

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS:

SHOSHONE NATIONAL FOREST OBJECTOR MEETING

9:08 a.m., Wednesday
October 8, 2014

525 West Yellowstone Avenue, Cody, Wyoming

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 RHONDA SHIPP: Hello. And welcome, everybody,
3 to the Shoshone National Forest Objection Meeting. We're glad
4 you're all here on this beautiful fall day, and we'd like to
5 welcome the people who are on the telephone.

6 I'm Rhonda Shipp. I am your facilitator. Today is
7 an opportunity to have a conversation, a conversation among
8 the objectors, among the interested parties, and with our
9 Forest Service leaders and decision makers.

10 This is unlike the traditional public meeting style,
11 okay? It's meant to be a dialogue approach. So the
12 traditional format is where we hear prepared statements and we
13 retell objections. Today's meeting is more about sitting
14 down, having a dialogue in order to create additional
15 information, new information, new remedies.

16 So it is slightly different than what you're used
17 to, perhaps. It's meant to be fairly casual and friendly. So
18 we're looking forward to a really fun day.

19 To get us going, then, we have a little bit of
20 housekeeping. In case of fire, we would like everybody to
21 exit out the nearest door. One here, one there. And then if
22 you would please congregate towards the back of the parking
23 lot against the fence so that we can keep fire lanes clear for
24 fire trucks.

25 The other safety issue has to do with cords.

1 There's lots of cords on the floor, so just be aware as you're
2 walking around that we do have a lot of cords. So watch out
3 for them.

4 If anybody has a health issue, we have a safety
5 officer, and that is Deb. She is right over here. If you
6 just let her know, she can offer assistance with any sort of
7 health issue.

8 We have a couple of breaks scheduled, one this
9 morning and one this afternoon. There are refreshments over
10 here to my left. Refreshments, delicious rolls, things to
11 drink.

12 There are rest rooms located in the back of this
13 facility.

14 Okay. For the people that are on the phone, we
15 welcome you. Can you hear me?

16 PHIL HOCKER: Yes.

17 RHONDA SHIPP: Oh, great. Okay. So we
18 welcome you. We are committed to having you hearing us, and
19 we need to hear you as well.

20 So if there are any issues at all with your ability
21 to hear, with the connection or anything, please speak up. Or
22 if you would just text us a message, I have a phone number for
23 you. It's (307)272-1696. Okay? Again, that's (307)272-1696.
24 And if you could just send us a message, then that gives us
25 the head's up that we've got something to deal with.

1 Also, in terms of the distractions, we've got quite
2 a crowd in this room. I don't know. What, 70, 80 people or
3 so. And so we would ask that, to eliminate distractions, for
4 those of you on the phone, if you could put your phones in
5 mute, that would be just great, until you're ready to speak,
6 of course. But that would help with some of the excess noise
7 that we have in here.

8 The other thing is I'm told that if you were to get
9 another phone call and you put us on hold, you'll probably
10 lose us. And so if you lose us, just call back. All right?

11 For those of you in this room, because there are so
12 many of you and the room is rather cavernous, make sure that
13 you speak into a microphone. And that way we can make sure --
14 we can hear each other in here, of course, but ensures the
15 phone people can hear.

16 Show those are a few housekeeping.

17 Yes, Olga?

18 OLGA TROXEL: Just one correction. Please do
19 not put us on hold at all, because we won't be able to
20 continue our call.

21 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. So for the phone people,
22 do not put us on hold. If you get another call, just simply
23 hang up, and then just call back in on that conference line.

24 Thanks so much, Olga.

25 PHIL HOCKER: Was that phone number you gave

1 us? The 307 number, what was that for?

2 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. It's to send a text. 3
It's (307)272-1696.

4 Okay. A few more details before we get going this
5 morning, and it's relating to this process, the ground rules
6 around this process.

7 Most of you probably know that this process is
8 regulated by -- well, it's controlled by regulations. And so
9 we have to follow those policies. We are going to need to be
10 somewhat strict about that.

11 So with that in mind, there are lots of people in
12 this room. It is going to be recorded. It is a public
13 meeting, so there is a court reporter joining us, Mary, here
14 on the corner. She is going to be quickly taking all of your
15 comments down.

16 When we're at the table and people are speaking, or
17 if you are speaking from the telephone connection, be sure to
18 give us your name first, and that will help her identify the
19 person with the comment. So very important to identify
20 yourself. If you would just state your name before you speak,
21 that would be terrific.

22 All right. Next thing is that we have lots of
23 different kinds of people in the room. We have our Forest
24 Service leaders and decision makers. We have objectors. We
25 have interested parties. We have Forest Service personnel

1 with subject matter expertise. So a lot of different people
2 in the room.

3 And again, we have to follow these regulations. So
4 here is kind of how it works. The objectors -- and you have
5 like a blue strip around your name tag. The objectors and the
6 interested parties are the people who actively participate.
7 In other words, they're the ones who get to speak.

8 The general public, they are our folks that are
9 listeners and observers of the process. And then the Forest
10 Service personnel with subject matter expertise will be called
11 upon if needed. So that's kind of how everybody fits into
12 this.

13 And I realize that some of these terms might be new
14 to you. And bear with us, I'm going to try not to confuse you
15 any more, but we'll walk you through the process. And that
16 way we can help kind of smooth it out, hopefully, as we go
17 through the day.

18 Let's see, then. The rest are sort of my ground
19 rules. These have to do with civility and expectations for
20 meeting behaviors. I suspect these are familiar to all of
21 you, and I'm told that these are the same, probably the same
22 that you have used in the past with your other meetings.

23 So my first one, it's on this board. My first one
24 is dialogue. And I've mentioned what that means, but let me
25 just go one step further with that explanation, because it is

1 a slightly different kind of conversation.

2 It is intended to be a meaningful conversation, so
3 it is focused. We are looking for specific kinds of
4 information; and therefore, there are some steps that we will
5 work through, some bullets that we will work through to make
6 sure that it results in increased understanding and this
7 opportunity for new remedies, for example.

8 So we will, again, help work through that process,
9 but that's what dialogue means. It's really having a
10 conversation where you're searching for deeper understanding,
11 deeper meaning, something else that you can -- you can wrap
12 your arms around.

13 To help with the dialogue, then, the next piece on
14 this board is participation. This requires active
15 participation. It requires both speaking and listening. This
16 is especially important -- well, it's important throughout the
17 day, but especially this afternoon when there are lots of
18 people.

19 It is important to share the air. That simply means
20 that we make sure that we aren't the ones who do all of the
21 talking, that everybody who wants to be heard -- and this
22 group is committed to hearing from anybody who wants to be
23 heard -- they get the opportunity to say something. They get
24 the opportunity to speak. So share the air.

25 This also includes just the usual: Being courteous

1 to each other, being respectful, limiting side conversations,
2 a lot of distractions, movements, those sorts of things. So I
3 think you're all familiar with that.

4 Third thing on my list is focus. We have a tight
5 time frame. We also have a long day and a lot to do within
6 that period of time. So we will stay focused.

7 If we tend to veer off track, I've got a parking lot
8 posted up there. I will simply put it in the parking lot for
9 later. But we will do our best to stay very focused so that
10 our reviewing officer gets the information that she is looking
11 for today. Okay?

12 Fourth thing to help us with our dialogue is called
13 end point first. This is critical. What it means is that you
14 clearly articulate your final point first. So if you want to
15 speak, and you've got something that you really -- a point
16 that you want to make, make sure that that is the first thing
17 out of your mouth.

18 In doing so, if we have to cut the comment short, I
19 don't want you to feel cheated, that you think, wow, I didn't
20 even get my big idea out there. So start with that. Make
21 sure we hear your end point first. That also, I believe, will
22 help keep us focused, and it will help us share the air.

23 The next one has to do with electronics, electronics
24 in some sort of position that they don't make noise. Again
25 thinking about the distractions. So anything that beeps or

1 rings or buzzes or plays music or whatever, if you could turn
2 it off or put it in some mode that doesn't create a
3 distraction, we would really appreciate that. And thanks for
4 doing that.

5 We will start and end on time, including with the
6 topics. It is critical that we stay on time, especially for
7 our people joining us on the phone, because we have people
8 joining us at certain and particular times. So we'll start
9 and end on time.

10 The last one on here, I've already dealt with. It's
11 always a question that I ask groups, and that is with
12 confidentiality. But I already told you this is a public
13 meeting, so it's not confidential. Everything will be public.

14 So those are my ground rules. And I will ask all of
15 you to work at enforcing those, monitoring those, and making
16 sure that we fit within those ground rules.

17 The next thing I would like to do is quickly walk
18 you through the agenda. I think you all have that.

19 Okay. We will set the stage for this first hour
20 this morning. That's what I'm doing, and that's what we will
21 hear shortly, is the setting of the stage.

22 We'll take a short break around 10:00. And then --
23 9:45 to 10:00. And then at 10:00 we will start our first
24 issue.

25 Remember, I said that a dialogue is a more focused

1 approach. And so if you look at those bullets underneath each
2 of those issues, that's the focus. Okay?

3 So we start with a need for glasses.

4 We start with issues -- the reviewing officer, Jane,
5 is going to set the stage for us. So she will set that up.
6 And then we will have discussion and clarification from
7 objectors to ensure that she understands these issues.

8 Next she will hear from objectors regarding
9 instructions being considered and objectors' recommendations.
10 Those second two bullets are hearing from objectors. Okay?

11 Then she will ask for input from interested parties.
12 Okay? So that's the point that the interested parties will
13 join the conversation.

14 And then finally, the last thing is opportunities
15 for -- or, I'm sorry. Interested persons. It's not on here,
16 but then after interested persons, she will ask for any other
17 objectors who might have an idea.

18 And then finally, we'll ask for opportunities for
19 agreement, or she'll talk about opportunities for agreement.

20 So that is the order that we will take you through.
21 As we start with this first issue, then, we'll help you get
22 sort of used to how we're going to pull you forward and those
23 sorts of things.

24 We will break at 2:30. Oh, I forgot lunch. Lunch
25 is at 12:00. That's on your own. We will break at 12:00. We

1 will rejoin at 1:00.

2 When you come back, then, we'll get into our last
3 two issues this afternoon. There's a break from 2:30 to 3:00.

4 We have scheduled time at 4:30. It's open time to
5 discuss remedies from other objection topics that were not on
6 the agenda this day. And then at 5:15 we will do a summary of
7 the day.

8 So that's kind of how it looks. It will be a fun
9 day.

10 Is there anything else that -- ground rules or
11 housekeeping, anything I've forgotten?

12 JODY SUTTON: Just check with the people on the
13 phone.

14 RHONDA SHIPP: So, folks on the phone, are you
15 still able to hear?

16 PHIL HOCKER: Yes, we are. Thank you.

17 JANE COTTRELL: Okay. Thank you. And we
18 appreciate you joining us.

19 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. So we'll start our
20 meeting this morning with our purpose, what the rules are, the
21 Forest Service personnel and leaders and decision makers, and
22 a little bit of overview of the process to today, et cetera.

23 I would like to introduce some key people to you
24 that are at the table. First is Jane Cottrell. Jane is the
25 associate deputy chief. She's right here.

1 Okay. Next is Bill Bass. And he is the deputy
2 regional forester. So thanks for standing, Bill. We
3 appreciate that.

4 Next is Joe Alexander, the Shoshone Forest
5 supervisor.

6 We've got Jody Sutton, who is the objection officer.
7 And a lot of you, evidently, have talked with Jody. So that's
8 Jody.

9 And John is at the table. John, your last name?

10 JOHN RUPE: Rupe.

11 RHONDA SHIPP: And your title?

12 JOHN RUPE: Regional planner.

13 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay, regional planner. And
14 then we have Mary, our court reporter. And I'm Rhonda, the
15 facilitator.

16 And with that, I am going to turn us over to Jane,
17 who will start us off with the purpose of the meeting.

18 JANE COTTRELL: Can folks hear me? I've never
19 been accused of needing an amplifier.

20 So first of all, I want to welcome everybody, both
21 on the phone and in person, because what this tells me is you
22 have a major interest in the Shoshone National Forest and in
23 the activities that happen on the forest.

24 PHIL HOCKER: Excuse me, Jane. It's Phil
25 Hocker on the phone. Sorry to interrupt, but if you all,

1 especially the Forest Service folks, could introduce
2 yourselves as you begin and your role, that would be very
3 helpful for us.

4 JANE COTTRELL: And we are going to go over
5 specifically what our role is here today.

6 PHIL HOCKER: Your name?

7 JANE COTTRELL: Yeah. My name is Jane
8 Cottrell. I'm the associate deputy chief. And today I'm here
9 as the recommending official to the deciding officer, and so
10 basically our deciding official, reviewing officer.

11 The process is new to all of us as we're working
12 through the new objection process. And we're going to talk a
13 little bit about how this plan actually got to this phase this
14 morning, as well as I would like to start out by also thanking
15 our host, which is -- I'm sorry I have to actually take mine
16 off -- which is actually Lynn Lampe. And Lynn is -- Lynn is
17 the proprietor of the facility that we're using and has
18 provided the refreshments. So I would like to thank her for
19 hosting us here in Cody.

20 At any time the folks on the phone cannot hear us,
21 please speak up just like that so that we can make sure that
22 we are including everybody's perspective.

23 So the purpose of the meeting today, it's not for me
24 to sit around and talk. It's not for Bill or Joe to sit
25 around and talk. It's for us to have an opportunity to listen

1 and to engage all parties in a dialogue, to see if we can,
2 one, clarify the objections, or two, really come to an
3 understanding about the remedies that are proposed and to see
4 if we can actually come to some remedy on these issues.

5 We did focus the discussion topics today. And we're
6 asking that we keep to those topics, because I believe that
7 you're all heavily invested in the topics that we have on the
8 agenda.

9 I want to ensure that I understand correctly both
10 your objections and what you're proposing for those remedies.
11 That way, they can be incorporated in those decisions to the
12 regional forester who is the final, signing decision officer
13 on this -- on the plan. Today I'm asking you to really go
14 into those remedies and to see if there is some common ground
15 that can be found between all the interests.

16 I want to ensure that the interested persons have an
17 opportunity to make suggestions as well. So as we near the
18 end of the period for each topic, I'll actually purposely
19 engage folks that are -- have the red band around theirs that
20 are interested persons.

21 It's important to me and the agency that we conduct
22 a thorough review, that if there is any additional
23 suggestions, ideas, or clarification, that we get that into
24 the consideration.

25 So what's in front of you? Most of you picked up

1 the topics, the discussion topics, either here or got them off
2 the web earlier. We're not hiding any of the information.

3 You know, in that, for these four topics, I've
4 shared, you know, what I'm considering. And that's what I
5 want to be able to talk through today.

6 There are a lot of issues in this plan. I mean,
7 there were over 70 objectors. And we don't have time today
8 nor will we go into all of the issues. I worked with a team,
9 a reviewing team, to literally look at every one of the
10 objections, and we boiled that down to what we thought were
11 the major topics where there might be some opportunity to find
12 some remedies. And so that's why we're focusing on those four
13 topics.

14 In addition, I heard from several folks about
15 topics -- issues that they had interest in, from the
16 Continental Divide Trail to grizzly bear habitat to gas and
17 oil to range use. That's why we have a little bit of time at
18 the end for folks to share their ideas on that, because there
19 may be some new remedies that, through time, you've been
20 thinking about.

