatureServe • Jim Strittholt, Conservation Biology Institute
12:30 pm	Wrap Up/Action Items
1:00 pm	Adjourn

Attachment B: Attendee List

First	Last	Title	Organization
Rob	Ament	Senior Conservationist	Center for Large Landscape Conservation
Doug	Austen	National LCC Coordinator	Fish and Wildlife Service
Carmen	Bailey	Impact Analysis Coordinator	Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
Malena	Bazurto	Grants Manager	Apache County Arizona
Michael	Bean	Counselor, Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks	DOI
Bob	Broscheid		Arizona Game and Fish Department
Carlee	Brown	Policy Associate	Western Governors' Association
Gregory	Costello	Staff Attorney	Western Environmental Law Center
Allan	Cox	Lead Program Manager	Montana Natural Heritage Program
Ken	Cunningham	Assistant Chief	NM Department of Game and Fish
Bob	Davis	Dir. of Planning, Watershed & Air	USDA Forest Service
John	Emmerich	Deputy Director	Wyoming Game and Fish Department
Steve	Ferrell	Policy Advisor	Wyoming Governor's Office
Sammy	Frazier		Colorado Outfitters Association
Chris	Friel	Natural Resource Lead	ESRI
Mary	Frye	Environmental Protection Specialist	Federal Highway Administration
Deb	Grieco	President	Allpoints GIS Inc.
Mike	Grieco	GIS Enabler	Allpoints GIS Inc.
Jeff	Hamerlinck	Director	Wyoming Geographic Information Science Center
John	Harja	Director	Utah Office of Public Lands
Audrey	Hatch		Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Richard	Hatcher	Director	Oklahoma Department of Wildlife Conservation
Jeanne	Higgins	Deputy Regional Forester	US Forest Service
Chris	Iverson	Assistant Director	U.S. Forest Service
Sharon	Kiefer	Deputy Director	Idaho Department of Fish and Game
Spencer	Kimball	Manager of Government Affairs	Western Energy Alliance
Mary	Klein	President & CEO	NatureServe
Jim	Lane	Director	New Mexico Department of Game and Fish

Holly	Michael	Conservation Policy Coordinator	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Kelly	Nesvacil	Habitat Biologist	Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Jim	Ogsbury	Executive Director	Western Governors' Association
Chris	O'Meilia	Conservation Planning Assistance	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Paul	Orbuch	WGA Consultant	Orbuch Consulting, LLC
John	Pierce		Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Richard	Remington	Regional Manager	Logan Simpson Design Inc.
John	Rice	Science Coordinator	Bureau of Reclamation
Laura	Richards	Chief, Wildlife Diversity Division	Nevada Department of Wildlife
Dave	Risley	Administrator	Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks
Michael	Rivera	CO/NM Ranch Owner/Manager	CO/NM ABV Ranch
Kirk	Robinson	Executive Director	Western Wildlife Conservancy
Arthur	Rodriguez	Oregon Conservation Strategy GIS Analyst	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Greg	Servheen	Wildlife Program Coordinator	Idaho Department of Fish and Game
John	Shamley	Natural Resource Coordinator	Apache County, Arizona
T.O.	Smith		Trout Unlimited
Amanda	Stanley	Dr.	Wilburforce Foundation
James	Strittholt	Executive Director	Conservation Biology Institute
Ray	Suazo	State Director	Arizona BLM
Carl	Sylvester	Strategic Accounts Executive	Esri
Jamie	Tedesco	President and Marketing Director	The Historic Taos Inn & Taos Tourism Council
Mike	Thabault		USFWS, Region 6
Bob	Vahle	NWF Representative	Arizona Wildlife Federation
Chet	Van Dellen	GIS Coordinator	Nevada Department of Wildlife
Gary	Vecellio	Staff Biologist	Idaho Fish and Game
Lisa	Veneroso	Assistant Director	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Madeleine	West	Program Director	Western Governors' Association
Byron	Woertz	Senior Project Manager	WECC
David	Wood	Natural Resources Project Mgr.	BLM