

BTNF Plan Revision Cooperators' Group
Public Collaboration & Economic Assessment Subcommittee Meetings

4-H Building, 255 W. Deloney, Jackson

Nov. 1st, 2006, 10:00am – 12:30pm and 1:00pm to 4:30pm

Main Objectives

1. Launch public collaboration subcommittee, identify membership, tasks and procedures for enhancing public involvement in the BTNF Plan Revision process
2. Launch economic assessment subcommittee, identify membership, scope of assessment, tasks and procedures

Agenda – Public Collaboration

- 1000 Round-robin: what do individual attendees see as needed improvements in the collaborative process and what would they like to contribute toward those improvements?
- 1100 Suggested tasks for enhancing participation at the Nov. workshops and beyond
- 1200 Schedule tasks and responsible subcommittee members
- 1230 ADJOURN

Agenda – Economic Assessment

- 1300 Function of subcommittee, roles/responsibilities (Rick & Temple)
- 1315 Scope of economic assessment: Economic Desired Conditions based on Draft Chapter 1, additional interests? (John K. & Tex)
- 1400 Identification of preferred measures, based on CER outline and/or other suggestions, and forecasting methods; needs for assistance with data collection and analysis (John K. and Tex)
- 1445 BREAK
- 1500 *Continue above*
- 1600 Timeline
- 1630 ADJOURN

Notes – Public Collaboration

ATTENDEES

Governmental Cooperators: Mary Flanderka, Larry Jorgenson, Temple Stevenson, Mary Thoman, Randy Williams, Deb Wolfley.

Forest Service: Kniffy Hamilton, Michael Schrotz, Rick Fox, John Kuzloski, Jane Darnell

Non-governmental participants: Pam Buline, Jeffrey Jacquet, Steff Kessler, Cathy Purves, Fred Smith, Lyn Shanaghy, Steve Thomas, Dru Bower, Lisa McGee

SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS

1. Open invitation to Cooperators' Group meetings for NGOs

- a. Presentations coupled with topics
2. Topical workshops (Shoshone had 6-7 of such workshops), perhaps by Plan Component (?)
3. Organizations can host such topical meetings on their own
4. Website is good, but need to get the work out better, e.g. through an advertisement
5. How to make the process more user-friendly?
 - a. Clarify at the outset the full process so the public can prioritize their time investment
 - b. More meaningful opportunities
6. When will the whole draft be available for public comment; why not just wait until then?
7. (answers above) We want to get the public to develop the Revised Plan with us.
8. No longer doing conventional model of public involvement ('here's our proposal, what are your comments'), but rather focused on building relationships to help develop ideas.
9. General public can't afford to devote a lot of time to help develop ideas.
10. Public discussion needs more framing
11. Public needs to know when choices are being made
12. Need place-based discussions
13. Why is the public not participating more?
 - a. Controversy drives participation
 - b. We need to give the public a clearer reason to participate
14. Need to focus on hot-button topics in a place-based manner, with Forest-wide vision too:
 - i. Oil & gas leasing
 - ii. Motorized Vehicle Travel Plan
 - iii. Sale or acquisition of NF lands
 - iv. Air quality
 - v. Rooding
 - vi. Access
15. How to avoid getting mired in discussion of FS policy?
16. Need to more clearly track how topics are addressed in various regulations
17. Need to get the message out for long-term public involvement in forest planning
18. Cooperators need to coordinate on outreach efforts
19. Cooperators should host (co-host) workshops
20. Participants/hosts need to have a responsibility, perhaps in offering a different, unofficial approach to topics
21. Where does the condition of the Forest come in?
22. Public needs to give value statements without having to repeat themselves excessively
23. Cooperators' multiple-use views should be represented
24. Are the communications between Cooperators and their constituents working? Maybe we need a better mechanism for this, such as proactive advertising.
25. Need to increase public attendance at Cooperators' Group meetings

TASKS TO ACHIEVE IMPROVEMENTS

1. Commissioners, Conservation Districts to start co-hosting workshops in March?
2. Following organizations volunteer to conduct educational workshops:
 - i. Teton Conservation District (wildlife in Jan. or Feb.)
 - ii. Greater Yellowstone Coalition (winter)
 - iii. Trout Unlimited
 - iv. Wyoming Outdoor Council
 - v. Sweetwater Conservation District
 - vi. Teton County Commissioners (oil & gas)
3. Teton Conservation District and Trout Unlimited agree to help with publicity