21 I don't know about you, but I don't make snap
22 decisions, so I'm sure as you put in your objections or put in
23 ideas and time has gone by, you've had an opportunity to look
24 at other folks' objections that were on the web page. You
25 know, maybe you've come up with some new ideas. And that's

1 really what today is about.

2 So the issues that were selected, as I mentioned, a
3 number of remedies have been recommended, and those have been
4 made available for folks to see. And in addition to that, you
5 know, there are -- we want to be able to pull to the table the
6 best science, suggestions, some well-reasoned legal bases,
7 bring all of that to the table today so it comes into this
8 final recommendation.

9 Let's see. I want to make sure I'm covering
10 everything that I had in my list.

11 But I want to also let you know that all of this
12 discussion as well as whatever you bring to the table today or
13 maybe what comes out in the next few days will be included in
14 that final written response to the objections. So even if the
15 topic doesn't get discussed today, we will be developing a
16 written response to every one of the issues on the objections.

17 I want to again remind you we're going to focus on
18 these topics. And lastly, this discussion is going to help
19 further inform that final written response to the objections.

20 And I want to be clear that we're not making any
21 final decisions today. I think that there will be an
22 opportunity to talk through some of this, to think through
23 this. And I'm sure that there's going to be some questions
24 that all of us are going to have to mull over even after
25 today.

1 And what we've found with the previous ones that
2 we've done -- I think this is our third one, fourth one --
3 that quite frankly, even up to a few days afterwards, there
4 are some pieces and questions that we tend to have to mull
5 over or get information on. And at the end -- we'll be
6 keeping track through the meeting. At the end, we may
7 identify some of those and when we'd like to hear final
8 information on that.

9 So at this point I'm going to turn it over to Bill.
10 And Bill's going to talk about the role of each of the Forest
11 Service leaders in the final decision on this plan.

12 BILL BASS: Thank you. My name is Bill Bass,
13 and I'm serving as the acting deputy regional forester for the
14 Rocky Mountain Region. And I can't think of a better place to
15 be on a nice sunny morning, sitting at the mouth of this
16 canyon right now. So thank you all for being here. I
17 appreciate your time.

18 As the roles of the three of us in particular are
19 involved in this process, you have Joe, as forest supervisor,
20 has led the process at the planning level. It's been a long
21 process. Joe's been at it for four years.

22 According to the 1982 rule, our regional forester,
23 Dan Jiron, is the responsible official for this plan. He
24 released the draft Record of Decision and the final
25 environmental impact statement in January of 2014. That

1 kicked off this objection process. He will be signing a final
2 Record of Decision.

3 I'm here today representing the regional forester,
4 Dan Jiron. The chief of the Forest Service serves as
5 reviewing officer for the regional forester's decisions under
6 1982 planning rule.

7 Associate Deputy Chief Jane Cottrell is here
8 representing Chief Tom Tidwell. The purpose of this meeting
9 is for Jane to understand the issues and hear from objectors
10 and interested parties so she can make informed responses
11 toward the conversations to the responsible official. That,
12 again, is the regional forester, Dan Jiron.

13 With that, I'm going to hand it off to Joe -- I've
14 got the nice, short spot -- on some of the history and
15 background.

16 Joe?

17 JOE ALEXANDER: Good morning. This is Joe
18 Alexander. For those of you on the phone, I'm the forest
19 supervisor for the Shoshone National Forest. And just on
20 behalf of myself and the Shoshone, I'd like to welcome all of
21 you.

22 It reminded me this morning when people started
23 coming through the door and started seeing familiar faces, how
24 rich this process has been. And you know, it's given me a
25 chance to, in a short time, to get to know a lot of my

1 constituents very well. So I feel really lucky to have been
2 through this process and happy at where we're at today,
3 because I know that all of us -- we're hoping to finally get a
4 plan for the Shoshone National Forest.

5 I'll take you through a little bit of the history of
6 the plan. Our last plan was developed in 1986. And so in
7 2005, just about 20 years later, we started the revision
8 process under the 2005 planning rule. That rule was later
9 struck down, and so we had to go back and start over. We
10 started under the 2008 planning rule again. That one was
11 struck down. And so with two invalid planning rules, we
12 again, in 2010, published a notice of intent, and started
13 under the 1982 rule. We started under that, and we gained
14 some momentum, and we've kind of continued since then.

15 So as this process has gone on, we've had over a
16 hundred public meetings. We've had over 20 meetings with our
17 cooperators, local and state elected officials. Those
18 meetings -- there's over 20 of those entities that were
19 participating in that plan. We had a draft environment impact
20 statement that was produced in July of 2012. From that, we
21 received about 23,000 comments from a variety of sources,
22 locally, nationally, internationally.

23 So I received all kinds of comments on the plan. Bill
24 mentioned that a final EIS was produced in January of 2014.
25 And that contained in it a new alternative that was

1 Alternative G. And that was produced as a result of the
2 public meetings we had had, all the public comments that we
3 had. That went into our final environment impact statement
4 and Land and Resource Management Plan.

5 We then went out and did another series of public
6 meetings. And as I had discussed at those meetings, we knew
7 that our plan was imperfect. We felt it was a good plan but,
8 you know, all these processes, everything that we've been
9 through together, are trying to make the plan better, trying
10 to make it something better that has had input from the public
11 and our interested parties.

12 And people are very passionate about the Shoshone
13 National Forest, what happens. And so it's been a terrific
14 process that we've worked through. But that's taken us to
15 where we're at today, that we still have some things that
16 folks would like to see us resolve differently. So we'll have
17 an opportunity to talk about some of those issues today.

18 I'm really thankful that we have our folks here from
19 the Washington office and the regional office here in Cody to
20 listen to your issues in person, to not just look at a letter
21 or response, that we're going to be able to discuss those
22 issues in person. So I'm very grateful that we have this
23 process in place. And that's where we're at today.

24 JANE COTTRELL: Okay. Again, this is Jane
25 Cottrell, reviewing official. And we're almost done with the

1 process part.

2 So the last piece I want to explain to you is the
3 review process under kind of this new paradigm.

4 As I said, we got about 70 objections. So an
5 advisory team and review team was put together to look at all
6 of those objections. Some of those objections were
7 procedural, and some of them were issues. So that review team
8 and advisory team has boiled down some recommendations for me
9 to make to the deciding official on the procedural side as
10 well as some on the issues side.

11 On the procedural side, we're not going to go over
12 those today, you know, whether it addressed, you know, the
13 Federal Advisory Committee Act or some specifics of the
14 planning rule. Today what we're going to focus on is the
15 issues.

16 As we went through all of those issues, we boiled it
17 down to: Which ones did I need some additional clarification
18 on, either on the issue or the recommendation? And where was
19 there some opportunity based on remedies that people put
20 forward? If you remember, part of the objection wasn't just,
21 "I don't like how this is in this alternative," but, "Here is
22 what I recommend that could actually fix that or address the
23 concern that I have."

24 And so when we started looking at those remedies,
25 there seemed to be some common ground. And that's how we

1 arrived at the four major ones that we're talking about today,
2 is there seems to be some fertile ground for finding that
3 common ground on a remedy.

4 I want to be able to address those remedies,
5 concerns, or additional information prior to putting that
6 recommendation forward to the deciding official or putting
7 that response forward to the deciding official, as well as to
8 ensure that we have that in -- a response to that in the final
9 decision on the revised plan.

10 So again, our purpose today, it's all about
11 discussion. We're going to talk with objectors first, as
12 Rhonda mentioned, expand the conversation to the interested
13 parties. And it occurs to me that now that you've had really
14 a chance to, you know, look at not only your issues and
15 remedies, you've seen other folks in this room, if you read
16 all the ones on the website, that you may have some new ideas
17 to lay on the table.

18 I'm kind of excited about that, because this is our
19 first time, with this plan, to be able to actually say, "Okay,
20 you know, we're near the end. What is it we're really willing
21 to live with?" And you will get the opportunity to share this
22 landscape, and for the next several years, at least, set the
23 course for where this forest goes.

24 I'm hopeful we can actually resolve some of the
25 concerns today, and that we move forward with some of these

1 remedies.

2 After this meeting, there may, you know, depending
3 on how today goes, there may be some opportunities to get some
4 final pieces in in the next week or so, not knowing what those
5 are at this point in the conversation today.

6 The next step will be: I will, in fact, develop
7 that final written response to -- to reflect my findings. And
8 those will go to Dan Jiron. That will incorporate the
9 discussion we have today, the written discussions that you
10 had, so we don't have to rehash what you've already put in
11 this writing.

12 And that actually concludes the objection process.
13 It moves right to decision. So at that point, the regional
14 forester and his team will develop the final Record of
15 Decision. The draft has already been put out there for this
16 plan. There will likely be some modifications to that. But
17 then that final one will be published.

18 In theory, that means the planning process is done.
19 We'll see where the legal process goes after that.

20 So at this point, I'll turn it over to Rhonda, our
21 facilitator. And we have an opportunity for a little -- we're
22 a little bit ahead of schedule, so I'm going to give you ten
23 minutes because we're a little bit ahead of schedule.

24 RHONDA SHIPP: We are ahead of schedule. Yes.
25 Ten minutes for a break.

1 We're actually scheduled until 10:00. 9:45 to 10:00
2 is our break. We'll meet back here at 10:00.

3 Again, rest rooms are in the back, and refreshments
4 are over here.

5 If I've totally confused you about how we'll
6 progress through the day, now would be a good time to come up,
7 and I'll try to straighten that out for you. But please let
8 me assure you that we'll go slow to go fast to go far. We're
9 going to go pretty slow here in the beginning to kind of help
10 you see how this shakes out.

11 Okay? Anything else?

12 JANE COTTRELL: And the phone.

13 RHONDA SHIPP: Are we still working with our
14 phone people okay?

15 PHIL HOCKER: We are. Thank you for checking
16 from time to time.

17 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. We are going to put you
18 on mute for the next 15 minutes so that you don't hear all
19 this background noise. When we rejoin at 10:00, we'll turn
20 you back on. But stay on the phone.

21 *(Break taken 9:44 a.m. until 10:00 a.m.)*

22 RHONDA SHIPP: The first topic on our agenda
23 is the pack goats and bighorn sheep. So I'm guessing that
24 most of you picked that up as you came in the door, or for
25 those of you on the phone, you've copied that on the Internet,

1 if you could pull that out.

2 This is the process we are going to use this
3 morning. Well, mostly because we have fewer people. We'll
4 have to modify this afternoon, but this will kind of be how it
5 works.

6 We're going to call you up to the table. And
7 pretend like this is the kitchen table, okay? And you're at
8 the kitchen table, and you're having a conversation.

9 And so the people who are invited into this
10 conversation, I'd like Larry Robinson, Irene Saphra, Kevin
11 Hurley, Jim Collins, and Governor Matt Mead's representative.
12 If you could come to the table, that would be terrific.

13 Okay.

14 JANE COTTRELL: And we're going to ask you to
15 mix around the table. This is Jane. I'm going to ask you to
16 mix around the table so that we're not just talking across at
17 each other. So I have a seat here for somebody.

18 JESSICA CROWDER: This is Jessica Crowder from
19 Governor Mead's policy office. I'm on the phone today. Sorry
20 I couldn't be there in person.

21 RHONDA SHIPP: Thank you so much. I was going
22 to ask. So we appreciate you checking in with us, Jessica.

23 So that's our first introduction. So let's just go
24 around the table and have the rest of you. I called you up by
25 name, but we may not know who you are. So if you could tell

1 us your names once again. This is for the court reporter's
2 benefit as well.

3 So we'll start with you.

4 JIM COLLINS: Jim Collins. I'm here
5 representing the Wyoming Wild Sheep Foundation and as a member
6 of the Wyoming Bighorn Domestic Interaction Working Group and
7 the Wyoming Plan.

8 BILL BASS: Bill Bass, acting deputy regional
9 forester.

10 IRENE SAPHRA: Irene Saphra. I represent the
11 pack goat community as a subject matter expert.

12 KEVIN HURLEY: Kevin Hurley. I work for Wild
13 Sheep Foundation and the Wyoming Chapter of the Wild Sheep
14 Foundation.

15 JANE COTTRELL: Jane Cottrell, reviewing
16 official for this plan.

17 ANDREW IRVINE: Andrew Irvine. Wasn't on the
18 list of names, but I am here representing North American Pack
19 Goat Association.

20 LAWRENCE ROBINSON: Lawrence Robinson, the past
21 president of the North American Pack Goat Association.

22 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Thank you very, very,
23 very much.

24 Just a reminder. What they are going to be
25 following is through those bullets, in order, sort of in

1 order. Jane is going to start us off setting the stage, and
2 then the conversation will begin.

3 And for those of you around the table, remember that
4 first it is the objectors that Jane will want to hear from.
5 And then we'll follow with the interested parties. Then we'll
6 open it up to other objectors, and then she will conclude. We
7 have about an hour scheduled for this topic, until 11:00.

8 So Jane, I'll turn it over to you.

9 JANE COTTRELL: Thank you, Rhonda. This is
10 Jane Cottrell again.

11 I also want to let folks understand, for the first
12 couple of topics, it's a fairly small group, so that's why
13 we've immediately brought the interested parties up to the
14 table. For the afternoon ones, we're going to focus first
15 with the objectors, because there are so many of you that we
16 want to -- it will be -- we'll be flexible throughout today.

17 So the first thing I want to do is just share with
18 you my understanding, and then that's a place for us to start
19 the conversation from.

20 So the issues, as I understand them, around best
21 science: The pack goat advocates do not believe that the
22 science that the Forest used supports the conclusion that the
23 goats could possibly transmit to the bighorn sheep, transmit
24 disease to the bighorn sheep.

25 Second of all, there was a concern about a potential

1 FACA violation, that the Forest Service used data and science
2 from the committee on the Payette National Forest or developed
3 their own committee which was found -- the Payette one was
4 found in violation of FACA, the Federal Advisory Committee
5 Act.

6 The mitigation measures. The objectors also believe
7 that there are some reasonable mitigation measures that can be
8 put in place to eliminate risk around separation of time and
9 space between the bighorn sheep and the pack goats, and that
10 they feel that the Forest Service didn't consider additional
11 mitigation measures to reduce that risk.

12 The potential remedies that I saw through this
13 process or that were proposed was for the Forest Service to
14 re-examine the science on disease transmission between pack
15 goats and bighorn sheep. And the objectors felt that then we
16 would accurately conclude that the science doesn't support the
17 decision to prohibit the goats.

18 In addition, the objectors are asking that we take
19 into account the unique difference between pack goats and
20 other domestic livestock, basically domestic sheep. Most of
21 the science, as those of us who have dealt with bighorn sheep
22 and domestic sheep know, is around the domestic sheep.

23 In addition, they'd like us to consider that pack
24 goats are separate -- consider separation from other domestic
25 goats, pack goats are different than other domestic goats that

1 may be kept by ranches in the area, to consider the
2 unlikelihood that the pack goats would carry the disease in the
3 first place, and to consider the unlikelihood that the pack
4 goats would ever come in close contact with the bighorn sheep.

5 Under mitigation measures, it's -- it says the
6 correct risk analysis, but basically a risk analysis to
7 include the probability of that disease transmission should
8 pack goats and bighorn sheep come together, to consider
9 appropriate mitigation measures to prevent the risk of disease
10 transmission between the goats and the sheep, and to consider
11 maintenance of separation between the sheep and goats as we
12 talked about earlier.

13 I'm not going to spend a lot of time today on the
14 FACA violation. We talked procedural. And so what I'd like
15 to do is actually talk the issue of the sheep and the goats
16 more than procedural.

