

**Forest Plan Revision
Cooperators Meeting
Green River Lakes
09/7-8/06**

Facilitation by Fran van Houten.

Day 1 – 09/07/06

Notes by Fran van Houten (from flipchart).

SUGGESTIONS/UPGRADES (TO COOPERATORS AND PUBLIC MEETINGS)

Make cooperators meetings more accessible to public; improve public education of process.

Need more localized meetings in advance of cooperators meetings.

Consider targeted invitations to groups with specific focus; allow them to make presentations and lead tours; cooperators participate, then pass info up at cooperators meetings; concern expressed over what interests/concerns might be of specific groups (e.g., Western Horsemen's Association, Blue Ribbon Coalition, National Outdoor Leadership School).

Best to keep facilitation simpler.

CALENDAR

9/14 – Public Workshop, Buffalo CANCELLED

9/16 – Public Workshop, Greys River CANCELLED

12/1 – Propose economic study parameters to Cooperators' Group meeting

11/27-12/1 – Public Workshops

12/1 – Cooperators Meeting

3/5-8/07 – Public Meetings

3/9 – Cooperators Meeting

3/29 – Cooperators Meeting

April 2007 – Comprehensive Evaluation Due

Day 1 – 09/07/06

Notes by Michael Schrotz

Review of Desired Conditions - Suggested changes/comments from Cooperators.

Measures (Cooperators identified and discussed concerns, as follows).

General comment (Greg Munther) Caution in the amount we propose to monitor. Budgets are down, past Forest Plans promised everything; Don't build a legal trap. Bottomline: limit what we plan to monitor; select key items that monitor management; we can always do more. Prioritizing our monitoring based on available budget is not likely to sit well with courts. If we need to monitor, then do it, budgetary limitations are not proving to be a good excuse.

1. ECOLOGICAL

a. Page 1

Deferred discussion since all were veg-related and Liz was not present to address.

b. Page 2

1.1.4.1 – Portion of acres infested by undesirable plant species.

i. add in - % or portion of “known” acres. (Matt Hoobler).

1.2 Disturbance (Greg Munther)

i. Concern is that list of disturbance relates only to natural disturbances including fire and insects/disease. Why not include mechanical such as timber harvest or human activity-caused such as livestock grazing?

ii. Is there a linkage between stand structure, disturbance and eco-type? (Bill Haagenson)

1.3/1.4/1.5 Habitat for species (Greg Munther)

i. Concern is quantity and quality; potentially a massive workload, with potential for huge legal trap. Suggestion to monitor by habitat condition, i.e., natural range of variability; manage for habitat not species.

Ans: Specific items in the regs; coarse filter (species lists) and fine filter (screen species status, habitat condition).

1.6 Watershed function (Russ Bacon)

i. Wording implies measuring entire stream; can't do with funds and time. Does this require application of Rosgren over entire forest?

Ans: Not every mile (sample)

c. Page 3

1.6.6 Air Quality (Greg Clark)

i. Scale is of concern; Management Area (MA) is too small.

A: Contact Terry Svalberg.

2. SOCIAL

a. Page 3

2.1 Recreation Opportunities (Brad Hill).

i. Routes used as trail in the summer and corridors in the winter should be referred to as corridors, not trails to maintain naming convention.

2.1.2 – OHV in Semi-Primitive Motorized settings (Brad Hill).

i. Referred to Chapter 1. include maintenance levels 2 and 3.

2.1.3 - OHV in Semi-Primitive Motorized settings (Brad Hill).

i. add “signing.”

ii. Table 2.1.3(b) add “safety shelter.”

Ans: Suggest that Brad coordinate with Susan Marsh on above three items.

2.1.1.3 – Miles of trails available (Temple Stevenson)

i. add statement about condition or standard

General comment – ADA standards specifically notes on page 5 under 2.2.4 – Access for persons with disabilities. (Kent Connelly)

i. Needs to be added to page 3 and 4 under all references to recreation.

ii. 4-wheelers in roadless should be acceptable.

Ans: Different standards for access by setting. (Refer to Susan Marsh for discussion and clarification).

General comment – Create a Glossary of words and acronyms.

b. Page 4 – no additional comments

c. Page 5 – no additional comments

d. Page 6

2.6.4 – Geo/Paleo sites (Kellie Roadifer)

i. Measurement is for the number only, what about the condition of the site?

ii. This should be protected, non-available info.

