



Diana Hawks

12/30/2002 10:33 AM

To: adgardner@washco.state.ut.us, Allen_Taylor@fws.gov, bbroscheid@gf.state.az.us, btowler@co.coconino.az.us, Becky Hammond/ASFO/AZ/BLM/DOI@BLM, Christine.Ballard@co.mohave.az.us, commiss@kanab.net, Dennis Curtis/ASFO/AZ/BLM/DOI@BLM, kptchair@color-country.net, lfthompson01@aol.com, lkuwanwisiwma@hopi.nsn.us, rdavidson@gf.state.az.us, rlprice92@msn.com, Roger Taylor/ASFO/AZ/BLM/DOI@BLM, spaicons@xpressweb.com, Steve Spangle/R2/FWS/DOI@FWS, William_Austin@fws.gov, Steve.Thomas@FHWA.dot.gov, spratt@co.coconino.az.us, oliver@color-country.net, kevinb@ci.colorado-city.az.us, joyj@xpressweb.com, Dennis Curtis/ASFO/AZ/BLM/DOI@BLM, David Kiel/ASFO/AZ/BLM/DOI@BLM, Becky Hammond/ASFO/AZ/BLM/DOI@BLM, Robert Sandberg/ASFO/AZ/BLM/DOI@BLM, Michael Herder/ASFO/AZ/BLM/DOI@BLM, Tom Folks/ASFO/AZ/BLM/DOI@BLM, Roger Taylor/ASFO/AZ/BLM/DOI@BLM, David Kiel/ASFO/AZ/BLM/DOI@BLM, Marisa Monger/ASFO/AZ/BLM/DOI@BLM, Whit Bunting/ASFO/AZ/BLM/DOI@BLM, Darla Sidles/PARA/NPS@NPS, Paula Branstner/PARA/NPS@NPS, David Boyd/ASFO/AZ/BLM/DOI@BLM, Kathleen Harcksen/ASFO/AZ/BLM/DOI@BLM, Richard Spotts/ASFO/AZ/BLM/DOI@BLM, Phil Seegmiller/ASFO/AZ/BLM/DOI@BLM

cc:

Subject: Meeting minutes from the last Cooperators meeting 12/12/02

For your information, here are the meeting minutes from our last meeting;



Meetingminutes December 12, 02 Cooperators

Our next meeting will be on January 9, 2003 - yikes, that is next week. We'll get an agenda out to you in a few days.

Please check the assignments and come to the meeting prepared. We'll try to do the same.

Thanks

Diana Hawks
Arizona Strip BLM
345 East Riverside Drive
St. George, UT 84790
(435) 688-3266 FAX (435) 688-3388

**Parashant Planning Meeting
December 12, 2002**

Facilitator: Dave Boyd

Upcoming meetings, deadlines:

January 9 Next meeting for Cooperators, BLM/NPS (10 am – 4:30 pm)
January 15 Items complete for Planning Bulletin #3
February 13 Meeting for Cooperators, BLM/NPS
February 15 Planning Bulletin #3 mailed, meeting notices sent out
March 10-13 Public meetings on alternatives; Mesquite, St. George, Fredonia, Flagstaff

Assignments

BLM/NPS Get Route Decision Tree draft criteria to Cooperators by 12/20/02
Cooperators Review of Route Decision draft criteria by Jan. 3, 2003 to Diana Hawks
BLM/NPS Get agenda for next meeting out to Cooperators before 1/9/03
BLM/NPS Get meeting minutes and assignments out to all Cooperators
Cooperators Complete handouts by next meeting on January 9, 2003

1. List 3 things you would like to see on the Arizona Strip in 20 years
2. And the things you would like to see in 100 years
3. Information for List of Preparers in document

Cooperators Review draft planning criteria, and mission, purpose, and significance statements by 3/28/03 (in Planning Bulletin #2, also at www.az.blm.gov/planning)
Wildlife Work Group – presentation on wildlife issues at February meeting?