17 The conclusion that I've come to -- now, this is
18 where I'm at right now. That doesn't mean I'm going to be in
19 the same place when I write the final document, but I am going
20 to disclose to you what I'm thinking right now.

21 I have asked -- I plan to ask the Forest to
22 strengthen the project record by additional review of what's
23 currently available in their best science, to focus on that
24 disease transmission between domestic sheep and goats and wild
25 sheep. So how all those connections are made, and what does

1 the current science say about that?

2 I think there's some additional supporting
3 documentation that's needed in the biological evaluation
4 specifically related to cumulative effects and probability of
5 disease transmission. So as the objectors put forward, so
6 what is the likelihood that a pack goat would actually have
7 the disease and transmit the disease? And there's some
8 additional work that I'm asking them to look into for that.

9 Recommending some evaluation, additional evaluation
10 of the mitigation measures that were put forward so that it
11 really describes why the forest went where they went with the
12 plan.

13 And you know, overall, basically what I've come to
14 with this is -- is to continue with what was put in
15 Alternative G, that the Forest Service does not allow the pack
16 goats in close proximity to the bighorn sheep.

17 Now, that, in full disclosure, is where I'm at right
18 now. So I would like to facilitate the discussion between --
19 I'd like to have a better understanding from the objectors as
20 well as -- as well as the interested parties on this. And I
21 would like to see if there is some remedy that perhaps
22 together we could come to.

23 And at this point, I'm going to open it to any of
24 the objectors that would like to start.

25 ANDREW IRVINE: This is Andrew Irvine. I guess

1 I'll begin.

2 One of the issues that North American Pack Goat
3 Association has, and especially with the conclusions reached
4 here -- and I'll use NAPgA as the acronym for the
5 association -- is that a lot of the science and conclusions
6 are based on domestic sheep and goats, especially pack goats
7 have been lumped in with the domestic sheep.

8 So I think it's important that the Forest Service,
9 in their conclusions, in their scientific studies, analyses,
10 separate those two species. They are different species. They
11 act differently. There's certainly different science on the
12 two species. That's one of our major concerns.

13 And even with herd domestic goats, they are a
14 different animal than pack goats. They have a very different
15 use. They're monitored differently. They're raised
16 differently. They have different diseases. And you know,
17 it's an important aspect of goat-packing that those be
18 considered differently on the forest.

19 JANE COTTRELL: So remedies?

20 ANDREW IRVINE: Straight on to remedies?

21 JANE COTTRELL: We might as well. What are you
22 proposing?

23 ANDREW IRVINE: So as far as remedies, NAPgA
24 has proposed a large suite of remedies. I think when they
25 first sat down with the Forest Service there were 13 different

1 remedies.

2 NAPgA is open to having their pack goats tested for
3 different diseases, see if they actually are carriers of
4 certain diseases. In using pack goats on the forest, they are
5 willing to have them on leads, basically leashed together,
6 tethered at night, GPS collars. Almost anything possible to
7 keep goat packing continuing on the forest, NAPgA is willing
8 to consider.

9 Rather than simply removing goat-packing as a
10 recreational use of the forest, we'd like to sit down and find
11 a collaborative approach to keeping this recreation on the
12 forest. As you said, it's -- I think, Jane, you said it's our
13 public lands. And you know, there's a lot of uses. And we
14 don't want to see this use end on the forest.

15 IRENE SAPHRA: I guess we, after reading your
16 objection response and some of the discussions -- this is
17 Irene Saphra. I'm a member of the pack goat community and
18 subject matter expert.

19 We did give a list of mitigation measures, and I
20 know that they were eliminated from the preferred alternative.
21 I didn't see very much discussion about why they were
22 eliminated. And I guess I'm just wondering why the people who
23 wrote the plan didn't think that those measures were going to
24 be effective in reducing the risk enough that pack goats were
25 not going to be a significant contributing factor to risk.

1 Realizing that we can't have zero risk and we can't
2 completely eliminate risk, why were our mitigation measures --
3 I guess there has to be an element of trust there, all the way
4 down to saying that we don't plan on issuing commercial
5 permits. I mean, I know that was mentioned in the -- in the
6 response to the objections. That would probably greatly
7 reduce risk.

8 So I guess I need to hear why we are not -- why we
9 don't think those mitigation measures are going to be
10 effective.

11 JANE COTTRELL: This is Jane Cotrell. Can I
12 ask you a clarifying question, Irene? When you ask the -- you
13 made the point about not issuing the commercial permits, and
14 you felt that would reduce risk. Can you help me understand
15 why you believe that would help reduce risk?

16 IRENE SAPHRA: Well, that was mentioned in
17 the -- I think that was mentioned in the response to the
18 objections about commercial permits and that -- I don't have
19 time to sit here and look at the wording, but that seemed that
20 that was a factor in the decision to not even consider
21 mitigation measures as one of the preferred alternatives.
22 Maybe -- maybe because there is not enough bonding between a
23 commercially rented pack goat and its owner? That's what I'm
24 going to guess.

25 I know, from my own experience, that our goats stick

1 with us all the time. They're very bonded with us. I don't
2 know in the case of a rental pack goat.

3 JANE COTTRELL: Okay. Thank you.

4 So at this time I'd actually like to ask the
5 interested parties, interested persons to -- because, being a
6 small group of objectors, I'd like to ask the interested
7 persons, either Jessica, Jim, or Kevin, to put their interests
8 on the table?

9 KEVIN HURLEY: Okay. I guess I'll start.
10 Kevin Hurley. I do work for the Wild Sheep Foundation and the
11 Wyoming Chapter of the Wild Sheep Foundation.

12 The State of Wyoming, for the last 14-1/2 years, has
13 had what we call a Domestic Sheep/Bighorn Sheep Interaction
14 Working Group. We've sat down at the direction of
15 then-Governor Gerring and then-Senator Thomas, and so we've
16 worked hard for 14-plus years with the domestic sheep folks to
17 try and arrive at a system that works well in the State of
18 Wyoming.

19 And we have gone through a stratification or triage
20 approach that said, "Where are our most important bighorn
21 sheep herds, where are our least important in terms of
22 struggling, you know, small transplant populations, and then
23 sort of where the middle ground is between those two end
24 points?"

25 So we have worked out a system that works well in

1 the State of Wyoming. And on multiple occasions, we've
2 invited Charlie Jennings and the North American Pack Goat
3 Association folks to come. I talked to Andy during one of the
4 breaks, and Larry, and they said, "Yeah, we'll come." But
5 we've gotten to this point.

6 What we identified in the northwest quadrant of
7 Wyoming is our biggest and best bighorn sheep herd. There's
8 over 4,000 sheep, bighorn sheep, on and around the Shoshone
9 National Forest, more than any forest in the national forest
10 system.

11 We agreed, science is not perfect. We don't fully
12 understand. But in terms of "err on the side of caution,"
13 this is a huge issue around the West on separation. You know,
14 there have been disease problems in Hell's Canyon. It's going
15 on right now. North Dakota, right now. Arizona. And goats
16 have been implicated. Not pack goats necessarily, but
17 domestic goats.

18 And I realize, Andy, Larry, you guys think they're
19 two different critters. But what we've advocated for is
20 erring on the side of the caution with the biggest and best
21 bighorn sheep resource in the country. And so we feel really
22 strongly that -- again, not a blanket closure.

23 And when Joe wrote the forest supervisor's order, it
24 talked about four of the five ranger districts on the Shoshone
25 where this would be precluded. The Washakie District, above

1 Lander, where we don't have a core bighorn sheep population,
2 we've said we're okay there. In fact, when I worked for the
3 Game and Fish Department, the Fish Division out of Lander uses
4 pack goats to haul their equipment.

5 So we're not anti pack goat, but we're very pro
6 bighorn sheep. And we're very concerned about any -- when you
7 get can't get to zero risk, but there are management steps to
8 lower that risk as low as you can.

9 We've tried to be reasonable across the State of
10 Wyoming. And Bill is sitting there as forest sup on the
11 Bighorn, knows that. We've tried to reach middle ground. Up
12 here, this is just one of those that's too critically
13 important to risk, in our opinion.

14 JIM COLLINS: Jim Collins with the Wyoming Wild
15 Sheep Foundation and a member of the Governor's
16 Bighorn/Domestic Interaction Working Group.

17 We -- I'll just reiterate what Kevin said. The
18 difference here and why we're requesting it here is the degree
19 of risk. We have such a national treasure sitting here that
20 we would like to ask the Forest Service to help us protect and
21 eliminate any risk that we'd possibly have with commingling.

22 KEVIN HURLEY: Jim, let me go back and say --
23 and Irene brought it up. I'll remember the time frame not
24 quite exactly, but seven or eight years ago we negotiated
25 financial incentives with the only permitted pack goat

1 operator on the Shoshone or anywhere that we were able to
2 discern, Charlie Wilson with Wind River Pack Goats.

3 He had 150 days' use above Dubois and 100 days above
4 Lander. We negotiated with him, rather than coming to the
5 Forest Service and saying, "Nah, just kick him off." He had a
6 legit permit and a business.

7 So the Wyoming Wild Sheep Foundation worked with
8 Charlie to come to an agreement that worked for him and for
9 us. And so we've done that. And I guess we feel really
10 strongly that we are middle-of-the-road, multiple-use
11 oriented. But in this case, we don't have a choice but to
12 stick up for bighorns here on the forest, on the Shoshone.

13 We think Joe and the staff made the right
14 recommendation with one of the five ranger districts still
15 being open for this use, so it's not like it's precluded. And
16 I realize the anxiety that this will ripple and go to other
17 places where there's bighorn sheep/pack goat overlap. But in
18 this case, we feel pretty strongly that Joe and the Forest
19 made the right decision here.

20 LARRY ROBINSON: Can I address something? We
21 keep talking about risk. We keep talking about risks. But in
22 the risk analyses there's never been any consideration
23 whatsoever to the abysmally small numbers of pack goaters that
24 are out there.

25 We are a very, very, very small organization to

1 begin with. And then, like any organization, there's this
2 large group of interested people that go out with goats or
3 walk up and down the road and go on a day hike. There's a few
4 of us, myself, Irene, and a few others, that actually get out
5 into the woods for days at a time.

6 But the numbers are abysmally small, and that has to
7 factor into the risk analysis. Because we just are not a big
8 presence.

9 JIM COLLINS: I guess, if I could, under the
10 Wyoming plan -- and we've invited you guys. We would have
11 loved to have you be a part of it. But we have determined
12 where we're willing to take the risk and, as a State of
13 Wyoming, where we would prefer to have as close to no risk as
14 we can.

15 And we will not go and try and limit your use
16 anywhere else. This is what we factor as the core native
17 herds. It's part of the Wyoming plan. You can look it up
18 anyplace you want. The other place would be cooperative
19 review or non-emphasis areas. And wild sheep advocates in the
20 State of Wyoming are not going to try limiting your use
21 anywhere else. This is a place where we would like to bring
22 the amount of risk as low as we possibly can.

23 KEVIN HURLEY: In the spirit of dialogue --
24 Kevin Hurley here.

25 Larry, I have a question for you. If you say --

1 your term -- abysmally small number of days users or days of
2 use on the Shoshone -- Andy, help me out, but I think the
3 Shoshone tried to get a sense of that from the ranger
4 districts. And it is negligible use. Single digit.

5 LARRY ROBINSON: Exactly.

6 KEVIN HURLEY: And so to us, you know, nobody
7 likes getting tread on, but there wasn't a lot of days of use
8 to tread on with this proposed action, the closure order that
9 Joe came out with a couple of years ago. And so I guess I
10 would turn that and ask you, you know, how many days use do
11 you think there are up here in grizzly and wolf range? And
12 realizing the investment you have in these goats, we didn't
13 think it was going to step on too many toes to do this up here
14 where there is virtually -- or abysmally low use, as you put
15 it.

16 ANDREW IRVINE: This is Andrew Irvine. Let me
17 say one thing first.

18 I know we've been talking about the Shoshone
19 National Forest and this is where you're focusing, but this is
20 a larger issue. Your foundation is very familiar with that.
21 And pack goats are being removed from forests and BLM lands
22 across the West. So it's not just an issue on the Shoshone.
23 And I know that the Wild Sheep Foundation is trying to get
24 pack goats removed from many, many other forests and BLM
25 lands.

1 So yes, we have a few users here. We have users
2 elsewhere. But this is a prime location for NAPgA. And you
3 know it will spiral downwards. This is important to us on
4 this forest for that reason. And we should not just -- I know
5 you're trying to limit it, but it's not limited in that
6 regard. I mean, this is, you know, a western issue.

7 LARRY ROBINSON: There's four national forests
8 right now doing their very best to run us out of the forest.
9 There is one national forest in Arizona that has pulled --
10 they didn't negotiate with him. They just pulled his permits.
11 He's been in business for 20 years. Boom, he's out of
12 business.

13 KEVIN HURLEY: Is that commercial?

14 LARRY ROBINSON: Yes. Yes. And he did really
15 low impact stuff, you know. So it isn't just about -- for us,
16 it isn't just about the Shoshone.

17 I understand where you're coming from. However, we
18 are fighting a very big movement. It just pops up everywhere
19 you turn around, of a new land use plan and a new attempt to
20 eliminate goats. And we believe that it is not legitimate for
21 any number of reasons.

22 You mentioned risks. But the risk analyses do not
23 take into account the limited number of people that are out
24 there doing this.

25 IRENE SAPHRA: Going back again to risk

1 analysis and whether or not -- Irene Saphra. I'm assuming
2 that the Forest Service used the risk analysis to base their
3 decision to close four out of five districts to goats, to pack
4 goats. And I guess one of the reasons that I've asked --
5 requested the risk analysis to be redone or improved is that I
6 didn't see the assumptions done in the risk analysis, the
7 degree of uncertainty, and as Jane mentioned, the
8 probabilities. What really needs to happen in order for
9 diseases to be transmitted, and what are the probabilities,
10 and what really is the actual risk? And then, how are you
11 going to base your decision on that?

12 And have it really done by people who don't -- I
13 don't really know all the background of the people who did the
14 risk analysis, but I'm going to just suggest that maybe there
15 is a trained bias there. I'd like it see it reviewed by
16 people who really know the science of risk analysis and can
17 see whether this really is a significant risk.

18 Your goal of risk reduction, is it zero? Is it as
19 low as possible? I didn't really see a good statement of that
20 in the forest plan.

21 So if you're going to make a decision, I'd like to
22 at least see it based on something that really is founded in a
23 good, sound risk analysis, a robust analysis that's done for
24 this type of situation.

25 And I -- the assumption that -- you know, you have

1 to assume that we are going to follow mitigation measures when
2 you do this analysis. There has to be a degree of trust that
3 we will follow them.

4 There has to be a good dialogue with us about which
5 mitigation measures we would use, and the frequency, again,
6 how much we would actually be in these areas, what we would
7 do, what exact mitigation measures you would like us to use.
8 And then probabilities and uncertainties, assuming goats have
9 these diseases, assuming whatever it takes to transmit,
10 whatever type of contact, overlap, spatial, temporal, et
11 cetera.

12 So I feel the risk analysis, if this is the key to
13 you making a decision about whether to close the area to pack
14 goats, needs to be done in an unbiased, robust manner. And
15 work with us to show the mitigation measures that are going to
16 be in place and that you assume will be followed.

