

Meeting minutes-Conference call-August 29th, 3:00 p.m.

In attendance: Loren Grosskopf, Dan Wenk, Brian Nesvik, Jodi Bush, Patricia O'Connor, Dalissa Minnick

The group began by outlining their objectives for the meeting 1) approve newest version of CS provided by Jennifer 2) approve any recommended changes to the habitat and sensitive species language as recommended by the USFS and Habitat Sub-group 3) Approve public comment response decisions by SC 4) Discuss Appendix C language 5) Discuss IGBST “stable” language 6) Discuss the timeline and next suspense 7) Discuss GB “value” language for CS introduction

Brian started by providing his analysis of his review of the new draft. Overall, he felt like Jennifer did a good job of representing the changes approved by YES at their August 2nd meeting. He acknowledged that there remained some editorial and formatting edits remaining, but that they could be addressed prior to sending the CS to the YES committee.

Loren provided a list of edits he felt necessary to address inconsistencies, grammatical issues and formatting issues. Loren agreed to provide the list to Jennifer for inclusion in the next draft CS.

Loren also recommended that the CS use consistent language when addressing the lands administered by NPS as “National Park Lands”. Brian indicated he believed that definition would help add clarity and would make the document more concise. Dan indicated he had no immediate opposition but wanted to consider it before committing to any changes.

Loren also identified inconsistencies regarding any future I&E sub-group of the YGCC. He also asked for a detailed map of the DMA and Jodi agreed to include it, but asked Loren to recommend a location in the CS.

Tricia indicated she found several inconsistencies and some need for editorial changes. She indicated she would send those along to Jennifer for inclusion in the next draft. Tricia pointed out the inconsistency and confusion between Recovery Criteria 1 and 3 and asked how it could be addressed. Brian asserted that any changes to address this confusion should be incorporated into the Recovery Plan and don’t belong in the CS. Jodi indicated that the USFWS intends to make some changes to the Recovery Plan. Jodi agreed to check with USFWS to see if there was interest in addressing this issue. She indicated she would report this at the September 8, YES meeting.

Tricia asked for new edits regarding changes to the 1998 baseline from the habitat sub-group. Dan indicated they were not complete as the USFS hadn’t concurred with the changes yet.

Tricia also indicated she had several items that she thought needed cleaned up (grammar, formatting, etc.) and that she would forward to Jennifer. She also said there were several CFR numbers that were not longer relevant as USFS planning rules have changed.

Tricia asked that “super-majority” be defined as 2/3 of members present. Jodi indicated she would add that language to Chapter 6.

Dan indicated he had not fully reviewed the draft and that he would have his staff look at it soon. He said that he expected in general that those things we agreed to disagree on would not be included.

Dalissa stated her support for Tricia's ideas on temporary camps and that she has comments regarding developed site language. She also indicated her support for Tricia's comments on transportation planning.

Jodi indicated she had nothing to add.

Dan asked if anyone knew any of the details of discussions occurring amongst senior leaders in all of the agencies. Brian indicated that he knew there had been some briefings and discussions but had no detail to share.

Loren stated his support for Alternative D of Appendix C. He also recommended that we inform YES of the significant debate and discussion that occurred around this issue.

Tricia recommended adding back in language regarding "the best available science". (Note: Brian provided a recommended version 2 of Alternative D to YES members just before the September 8th meeting).

Loren indicated his support for the Wenk/Nesvik version of the values language for the CS. All other SC members approved the language as well.

All agreed to review Alternative D and vote by e-mail (results: Nesvik Alt. D version 2, Grosskopf Alt. D. version 2, Minnick Alt. D version 2, Wenk Alt. B, Bush Alt. B)

Brian reviewed all due outs with the group:

- Habitat sub-group draft language by August 30
- Sensitive species language from USFS NLT September 8
- Edits related to grammar, inconsistencies, formatting to Nesvik and Fortin-Noreus by September 1
- General comments and review by Grosskopf to Fortin-Noreus by August 30
- SC will evaluate Appendix C alternatives and provide response to Nesvik by September 1
- Wenk to work with Fortin-Noreus regarding location of values paragraph
- Nesvik will evaluate 13 comments from Jodi and compare to meeting notes and will reply to the committee
- Jodi will get with IGBST regarding stability language
- Nesvik to provide a final draft CS to entire YES committee by September 1 in the evening

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.