2.6.6 – Scenic ways

i. Coordinate with County Commissioners prior to

designating (Mary Thoman).

2.6.8 – RNAs (Temple Stevenson).

i. Does this refer to current versus proposed RNAs or both?

e. Page 7

2.7.2 – Land Use Culture of Old West (Mary Thoman)

i. Question is how to measure this item concerning sense of place.

ii. State offered to help with social survey and possible funding; qualitative

3. ECONOMIC

a. Page 7

2.1 Commercial Rec – Ski areas (Roger Bower).

i. Proportion of acres suitable does not answer the question; what is the economic question? may be wrong measurement.

General comment – (Matt Hoobler)

i. Matt referred to Old West Agricultural Ranching study in Routt Co. Copy of the Economic Report has been sent to Rick for review.

General comment – (Larry Jorgenson)

i. Questioned rationale for proportion of acres. Concern is qualitative versus quantitative, e.g., an area could have lots of acres, but all poor condition or quality, or another area could have few acres but of great quality.

b. Page 8

3.1.1.4a-e – Revenue from ski areas (Larry Jorgenson)

i. Tax revenue or other (non-tax) revenue?

Largest portion of revenue is not taxed, such

as, lift tickets.

ii. What is the measure; percent of gross; wrong measure?

3.2.1.3 thru 3.2.1.7 (Greg Munther)

i. What does *** refer to?

Ans: Refers to FSM direction.

General question – (Matt Hoobler)

i. Will the Plan use a suitability model for suitable acres? e.g., generally suitable versus suitable for grazing on an allotment basis.

3.2.3.1 – Proportion of acres for grazing (Matt Hoobler)

i. Where is the ecological measure? Is there a separate plan for grazing suitability or will it be included in this Plan.

c. Page 9

3.2.6 Energy Resources - (Tom Darin).

i. Concern of separating minerals into various energy types. Seems reasonable from a planning viewpoint, but the mineral estate cannot be separated once sold by BLM; the purchaser gets all the mineral rights, not coal bed methane, separate from coal, separate from oil, separate gas, etc.

General comment – (Temple Stevenson)

i. State will finance economic assessment; MedBow completed; Shoshone underway. Each is tailored to local/county needs.

ii. Data needs are tracked on websites (Roger Bower)

Day 2 – 09/08/06

Notes by Rick Fox

Summary of main points heard regarding Need for Change:

- Stop 1: (Wilderness @ GRL) Consider enhancing commercial and/or front-country-oriented recreation (thinking about the cabins and some evidence of increased day-use from Pinedale)
- Stop 2: n/a
- Stop 3: (Feedground) Concern about combined effect of cattle grazing and elk feeding on erosion/watershed condition. Permitting storage of hay (and thence the feedground) remains a complex question.
- Stop 4: (Dollar Lake) Consider an intermediate form of campsite with some improvements such as parking areas, etc., that concentrate dispersed use to avoid widespread resource damage, without converting a dispersed camping experience to a fully developed one.
- Stop 5: (Kendall Warm Springs) Consider the trade-off between enhanced interpretational elements with the potential threat to T&E habitat caused by attracting more visitation. Consider the possibility that broader protections (more than 160-acre withdrawal) may be needed with respect to the geology and subsurface hydrology of the area
- Stop 6: (Boundary) Broad agreement in support of creating a special area to protect an antelope migration corridor to compensate for emerging loss of corridor in private inholdings. Such a special area could include uses such as grazing and timber harvest. Continue managing for Scenic designation of the upper Green River, with the presumption that such status does not preclude uses such as grazing.

Notes by Michael Schrotz

On Ground/field Exercise - Need for Change in Desired Condition (matrix).

Facilitator used green-yellow-red card to check temperature of group; discussion focused on yellow-red cards (why).

Stop 1 – Bridger-Wilderness @ Green River Lakes

- First attempt at real-life test of the matrix.
 - Too many items to review; focus on the 5 highlighted areas.