17 LARRY ROBINSON: Can I address something?

18 I have been the president of the North American Pack
19 Goat Association for probably six, seven years. And within
20 our community, I've mentioned to you, we are concerned about
21 the environment, about our impact on the land. One of the
22 reasons we use goats is because that's the least impact.
23 We're concerned about our impact on other animals, these sorts
24 of things.

25 In fact, at my house, I happen to live out where I

1 have frequent encounters with elk. And I've had to run them
2 off, I've had to have to keep them away from the goats so that
3 there's no -- so we're concerned about all these issues within
4 our community.

5 Now, I know it says something else in here. Within
6 our community, high-lining has become an absolute mandatory
7 thing that we do. In pack-goating, it's kind of come up
8 slowly from the ashes. And it was -- the basic prevailing
9 thought was that you just let them roam at night.

10 Well, we've had a couple of bad experiences with
11 that, and we're having more people interested in it now, and
12 as a group we are saying, absolutely, there will be no
13 consideration of allowing an animal to roam at night. They
14 will be high-lined. They will be kept under positive control.

15 So we are very concerned with the same issues
16 generally you are. We're not as heavily invested in bighorn
17 sheep, but we are concerned overall about environment,
18 environmental issues.

19 KEVIN HURLEY: Kevin Hurley, Wild Sheep
20 Foundation.

21 I read in one of the questions you have -- and I
22 can't speak for the Forest Service, but in terms of the
23 Wyoming Domestic/Bighorn Interaction Working Group, I chaired
24 that group for 11 years. One of the agreements -- and, Jim,
25 help me. And, Bill, you've been at many of the meetings. We

1 agree there's no way to get to zero risk of contact and
2 disease transmission. But what we said was, especially here
3 in our core native herds in the northwest quadrant of Wyoming,
4 management steps can be taken to minimize that risk to as low
5 a level as possible. And we see this as a very tangible,
6 sound management action on the part of the Shoshone to say,
7 "Okay, we can't get to zero risk, but through our management
8 we're going to try to lower that risk as low as we can manage
9 for."

10 IRENE SAPHRA: And I do not see that type of
11 language in the forest plan.

12 JIM COLLINS: Jim Collins, Wyoming Wild Sheep
13 Foundation.

14 As part of this Governor's License Coalition, which
15 is -- or excuse me, the Governor's Bighorn/Domestic
16 Interaction Working Group, which has been active now for 15
17 years, we would have loved to have had this conversation with
18 you folks -- and we've invited you to it -- on how best we can
19 all work together, develop the trust and that. We've been very
20 disappointed that you guys haven't come to the table with us.

21 And so we've come up with -- and we have not asked
22 for this as a blanket on the forest, just in the core native
23 herds where these sheep have never been removed by disease or
24 any other deal. And so I guess, lacking your input from our
25 group, this is what we've asked the Forest to do, and we think

1 we're justified in asking for that.

2 IRENE SAPHRA: Why were we not invited to come
3 to the table? I offered in my comments to come and sit down
4 and develop mitigation measures with you. I offered in my
5 comments. Was this something the Forest Service should have
6 facilitated?

7 JANE COTTRELL: And I -- this is Jane Cottrell.
8 I believe he's talking about the governor's work group table.
9 So maybe this would be a chance.

10 Jessica, is there something that you would like to
11 put into this conversation?

12 JESSICA CROWDER: Sure. Absolutely. Thank you
13 for remembering me here on the phone. Just a few things, and
14 I have a couple questions as well.

15 You know, we support the Wyoming Bighorn
16 Sheep/Domestic Sheep Interaction Working Group plan for
17 Wyoming. The plan lays out a clear path for how domestic
18 livestock, particularly sheep, can graze on the forest and
19 where core herds are. It serves the State of Wyoming as a
20 whole very well for several years, so we support that plan
21 100 percent. I think it's important to also note that the
22 Forest Service did consider that plan when they were looking
23 at redoing the forest plan and as part of their analysis.

24 I do have a question about the conversations on
25 mitigation. I keep hearing this come up, so what I'm

1 wondering is: What were those conversations with the Pack
2 Goat Association and the Forest Service? And was the Game and
3 Fish involved in any of those conversations, the Wyoming Game
4 and Fish Department? And what did those conversations lead
5 to?

6 ANDY PILS: Andy Pils. I'm a biologist with
7 the Shoshone National Forest.

8 I guess my involvement with this was a little bit
9 limited. Forest Biologist Joe Harper took the lead on this.
10 He's now retired.

11 Let's see. You know, I think our overall take on
12 mitigation measures was that certainly they may have been
13 effective at reducing the risk, but it certainly wouldn't get
14 the risk as low as we wanted it to be. And we wanted to be
15 very conservative with our management of these bighorn sheep
16 herds. And so that's why we didn't pursue an alternative
17 incorporating mitigation measures.

18 KEVIN HURLEY: Jessica, Kevin Hurley here.

19 One of the comments I would make: When I worked for
20 Game and Fish, that was up until three and a half years ago,
21 before this issue really surfaced, as Larry said, in 2011, but
22 one of the things that we've seen across the West is whatever
23 the disease agent is, some respiratory bacteria, whether it's
24 *Mannheimia* or *Mycoplasma* or whatever, once that gets started,
25 when you have connectivity between your bighorn sheep

1 subpopulations and in this case a meta population of, like I
2 said, almost 4,000 sheep, all continuous in their
3 distribution, that it can go from here to here to here to
4 here. It's like a room full of school kids. One come comes
5 in with a snotty nose, pretty soon half the class has it when
6 they go home. To me, that's the management decision that says
7 to minimize, through management, that risk of something ever
8 getting started.

9 And so, you know, if it was an isolated, discrete
10 herd that had 150 animals and no connectivity to adjacent
11 bighorns, we wouldn't feel as strongly as we do. But we're
12 talking about the crown jewel of bighorn sheep in the country
13 right here. We just thought management needed to minimize to
14 that lowest level possible, realizing zero is not attainable.

15 IRENE SAPHRA: And I'd -- I have not really
16 seen very good documentation of your meeting that you had with
17 Joe Harper, and I really haven't seen much documentation again
18 upon why the mitigation measures were rejected.

19 I also want to remember -- I want to remind
20 everybody, it says in your forest plan there has never been a
21 documented case of disease transmission between goats and
22 bighorn sheep on the Shoshone National Forest. That needs to
23 be put into your assumptions if you redo your risk analysis.
24 That is stated over and over in your forest plan.

25 And again, I feel like this is sort of morphing, the

1 risk analysis is morphing from maintaining low or very low
2 risk to now reducing risk as much as possible. I'm hearing us
3 move in that direction, and I haven't seen a lot of supporting
4 documentation on that in the forest plan.

5 ANDREW IRVINE: Andrew Irvine.

6 To follow up on Irene's comments, we'd like to know
7 why pack goats are being singled out. There is no science,
8 none, showing that pack goats transmit disease to bighorn
9 sheep. And it's never happened. There's never been a
10 documented case.

11 Domestic goats, there is very little, if any,
12 science showing that they transmit disease to bighorn sheep.
13 And the science provided by the Shoshone says the same thing.
14 There is no -- there is no scientific evidence there.

15 So we would like to see that in any analysis,
16 exactly what is the science, and March through the steps for
17 disease transmission. And this is what the Payette National
18 Forest did. We have the ability to do that, our agencies do,
19 is to provide a quantitative analysis.

20 And you can go through all the steps of disease
21 transmission, of which there are many. It's not just as
22 simple as two animals occupying the same habitat at a given
23 time. There's lot more to it. So we'd like to see the
24 science.

25 And there are other considerations. There are a lot

1 of animals that carry these types of infectious bacteria.
2 Pack goats is probably the least of the worry. I mean, we've
3 got cattle near the forest, domestic sheep. And there are
4 many species on the forest that carry similar bacteria. So
5 there needs to be some explanation of why pack goats,
6 especially when there's no science associated with pack goats.

7 KEVIN HURLEY: Kevin Hurley again.

8 Using Larry's distinction between pack goats and
9 domestic goats, grazing goats, herd goats, I guarantee you
10 there was a situation in the Silverbell Mountains in Arizona
11 where a state land lessee let 5,000 goats loose --

12 LARRY ROBINSON: I'm aware of that one.

13 KEVIN HURLEY: -- to the detriment of the
14 bighorn sheep herd. And that individual was convicted of the
15 illegal taking of 21 desert bighorn sheep in the State of
16 Arizona. So there's case law, there's precedent that exists.
17 Unfortunately, the Arizona legislature swept that money away
18 from the Game and Fish Department so they couldn't restart
19 that herd.

20 But domestic goats have been implicated. In 1995 in
21 Hell's Canyon, that trigger point, by all appearances, for the
22 Hell's Canyon die-off that persists -- and problems persist to
23 this day -- resulted from a domestic goat that was turned
24 loose in Hell's Canyon after spending time at a county fair
25 pen with some domestic sheep.

1 So precedent does exist. Recreational pack goats,
2 as you guys describe them, perhaps are different. You know,
3 they're like your pets, your kids. But they're still a
4 domestic goat that can carry these respiratory bacteria that
5 we're so concerned about.

6 ANDREW IRVINE: Kevin, this is Andrew Irvine.
7 I am familiar with the studies that you cite. It's Jansen,
8 did the Arizona study. That did not involve these strands of
9 *Pasteurella* that we're talking about. It was an ocular
10 disease, was what the study involved. And we're certainly not
11 talking about 5,000 domestic goats running on the forest.
12 We're talking about three or four tethered, leashed pack goats
13 observed by humans at all times.

14 The other science to cite is Rudolph, 2003, who
15 determined that the feral goat at issue did not spread those
16 bacteria to the bighorn sheep causing that die-off. And
17 that's the science that the Shoshone cites, and they need to
18 look at those conclusions, because I think what you're getting
19 at is not shown by those papers.

20 And we would like to see that scientific evidence.
21 It can't just be an implication based on what people have
22 said. We need to see actual science, and that's not what the
23 science says, you know, in those instances.

24 KEVIN HURLEY: I don't think there's time here,
25 Andrew, to debate the Rudolph paper.

1 ANDREW IRVINE: Yeah, we're digressing into
2 science. But it's something the biologists need to analyze
3 and we'd like to see discussed in an analysis.

4 LARRY ROBINSON: Larry Robinson.

5 I'm very familiar with the one you're talking about.
6 That was a criminal act. He was prosecuted. He should have
7 been. There isn't anybody that would ever consider anything
8 that stupid.

9 And as we pointed out, we travel with a very limited
10 amount of animals. And too, we watch the animals like a hawk.
11 I probably look out on my pen 20, 30 times a day. Any animal
12 that does any behavior that's a little bit odd, boom, we're
13 watching them. What's going on? Why is this happening? We
14 would never, never take a sick animal on the forest. Never.

15 KEVIN HURLEY: Just a question I'm curious
16 about. I'm not a pack goat user. I haven't done it myself.
17 But especially up here where I think most everybody in the
18 Cody country can talk to the number of grizzly bears up above
19 town here, what incidents have happened that you guys are
20 aware of where, whether it's a moose or a grizzly or something
21 comes in and, you know, scatters a string of goats? I'm just
22 curious if that happens.

23 IRENE SAPHRA: I've had a direct encounter
24 with, not a grizzly bear, but a black bear. Our goat stuck --
25 if possible, the goat glued to us even more. I mean, we're

1 their protectors. So they stayed with us. That was -- that's
2 my one anecdotal story.

3 RHONDA SHIPP: Folks, you're starting to kind
4 of loop here.

5 JANE COTTRELL: And Jessica had some more
6 questions.

7 RHONDA SHIPP: Yes. Jessica had some
8 questions. And then also, remember, think of anything new,
9 additional, any solutions that you might have that you would
10 propose to each other.

11 JANE COTTRELL: So first, why don't we go to
12 Jessica? This is Jane Cottrell again.

13 Jessica, you said you had a couple of questions.
14 And then let's see if we can move on that. Is there some
15 suggestions that we might have in common here?

16 JESSICA CROWDER: Thank you. Jessica Crowder
17 again.

18 It sounds like all my questions were answered. I
19 just wanted to also let the group know that Rick Huber with
20 the Game and Fish is also listening in with me on that pack
21 goat issue.

22 And I do want to reiterate that the Interaction
23 Working Group plan as it relates to the State of Wyoming as a
24 whole is very important to us. And that plan has actually
25 closed down or identified bighorn sheep as priorities in the

1 North Zone of the Shoshone National Forest, and domestic sheep
2 are no longer there.

3 So I just wanted to reiterate that for the group's
4 information, and just again suggest that we support that plan,
5 Game and Fish and the State of Wyoming.

6 KEVIN HURLEY: And, Jessica, Kevin Hurley
7 again. The domestic sheep that were on the Shoshone were not
8 forced to go away. They were incentivized. They were helped
9 to relocate to other forests. And so we feel again very
10 strongly, a business approach, a multiple use approach, and we
11 feel pretty defensible on that. We're not being rabid. We're
12 being reasonable. But we are sticking up for bighorn sheep.

13 ANDREW IRVINE: This is Andrew Irvine.

14 In talking about new solutions here, we need to
15 recognize that the decision here will likely cascade down to
16 other forests and other BLM land across all the other federal
17 public lands in the West, so it's very important in that
18 regard. And before we start removing goat packing as a
19 recreational pursuit and removing pack goats from the forest,
20 let's try something else rather than complete removal, because
21 once complete removal becomes the standard, it's going to be
22 very hard to get back this recreational interest.

23 NAPgA is absolutely open to some sort of permitting
24 system. We have many activities in our national parks and our
25 forests that are permitted. I raft rivers all the time. I

1 need a permit to do that. I've got ten different things I
2 have to bring. I have to have a certain amount of training.
3 We can do that. The forest can do that.

4 We can permit goat packing. We can, you know, make
5 sure that they have the right equipment, they have the right
6 training, they have the right goats. We can provide health
7 certificates for the goats from a vet. There are many other
8 tools that we can use in a permit system that will reduce risk
9 to negligent, you know, negligent risks, almost no risk. And
10 we can do that. We have that ability.

11 And I guess it would be -- it seems better to
12 provide that sort of approach, perhaps, on a trial basis, if
13 you would like to do that, before we just start removing a
14 recreational use from the forest. And we need to recognize it
15 will propagate from here. And that's part of the risk.

16 You have two people who bring pack goats on the
17 forest all year and a total of six goats. And they're kept
18 with a human. They are tethered. They are leashed. I mean,
19 the risk is very minimal.

20 And we can go to big steps. You know where the
21 bighorns are. We got GPS collars on them. We can GPS-collar
22 pack goats. There are many different things we can do here to
23 find a collaborative solution versus just removing a use from
24 the forest. We'd like to see steps taken in that regard
25 instead of starting with a conclusion, which is what I think

1 has happened here, no pack goats on the forest. And you know,
2 since then, it seems the forest has been trying to find
3 reasons to justify that. Let's talk about what we can do and
4 then come up with a conclusion at the end of the day.

5 JIM COLLINS: Jim Collins.

6 I guess, talking about solutions, our solution in
7 the core native herd area -- we understand you guys keep good
8 care of them, but there is no way we can keep our bighorns at
9 night from coming up and making nose-to-nose contact with your
10 tethered goats. We can't. We don't have control over them.
11 And you are asleep in the tent.

12 And the solution that we've come to, without you
13 guys' involvement, because you weren't there, is that we're
14 only asking for that here. The rest of the State of Wyoming,
15 bighorn advocates are not going to push for any other closure
16 anywhere else.

