

***Cooperators Forest Plan Meeting Notes
1000-1630 February 27, 2008
Jackson-Four-H Building***

Notes taken by Joanna Behrens

Attendees:

Kellie Roadifer – BLM, Kent Connelly - Lincoln Co., Margaret Wilson - GTNP, Mark Toft – Governor’s Planning Office, Lyn Shanaghy - Sen. Enzi, Pam Buline - Sen. Barrasso, Jay Dunbar - BTNF, Jonathan Teichert - Lincoln Co. Planner, Scott Smith - WGFD, Rob Gipson - WGFD, Greg Clark - BTNF, Randy Williams - Teton CD, Bill Haagenson - Wyo. Div. of Forestry, Jeffrey Jacquet - Sublette County, Mary Thoman - Sweetwater CD, John Linn - Sublette Co., Kim Johnson - BTNF, Liz Davy - BTNF, Tammie Archibald - Lincoln Co., Roger Bower – WY Business Council, Darrell Walker –Sweetwater CD, Tom Peters - BTNF, Michael Schrotz - BTNF, Andy Norman - BTNF, Rick Fox - BTNF, Eric Winthers - BTNF, John Kuzloski - BTNF, Susan, Marsh - BTNF, Joanna Behrens - BTNF, Faith Ryan - BTNF, John Hagengruber - BTNF, Brian Goldberg - BTNF, Russ Bacon - BTNF, Dale Deiter - BTNF, Kniffy Hamilton - BTNF, Mike Balboni - BTNF

Observers / Consultants:

Nancy Shea – Wyoming Wilderness Association, Louise Lasley – Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance, David Allison – Coalition of Local Governments

The meeting was facilitated by Frances VanHouten.

Objectives: Present the scenario development process to address “need for change” on the Forest and present the results of the Economic and Social Surveys.

Agenda:

- 10:00 Start Up/Welcome
- 10:45 Forest Plan Revision process update
- 11:15 Planning Team demonstration of scenario development process
(working lunch)
- 12:45 Presentation of BTNF Economic Profile (Tex Taylor, Univ. of Wyoming)
- 1:45 Break
- 2:00 Presentation of BTNF Social Survey (Jessica Clement, Colorado State Univ.)
- 3:30 Wrap-up
- 3:45 ADJOURN

Handouts: Agenda, Scenario Presentation to FPR Cooperators’ Group, BTNF Forest Plan Revision- GA45 Scenario Development Worksheet, BTNF Forest Plan Revision – The Scenario Building Process, printout of powerpoint slides for the Socio-Economic Profile of the Bridger-Teton National Forest (Phase II), printout of powerpoint slides for the Social Survey (Local Values and Preferences Regarding The BTNF, Wyoming – Results of two Surveys), My Parking Lot (worksheet for attendees to write their thoughts on regarding the scenario development process)

Kniffy welcomed the attendees, summarized the Forest Service planning activities since the last cooperators meeting, and emphasized that all our activities including this meeting are “rule neutral” until a New Planning Rule is approved by the court.

Fran talked about the “3 hats” that the cooperators are wearing at this meeting:

1. They are here to represent their own thoughts.
2. They need to consider the relevance of information in the context of the community they represent.
3. They need to draw meaning from conflicting or ambiguous information.

Scenario Development: Rick referred to the four basic questions of Forest Plan Revision

1. What are our goals?
2. How should these goals be measured?
3. How much progress are we making?
4. How can we make better progress?

Each specialist has completed a draft of the Comprehensive Evaluation Report (CER) that discussed the need for changes in their resource area. A list of Need for Change Emphasis Items was drawn up by the resource specialists and approved by the BTNF Leadership Team. The purpose of scenarios is to identify where and how Need for Change can realistically be addresses given current management approaches, conditions on the ground and the likely trade-offs that come into play for actual values in specific places. Its goal is not to generate decisions but rather to establish a range of choices for further consideration. The intent is to promote a shared understanding about the real choices on the table for Forest Plan Revision and provide a rational framework for analyzing, refining, and ultimately making those choices.

