

AG/COUNTY Sector Response to concerns about idea 1: “C is too prescriptive”
Answer to questions on page 12:

1. How do you set pro-active goals?

-Meet with users/BLM

-Identify issue or concern that might occur as a result of a certain use while out on the ground analyzing a certain area

-Come up with solutions to address issue/concern using an adaptive management approach

-Solutions will be keeping the already established BLM standards and guidelines in mind

- This approach will be done on a case by case basis, and if solutions are not working or appropriate, fall back to prescriptive.

-Look to adaptive management approach first then if it does not qualify turn to prescriptive.

-Adaptive Management as first priority needs to be written into the RMP

2. Sufficient protection for interests?

- Yes, because we have the prescriptive approach to fall back on.

- Adaptive Management must meet goals and objectives set out in the RMP

- Adaptive Management approach needs to be an agreement between the user and the BLM. The BLM does represent the public.

- We did have discussion on an Advisory Committee. This advisory committee’s goals should be defined in the RMP. It is committee that would provide input on an advisory basis. The adaptive management approach would be an agreement between the BLM and the user. The BLM and user will work out the final decision.

-

3. Funding and Staff issues?

- Use the approach of cost/staff sharing between BLM and user. (Example: need to monitor range, rancher helps pay for a BLM approved range specialist). Adaptive Management would be a partnership on the agreement and cost.

4. BAH – how analyze?

-BAH needs to analyze the adaptive management guidelines and how they would be applied in combination w/ the prescriptive fallback.

-Evaluate if you meet goals and objectives.

-Adaptive management has to be tied to monitoring.

-The outcomes for evaluation are in the goals and objectives set forth in the RMP.

-Using best management practices the user and BLM will choose from those practices and the monitoring will evaluate if they are heading in the right direction.

-Analyze impact something greater than prescription. Adaptive management will identify problems faster than a prescriptive approach and have a plan outlined.

4. Analyze solutions to meet goals?

-This would be a part of the adaptive management guidelines.

-Adaptive management would give the flexibility to the range scientist to react. The BLM and user can analyze the impact sooner if you are constantly monitoring the range. Impact can be positive or negative. This will benefit the resource.

5. It would be good to talk to other BLM offices that have used this approach.
6. Time, funding, trust, long-term security?
 - As in #3 above, time and funding could be cost shared by BLM/Users. Long term security is addressed in #2. The security is the fall back on prescriptive. As for trust, perhaps encourage those with concerns to observe the process as the BLM/users identify and deal with the issues and concerns. In Moffat County we have had a success story in the CRM. Stakeholders give their concerns and objective advice and then review the outcome. This is advisory only.
7. Agreed – goals would need to be detailed and measurable. The goals would be outcome based, using the already established Standards and Guidelines. It is important to look @ other projects such as the Pinedale Anticline Working Group and learn from what they have learned.
8. Burden of proof – this is again a shared project, so burden of proof should be share by the partners in the project – BLM/user
9. Monitoring – MONITORING IS VERY IMPORTANT! Again, this would be a shared responsibility between the partners – BLM/user. Have experts involved. Baseline data is a must.
10. Increase or reduce bureaucracy ?

With many partners involved, one would hope the gridlock would be reduced and therefore hopefully the bureaucracy would be less.

Consider Opposition and Support for Idea 1 (C is too prescriptive)

Support from energy, unaffiliated citizens, ag and county, motor rec. Possible partial support from Wild. And non-mot. rec., wildlife and plants, and wild horse. We feel if this is done in a manner w/ sufficient emphasis on the prescriptive fallback.

Refined Proposal:

(page 15)

As outlined above – We feel we can accommodate the concerns of other sectors as outlined above.

Would it be helpful to also use a “matrix approach” in certain areas when there are sensitive species of plants or animals involved? This might be a possible solution to help those in doubt feel more comfortable.

Example: in a wolf management plan the matrix is designed around the # of wolves.

Few wolves – the management tools would be more restrictive (when dealing w/ depredations and or concerns on prey species #'s) and there would be less compensation and incentive programs available.

More wolves- as the wolves become more established, there should be less restrictions on management tools (when dealing w/ depredations or concern over prey species #'s) and there should be more availability of compensation, incentives, etc.

Sage Grouse- in an area of a struggling population, have less opportunity to use adaptive management approach, more prescription.

In an area where the sage grouse are doing very well, have more opportunity to use adaptive managements approach and creative solutions, be less prescriptive.

Bartering

This concept is of course an option. We are not totally sold on this approach. Our belief is that it is either good for the land or not. If for example, the oil and gas sector said “we will compromise on the Vermillion Basin. . . drill in the portion of Vermillion that is deemed to be most productive and leave the other portion of Vermillion to be managed in a manner that acknowledges the “wilderness characteristics”. Using this approach however has the potential to severely impact other users. What about T-Wright’s family ranch and the Raftopoulos ranch, and the Walkers and the Solaces, etc. etc. We would not be willing to sacrifice any of them to barter.

The only acceptable way to barter something like is mentioned above would be to have all the users in an area that may be impacted @ the table to help craft the “barter deal”. . .and even then it makes us very nervous, because all of the users @ the table may strike a deal only to have some outside party bring a legal action to change or undo the deal.

The only other barter situation we could see would perhaps be like was outlined in the matrix example given above.