

Notes of PVHP Meeting April 19, 2013, Saratoga.

Just in relation to WGFD Funding, WGFD asks PVHP to provide input regarding:

- (1) The reasons to move ahead with a project
- (2) Concerns re. a project (ALL PVHP Decision)

PVHP Voted unanimously:

- Regarding PVHP Decision-making: no working group – all have access to decision-making.
- Regarding Objectives 2 thru 5 are now Benefits 1 thru 4 as described in Chapters 2 and 6 in the PVHP Plan.

PVHP Discussed future coordination and facilitation of PVHP. Options are:

- UW Extension as a plan B
- VoV
- It was approved by PVHP to pursue funding to keep J. Clement on to bridge the gap between June 30 and the possibility of VoV coordinating PVHP.
- Also it was discussed though no vote re. UW Extension as Plan B

Breakout Group Comments regarding the Working Document

Group 1: “Plan Comments”

Chapter 6

1. Chapter 4 page 44, Riparian area enhancement. Also see one bulleted option would be page 52 channel manipulation (Christina B.)
2. P.73 4th bubble- Replace coincide w/ prepare for WWNRT funding cycle
3. p. 77 list landowners first
4. p.78 Measurements sub section
5. #3 Replace “Annual” w/ “Animal”
6. p. 80 #6 add “deer” to hunters, remove guides, leave outfitters, and add ranchers/landowners
7. p. 80 Add artists/photographers/writers to 2.
8. p. 84 Under Benefit 4: It says actions and measurements are listed below.... But they are not!
9. Map legends- increase font and add highways to maps

Group 1 Page 2 “Plan Comments”

Chapter 7

1. Add to preface- This is a living document and multiple species
2. It never really gets to the part of looking at monitoring data or presenting to the group
3. “Group Analyses”
4. P.11, Objective 2- Additional bullet- look at ranch income from deer hunting
5. P. 26 – Minerals – put ranges for intake in document

6. P.74 , and also elsewhere check to make sure WGFC is used instead of WGFD,
With regard to funding
7. Consider an “HRM” Holistic Resource Management Model

Group 2, The Plan, Pg.1

1. On chart under species density: (table 1) is the species density tied to production or is it a subset of its own?
2. Pg. 7- “Another Pinedale”: needs clarification. Say what we mean ~ energy development, reduced deer herd, poor air quality, “air pollution”
3. In mule deer initiative, the word “disturbance” was used in a negative connotation towards deer; in this plan “disturbance” towards habitat is positive. Do we want to use a different word? Or is in a non-issue?
4. Having an example to follow is nice, however, the application is long. Is there a way to shorten the application?

Group 3 The Plan

1. Pg. 38- Strike- ~~more expensive~~ terminology
2. Ch3 Pg. 46 – Need specific months on which grazing should be minimized on key plant communities – i.e. bitter brush- late summer – early fall- timing varies with habitat conditions in a given year
3. Pg. 47-Caution when using goats and sheep near BH sheep range
4. Pg. 50 We may not see utilization
5. Pg. 50 Need to monitor precip data and correlate effectiveness to habitat
6. Pg. 52 Some areas with good habitat because of disturbance. Need to be able to measure habitat effectiveness- i.e. barriers, etc
7. Top of page Pg. 78- water managements effects on mule deer habitat
8. Pg 78 add under sections- cost share to implement practices to install infrastructure
9. Pg. 78 -Landowner incentives further identified
10. Pg. 84- Need better transition from Trask Seminar (?) to remaining chapter, more clarification
11. Pg. 84 Change to – Should be Comprehensive but brief and straightforward as possible

Group #4 PVHP Breakout Group Pg. 1

1. Figures (Maps, precip, GIS products (export as PDF?)) are of poor quality- not sharp and clear
2. Need to be able to read the legends/keys
3. Pg. 16- Habitat Selectivity
 - As data becomes available it should be included
 - -Include Collar Data w/in plan to help prioritize work (fence conversion, etc.)
4. Pg. 24 – 2nd paragraph- Juniper question only

5. Pg. 45 → Grazing season rest, BLM- Growing season not necessarily 2 years. Could divert from this requirement if goal and objectives are outlined in NEPA.
6. Pg. 46 3rd bullet- adequate time for plants to recover from winter is necessary- lots of variables- probably not a good idea to put exact time frame w/out qualifying
7. Figure 8 flow chart
 - We should identify where monitoring fits in and the tie to adaptive management
8. Natural Fire Plan → “Managed Wild Fires” vs. natural fire plans
9. “Any MWF would have to coincide w/ BLM Fire Plan” If not full suppression would be enacted
10. Application- Need Rec Plan for (Reclamation) BLM under Authorization
11. Another Pinedale:
 - Reduced Deer Herd
 - Energy
 - Significant air pollution
 - Significant impacts on tourism

Breakout Group Comments regarding the Working Document

Group 1 page 1 “Working Doc”

1. Pg.18 Adaptive Management Table
2. Summer 2013 add transition of facilitation/leadership as subject
3. Check spelling of Conduct in document

Group 2“Working Document” Pg.1

1. Flow chart pg. 14 – When request submitted, how long should the recipient wait for an answer? Just add a time frame at end of sentence.
2. Pg. 16 1st paragraph- Drop out Med Bow F.S. Management plan and replace with “Land in the resource management plan.” As it is written BLM is not involved with F.S.
3. Delete the word assessment unless the BLM uses the terminology –standards and guidelines of the plan

Group 3 Working Document- pg. 1

1. Cross-reference working document page #, with page # in plan - living document
2. Hyphen between Saratoga-Encampment-Rawlins Conservation District
3. Spell out agencies on first iteration then (parens)- same with NGO’s
4. Make sure comments from big plan are same as on working plan-Ex. pg. 9 on working is same as pg. 50 on big plan
5. Make known that working plan is abbreviation of source document- for citations, etc., go to big plan.
6. Pg. 26 #20- WHO SIGNS?
7. Caption for figures should be below

8. Specify map format on app for continuity
9. Grant Application
 - a. Add question: Specify where grant \$ will go
 - i. -Land owner
 - ii. -CD
 - iii. -NGO
 - iv. -WGFD
 - v. -Vendor
10. In Addition to SHB → Project sponsor signature?
11. Map attachments- Electronic? Shapefile at time of closeout report

Group #4 Working Document Review

1. Jim States likes it.
2. Flow chart- include “invoice” on payment box i.e. invoices can be submitted periodically for ongoing work.
3. Reference the Mother Ship more often
 - a. specific section or chapters
4. Pg. 9 Describe any future monitoring plans- delete “any” + “future”
5. Pg.9 Adaptive Management Figure too generic- New Flow chart for process
 - i. “And” Landowners listed below
 - b. -Bullets- Rewrite
6. BLM Chad Allotment ~~and~~ Grazing in fracture project
7. Add page regarding site evaluation, goal development + option development process w/ SHG (and fed partners). Point of contact, etc.
8. Pg. 16 “and” last sentence, 1st paragraph. Rewrite this sentence- Coord. w/BLM and FS to help meet their needs...
9. Project Costs- Need More Clarification (costs, contributions)