

INTERAGENCY COORDINATION GROUP MEETING NOTES

June 19, 2002

Participants: Bob Martin, Idaho Fish and Game, Jeff Cook-Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation, Wes Whitworth-Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation, Dick Sheehan-Idaho Army National Guard, Jim Desmond-Owyhee County Natural Resource Committee, Mary Jones-BLM, John Sullivan-BLM, Mike O'Donnell-BLM, MJ Byrne-BLM, Leslie Freeman-DEQ

Presenter: Mike Harty, CDR Associates (working for the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution)

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 Wednesday, June 19, 2002, in the BLM Lower Snake River District Office Conference Room from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon. The meeting objectives were to:

- Hear and discuss the results of the Assessment
- Review and provide feedback on the proposed public involvement process
- Review and provide feedback on the draft bundling of issues, and
- Provide status reports respective to the socioeconomic study scope of work and the planning criteria

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's May 23, 2002, meeting notes and action items. The one change to the meeting documentation was to make the clarification that the "ICG recommended" pursuing a RFP as plan B to the socioeconomic study scope of work. Mary Jones noted the change and will provide the corrected version with the next distribution of meeting materials. All May 23 meeting action items have been completed except for the delivery of a signed Owyhee Initiative Charter document distributed to ICG participants.

Assessment Review—Mike Harty, CDR Associates, confirmed that all ICG members present have in fact received a copy of the Assessment and summarized its resulting recommendations to the group. ICG members had no substantive questions about the Assessment, but the topic did generate some discussions about :

- How to engage the “silent stakeholders,”
- That people come out to raise objections and when an issue is “bad enough” that it becomes a priority,
- If things are perceived to be going along fine, people are not motivated to participate
- The merits and concerns of using polling as a tool for gauging public perception
- The use of consensus and when it is and is not most effective. In the Assessment, consensus and collaboration are thought to not be a good tool in that stakeholders are so polarized amongst themselves that they are not willing to engage in that kind of process
- The observation that this Assessment is a tool not only useful to the BLM but to other entities with stakeholders in the same area, and
- That the Assessment is the basis on which the ensuing public involvement process was created.

The Assessment will be available on the Institute’s Website; the executive summary will be available on the BLM Website with a link to the entire document.

Public involvement process—Mike O’Donnell presented the public involvement process flow chart as developed in response to Assessment findings and recommendations. ICG members had no comments on the process itself, except to seek confirmation that the process provided for intergovernmental coordination opportunities before going to the broader public. The flow-chart depicts the pre-public coordination that occurs with Owyhee County and the ICG before going to the public. The tribes are invited to participate in the intergovernmental forum—where governmental issues have the opportunity for “cross pollination.” While they are considering that opportunity, they reiterate their perspective that they are an independent nation and will coordinate with the BLM in that capacity. An additional public meeting will be held in Marsing on July 8 in response to the request by the Owyhee County Commissioners.

Scoping issues—BLM has posted the raw scoping issues on the internet and that address was provided to ICG participants late last week and can be found at www.id.blm.gov and click “planning”. Mike O’Donnell described how comments were transformed to issues that could be studied without value-laden statements, and distributed a “Decision-level” document to use by way of explanation and example. The issues as bundled in draft form by the BLM’s interdisciplinary team were distributed to the group for review and feedback. For discussion purposes, the ICG reviewed three of the bundled issues—all respective to the Bruneau—including vegetation, recreation and socio-economics. The group made a number of suggestions to these three issue statements (included in the flip charts that follow). All ICG members are invited to review the bundled issues on their own and provide comments to Mike via mail or e-mail by July 1.

Scope of Work—University of Idaho is available and willing to conduct the socio-economic study, and a scope of work is being negotiated with them at this time, a copy of which was distributed to the ICG. One participant asked BLM to investigate the ability for the University to print two reports—one specific to the Bruneau and the other to the

NCA. ICG participants were asked to identify what information they might have available for UI to use as it conducts its first round of research of existing information.

Planning Criteria—BLM is still working on the planning criteria and seeking some direction from the State office relative to the use of draft guidance specific to Sage Grouse. ICG members were encouraged to review the materials and provide any input they may have. So far, BLM has received comments only from one ICG member.

Action Items

1. Marsha will provide the draft meeting notes to BLM by Thursday, June 20
2. Mary will distribute the 6/18/02 draft meeting notes, final 5/23/02 meeting notes, draft bundled issue statements, and current planning criteria document to ICG members by Friday, June 21, 2002
3. ICG members will review the draft bundled issue statements and provide comments to Mike by Monday, July 1, 2002
4. ICG members are encouraged to provide to Mike any information that might be helpful to UI as it initiates the socio-economic study process.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, August 21, 2002. The next meeting agenda includes an

- Update regarding the public meeting process and
- Review of the draft alternatives as developed by that date.

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

FLIP CHART NOTES

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT—FEEDBACK

- Would like other agencies to participate in outreach meetings
- “Tourism” group difficult to get a handle on
(Department of Commerce – Gov council on commerce and tourism, mountain home, chamber tourism, Marsing Chamber, Owyhee County Historical Society)
- Put word out...if you want us to come out we are happy to

DRAFT BUNDLING ISSUES—FEEDBACK

- There are distinctive types of OHV use – purely OHV, working OHV (ranchers), secondary recreation (hunting/fishing) – how do you address that distinction?
- After public meetings another rework of issues
- Owyhee County wants its input considered before public review

VEGETATION

- “Possible” levels “to meet standards and guideline levels?”
- Point of question is to show the kinds of things to be addressed in the analysis
- Drop the second question as it is in first
- Sage Grouse Habitat/Standards
- Does vegetation issue include needs of special status species?
- Which management practices are needed to achieve standards and objectives to protect
- Monitoring data

RECREATION

- Broad range of hunting/fishing opportunities- access- including NON motorized access use
- “OHV use and restricted OHV use”
- Seems to have a bias for OHV
- Demand increasing – motorized and non-motorized
- What’s the impact to county/local (in socio-economics)
- Where are opposition?
- Designations apply to rec use – exceptions for other uses found

SOCIO-ECONOMIC

- What is “local” community?
- Do we really need first guests?
- Socioeconomic impact may be bigger than south of the river...?
- “Regional” economy
- Change “local” to “affected”

SCOPE OF WORK

- What information do you have?

- Regional model compartmental on the different areas – 2 distinct reports even with overlap in info
- Planning criteria – please look at them if you haven't

NEXT MEETING

August 21st 2002

9am – Noon

BLM

- Update on public meetings
- Comprehensive review of alternatives

ACTION ITEMS

1. Marsha – deliver meeting documentation to BLM by Friday
2. Comments on issues to BLM by July 1st
3. May send corrected issues, planning criteria