Introductions, Ground Rules, Minutes

Favorite Places: Silk Creek Pasture, Kelly Point, Grand Gulch Mine, Powells Monument, Hidden Canyon, Twin Point, Toroweap, Mt. Trumbull, Saddle Mountain, Snap Canyon, Mokiak Meadow – old growth area, Mt. Logan, Jackson Tank area after a good rain storm, the Wave, Antelope

Review of the minutes

1. Change title from Parashant planning meeting to Arizona Strip Planning Meeting
2. List of Attendees should be attached
3. Change date from April 03 to April 04 for plan completion
4. Status of Affected Environment Sections – supposed to be completed by now but have stopped due to development of alternatives
5. Involvement of Lake Mead Resource Staff – also put on hold for now in preparation of affected environment

Minutes were approved

Bill Dickinson questioned the distribution of minutes – just those who attended or all on mailing list

- Goes to all team members and cooperating agencies

Meeting Objectives

- Inform all about planning progress and schedule
- Clarify what coop agencies are providing
- Complete MOU roles and responsibilities
- Determine Route Designation process
- Clarify role of work groups (will we have them?)

Planning Update – Diana Hawks

- We want to prepare one environmental impact statement. One public involvement process, one draft document, Sept 03 draft EIS completed for internal review, completed winter of 04 for public and external review
- Then we will separate the documents into three geographic documents in the Spring-summer of 05
- Scoping Report is on the www.AZ.BLM.GOV/planning/arizonastrip/reports
First Newsletter went out in May
- Second Newsletter will go out this week – draft distributed at meeting
- 2,219 scoping comments received
- Major Issues: Transportation and access, wilderness, management and protection of resources, livestock grazing, recreation, restoration remained as a management concern
- Planning Bulletins are being put on the web site
- 3,500 people on the mailing list
- Seeking public review on planning criteria, mission and purpose statements
- Detailed planning schedule was distributed
- **Public meetings in March – 10th-13th** - Alternative feedback from the public – Mesquite, St. George, Fredonia, and Flagstaff (based on public turnout at last meetings) – (Tribal representatives usually do not attend public meetings and Kingman is not on list of public meeting locations)
 - Beaver Dam in local school or city hall
 - St. George at Dixie Center
 - Fredonia – New town hall
 - Flagstaff – DuBois Center
 - Christine Ballard will inquire with the County Board on whether a Kingman Meeting would be desired
- Meetings will be 4 to 6pm in an open house format
- Meeting notices need to go out by February 15th – need all input for newsletter on January 15th (next meeting of this group is Jan. 9th)
- Ecozone map and alternatives will be presented and seeking feedback
- Lightly shaded items are completed in planning schedule
- If a community would like a meeting with the planning team – a meeting can be arranged or scheduled

BLM Land Use Planning Handbook – Copies distributed

- Appendix C – decisions BLM must make are listed for each resource and use
- Land Use Plan Decisions – Types of land use plan decisions are identified
- Implementation decisions – will be in future documents
- Directed to include a transportation plan – by Washington Office
- NPS also provides planning guidelines but are generally not as specific so these are covered for NPS

Cooperating Agencies

- US Fish and Wildlife, AZ Fish and Game, Mohave County, Coconino County, Kane County, Washington County, Hopi Tribe, Kaibab Paiute Tribe, Federal Highway Administration, City of Fredonia
- None of the MOUs have been completed to date – still in Solicitor's Office
- Have prepared a draft template – all will need specific Solicitor's review
- Planning schedule now includes the cooperators

Alternative Development

- No Action Alternative – what we are doing now – proclamations and existing planning and interim guidelines, Lake Mead NRA Administration – matrix distributed for recreation under no action column – there will also be a matrix for transportation and all other issues
- Increase Management Option - human influence and Decrease or minimum human influence
- Looking to develop 4 alternatives as the preferred will be developed from a mix of these
- Difficult to understand what the numbers represent in the alternative matrix
- Jan 15 – the matrix will be completed for all alternatives – in general
- Will identify those decisions that are currently in place and will not change – actions common to all alternatives – AZ Strip
- Items specifically identified in the Proclamation will be constants across all alternatives
- Recreational and environmental hot spots will be delineated on maps
- All locations are in the Paiute sensitive areas – so Tribal interests are there and want to concur with decisions that are made
- When we go out to the public will not have formal alternatives but we will have issues identified and how to generally approach the resolution of the issues
- Scoping process information to be presented to the public to react to in the public meetings – need to know exactly what we are going to present. Need to give them something to show we heard their concerns during scoping – do not want to repeat the initial scoping meetings
- Two new Congressman in Arizona Rick Renzi and Trent Franks – invite them for a tour – may want to do the same for the Utah delegation