4. Each organization above to link to BTNF Plan Revision website
5. Following persons volunteer to help with making BTNF outreach materials more understandable, with less jargon:
 - i. Steff Kessler
 - ii. Randy Williams
 - iii. Cathy Purves
 - iv. Steve Thomas
 - v. Lisa McGee
 - vi. Note from BTNF: need a better cross-section of interest groups here?
6. Update BT FPR newsletter with workshop dates incl. educational workshops per above
7. Q&A on websites
8. More audience seating at Cooperators' Group meetings
9. Rework primer for November workshops
10. Shorten workshops to 2 hours?
11. Clarify importance of attending full workshop
12. Cost-sharing w/ State & Cooperators to increase number of workshops
13. Topical working groups?
14. Invite public comment interspersed throughout Cooperators' Group meetings.

Notes – Economic Assessment

ATTENDEES

Governmental Cooperators: Roger Bower, Mary Flanderka, Larry Jorgenson, Temple Stevenson, Tex Taylor, Mary Thoman, Randy Williams, Deb Wolfley.

Forest Service: Jane Darnell, Rick Fox, John Kuzloski.

Observers: Pam Buline, Jeffrey Jacquet, Steff Kessler, Cathy Purves, Fred Smith, Jonathan Schechter, Lyn Shanaghy, Steve Thomas, Dru Bower

The main focus of the assessment at this stage should be the current condition. How is the Bridger-Teton currently contributing to economic sustainability? The ideas outlined below are for Tex Taylor (UW) to consider in developing a proposal. They are organized by the elements of economic sustainability identified in "draft Chapter 1" of the Plan Revision. In general, we are interested in data at the county level, including Sublette, Lincoln, Teton, and Fremont Counties. Uinta and Sweetwater (or other scales, for example, state-wide) may be proposed by Tex for inclusion in analyzing specific elements based on his professional judgment.

Commercial recreation (3.1.1)

- Possible thresholds of viability (with confidence interval if quantified)
- Functional Economic Unit

Utilities and Transportation Corridors (3.1.2)

- Lower Valley Energy, Pipeline Authority, Infrastructure Authority, possibly statewide context.

Wood Products (3.2.1)

- University of Montana; Chuck Keegan
- Impact of mill closure
- Wood pellets/biomass – check with Hayley
- Stewardship contracts
- Small operators vs. large mills (small operator may need primary data, counties help identify).

Non-timber Forest Products (3.2.2)

- Permits; not a large element

Permitted Livestock Grazing (3.2.3)

- Tex has standard methods
- permits

Water Development (3.2.4)

- Consider per unit value of water

Minerals (3.2.5)

- Sand and gravel okay
- Presence of ores

Energy resources (3.2.6)

- Production back to 1986
- Consider potential (as/if relevant to assessing current contribution)
- 3 categories: producing well; leased but not producing; available but not leased.
- Consider the value of leasing and the value of not leasing (such tradeoff analysis may be beyond the scope of the current phase of this assessment).

Carbon Sequestration (3.2.7)

- Net Primary Productivity (NPP)
- May just estimate amount of carbon being sequestered
- Teton Conservation District may assist
- Forecasting based on structural stages (in the future)

Visitor Amenities (3.3.1)

- Visitor spending by activity and sector
- Associated employment
- Hotel/motel stays per visit

Resident Amenities (3.3.2)

- Largely narrative
- Possible consideration of "family economic self-sufficiency"

Possible/Likely Addition – Role of FS Budget in Local Economies

Some general remarks:

- Consider trends (not just current/static condition)
- Forecasts will come later, but assessment should use similar methods
- Consider ability to update during plan implementation (monitoring)
- Consider non-monetary measures and intrinsic value
- Different communities are impacted differently; assessment should reflect this
- What predictive model(s) should be used? IMPLAN? REMI?

Next Steps:

- Type/Circulate notes;
- Tex develops proposal;
- Tex presents proposal to cooperators on December 1 meeting in Afton.