17 ANDREW IRVINE: This is Andrew Irvine.

18 And, Kevin, are you only asking for it here versus
19 throughout the West, the Wild Sheep Foundation?

20 KEVIN HURLEY: Certainly you're correct, this
21 is an issue all over the West. We know that. But I don't
22 want to dodge your question, but I want to come back before I
23 forget what you were just saying.

24 I'm just curious. Would you guys on the Washakie
25 District -- this is something the Forest Service would have to

1 see if they can handle or set up. But where we've said we're
2 good down there, keep your use down there, are you guys
3 willing to go through the hoops that Irene talked about, the
4 steps you just talked about, Andrew, you know, and try to set
5 up a pilot deal?

6 What I'm pretty confident in saying is we're not
7 willing to gamble up here with this. But if there is a system
8 of permitting and numbers and reporting and advanced health
9 screening, that kind of stuff, would you guys be willing to
10 try that somewhere else rather than trying that here?

11 ANDREW IRVINE: This is Andrew Irvine.

12 Yeah, we'd be interested in a pilot program. We'd
13 obviously like to see something like that in place before
14 elimination of all goat packing on the forest. If we'd want
15 to set up a pilot permit program, yeah, let's do it.

16 And as far as a bighorn wandering into a camp at
17 night, we've all -- most of us, probably, have been in the
18 back country. Bighorns are not prone to wander near humans
19 that often. And the goats are tethered at night, so they're
20 not moving. They've got bells on. And they are incredibly
21 afraid of wildlife. More likely to jump in the tent with
22 their owner than anything else. And it's just -- that's not a
23 very likely probability.

24 KEVIN HURLEY: Kevin here.

25 And again, I hate to correct you, but there have

1 been instances, and it's typically a subadult ram, probably a
2 two-and-a-half-year-old young bighorn ram is the big culprit.
3 They are horny -- excuse my French -- looking for love in all
4 the wrong places. They'll go anywhere, and they'll
5 approach -- you name it, they'll approach.

6 So talk about extreme measures. There have been
7 examples in multiple states where a shepherd or a permittee
8 has been given authorization by the Game and Fish Department
9 to kill that bighorn. That's how seriously we take that. And
10 that's happened. It's happened in Oregon. There is a
11 permittee on Bill's forest that has that authority from the
12 Wyoming Game and Fish Commission.

13 So they will approach. It's not a matter that they
14 won't. They will. And through no fault of the domestic sheep
15 operator or the pack goat user, those bighorns will come down.
16 But that's how seriously we take it collectively in the West.
17 We're willing to kill those bighorns so they do not become
18 atomic and be a vector back to the herd they came from or a
19 subsequent herd as they travel.

20 So we don't think we're being overly paranoid. We
21 think we're being realistic. And we're trying to step up the
22 management intervention and responses by the land management
23 agencies, but also with the game and fish departments around
24 the West.

25 LARRY ROBINSON: Larry Robinson here. I'd like

1 to address what you said.

2 I personally high-line, and I think most of us do,
3 close to where we're tenting. When anything is going on, I
4 mean anything is going on, we'll know about it because the
5 goats will wake us up. They immediately start making noise.
6 They immediately start, basically, calling out to us, telling
7 us something's happening out here. And they will know.

8 When you're there with your goats and they start
9 staring, you know that there's something out there that they
10 see that you won't see until you really start looking for it.

11 KEVIN HURLEY: I've got two good horses that do
12 that, too, Larry.

13 LARRY ROBINSON: Okay. So the idea of us
14 sleeping through all the commotion like that isn't going to
15 happen. They will let us know before that.

16 And the only encounter I've ever had with mountain
17 sheep, we were only close enough to maybe an eighth of a mile,
18 any my goats were watching them, and they were dancing because
19 they were nervous, and they started moving off. So I don't
20 know.

21 The thing is, there is not some big thing going to
22 happen outside our tent and us not knowing about it. It's
23 just not going to happen.

24 IRENE SAPHRA: My only question about the
25 permit system, some kind a trial permit system on the Washakie

1 District is that there's currently no restrictions in place on
2 that district, so you would be imposing more restrictions in a
3 place where we don't necessarily -- we're not required to have
4 them now. I just am wondering what the benefit would be,
5 other than unless the ultimate goal is to see whether or not
6 we could expand that to the -- to the other places where
7 they're currently -- that are currently closed to pack goats.

8 So we would be willing to do it, but if anything,
9 it's going to be make it more difficult for us. If it would
10 help to build some trust there, which I'm not sure why we're
11 not trusted to follow close mitigation measures or why, again,
12 these are being discounted in the first place, we would be
13 willing to consider it. But it's not really buying us
14 anything right now.

15 KEVIN HURLEY: Kevin Hurley.

16 I guess, to respond, Irene -- and I don't know.
17 Maybe the Forest Service could help. Are there permit systems
18 elsewhere around the West? I just don't know about them.

19 But I guess the reason I suggested the Washakie is
20 because it's an area that we've stated publicly and in writing
21 that we're not as concerned about. And so knock yourselves
22 out. As I say, I'm not being flip there. But rather than
23 trying to establish a pilot or trial program up here, we're
24 saying let's prove something in a fairly more benign setting
25 than this one.

1 IRENE SAPHRA: And what are we trying to prove
2 exactly?

3 KEVIN HURLEY: Well, the permitting system that
4 Andrew described. And I realize there is a lot more
5 discussion that could be had about that, and I don't know what
6 the Forest Service capabilities would be. But if there is a
7 permit or a pilot system to be worked out, I guess the
8 suggestion is: Let's try and work that out, not at ground
9 zero, but somewhere safer to do that, more benign. If you
10 guys have a point you're trying to prove, we're willing, and I
11 would guess the Forest Service is willing to have some
12 dialogue. But not up here.

13 JANE COTTRELL: Okay. So this is Jane
14 Cottrell. I want to reiterate some things I'm hearing. And I
15 want to start with this kind of proposal that's been laid on
16 the table, that there is a request by the Wyoming Bighorn
17 Sheep and Domestic Livestock Working Group that maybe that is
18 an opportunity to bring together the domestic pack goats as
19 part of this and lay out: Are there some places where a
20 permit system, a testing of some kind of pilot with that, that
21 maybe not where the core bighorn sheep populations are that
22 have been identified in the plan, but through the rest of
23 Wyoming, there might be some opportunities there to bring
24 folks to the table and say, what could we do not to eliminate
25 pack goat use across all of Wyoming wherever there's bighorn

1 sheep?

2 In addition, you know, there is always the
3 opportunity to amend the forest plan if something developed in
4 the future that might bring back some uses, if you found
5 through that system, that pilot and research on that, that it
6 really significantly reduced the risk.

7 What I heard as part of that pilot was obviously the
8 testing of the pack goats for disease, a permit system for
9 recreational use, not commercial use again, but having some
10 measures in place like tethering, high-line, collaring, et
11 cetera. But that there may be some common ground so that it's
12 not everywhere in the West, and that maybe Wyoming could be
13 ground zero to test that for states like Idaho, Montana,
14 Arizona, Utah. I'm trying to think of all the places that
15 I've dealt with the sheep and bighorn sheep issue.

16 In addition, I did hear a request to, really, the
17 Forest Service, to clarify their assumptions, probabilities,
18 and the quantities in the risk analysis. And the goal -- and
19 really clarify what the goal of the risk analysis was, low or
20 zero risk.

21 Quite frankly, I heard every one of you say we can't
22 completely reduce the risk. We know it's not just pack goats.
23 We know it's not just domestic sheep, that it's interaction
24 between various wildlife species as well.

25 And to bring into that risk assessment any

1 documented cases of transmission, especially between goats and
2 bighorn sheep.

3 To clarify the Forest Service's evaluation of the
4 mitigation measures. Why or why not did they feel that those
5 were effective in reducing net risk and meeting that risk
6 goal?

7 And being sure -- and I wanted to capture -- you
8 mentioned Jansen's research. I didn't quickly get the other
9 one. Being sure that we actually clarify what the -- if you
10 will, what the evaluation was of those -- of the science that
11 was brought forward in the plan around bighorn sheep and goats
12 and that -- and some kind of quantitative analysis of disease
13 transmission, very similar to what the Payette ended up doing
14 in their SEIS, supplemental environmental impact statement.

15 So those are things I'm hearing at this point.
16 Perhaps not necessarily a resolution for this core population
17 that has been identified as the most significant by the state
18 working group in the State of Wyoming, but -- but maybe a
19 future alternative across the West, or helping test some of
20 this across the West.

21 Is there anything to add to that?

22 KEVIN HURLEY: One comment I would make, Jane,
23 just for everybody's benefit. And the Wild Sheep Foundation,
24 we are helping fund some domestic goat *Mycoplasma* research at
25 Washington State University with Dr. Tom Besser, who is

1 probably the foremost authority on *Mycoplasma* anywhere. And
2 that's underway right now.

3 And as an action item for myself, if it would help
4 you, I can get you guys a copy of the study plan to see what
5 he's doing.

6 ANDREW IRVINE: We're very familiar with it.

7 LARRY ROBINSON: We've been talking with him
8 ongoing.

9 RHONDA SHIPP: Excuse me just a second here.
10 We're almost out of time. Did you want to hear from the rest
11 of the room at any point?

12 JANE COTTRELL: Why don't we let him finish,
13 and then we'll ask if there are any other objectors.

14 JIM COLLINS: We are in the process right now
15 of setting up a date in December for the Domestic/Bighorn
16 Interaction Working Group to get together. We obviously have
17 you guys. You will be invited again, and we would love to
18 interact with you and work through these issues if we can.

19 ANDREW IRVINE: This is Andrew Irvine. I'll be
20 there.

21 LARRY ROBINSON: And I'll do my best.

22 RHONDA SHIPP: So sometimes it is interesting
23 when we have this fishbowl format for the others who are
24 listening to maybe see something that's a possible solution.
25 Are there any objectors out here that maybe have a solution

1 that they would like to propose? And if so, please come to
2 the mic.

3 Got a solution?

4 MARK HINSCHBERGER: Not necessarily a solution.

5 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay.

6 MARK HINSCHBERGER: My name is Mark
7 Hinchberger. I'm a former Forest Service biologist. I was a
8 member of the Whiskey Mountain Bighorn Sheep Tech Committee
9 for 16 years. That organization is older than most of the
10 other organizations in this state. It started in 1969.

11 My questions are: Does every pack goat user belong
12 to the North American Pack Goat Association?

13 LARRY ROBINSON: No, they don't.

14 MARK HINSCHBERGER: And if we're talking about
15 commercial use, yeah, you can restrict it. We attempted to do
16 that down in Dubois on the Wind River District with Charlie
17 Wilson. But he's the only pack goat commercial operator at
18 the time.

19 And we tried -- you know, he said herding and, you
20 know, tethering and all those things, in our Whiskey Mountain
21 bighorn sheep area. And we put those into his permit for a
22 short period of time until the -- Kevin pointed out that that
23 permit was waived back to the Forest and moved down to the
24 Lander portion of the Wind River Range.

25 But also, what I want to know is if we're going to

1 do this with commercial operators, what are we going to do
2 about noncommercial pack goat users? Are they going to adhere
3 to those standards that you're talking about or those
4 mitigation measures?

5 That was the concern I had down there, was we're
6 singling out different users. The commercial user we can
7 maybe control. What about the noncommercial user?

8 LARRY ROBINSON: I can address that. Larry
9 Robinson.

10 Our basic feeling within NAPgA is that it doesn't
11 matter if you're member of NAPgA or not. If the Forest in a
12 sensitive area establishes a permit system, we're all for it.
13 So that would affect everybody.

14 KEVIN HURLEY: And I guess, Mark -- Kevin
15 Hurley -- there are no commercial operators, and I don't think
16 there's going to be any. So this is focused on the private
17 recreational user.

18 JANE COTTRELL: So I want to thank all of you.
19 This is Jane Cottrell again. I want to thank all of you for,
20 one, your interest; two, coming to the table; and three,
21 honestly, I'm starting to hear some dialogue where maybe this
22 could, you know, change the interaction across the West,
23 bringing more people to the table of these working groups
24 across the state to think about both the recreational use as
25 well as the commercial and domestic use. So thank you.

1 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Thanks so much. We
2 appreciate you coming to the table.

3 Okay. We're ready for our next topic, so sounds
4 like everybody's having a good visit. This next topic is
5 forest management and lynx habitat. All right. So if you've
6 got the issue statement on that, pull it up.

7 And we are looking for Tom Troxel, Loren Grosskopf.
8 And for the interested parties, we'll go ahead and have you
9 come to the table at this time as well.

10 And, Jessica, are you still with us from -- on the
11 phone?

12 JESSICA CROWDER: Yes, ma'am.

13 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Connie Wilbert and Peter
14 Aengst.

15 Peter is not here. You're the representative, then.

16 Okay. Once again, our group is small enough, let's
17 go around the table and have you give your name, and then
18 we'll get started, Jane will get you started on the
19 conversation.

20 So if you would start, sir.

21 MIKE HILLIS: Mike Hillis. I'm a consultant
22 with Ecosystem Research Group hired by the Counties.

23 TOM TROXEL: I'm Tom Troxel, with the
24 Intermountain Forest Association.

25 LOREN GROSSKOPF: Loren Grosskopf, Park County

1 Commissioner, representing the SCAC.

2 ANDY PILS: Andy Pils, wildlife biologist for
3 Shoshone National Forest.

4 JANE COTTRELL: Jane Cottrell, reviewing
5 official.

6 CONNIE WILBERT: Connie Wilbert, Sierra Club.

7 BILL BASS: Bill Bass, acting deputy regional
8 forester.

9 JODY SUTTON: Let me ask if there's anybody in
10 the room from the Wilderness Society.

11 JANE COTTRELL: Is there anybody from the
12 Wilderness Society?

13 Is there anybody on the phone?

14 PETER MCDONALD: Yes. This is Peter McDonald,
15 the endangered species program leader for the Rocky Mountain
16 Region of the Forest Service.

17 JANE COTTRELL: Okay. Is there anybody from
18 the Wilderness Society on the phone?

19 Okay. Just wanted to make sure. And unfortunately,
20 these don't always work so everybody can join us.

21 This is Jane Cottrell again. I'm going to lead off
22 of with a little bit of my understanding of the issues, what
23 I've heard as potential remedies, and where I currently am in
24 my conclusions.

25 So the issues that I've heard are around

1 pre-commercial thinning and the impacts on lynx. The
2 objectors are concerned about the restrictions on thinning in
3 lynx habitat because it significantly reduces the board-foot
4 growth, especially in young lodgepole pine which are heavily
5 used by lynx.

6 The lynx-occupied habitat, the discussion of whether
7 the forest is truly occupied or not occupied based on
8 occurrence.

9 The issue around lynx matrix habitat. The objectors
10 are concerned that the Rocky Mountain Lynx Management
11 Direction or Northern Rocky Lynx Amendment, for those of you
12 that know it that way, that the vegetation standard may be
13 over-applied to identified matrix lands as far as restrictions
14 on thinning.

15 And then the public involvement and determination of
16 lynx habitat, some concerns about identification of the lynx
17 habitat and the mapping of lynx habitat in the forest plan and
18 whether the public had a chance to review or comment on that.
19 And again, that's a procedural piece. I'd like to focus on
20 the habitat and thinning issues during this dialogue.