Route Designation Process – Dennis

- Access is a major issue in this plan – we knew this before we started this planning effort
- Also we watched all the issues in the Grand Staircase NM

- No cross country travel – need to stay on existing roads
- We will most likely be challenged on our decision no matter what it is
- Need a process that is defensible
- State office is concerned that there needs to be some consistency between the new Monuments in Arizona
- Les Weeks with Private firm under contract for planning in the Mojave Desert of California presented a potential Route Decision Tree
- Presented the route decision tree process to the Arizona Strip staff last week – is this a process we want to follow
- We have route inventory map for both monuments – now we need to determine which routes will remain open and which will closed – NPS planning will carry forward from Lake Mead GMP in 1986
- Handout – Route Designation Decision Tree
 - Yellow – legal access – land tenure access – includes all County roads
 - Green – natural resource issues
 - Blue – recreation issues – is it important to recreation
 - Tan – redundancy
- This process could be repeated - would not be arbitrary or capricious – would provide a legal framework for decision making
- Would have to be revised to meet our needs (the current one is driven by desert tortoise, we would need one which incorporates the monuments)
- Application of this approach could be overwhelming
- 2000 miles of routes exist and the Wilderness Groups propose to close 1500 miles of these
- Could be defended in court – have been directed to complete a transportation plan in this plan
- Need alternatives that range from closing all 1500 miles to keeping them all open
- Need public involvement during this process – Southern California formed task groups to assist in route designation – directly involved the public in this project
- Bill Dickinson – it is critical that we have criteria for making decisions relative to roads
 - Also need to decide if a road is available for restricted use – livestock grazing management
 - Also need to decide to what standard a road will be maintained
- Get input for criteria and on eventual decision
- Allows for special circumstances to be considered
- Need to make sure that roads stay open where NPS roads are open
- Air quality issues and miles of gravel roads open
- County wants to maintain access not necessarily improve access
- We need a defensible process – all agreed upon this
- Need to have matrix available for public meeting – can we have the matrices for all alternatives?
- Looking for agreement to begin developing this type of approach
- Feedback from Cooperating Agencies
- AGF will want to be involved in the development of the criteria
 - Agua Fria is holding a workshop this weekend where they are using this process

USFWS expressed concern that the matrix would be huge – so many factors and decisions – it is not clear just how practical how this decision tree will work with all the decisions that have to be made.

- BLM needs to know where their environmental and cultural resource hot spots are
 - It will be a big job to develop criteria
- Grand Canyon NPS
 - Decision Tree template is needed
 - Get hot spot info for adjacent lands is also important
 - Has any of the social science aspect been completed? Yes and a visitor use survey is underway
- BLM
 - Hot spots for all recreation sites are also factors
 - Decision tree – there are many questions beneath the boxes on the tree
 - Look at all roads in the area in context
- Ila Bullets - Kaibab Paiute -
 - Like the idea but it is a lot of work –
- Bill Towler
 - Really doesn't like decision trees – prefer a list of criteria – just a bunch of questions
 - Is there a working definition of route – what did they GPS? Used route, not road – had to be more than just a two track – had to be used and be noticeable
- Sue Pratt
 - If this format is used and incorporates the escape clause, there needs to be additional criteria to use the escape clause
- Alan Gardner
 - The majority of those roads out there were created with a purpose
- Chris Ballard
 - Criteria are more important than the process
- Bill Dickinson:
 - Did the wilderness groups provide criteria? Yes , they completed a road inventory – stated they did not oppose restricted access for grazing administration – this would be a “way” in the wilderness legislation
- Dennis Curtis
 - Can we pare down the decision tree? Also like to take a lot of the roads off the plate – example the County roads or BLM maintained roads

