
INTERAGENCY COORDINATION GROUP
MEETING NOTES

May 23, 2002

Participants: Bob Martin, Idaho Fish and Game, Jeff Cook-Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation, Wes Whitworth-Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation, Ken Crane-Idaho Department of Agriculture, Marj McHenry-Idaho Army National Guard, Jim Desmond-Owyhee County Natural Resource Committee, Chad Gibson-Owyhee County Consultant, Mary Jones-BLM, John Martin-BLM, John Sullivan-BLM, Mike O'Donnell-BLM, MJ Byrne-BLM, Howard Hedrick-BLM, David Diamond-BLM

Facilitator: Marsha Bracke, Bracke & Associates, Inc. (working for North Country Resources, Inc. and the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution)

Meeting purpose

The Intergovernmental Coordination Group (ICG) met on Thursday, May 23 in the BLM Lower Snake River District Office Conference Room from 9:00 a.m. to 12:15 p.m. The meeting objectives were to:

- Hear an update on RMP activities and status
- Review and provide feedback on socioeconomic work tasks and options, and
- Review and discuss the draft planning criteria as provide by BLM and collect other government guidance

The facilitator maintained meeting conclusions, feedback and action items on flip chart notes as a record of the group meeting. Those flip chart notes follow this meeting summary.

Results

Participants reviewed the ICG purpose and objectives, action items from the January 23 meeting, and January 23 meeting notes. The meeting note revision will include the correction of some typographical errors and clarification regarding Jim Desmond's comment that it was not apparent where to place comments respective to grazing at the scoping meeting held at Rimrock High School. Mary Jones noted the changes and will provide the corrected version with the next distribution of meeting materials.

RMP Update—Mike O'Donnell, BLM informed the group that the raw scoping comments are still being processed and will be made available for review as soon as they are ready. BLM received approximately 1050 comments. Mike also shared with the ICG the status of the Assessment document, anticipated for completion in early June. The scoping comments and the Assessment results will be the focus the group's next meeting agenda.

Socio-economic analysis—Participants discussed the socioeconomic analysis with three objectives in mind: 1) to review and comment on the task list, 2) to identify and discuss the options available to the BLM to pursue for completing the task list, and 3) identifying the ICG's preference related to those options.

Suggestions to the task list included:

For task 1, providing the clarification that the consultant will seek out and review studies from all affected counties and agencies, and clarify that the task is to use the results of existing studies (as opposed to evaluating the studies themselves) from which to create the baseline for the current study.

For task 2, the group discussed the importance of taking the IMPLAN model and correcting it for discrepancies and selecting those variables most appropriate to the area under study. As an example, the group discussed the fact that there are those whose physical address is actually in Owyhee County, but whose mailing address indicates residence in a different county. Census data does not pick up this discrepancy. The process of conducting the socioeconomic study, however, allows for corrections to the model to make such adjustments. It was suggested that references to IMPLAN be termed "modified IMPLAN" for clarification purposes and to ensure the focus on meeting individual needs. It was also suggested that the tasks be rewritten to indicate the study involves a 4-county area.

BLM State Economist John Martin, in addressing task 4, described how "sub-models can convert alternatives into a form that the model can run 'changes in final demand.'" This capability enables an analysis of the impacts of specific activities in the context of a number of variables. Owyhee County consultant Chad Gibson indicated that it is this kind of analysis that gets at the heart of his concern as expressed at the January 23, 2002 meeting (and takes away the need for him to follow up on action items #4 as identified in the January 23, 2002 meeting notes).

Mike O'Donnell invited ICG participants to submit their own questions for potential inclusion into the economic analysis. He also explained the time critical nature of issuing the task, and that the task must be obligated by the end of June. Mike will revise the task and send it to participants electronically by May 31, 2002. Participants have one week to submit additional comments, and Mike will issue the task one week after that.

The group explored a number of options for completing the socioeconomic task, including:

1. Issue a Request for Proposal
2. Have the Sonoran Institute complete the baseline work, and then issue a Request for Proposal,
3. Outline the contract specifications and request a cost from potential providers,
4. Use the existing task agreement with the University of Idaho and have them do the work, and
5. Have the BLM State Economist perform the work.

Participants collectively preferred to have the University of Idaho conduct the socio-economic analysis, assuming the responsible faculty were in fact available to do so. John Martin will follow-up with the University to confirm its interest and availability. The ICG recommended that in the event that option is not available, BLM will pursue the issuance of an RFP as plan B. BLM will keep participants informed about these efforts.

Resource Management Plan guidance and sideboards—BLM providing a very preliminary draft of its guidance and sideboards document for participant review and comment. The document is an attempt to help identify those parameters within which BLM decisions respective to the RMP must be made, and it is one eventually intended for public distribution in order to share those decision-making parameters.

Some ICG participants came with comments about the document, and others had not yet had a chance to review it. In the flip chart notes (pages 7-8 of this document) are the general comments collected at this meeting respective to the document. Mike O'Donnell said that given the significance of this document, BLM would very much like a sound review of the materials and comment by ICG participants. Participants will provide comments to Mike in writing or by e-mail by June 7, 2002, after which Mike will prepare the next version.