21 What I heard as potential remedies: That the
22 pre-commercial thinning and impacts on lynx habitat, that we
23 eliminate the restriction, the Forest Service eliminate the
24 restriction on pre-commercial thinning in lynx habitat,
25 contingent on leaving 20 percent of the acreage unthinned, or

1 of the stand unthinned.

2 MIKE HILLIS: It's the reverse of that.
3 20 percent thinned within stands based on the Griffen-Mills
4 research.

5 JANE COTTRELL: So it's not leaving 20 percent;
6 it's actually retaining 80 percent.

7 MIKE HILLIS: I may have misspoke.

8 JANE COTTRELL: Okay.

9 MIKE HILLIS: Apologies.

10 JANE COTTRELL: No, that's a good, big piece of
11 why we're trying to have these discussions.

12 That we revisit the Shoshone National Forest
13 designation as a lynx occupied forest.

14 And that the lynx habitat, you separate non-lynx
15 matrix habitat. And what you mean, I'm assuming, those where
16 there have not been visual occurrence or documented
17 occurrences.

18 MIKE HILLIS: Matrix habitat is lands that are
19 not spruce fir lynx habitat that are interspersed among lands
20 designated as lynx habitat.

21 JANE COTTRELL: Based on species composition,
22 got it.

23 MIKE HILLIS: Yeah, vegetation composition.

24 JANE COTTRELL: So separating those non-lynx
25 based on species composition with lynx habitat by suitable and

1 non-suitable, applying some kind of suitability screen.

2 And the conclusions that I've come to so far about
3 the -- let's do the occupied habitat. Information available
4 in the Northern Rockies Lynx Amendment, the ROD and the FEIS,
5 the biological opinion, and the revised plan, et cetera, et
6 cetera, indicate that the forest is occupied by lynx, that the
7 Conservation Agreement with Fish and Wildlife Service as well
8 as between the Forest Service and Fish and Wildlife Service
9 also classifies the forest as occupied with the caveat that
10 available data does not fully meet the "occupied" criteria.
11 However, based on existing evidence and limited surveys,
12 presence is a high probability as well as habitat proposition.

13 Additional, the -- as far as occupied habitat,
14 additional information in the plan supports documentation
15 concerning how the lynx observations on the forest contribute
16 to the requirements that define this forest as occupied. So
17 they don't have to be everywhere on every acre, but within
18 that range.

19 As well, it provides some additional information in
20 the final ROD concerning how the lynx observations that have
21 happened, that have been documented contributed to that
22 requirement as occupied.

23 So at this point, is there one of the objectors that
24 would like to start with clarifying what their objection is
25 and what some potential remedies are, or even clarifying what

1 I had in those potential recommendations?

2 LOREN GROSSKOPF: Madam Deputy Chief and Deputy
3 Regional Forester Bass, Forest Supervisor Alexander, thank for
4 this opportunity.

5 Before we get started, I'd like to welcome all of
6 you to Park County and to Cody. We certainly appreciate this
7 opportunity to have a meeting like this, and especially when
8 we're the ones that don't have to travel as far.

9 I'm Loren Grosskopf. I represent the Shoshone
10 Cooperating Agency Coalition, which is comprised of three
11 different counties. That is basically 18,000 miles of
12 property that is adjacent to the Shoshone Forest. We
13 represent the three counties: Fremont, Hot Springs, and Park
14 County. I myself am a county commissioner. We have County
15 Commissioner Joe Tilden sitting behind me.

16 Also part of the SCAC is five conservation
17 districts: Cody, Dubois-Crowheart -- which we have Reg
18 Phillips sitting behind me as representative -- Hot Springs,
19 Lower Wind River. And the Meeteetse Conservation District, we
20 have two representatives, Steve Jones and Steffen Cornell
21 sitting behind me.

22 Like I said, we're all adjacent to the Shoshone
23 National Forest. We are all duly elected officers of these
24 counties. And I think what I was trying to portray is that as
25 duly elected officers, you know, we represent all these

1 counties. And by statute, we're responsible for the health,
2 wellness, welfare, providing essential services to the
3 counties, planning for the future. So whatever happens in the
4 Shoshone Forest, good or bad, has a dramatic impact on our
5 counties and our ability to manage all the lands adjacent to
6 the forest. So I just wanted everybody to make sure they
7 understand why the SCAC -- we have such a vested interest in
8 what's going on here.

9 And I -- we -- in order to officially present our
10 information today, we're not going to have every county
11 commissioner and every representative from the conservation
12 districts present similar information, so we hope you
13 appreciate the strength of the organization we've had. We've
14 been in this process since 2006, so we have a long history on
15 this. We all live, work, and recreate here in the forest.

16 We're not professional speakers. So with that in
17 mind and with your permission, I may ask other commissioners,
18 conservation district supervisors, or technical support staff
19 to expand on a point or an issue that I'm not knowledgeable
20 about.

21 And in this case, we have our consultants, and I
22 have Mike Hillis is sitting here with us, too, when it comes
23 time to elaborate on a point. But I do have some general
24 statements about the lynx habitat.

25 The Canadian lynx habitat is limited to pockets of

1 spruce fir at high elevations. And I guess before I -- I
2 think we have a relatively easy fix, the objections that we
3 have to the forest plan, I think, compared to all the other
4 issues, that hopefully this is a relatively easy one.

5 Interspersed areas of non-forest or areas of dry
6 Douglas fir, which we call matrix lands, you know, this is not
7 prime habitat, do not constitute lynx habitat according to the
8 Northern Rockies Lynx Management Direction. Quite a mouthful.

9 Having access to as many lands as possible,
10 including this lynx matrix habitat, is essential for improving
11 forest health on the Shoshone National Forest. While the
12 final plan states that treatments in these matrix lands are
13 acceptable, we find that the final environmental impact
14 statement, the FEIS, infers that these actions would be
15 adverse to the lynx.

16 Therefore, the SCAC, we're concerned that these
17 matrix lands, the non-lynx habitat that is embedded into
18 pockets of suitable habitat, would be avoided for needed
19 forest treatment, habitat restoration activities. By treating
20 this area, we essentially protect the habitat, the suitable
21 habitat that's surrounding this. So it's really critical that
22 we have that opportunity and make that clear in the plan.

23 We believe that the FEIS needs to be revisited,
24 revised, to be consistent with the Northern Rockies Lynx
25 Management Plan. The FEIS and the plan need to make it

1 absolutely clear that forest health restoration will be
2 planned within these matrix lands. And our suggestion would
3 be to include in the plan and FEIS that forest health
4 treatments are encouraged and anticipated within these lynx
5 analysis units.

6 And I guess then that's kind of a general statement,
7 so please allow me to introduce Mike Hillis. He is our SCAC
8 wildlife expert, and he can elaborate on probably what I just
9 said, you know, make it more clear. He's a lot better at
10 articulating than I am.

11 Thank you.

12 MIKE HILLIS: Not necessarily.

13 Mike Hillis, Ecosystem Research Group, again hired
14 by SCAC.

15 Jane, you're very familiar with the whole lynx
16 issue, obviously.

17 JANE COTTRELL: You've seen my name, obviously.

18 MR. KRAMPNER: Yes, I have. When you look at
19 the research from northwest Montana where they have
20 substantial reproducing populations of lynx, it's absolutely
21 clear that the survival of lynx in terms of both long-term
22 survival and reproduction is tied to spruce fir forest. And
23 if you look at those northwest Montana forests, it's kind of
24 easy, because high elevations are kind of wall-to-wall spruce
25 fir with relatively few inclusions of dry Douglas fir,

1 Ponderosa pine, or sagebrush, or whatever.

2 It's kind of the reverse of that on the Shoshone,
3 where you've got small pockets of suitable habitat with a ton
4 of interspersed non-habitat. And you know, the problem that
5 Loren presented kind of sounds like a semantic thing.

6 Yeah, you've got some inconsistent language with the
7 plan and FEIS, but it's little bigger than that, because when
8 you draw a circle around a large landscape and label it as
9 lynx habitat or LAUs or whatever, it both builds concern among
10 individuals that are concerned about lynx, for obvious
11 reasons, and it also, I think, builds a level of reluctance by
12 the management agencies, Forest Service included, to
13 aggressively get in and do what needs to be done. And we've
14 seen that forest to forest to forest, that that label is kind
15 of killing efforts to do forest health restoration.

16 So, again, what Loren has asked for is just a
17 clarification that -- not only fix semantically that
18 inconsistency between the FEIS and plan, but also to make it
19 very, very clear that those matrix lands are not just not
20 restricted by the lynx amendment, but also that we -- the
21 Forest very clearly intends to do whatever those land
22 allocations within there allow for and intend to do.

23 JANE COTTRELL: Go ahead, Tom.

24 TOM TROXEL: I'd like to get at this issue of
25 whether the Shoshone National Forest is classified as occupied

1 or not. And really, that's a means in my mind to put in some
2 context to lynx habitat and populations on the Shoshone
3 National Forest.

4 Technically, the way I read the definition of an
5 occupied forest, the Shoshone does not meet the definition.
6 And you could put some context to that, and maybe there's
7 rationale for it should be occupied. But I think regardless,
8 the lynx densities and lynx habitat -- lynx densities are very
9 low on the Shoshone National Forest, and the forest plan
10 acknowledges that. It -- and yet the Shoshone National Forest
11 is proposing to manage about 600,000 acres of the Shoshone
12 National Forest as lynx habitat.

13 I thought the Fish and Wildlife service had some
14 very interesting discussion in their Federal Register Notice
15 last fall when they were proposing critical habitat. And they
16 talked about lynx populations across the United States, and
17 that there are some robust lynx populations where you have a
18 lot of lynx and they're reproducing, and then you have other
19 areas that there are a few lynx, they are transient, they are
20 not reproducing.

21 Whether you call it occupied or not, the Shoshone
22 National Forest does not have those robust lynx populations.
23 There's nothing in the FEIS about lynx reproduction. And so
24 that's what I'm trying to get at in questioning whether it's
25 occupied or not, is really just a recognition that the habitat

1 and the population are very low, and -- and then that feeds
2 into some discussion again by the Fish and Wildlife Service
3 from their critical habitat proposal on prioritizing efforts
4 for lynx recovery in those areas of robust populations and not
5 so much in the areas that don't have robust populations.

6 CONNIE WILBERT: Thank you. This is Connie
7 Wilbert with the Sierra Club. And thank you for the
8 opportunity to share a few thoughts with you about this. I'll
9 speak first about the subject that was just on the table,
10 which is the occupied habitat kind of designation, I guess.

11 I just took a few minutes before I came up here to
12 this meeting to look at some information from the Wyoming
13 Natural Diversity Database which is based out of the
14 University of Wyoming. It's a database of biological
15 information across the State of Wyoming. And I specifically
16 looked at their database on lynx occurrences. And what I
17 discovered when I glanced through that spreadsheet -- I
18 certainly didn't have time to go through it with a fine-tooth
19 comb, but I counted up more than 70 lynx occurrences since the
20 late '90s on the Shoshone National Forest that were all ranked
21 as having a very high likelihood of being an accurate
22 measure or observation.

23 The Wyoming Natural Diversity Database has a way of
24 classifying the observations that they put into their database
25 with how likely it is that those are good, solid observations,

1 who made them, what their qualifications were, what kind of
2 observation it was.

3 Now, I will say that there is absolutely some
4 likelihood of some duplication in that database, because they
5 get data from several different sources. And I don't know --
6 I didn't have time to go through and sort that all out. But
7 even assuming that there is a 50 percent duplication there,
8 that means that there are 30, 35, 40 documented occurrences of
9 lynx on the Shoshone National Forest since the late '90s.

10 That certainly, by my reading of the information,
11 meets the occurrence criteria to define this forest as
12 occupied lynx habitat. They also do have, in some of those
13 occurrence designations, they have documented some denning
14 sites. And that also meets the criteria of documented
15 reproduction on the Shoshone National Forest.

16 So I don't think there is actually much question
17 about meeting the criteria. It may be that the Forest Service
18 did not clearly spell that out in the planning documents, but
19 I think that the supporting information is absolutely there.

20 Then I also wanted to talk for just a minute about
21 the question of pre-commercial thinning and what the
22 correlation is between stem density and snowshoe hare density
23 or quality of lynx habitat, which is, of course, closely
24 linked to snowshoe hare density.

25 Our reading of the information that's available is

1 that, in fact, most of the relevant science supports the idea
2 that maintaining stem density maintains snowshoe hare density
3 and is an important, critical piece of maintaining
4 high-quality lynx habitat. I think that it's interesting that
5 there is also some really interesting new information or
6 relatively new information about horizontal vegetation density
7 and the effect that that has on snowshoe hare density and
8 quality of lynx habitat.

9 I don't see any of that information here, but I'd
10 like to point the Forest Service and the folks who are
11 continuing to do this analysis towards some specific recent
12 research that indicates that the horizontal vegetation density
13 is correlated not only with snowshoe hare density but also
14 with the lynx denning -- appropriateness of lynx denning sites
15 and therefore reproduction.

16 There is a good paper by John Squires that was
17 published in the *Journal of Wildlife Management*, and I can
18 share that citation. I won't do it right here and now. But
19 that is important, and I would like to see some information on
20 the effects of pre-commercial thinning on that horizontal
21 vegetation density factor.

22 It's also, I think, from the reading that I've done
23 on this, important to note that this horizontal vegetation
24 density occurs in both young structure stands as well as
25 multistory forest stands. It's not simply in the mature

1 forests that it's an important factor for lynx habitat.

2 I know -- well, I don't know exactly how these two
3 things tie together, but I do know that in the Southern
4 Rockies Lynx Amendment -- and I know the Shoshone National
5 Forest isn't covered by that particular document, but
6 nevertheless, they have adopted these horizontal vegetation
7 density standards. And I know that there is -- even though
8 it's not -- the Shoshone National Forest is not technically
9 under that, I know that there is research crossover between
10 these.

11 For example, I know that the Region 2 wildlife
12 biologist out of Golden, Colorado, is actually right now
13 working on some lodgepole community studies that are related
14 to lynx habitat. And they have to do with not only
15 maintaining the existing habitat that's available right now,
16 as you fellows were talking about, the core areas, kind of the
17 spruce fir forest, but also in those matrix habitats. And
18 what this research is looking at is how those matrix habitats
19 may provide the habitat of the future, right? The seral
20 stages and the forest successional stages.

21 And so I think it's kind of a mistake to really say,
22 well, we know that the lynx mostly like these core areas, and
23 so we can really do whatever we want out here in the matrix,
24 it's not going to affect lynx. In fact, lynx have to pass
25 through those matrix habitats, and they do use them. And

1 those matrix habitats often are the habitats that succeed into
2 the critical lynx habitat of the future.

3 So I would like to see some investigations into
4 those kind of current research projects that are getting at
5 those questions.

6 JODY SUTTON: Peter is on the phone. He might
7 have some thoughts on that.

8 JANE COTTRELL: Peter, you maybe want to pick
9 up on this?

10 PETER MCDONALD: I can certainly talk about
11 this issue of occupancy. We have data from track surveys, GPS
12 collared lynx locations, and also some DNA hair sample data
13 from across the forest. And you know, the pattern that
14 emerges, at least to me, is quite a bit of verified occupancy
15 down on the Wind River District. There is a very high
16 probability of a resident breeding group of lynx down there.
17 I think it's less clear as to whether we have resident
18 breeding lynx across most of the rest of the forest based on
19 the data that we have.