Bill Dickinson

- The first thing we need to do is to develop the criteria.
 - Are we looking for criteria for level of maintenance?
 - Hot spots – criteria to protect hot spots
 - Can this group define what those areas needing criteria are?
 - Be careful that you do not make the process so cumbersome that nothing gets done
 - Have everyone submit comments on criteria to planning team and then assemble the criteria and circulate for review.
- Work Group Proposal

1. Transportation and access Group
2. Wilderness Group
3. Wildlife/Vegetation Group
4. Native American Group
5. Socioeconomic Group

Lunch Break

Science-based Planning – Bill Towler – Coconino County

- Coconino County Comprehensive Planning Partnership
- Science-based - Science Group – 6 members: 3 NAU professors and USGS,
- Link to forest restoration and risk reduction – science
- Conservation focus in comprehensive planning
- Time, species, unique place and landscape principles
- Identification of hot spots – maps are being developed
- Facilitated a meeting of these groups that would not have occurred otherwise
- Conservation framework – attempting to go through each of the principles
- Their planning process is very similar to what the BLM/NPS is trying to do
- 9 land owners who own 1.1 million acres – want them involved in land use planning
 - How did this science committee affect the time line – it is 50% of Bill's time
 - Organizing all the meetings is taking considerable time
 - Product will be a CD that will reference maps that are on the web and can be updated regularly
 - How much do you develop in small group vs. a larger group or the public
 - Newsletter goes to the public – 65,000 households
 - Did you have written roles and responsibilities – Yes but not a written contract
 - Took a year to develop this structure

How can we use science based planning in our plan?

- National Science and Technology Center in Denver – BLM office that offers support
- They actually came to us
- Worked with them for about a year. They dropped us when we chose not to become a time sensitive plans
- We have a solid group of scientists on the staff that are working on this plan
- Partners provide additional science – USGS and NAU, as well as other agencies
- Larry Stevens of the Wildlands Council – suggested we host a science symposium on the Parashant
- Grand Staircase NM did hold a symposium and maintained a science advisory group
- Not in the Proclamation that science itself the goal of this planning but it does say that science is used in decision-making
- Need to protect science from being considered biased
- Many of staff are members of professional organizations and receive journals with the most recent research findings
- Cite the credentials of the members of the planning team
- Updating the database – bringing in new data – repository of contacts and data

- Grand Canyon hired a short-term data manager – solicited data from all sources and consolidated for planning use – 6 month position
- Planning needs to be based on best available information
- Not all resources fit into ecoregions – wilderness, recreation are good examples – they will be addressed by the ROS approach
- Take time to ensure our scientists are up to date in their fields of expertise
- BLM/NPS newsletter does lay out the purpose and significant and planning criteria – similar to Bill Towler’ criteria for Coconino County
- Coconino County does not have the science capability inhouse like BLM/NPS
- AGF suggests we make decisions based on science

Citizens Wilderness Proposal

- Followed BLM wilderness guidelines to a “T”
- 31 individual proposals submitted for a total 956,700 acres
- Parashant NM = 752,500 acres – 535 miles of road closures
- Existing wilderness + Citizens proposal for Parashant = 81 percent
- Vermilion Cliffs wilderness existing and proposed = 71 percent
- Roads they want open and roads closed
- Proposal is very similar to NPS proposal
- Dennis Curtis
 - Could evaluate each individually – if it doesn’t have integrity it could be thrown out
 - We are going to take their proposal and will consider it for wilderness designation
 - Lands may be more valuable for higher and better use
 - Will have to justify all decisions in the plan
 - Decisions need to be based on solid criteria
 - Does the Citizens proposal frame one of our alternatives?
 - Bottom line – we need solid criteria for wilderness decisions

Draft MOUs with Cooperating Agencies

- Built a template for agreements with cooperating agencies
- Mohave County’s was adopted
- Today the template is with the BLM solicitor for review
- Cannot share the draft template with the cooperators until Solicitor’s approved it
- An example was distributed so others can see roles and responsibilities
- NPS and BLM are joint lead and others are cooperators
- AGF came up with two separate MOUs – a separate one for Parashant and one for the rest of the state
- Talk about some of the specifics
 - Authorities
 - Responsibilities
 - Primary and secondary contacts
- Assist with public meetings
- Assist in development of alternatives
- Assist in identification of hot spots on maps