Action Items

1. Marsha will provide the draft meeting notes to Mike by Tuesday May 28, 2002
2. Mary will revise the January 23, 2002 meeting notes
3. Howard will ask Fred Grant for a current and signed Charter of the Owyhee Initiative which will be distributed to meeting participants
4. Mike will have the raw scoping comments placed on the web in June for participant review before the next meeting
5. Mike will provide background information on cooperator status to ICG participants
6. All participants are encouraged to submit agenda item topics/share planning information in this forum
7. John Martin will follow up immediately with University of Idaho regarding its availability to conduct the socioeconomic study
8. BLM will communicate with participants whether University of Idaho is available to conduct the study or if BLM has to resort to plan B (issuing an RFP)
9. ICG participants will provide their comments on the BLM guidance and sideboards document by June 7, 2002. Comments can be provided in the mail or electronically to Mike O'Donnell
10. BLM will distribute these meeting notes and the revised January 23, 2002 meeting notes to meeting participants by May 31, 2002 electronically. Also scheduled for distribution on May 31, 2002 is a copy of the Owyhee Initiative Charter and background information on Cooperator Status. These will be provided electronically if possible and via mail if necessary.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held in conjunction with a visit from Mike Harty, CDR Associates, who will be in the area on Thursday, June 20 to be available to Assessment interviewees. If Mike is available to meet on Friday, June 21st with the ICG, the meeting will be held that morning from 9 a.m. to 12:00 noon, to accommodate the availability of some of the ICG members. If Mike is not available on Friday, the ICG meeting will be held as originally scheduled on Wednesday, June 19, 2002 from 9 a.m. to 12 noon.

The next meeting agenda includes a:

- Review and discussion of the Assessment with Mike Harty, CDR Associates
- Discussion about the raw list of scoping issues, available on the BLM website for review prior to the meeting, and
- A review of the public involvement process as developed per the results of the Assessment.

Subsequent meetings of the ICG are tentatively set for Wednesday, August 12, and
Wednesday, September 25. Both meetings will be held from 9 a.m. to 12 noon.

FLIP CHART NOTES

WELCOME ICG

MAY 23, 2002

MEETING OBJECTIVES

- Review and finalize 1/23 meeting notes
- Update on RMP activities
- Socioeconomic feedback
 - On tasks...is it all there?
 - On options...what are your preferences?
- Planning Criteria
 - Review and discuss draft
 - Other government agency guidance?
- Confirm next meeting and next steps

MEETING CONDUCT

- Participate! Share perspectives and ideas
- Listen, learn and understand
- One speaks at a time, refrain from side conversations
- Focus on discussion topic/objective – honor time constraints
- Don't monopolize- share time with others
- Turn off cell phones, pagers

SOCIOECONOMIC DISCUSSION

1. Review tasks
2. Outline options
3. Identify Preferences

SOCIOECONOMIC TASKS

Task 1:

- Evaluate and use results of existing studies – clarify
- Seek out all studies
- Review other studies/other counties - ISPR has a nonresident visitors study, F and G will look for theirs (look at full range)

Task 2:

- UI Modeling OK, question about application
 - Re census data, what about those who live in Owyhee County with another county address?
 - Correct model for discrepancies
 - Just gather base line data
-

- Modified IMPLAN to meet individual needs
- Communities in study areas – not just Owyhee County (4 county area)

Task 3:

- Modified IMPLAN

Task 4:

- Sub-models that convert alternative (change in purchases) into a form that the model can run “changes in final demand” (converted into additional tasks, etc....)
- What are your economic questions that you would like to factor into this?
- By end of next week will send electronic copy, need comments by the end of that week
- Time is of the essence—it will go out

SOCIOECONOMIC OPTIONS

1. RFP

Contractors respond and team selects contractor

- Competitive
- Negotiated
- Plan B

2. Sonoron does base line -- (followed by option 1)

3. Prepare specific contract and request cost

4. Assistance agreement with UI on task basis

- Need key players
- Don't know if they are willing

3. John Martin – State BLM economist - does it

4. Peer review of UI (or others?)

- Built into UI process

PLANNING CRITERIA

- First airing
 - Un-reviewed
 - Early
 - Dialogue with ice
 - Not for distribution
 - Not comprehensive – a starting point
 - Want to use to set up realistic expectations
 - Where does socio-economic fit?
-

GENERAL COMMENTS

- Does criteria fall within parameters set by Congress?
- Confusion with format—have general criteria for NCA, review, separate out
- Question about interpretation of FLPMA—extract exact language
- Question about reference/guidance in draft document “Sensitive Species” status
- Wild horse/vegetation management – consistent with ACT (Wild horse and burro Act)
- Wild and scenic river determination question
- Clarification on some of the wording
- Site/Reference BLM policy more specifically
- These are important – please provide your comments

ACTION ITEMS

10. Marsha provide draft **meeting notes** to Mike by Tuesday 5/28
11. Make changes as **noted to 1/23** meeting notes- Mary
12. **Howard** will ask for initiative information and get to Mike to distribution to meeting participants
13. Raw comments distributed to group before next meeting – Mike (on web in June)
14. Mike provide **background info on cooperator** status to ICG participants
15. All—feel free to share planning efforts/submit agenda items, to this forum
16. John Martin follow up immediately with UI regarding socio-economic study
17. Communicate to participants if BLM has to go to plan B
18. Participants comment on sideboard document – 2 weeks – June 7

NEXT MEETING AGENDA

Explore June 21st or do 19th

- Assessment
- Public involvement
- Potentially distribute next revision of side boards and guidelines
- Socioeconomic update

August 21st

- Socioeconomic update
- Scoping issues

September 25th

- Bundling
- Alternatives development
- Socioeconomic update

~Check in on meeting dates

PARKING LOT

- 1/23 action items 6 and 4 to be pursued at appropriate time in the future
 - Socioeconomic Task 4 comments gets at the heart of action item 4 comments
-