20 MIKE HILLIS: This is Mike Hillis with
21 Ecosystem Research Group.

22 Talked a little bit about occupancy in another
23 manner. The only 100 percent occupancy is if you have an
24 animal in hand or if you have DNA. Everything else is
25 somewhat speculative based on the conditions and the

1 qualities.

2 An awful lot of those 70-plus occurrences are tracks
3 in the snow. The overlapping foot size between a lynx and a
4 lion is huge. So unless you know a lot about when that track
5 occurred, what the relative snow density is, it becomes kind
6 of a guess. It doesn't mean that that's not interesting
7 information, but you kind of have to be careful about calling
8 those things highly reliable once you get outside that animal
9 in hand or DNA.

10 Talking a bit about the -- I think everybody here
11 has probably seen those migration data from reintroduced
12 animals in Colorado. And it's like a shotgun blast. Those
13 animals travel really randomly. Some show up in Iowa,
14 Nebraska, Montana, the Dakotas. And so the question is not
15 did an animal go there, but did the animal survive for a
16 period of time and/or ultimately reproducing?

17 And so ultimately, a litmus test in terms of what
18 Tom was getting at is: Do you see those kind of things
19 showing where, yeah, there's some strong evidence of a denning
20 or a successful reproduction, or even long-term survival of a
21 collared animal. A lot of those animals die in pretty short
22 time. And that's pretty consistent with other studies
23 from Montana, too, or even Canada, is that, you know, animals
24 move, and life-span can be pretty brutally short.

24 Talking a little bit about your point about matrix

1 lands, the simple truth is dry Douglas fir does not turn into
2 subalpine fir over time. I mean, basically, those things are
3 set by the basic habitat types on the site, elevation, aspect,
4 and moisture.

5 And yes, they may move through those lands. They
6 may provide a certain role in those lands. But there's
7 nothing in the literature that says that lynx respond to very
8 much other than vegetative conditions that provide prey base.

9 So I mean they cross roads with relative abandon.
10 They cross cornfields with relative abandon. The only
11 question is -- is that -- how much, you know, mortality
12 factors are there, that when they do do those kinds of
13 activities, whether it's crossing freeways or whatever, does
14 that end up getting them dead?

15 So I think we have to look at the ultimate
16 suitability of the land based on basic habitat types. Do
17 they -- they may go through a bunch of seral stages from
18 lodgepole to subalpine fir to old growth subalpine fir, back
19 to lodgepole after the next fire, but you do not see that from
20 those drier, warmer, lower elevation habitat types at all.

21 So I think the strategy in the lynx amendment is
22 pretty good in terms of treating these matrix lands -- yeah,
23 we'll still consider some of those connectivity aspects, but I
24 think it's a huge mistake to think that somehow they're going
25 to, over time -- wishing that they'll turn into spruce fir

1 doesn't mean it's going to happen.

2 JANE COTTRELL: So, Connie or Peter, would you
3 like to bring maybe a little bit more -- I don't know if it's
4 more of a dialogue -- to the matrix lands and the Southern
5 Rockies Lynx Amendment research? Because I'm not sure -- that
6 was a little confusing for me, personally, my perception of
7 what that current research is discussing in the drier sites
8 where lynx actually have habitat that is not similar to the
9 Northern Rockies.

10 PETER MCDONALD: This is Peter.

11 You know, we have used basically the guidance from
12 the Lynx Steering Committee to identify lynx habitat on the
13 forest. The management direction in the plans, both from
14 Southern Rockies Direction and the Northern Rockies Direction,
15 applies to lynx habitat.

16 So I think within the guidance that has been
17 provided in the past from the national level, it itself has
18 identified sort of the core habitat, the primary vegetation
19 that serves as the best habitat for the Canada lynx, and then
20 some other vegetation that maybe serves as secondary habitat
21 or quality of habitat that maybe adjacent to this primary,
22 high-quality habitat that we need to consider, too, because of
23 the proximity and adjacency. And that direction also
24 identified some of the drier forest types as not representing
25 lynx habitat.

1 So from my perspective, when it comes to
2 implementing this management direction, it's really targeted
3 at the lynx habitat. And regardless of whether the forest
4 drew a big circle around some area or identified the Lynx
5 Analysis Unit, the management direction will apply to the
6 habitat within that polygon or that area. So that does
7 require some site-specific, project-level evaluations to see
8 which areas are the habitat actually on the ground in that
9 project area and which management standards apply to that
10 area.

11 So I'm not sure -- the concern about the matrix
12 habitat -- I think it's recognized that there are different
13 kinds of vegetation out there that may represent lynx habitat
14 or not. We may have to define some polygons in terms of
15 analysis areas and project and action areas, but really the
16 site-specific evaluation does determine where the habitat
17 is and which standards apply and where.

18 JANE COTTRELL: Thanks, Peter. Maybe we could
19 roll towards the proposed remedy.

20 CONNIE WILBERT: Could I just make one other
21 quick comment, Jane? Because it's to follow up on the comment
22 that was made. And that just goes back to the reliability of
23 the data and how the data is collected.

24 If one actually looks at the WYNDD data, every
25 occurrence is identified by what kind of occurrence it was, be

1 it tracks in the snow or visual observation or whatever. And
2 they have pretty strict, well-defined criteria for how they
3 assign a reliability rating to those occurrences. So I think
4 it's a mistake to dismiss that data out of hand.

5 MIKE HILLIS: This is Mike Hillis with
6 Ecosystem Research Group. I'd like to talk about the thinning
7 question.

8 You make a good point that data is really pretty
9 good on thinning response to hare populations and ultimately a
10 correlation back to lynx use. There's only two studies,
11 basically, but the one study, Griffen-Mills, was modified
12 halfway through so that they could look at not just effects of
13 pre-commercial thinning on hare populations, but also what
14 would be the effect if they conducted daylight thinning
15 around, in that case, rust-resistant western white pine,
16 recognizing that's another species that's suffered horribly,
17 to see if that would have any effect on hare populations.
18 That was the point Tom was referencing.

19 They basically found that daylight thinning around
20 those desired seral species, also including western larch, had
21 virtually no significant effect on hares. And so the -- and,
22 Jane, correct me if I'm wrong. You guys discussed that during
23 the development of the amendment. There was no alternative
24 per se that carried the daylight thinning through to decision,
25 but the avenue was left open that forest plans could consider

1 that at more of a forest plan scale.

2 And that's what Tom is advocating, is that because
3 of the marginality of lynx habitat in this part of world and
4 somewhat limited timber opportunities, that it would seem that
5 there would be very little conflict to carrying that through,
6 even under an experimental status, where you'd look at it and
7 measure effects until 15 years from now, you do another forest
8 plan revision and decide if and when it's applicable on a
9 bigger scale.

10 You know, the acreage and the magnitude is pretty
11 inconsequential, either -- certainly for lynx -- when you look
12 back at the effects of that Griffen-Mills research.

13 JANE COTTRELL: So, Tom, maybe you could help
14 clarify what the remedy is that you're proposing.

15 TOM TROXEL: Okay. But let me get at just
16 clarifying the question a little bit more, too, because there
17 is an inherent contradiction in how the Forest Service is
18 going about lynx direction.

19 And I'll look specifically at Management Area 5.1,
20 which is for the production of forest products. There is
21 120,000 acres of that on the Shoshone National Forest. It's
22 about 5 percent of the two and a half million acres. And it
23 specifically is designed for long-term management, intensive
24 management, production of forest products. But that's
25 contingent on pre-commercial thinning in order to accomplish

1 the objectives of that management area.

2 On the other hand, the Forest Service is including
3 direction that prohibits pre-commercial thinning in anything
4 that's lynx habitat. And so while you have this direction for
5 Management Area 5.1, the Forest Service is stuck in a rut of
6 not being able to implement that direction because of the
7 contradictory lynx direction.

8 My recommendation was, number one, to question the
9 application of the Northern Rockies Lynx Direction as part of
10 the Shoshone because of the fairly marginal nature of lynx
11 habitat and the low level of lynx populations on the forest.

12 My fallback was to look at the Griffen-Mills study
13 and to be moving towards implementation of that. It's, by all
14 accounts, a good study. It provides an opportunity.

15 One of the things you mentioned is that that should
16 be addressed at the project level. But we don't see it
17 addressed at the project level. And you know, there's no
18 consideration of that study as part of the plan revision. And
19 there's no direction or encouragement to use that study as
20 part of implementing this plan.

21 JANE COTTRELL: To clarify a little bit, you're
22 saying that you'd like, as a remedy to this piece, you'd like
23 to see direction that says: Consider daylight thinning around
24 desired species in the MA 5.1.

25 TOM TROXEL: Yes.

1 JANE COTTRELL: Okay. That helps me make some
2 connections there.

3 MIKE HILLIS: I would even add that you could
4 monitor various things over time.

5 LOREN GROSSKOPF: Madam chief, I'd like to
6 offer something else. I'd like to come back full circle to my
7 original statement that one of the other benefits of allowing
8 this pre-thinning of this area not only protects the shoulder
9 area where the lynx, the habitat that probably is being
10 occupied, but from the forest health perspective and thinking
11 about forest fire and other forest treatments, this may
12 protect all that other habitat by doing pre-thinning
13 activities.

14 And I think we all realize about the horrible --
15 what's going to happen, the consequences if we don't do some
16 of that. But the pre-commercial thinning would help the
17 habitat by itself. But we just wanted to make it clear that
18 between the FEIS and the forest plan, that there is no
19 impediment to doing that because of the language. That's why
20 we offered that original statement.

21 TOM TROXEL: Tom Troxel, Intermountain Forest
22 Association.

23 I'd like to pile on with Loren's comment, because
24 he's exactly right that the pre-commercial thinning will help
25 the Forest Service move toward desired conditions in the

1 forest plan other than producing forest products.

2 And I believe -- and we know what happens to those
3 lodgepole stands if they're not pre-commercially thinned.
4 There's a small window when pre-commercial thinning is
5 possible. And if they're not pre-commercial thinned, they
6 turn into dog-hair lodgepole pole stands and have really
7 little value for wildlife or the structural stage distribution
8 that the forest is after.

9 JESSICA CROWDER: This is Jessica Crowder in
10 Governor Mead's office. And our interest in this discussion
11 did revolve around the ability and flexibility for forest
12 management projects. So I guess my question for both Loren
13 and Tom is: Is the proposal by the Forest Service, does that
14 proposal address your concerns, or does it not go far enough
15 in allowing some flexibility and some opportunity?

16 TOM TROXEL: Tom Troxel, Intermountain Forest
17 Association.

18 It's hard to tell. I think the proposal could be
19 helpful, but it's -- I would need to dig a little bit deeper
20 into that to understand the details.

21 I like the idea of the 2,130 acres of pre-commercial
22 thinning. I don't understand the context of the needs, how
23 much pre-commercial thinning is actually needed on the
24 Shoshone National Forest. What are those needs? And I know
25 there are ways to identify those. It really would need to be

1 in the forest plan or in the Record of Decision, not buried
2 back in an appendix somewhere.

3 I have a question about the length of it. It says
4 10 to 15 years. And what happens at the end of 10 to 15
5 years? Forest plans have a way of not getting revised on
6 schedule. I'd like to see that be measured on a decadal
7 basis, so 2,130 per decade, and then that would roll over.

8 And then I don't understand if there are any
9 limitations on acres in terms of objectives or where it could
10 be applied or what the purposes would be for it. And again,
11 you need to understand how that fits in with the overall --
12 the desired condition of the forest and on timber
13 productivity.

14 LOREN GROSSKOPF: Jessica, this is Loren
15 Grosskopf.

16 To answer your question, I think our desire at SCAC
17 would be to maintain as much flexibility in the plan, not site
18 specific, but in the plan, be as flexible as possible, you
19 know. And changing some of that language would at least take
20 that impediment out that there is any confusion about what the
21 direction of the plan would be.

22 ANDY PILS: I guess I'd like to make a couple
23 of statements. I think that 2,130 acres allowance in the
24 forest plan was pretty much for lodgepole pine production and
25 enhancement.

1 And also, you know, the forest plan does provide
2 other exemptions from that standard that would allow thinning.
3 For example, it allows thinning for fuels reduction purposes
4 within the wildland-urban interface. And a lot of our
5 suitable timber base is also within the wildland-urban
6 interface. And there's other exemptions for aspen
7 enhancement, PCT, things of that nature as well.

8 And I think we're capped at six percent of our lynx
9 habitat on the forest, we can go up to that, which amounts to
10 38,000 acres or thereabouts.

11 TOM TROXEL: Tom Troxel.

12 Those details and understanding those details would
13 be really helpful to me.

14 ANDY PILS: Okay.

15 JANE COTTRELL: So what I heard out of that is
16 there is a need for some clarification about the 2,130 acres
17 of pre-commercial thinning. You know, how adequate is that in
18 relation to the need across the forest? Is that decadal
19 versus over the next just ten years and then it's -- the life
20 of the plan, how would it carry on?

21 Limitations on: How is it applied? Is that only in
22 the lodgepole pine?

23 And then I heard two more exemptions that had not
24 been perhaps as clearly brought forward about the thinning in
25 wildland-urban interface as well as with the aspen

1 enhancement, and then the limitation for the six percent of
2 total lynx habitat which actually adds another 38,000 acres.

3 So I still have a question. I understand daylight
4 thinning. But in your proposal, you talked about eliminating
5 the restrictions on pre-commercial thinning in the lynx
6 habitat contingent on leaving 20 percent of the stand
7 unthinned. 80 percent thinning in the stand isn't the same as
8 daylight thinning.

9 So I'm not sure -- daylight thinning is one
10 potential where you clear out around that specific tree that
11 you'd like to perpetuate into greater growth and vigor. But
12 help me understand the proposal that you had put forward.

13 TOM TROXEL: It was based on the Griffen-Mills
14 study and retaining 20 percent of the stand in an unthinned
15 condition, thinning the other 80 percent.

16 JANE COTTRELL: So over 80 percent of the
17 stand, say, if it's a hundred acres, then 80 acres you could
18 do the daylight thinning on and not on the 20.

19 TOM TROXEL: 80 acres you would do
20 pre-commercial thing.

21 JANE COTTRELL: Well, there's difference in
22 daylight thinning and regular pre-commercial thinning.

23 TOM TROXEL: And my understanding was the study
24 was pre-commercial thinning on the other 80 percent,
25 although -- help me out, Mike.

1 MIKE HILLIS: I think we have our numbers
2 backwards. We'll have to double-check that. And I suggest we
3 get back to you on that.

4 JODY SUTTON: In the next week or so?

5 MIKE HILLIS: Yeah. Do you have that paper?
6 You do. What's the abstract say? Sorry.

7 JANE COTTRELL: No, no. I mean, that's part of
8 why we're trying to have these discussions, is an
9 understanding. Because I have one picture in my head of what
10 that would look like, and then when you brought the research
11 in, that brought a different picture.

12 JODY SUTTON: Yeah. You clarify, and then
13 we'll clarify.

14 TOM TROXEL: 80 percent was thinned, and
15 20 percent was --

16 MIKE HILLIS: What's the results of that?

17 JANE COTTRELL: We could give you five minutes.

18 MIKE HILLIS: That would be wonderful.

19 JANE COTTRELL: And maybe during that time, is
20 there some other objectors in the room or on the phone that
21 may have some piece that they'd like to add to this while we
22 clarify just kind of what that proposal is?