- Provide all information to Darla and Diana next meeting on January 9, 2003 – the next meeting – assuming there will be some outreach to those who are not at this meeting – they will be contacted and emailed the minutes
- Maps can be provided at the next meeting to record hot spots by cooperators
- Will send out draft template as soon as approved by Solicitor
- would like to have questionnaires completed by next meeting as well:
 4. List 3 things you would like to see on the Arizona Strip in 20 years
 5. And the things you would like to see in 100 years
 6. Information for List of Preparers in document

Work Groups

Transportation and Access – development of criteria

- 1. Have the core team put the first cut of a decision tree for all to review – draft will be mailed out by December 20, 2002
- 2. Review the Planning Criteria and Monument Purpose and Significance
- 3. Review the California decision tree process and suggest changes – have to Diana by January 3, 2003 so the core team can send out before the Jan. 9th meeting
- 4. Send in ideas on what process we should follow to develop criteria

Driver would be the Proclamation and protection of those resources rather than the desert tortoise

- Also use the planning criteria that will soon be out for public review
- Start from California example – use the planning guidance
- Parashant Staff will consolidate input and present back to the group at the next meeting on January 9th
- AG&F and Parashant wildlife staff will be meeting on January 15th so their data are not going to be available – this is the wildlife workgroup and they will make a brief presentation on wildlife issues to the group possibly for the February meeting

List of Attendees

Darla Sides	Parashant NM	darla_sides@nps.gov	435 688-3226
Mark Sappington	Lake Mead NRA	mark_sappington@nps.gov	702 293-8974
Rosie Pepito	Lake Mead NRA	rosie_pepito@nps.gov	702 293-8959
Jim Holland	Lake Mead NRA	jim_holland@nps.gov	702 293-8986
Dave Boyd	AZ Strip BLM	david_boyd@blm.gov	435 688-3303
Rebecca Davidson	AZ Game & Fish	rebecca_davidson@blm.gov	602 417-9612
Dennis Curtis	Parashant NM	dennis_curtis@blm.gov	435 688-3202
Gary Warshefski	Lake Mead NRA	gary_warshefski@nps.gov	702 293-8920
Elaine Leslie	Grand Canyon NP	elaine_leslie@nps.gov	928 638-7904
Ila Bullets	Kaibab Paiute Tribe	(b) (6)	928 643-6014
Becky Hammond	Vermilion Cliffs NM	bhammond@blm.gov	435 688-3323
Bill Dickinson	Lake Mead NRA	william_k_dickinson@nps.gov	702 293-8920
Richard Spotts	AZ Strip BLM	richard_spotts@blm.gov	435 688-3207
Diana Hawks	AZ Strip BLM	diana_hawks@blm.gov	435 688-3266
Paula Branstner	Parashant NM	paula_branster@nps.gov	435 688-3377
Alan Gardner	Washington County	adgardner@washco.state.ut.us	435 634-5700

Kathleen Harcksen	Parashant NM	kathleen_harcksen@blm.gov	435 688-3380
Robert Sandberg	AZ Strip BLM	robert_sandberg@blm.gov	435 688-3219
Michael Herder	AZ Strip BLM	michael_herder@blm.gov	435 688-3239
Sue Pratt	Coconino County	suepratt@co.coconino.az.us	928 226-2700
Bill Towler	Coconino County	btowler@co.coconino.az.us	928 226-2700
Marisa Monger	AZ Strip BLM	marisa_monger@blm.gov	435 688-3283
Christine Ballard	Mohave County	christine.ballard@co.mohave.az.us	928 757-0903
Luke Thompson	AZG&F	(b) (6)	435 986-4289
Joy Jordan	City of Fredonia	joy@xpressweb.com	928 643-7207
Gloria Benson	AZ Strip BLM	Gloria_Benson@blm.gov	435-688-3302