The Planning Team demonstrated via GIS and powerpoint how they drew scenarios in Geographic Area 45. The process is explained in handout “The Scenario Building Process” and “GA 45 Scenario Development Worksheet”. The Planning Team will be taking this process to public workshops in March and April. It was emphasized that these scenarios are just examples and the public will have a chance to give their input and draw up new scenarios if they desire.

There was some discussion about where workshops should be held. Some attendees felt that shift workers in Kemmerer should have a chance to attend meetings without having to drive to Rock Springs. The Forest Service also needs to explain to the public what it has been doing in the past year and why the delay. Explain exactly what you want from them, because the public feels they already told you what they want.

Socio-Economic Profile

Tex Taylor presented the Economic Survey results via speaker phone and Powerpoint. It is available on the web at <http://agecon.uwyo.edu/econdev>.

Social Survey

Jessica Clement presented “Local Values and Preferences Regarding the Bridger-Teton National Forest, Wyoming – Results of Two Studies” via Powerpoint. She surveyed people living in the five counties surrounding the BTNF. The results of the survey will be posted at http://www.fs.fed.us/r4/btnf/news/forest_plan_revision.

Jessica received a total of 438 surveys from all 5 counties, a response rate of 33%. This is considered more than adequate for the overall survey, resulting in margins of error of reported results for the overall BTNF region to be +/- 4.45% or less.

However, there was concern that some of the sentiments in the survey were not representative of Sublette County residents. Jessica stated that the number of people that responded from any one county was too low to draw conclusions about the citizens of that county in particular (at least 300 responses would be needed per county).

Therefore, while the overall results for the five-county area are statistically valid estimates (+/- 4.45%) for the population of that five-county area as a whole, the county-specific results should not be used to draw conclusions about the values or preferences of specific counties.

Key Forest Plan Revision Dates

March 26, 2008: Public Workshop – Northern BTNF Scenarios, Afton

March 27, 2008: Public Workshop – Northern BTNF Scenarios, Jackson

April 28, 2008: Public Workshop – Southern BTNF Scenario, Pinedale

April 29, 2008: Public Workshop – Southern BTNF Scenario, Rock Springs

...or Kemmerer?

September, 2008: Cooperators Meeting

Cooperators Questions/Comments

How fast can you have impact? How fast will this move? What's the scale and timing of project planning?

What is the number and size of the Geographic Areas (Gas)? Target GAs at each location.

Have more descriptions on Need for change elements. Distribute at public meetings.

Why designate areas at all?

How do Regions bump up against each other?

At the beginning of the public meetings, look at the big map first so people can orient themselves to where the GAs are. Then zoom into the GAs. It would be less confusing.

Identify major resource issues or topics before going to zones or GAs. (vegetation, socio-economic, mineral etc.)

Susan, explain to the public that all areas do not need to change.

John, only change zone if warranted.

Identify Need for Change driver for each GA.

Need to include access to diversions and other water rights related facilities.

Need to include water rights on Need for Change Emphasis Items (economic).

How much will local input shape the scenarios?

How does the restricted vehicle access work? Can individuals cut firewood or is it for public or private business by sale or bid?

Oil and Gas leases – does the map reflect possible roads needed for existing oil and gas leases in Wyoming Range and the Southern BT?

Not enough access for major fire suppression.

Need repeater/radio site access.

No discussion on Need for Change to OHV trails.

Public notice to include reasons why 6 month delay and why the public input is valued.

How are the current roadless regulations affecting scenario development? Be careful with how much influence the RACR has, it might not be around long. What if the courts get rid of the roadless rule?

Need to incorporate Desired Future Conditions into the theme and analysis early.

Standards and guidelines are 1982 rule terms.

Given the high levels of roadless and wilderness, it's important to keep roaded areas as manageable as possible. That is, I would hate to see roaded areas treated as pseudo-roadless.

Wildlife management will need to make some choices – if, for example, treating whitebark pine is important to wildlife over the long run, then there might have to be some short-term sacrifice.