- Too many pages including Chapt 1 (31 pgs) and excerpts from Forest Plan (52 pgs).
- Changed “rules” during presentation; on-site to forest-wide application; confusing to participants.
- Air Quality
 - Need to have expert on site for discussion; unanswered questions.
 - Who does have authority in Class 1 areas; FS or DEQ?
 - What are the trends v. what do you see here today?
- Front-country recreation
 - Need to define “front country recreation.” Not a common understanding of what the term means; lots of personal visions of what this could be; but what is intended. No local knowledge of area.
- Guided recreation
 - Hard to discuss; not enough knowledge of the area.
- Need for change? For me? For the resource for 15 years from now?
- Need time to share between Cooperators and publics to listen and learn various viewpoints.
- Forms not useful for discussion; too detailed. Good for recording info.
- Questions selected for scenarios well presented; discussion was good; questions presented were good.
- Need for Change and Suitable Uses forms limited use; too complicated; too much time required; losing interest and patience. (Same for remainder of stops).

Stop 2 – Green River Lakes Campground

- Stop was cancelled

Stop 3 – Feedground

- Forested – yes in the revised Plan

- Do more vegetation treatments faster/sooner; don't allow habitat to reach these conditions.
- Control wildlife/livestock or they'll eat it all.
- Habitat for Species of Interest -elk- Yes, this should be a Desired Condition in the Revised Plan
 - Manage for healthy habitats, and you will have healthy wildlife at appropriate population numbers.
 - Why are we managing for (artificial) increased wildlife numbers?
- Riparian – yes, take care of riparian areas.
 - Confusing, not in DFC 12, but FW guideline.
 - If we desire willow habitat, why is this land used as feedground for wildlife and livestock; looks beat out.
- “Old West”
 - Change term to Custom and Culture; active management.
 - Difficult to describe pastoral on public lands.
 - Fishing is part of the Old West; should we enhance.
 - Referred to Routt Co. study (Matt Hoobler).
 - Call it a working landscape, as suggested at Kemmerer.
 - Chief's four threats – Open Space/economic; grazing on public lands helps to protect private lands outside the forest boundary.
- Livestock grazing
 - OK in Revised Plan, but not at concentrated, hi-density use.
 - Un-natural conditions due to fire.

Stop 4 – Dollar Lake – dispersed camping – yes in Revised plan

- General comment – Desired Future Conditions. Public/Cooperators do not understand nor know the difference between DFC 3, 10, 12 or any other. This is for internal use.
 - Discussion can occur and by understanding of discussion and rationale, the Planning Team can determine need for change without complicating with DFC discussion.
- Insect/Disease
 - Manage actively, sooner so vegetation conditions such as these do not result.

- Concern; landscape scale treatment v. timber sale size limitations (<40 ac) will not treat problem via mechanical solution; fire?
- Soil Productivity
 - Bare ground is of concern due to seedbed for weeds, and loss of soil due to wind/water erosion.
- Roadside dispersed Rec. – yes in Revised Plan
 - Group suggested a range of recreation from dispersed to node to campground.
 - Dispersed – Limited use/time such as hunting season only.
 - Node – Constant use expected for some reason such as Dollar Lake.
 - Campground – High-use w/facilities
- Scenic
 - Do not allow veg to reach this condition; not acceptable at recreation sites; behind the curve at this area.
 - Viable, healthy, young veg.

Stop 5 – Kendall Warm Springs

- Habitat for T&E Species
 - Unanswered questions:
 - What is known about mineral withdrawal?
 - What is protected; limestone karst geology?
 - Research required; Conservation Plan; why are we doing what we are doing?
- Interpretive/Access
 - Very unique place; need to let American public know; make it a State Park or Administrative Special Area or Research/Educational Natural Area.
 - Increase signage
- Utility/transportation corridor
 - Check alternate route possibilities first before allowing in this area.
 - Relocate road around the warm springs

Stop 6 – Tie Hack area – Forest boundary

- Habitat for species of interest.
 - Discussion of antelope corridor protection.
 - Generally in agreement to protect corridor(s).
 - Uncertain as to what this would mean; livestock grazing, road, access, recreation, etc.
 - Discussion of timber project behind private homes to create corridor and change veg types for antelope.

- ROW/access/easements
 - Must continue to work outside Forest boundary toward common goals.
 - Conservation Easements w/Home Owners Assoc.

- Wild & Scenic Rivers
 - Need to have expert (Susan Marsh/Cindy Stein) on site for discussion; unanswered questions.
 - What is status as candidate, eligible, recommended?
 - What is protected; proposed length of river reach?
 - What are consequences to other resources and management?