23 RHONDA SHIPP: Anyone else?

24 JODY SUTTON: We're going to give them five
25 minutes to talk.

1 RHONDA SHIPP: Oh, and then --

2 JANE COTTRELL: Well, actually, we could maybe
3 do that at the same time, because we only have ten minutes.

4 JODY SUTTON: Oh, really. My gosh.

5 JANE COTTRELL: Yeah. Let's go ahead and see
6 anybody else, because we only have ten more minutes on this
7 topic.

8 RHONDA SHIPP: We have about 13 minutes or so
9 left. Anybody else that would like to propose a different
10 solution? A different remedy, I should say.

11 CONNIE WILBERT: Could I make another point?

12 JANE COTTRELL: Yeah. Sure. Of course.

13 CONNIE WILBERT: I just also wanted to -- oh,
14 I'm sorry. There is someone.

15 RHONDA SHIPP: We do have one.

16 CONNIE WILBERT: I'll hold.

17 GREGORY KENNETT: My name is Gregory Kennett.

18 JANE COTTRELL: So one of the difficulties we
19 have -- and I have to apologize for this -- is the way the
20 regulations were written, you have to be an objector or an
21 interested person, you actually had to file for that status to
22 be able to participate in the dialogues. And so that is a
23 little -- it's new for all of us.

24 As folks bring some things forward, if you're
25 working with a group that is -- has either of those statuses,

1 you could sure, you know, feed them the information and have
2 them stand up and speak. But that is part of the regulations.
3 We're all learning to play with them. So I have to apologize.

4 RHONDA SHIPP: Must be an objector to come to
5 the mic, or interested persons.

6 JANE COTTRELL: So let's have Connie make her
7 point, and then we'll see if we've got something here that we
8 want to follow up.

9 CONNIE WILBERT: Yeah. I was just going to
10 point out that it is an interesting thing, I think, that this
11 study that the gentlemen across the table are reading right
12 now, rereading, was a two-year study. And I think that it --
13 that study which indicates that varying levels of thinning may
14 or may not have an impact on snowshoe hare density was a
15 two-year study, which is actually quite short for any kind of
16 animal response to vegetation treatment study. So I think
17 that that's just a note of caution that I would throw out
18 there.

19 MIKE HILLIS: The thought was, with Dr. Mills
20 on that, is because bunnies reproduce like mad and occur at
21 really high densities, that in those kind of animals,
22 short-term studies are often as good as longer-term studies.
23 Obviously, the point is well made for other kinds of species.

24 CONNIE WILBERT: Thank you.

25 TOM TROXEL: So Tom Troxel, Intermountain

1 Forest Association.

2 We are running short on time, and I want to make
3 sure we get to two other points. Can I go there?

4 JANE COTTRELL: Okay. So how about this? Were
5 we able to clarify what you meant by the proposal?

6 MIKE HILLIS: Tom was correct.

7 JANE COTTRELL: Okay. So the remedy or
8 proposal that you put on the table was to actually -- it's
9 more than just daylight thinning in 80 percent of the stand.
10 It is to thin 80 percent of the stand.

11 MIKE HILLIS: Retain patches of unthinned.

12 JANE COTTRELL: And retain. Okay. That helps
13 clarify. So it's a little bit different.

14 And then, Loren, was yours on the same topic, or are
15 we -- before we move to the other.

16 LOREN GROSSKOPF: What I was going to do, Madam
17 Chair, was to allow with, your permission, that Gregory
18 Kennett is one of the objectors. He is on our list of
19 objectors as part of the SCAC. And I could relinquish my
20 chair and let him come forward and speak. But he is on one of
21 the objectors on the list.

22 JANE COTTRELL: Is he?

23 LOREN GROSSKOPF: Yes. So I don't know where
24 we draw the line, but I would be happy to give up my chair
25 right now and let Gregory sit here and whatever he had to say.

1 JANE COTTRELL: I'm looking at my specialist.

2 JODY SUTTON: I'm thinking.

3 JANE COTTRELL: So how about if we go to these
4 two, and then we do want to save a couple of minutes for that.
5 Because, like I say, we are all playing with new rules.

6 TOM TROXEL: Tom Troxel, Intermountain Forest
7 Association.

8 Wow, time goes fast up here. I did want to point
9 out -- and this is in my Appendix 11, and there is a
10 clarification that's needed on -- that the lynx direction is
11 applicable to lynx habitat, not the entire Shoshone National
12 Forest. And I would be happy to follow up on a detail there.

13 And then, finally, the other issue that I raised was
14 on public participation, review, and comment of lynx habitat
15 mapping. And forest plan direction is a two-piece deal. One
16 is the direction, and the second is where it's applied to.
17 And the Forest Service has allowed throughout this process,
18 going back to the Northern Rockies Lynx Amendment, public
19 review and comment on the direction, but never has allowed
20 public review and comment on where that direction is applied
21 either as part of either the criteria in the LCAS or in the
22 mapping that each forest has done.

23 And personally, I think that's something that would
24 benefit all of the public that are interested in this issue.
25 And I think with the Forest Service's emphasis on public

1 involvement in forest planning -- I think that would be a
2 welcome change to incorporate that into the process.

3 JANE COTTRELL: Okay. So, is he officially
4 part of your staff?

5 LOREN GROSSKOPF: Professional staff. And he
6 is on the list that I provided you before I came here, along
7 with myself and the other commissioners and conservation
8 district officials. And he is one of the guys that can
9 articulate.

10 JODY SUTTON: Yeah, we have that gentleman.

11 ANDY PILS: He is a consultant, right?

12 LOREN GROSSKOPF: Yeah. Professional staff.

13 JODY SUTTON: The rules are -- that we have
14 with the groups, with the groups, the rules basically are we
15 have people designate a lead objector, because there are so
16 many objections. On the other hand -- on the other hand, what
17 we do also have is, in the regulation, the group itself is the
18 objector. And that's where it gets a little gray as far as
19 who talks and who doesn't and who is objecting and who isn't.

20 And so with these smaller issues with the less
21 objectors, you know, we've been trying to be flexible, you
22 know, to allow people to sit at the table. And we obviously
23 are -- you know, if a lead objector wants to relinquish their
24 role and give it to somebody else, that's not a problem,
25 because again, it's the group that's objecting itself, not an

1 individual.

2 But just to clarify, next time you guys have to go
3 through one of these, okay, because -- not that there's going
4 to be another forest plan any time soon, but an amendment --
5 okay, we'll go with that.

6 If you do this again, basically, you know, as an
7 individual, you can be an objector. As a group, you can
8 object. But the people that speak for the group are the
9 professional people that are affiliated with that group.
10 Because I'm a member of Sierra Club does not make me
11 automatically an objector because of the hundreds of thousands
12 of people that are part of Sierra Club. But it's the group,
13 it's the professional entity that is the objector.

14 Now, one other odd caveat in all of this confusion
15 is basically the part of the regulation where, once you've
16 sent us an objection and you have the names on that objection,
17 and you say these are the professional people affiliated with
18 this objection, we are required to actually make sure that all
19 those people's names on that objection are actually eligible
20 to object. How's that for a fine kettle of fish? Basically,
21 all your affiliates would have to have commented to become
22 eligible.

23 Now, in this case, we're good to go, because we did
24 check, and everybody was eligible. So that's why, when you
25 see us up here looking at each other and a little bit confused

1 on who can talk and who can't talk, those are all the things
2 that are going through our heads. Does that make sense? Or
3 not. But that's what I've had to deal with for the last six
4 months.

5 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. So can Gregory speak?

6 LOREN GROSSKOPF: Madam Chair, I guess in the
7 interest of getting the best forest plan possible, we have a
8 person that would like to speak that can articulate,
9 hopefully, an answer to your questions far better than I can.

10 JODY SUTTON: I'm going to let you make that
11 decision.

12 JANE COTTRELL: So we have three minutes. We
13 have three. I'm going by Google Earth. Sorry. Three
14 minutes. So we'll give him three minutes.

15 Actually, I'm going to ask for two, because I need
16 to recap this, and I will do that in one.

17 GREGORY KENNETT: My name Gregory Kennett.
18 Thank you very much.

19 I just wanted it provide a data point to the WYNDDB
20 database. We actually did have our staff go through and look
21 at that detail, those 75 reports. And 30 of the reports were
22 tracks. And when we went through and looked in the notes in
23 the tracks, they were questionable. So out of the 75 total
24 records in the 2000s, there were six that were reported as
25 tracks.

1 So you know, there's some question about how --
2 how -- how valuable this data is, especially when Mike talks
3 about different tracks and between snow conditions and
4 different species. So it was just a data point as a comment.

5 JANE COTTRELL: Okay. Thank you.

6 So I think -- this is Jane Cottrell.

7 As Tom said, time goes by really fast at this table,
8 doesn't it. I can't believe we're through half of the day.

9 So this topic, what I kind of heard with this one,
10 there was a couple of proposals on the table. And we did have
11 a dialogue over what meets the requirements of an occupied
12 habitat or occupied forest in terms of observations and
13 capturing that.

14 In this case, it was also clarified that the forest
15 has collared GPS, hair-snare DNA, especially in the Wind
16 River, that there are lynx occupying and, based on denning
17 habitat, very likely reproducing here.

18 We do understand that there are a variety of issues
19 around criteria for the reliability of observations, even, you
20 know, whether people get confused whether it's a bobcat or a
21 lynx. So it's more than just the track. We understand that.
22 And that's part of why the data is collected the way it is.

23 But meeting the requirements that are in the
24 Northern Rockies Lynx Amendment around occupied habitat, it's
25 clear that the information that the Forest has collected meets

1 those requirements.

2 The questions that are still on the table is there
3 is -- there is some clarification around: How are the
4 management treatments that are identified, especially in MA
5 5.1, being applied within matrix habitat and within core lynx
6 habitat?

7 And I think there is an opportunity to clarify
8 whether the Forest, at a site-specific level, can consider
9 studies like the Griffen-Mills study that allows daylight
10 thinning. And daylight thinning is a bit different than the
11 80 percent pre-commercial thinning that was put forward across
12 the stand, that was put forward in the proposal. There are
13 still opportunities for thinning additionally on the forest
14 that perhaps need to be clarified a bit more or daylighted a
15 bit more in the plan.

16 And those -- in addition to the 2,130 acres, even
17 describing how they came to the 2,130 in terms of need, in
18 terms of how that's applied across the decade, and in terms of
19 limitations as that was meant to be used for improvement of
20 lodgepole pine.

21 Some additional clarification: Description of the
22 thinning opportunities related to wildland-urban interface and
23 aspen enhancement. We all know the forest has issues around
24 spruce budworm. It's really easy to see.

25 So also those opportunities in thinning in

1 six percent of lynx habitat, up to six percent in the lynx
2 habitat. So there's another around 38,000 acres there that I
3 think may help clarify this issue through some clarification
4 in the plan.

5 The proposal that was on the table or that was put
6 forward by the objectors around eliminating restrictions of
7 pre-commercial thinning in that lynx habitat, so that
8 six percent limitation, they requested the elimination of that
9 and going to a contingency instead, if I understand this
10 correctly, of an 80 percent of the stand could be thinned in
11 lynx habitat. And so that is one of the -- that is the
12 proposal that's on the table.

13 Like I said, there the won't be any decisions out of
14 today. I think there is some information that you helped me
15 understand a little better about what did you mean with the
16 Griffen-Mills study, what did you mean with the 80 percent of
17 a stand treatment. So I can get that picture in my head, as
18 well as some opportunities, I think, in the direction for the
19 Forest to articulate a little more clearly about when can
20 thinning be applied across different types of stands for
21 different purposes.

22 And at this point, I think that's the best that we
23 came to on both of the issues related to lynx, both occupancy
24 as well as thinning in lynx habitat.

25 TOM TROXEL: I would like to make sure that

1 those two last issues I brought up on the clarification and on
2 the public involvement don't fall through the cracks.

3 JANE COTTRELL: Yes. And the public
4 involvement one was kind of a procedural piece, because I do
5 think we have to look at whether the habitat was remapped from
6 the previous plan to this plan, which has been where a lot of
7 the contention about public involvement has been. So there is
8 some direction in that realm as well.

9 On the phone, was someone trying to ask a question?
10 Was that you, Jessica?

11 JESSICA CROWDER: No.

12 JANE COTTRELL: Okay. Just wanted to make
13 sure.

14 JODY SUTTON: Anybody else?

15 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. All right. Thank you
16 all for making this such a productive morning. I appreciate
17 your attention, courtesy, and respect.

18 For those of you on the telephone, can you hang up
19 and call back at 1:00?

20 JESSICA CROWDER: This is Jessica. We can't
21 hear you on the telephone.

22 RHONDA SHIPP: And the rest of you, we'll see
23 you at 1:00. Enjoy your lunch.

24 *(Break taken 12:04 p.m. until 1:04 p.m.)*

25 RHONDA SHIPP: Welcome back everybody. We're

1 glad to see you all. And as you can see, our physical
2 arrangement has been changed. Because we have new people
3 joining us this afternoon, I just need to repeat a few things
4 from this morning.

5 So first off, can those of you on the phone hear me?

6 PHIL HOCKER: Yes, I can hear you. This is
7 Phil Hocker. Would you identify yourself again, please.

8 RHONDA SHIPP: I'm Rhonda Shipp, the
9 facilitator.

10 PHIL HOCKER: Thank you very much.

11 RHONDA SHIPP: You are welcome. Thanks for
12 reminding me of that.

13 If you're just joining us for the first time, if you
14 lose your connection or something is wrong with the
15 connection, we do have a phone number for you to text a
16 message to us. It is (307)272-1696. And you could just send
17 us a text if something isn't working with the connection.
18 That would be terrific. Again, (307)272-1696.

19 We are committed to hearing you, and we want you to
20 be able to hear us. If you cannot, be sure to speak up and
21 tell us.

22 Okay. Then just a reminder of the ground rules.
23 Our group around the table -- so pretend like this is still
24 the kitchen table out here. The group around the table has
25 grown. And so a reminder of the ground rules, because they

1 become very critical this afternoon. They are posted over
2 here on the wall.

3 The first is dialogue. That is the focused intent
4 of our conversation, where we want to end up in terms of the
5 outcomes of this meeting.

6 We need participation from people, both listening
7 and hearing. So it's important to share the air. That is
8 crucial this afternoon. We have shorter -- not shorter. We
9 have slightly longer time frames, but more people. So sharing
10 the air is critical.

11 To help us continue, then, focusing, we're going to
12 stay on topic. We will probably have to use the parking lot a
13 little bit more.

14 We ask you to really honor that fourth point up
15 there, which is end point first. Okay? So what is the most
16 important thing you want to say? Say it first thing out of
17 your mouth. And then if there's time, we'll have you explain.

18 I don't mean to be rude, folks, but we may have to
19 cut you off if you can't get it said in a shorter period of
20 time. So just be aware of that. I really need you to focus
21 on end point first, because I don't want you to feel like I'm
22 cheating you. Okay?

23 And then just a reminder on electronics, if you
24 could make them quiet, turn them off, whatever you need to do
25 so that we don't have that distraction this afternoon.

1 Start and end on time. We're committed to doing
2 that. We have until 2:30 for this next issue.

3 And then this is a public meeting, so we have our
4 court reporter. Again, it will become -- it is crucial for
5 the objectors to be sure that you state to your name right up
6 front. Okay?

7 Yes, sir.

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can you explain how you're
9 going to use this information?

10 RHONDA SHIPP: Oh. Would you like to take the
11 mic?

12 JANE COTTRELL: Yes, I'll actually take this
13 mic.

14 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay.

15 JANE COTTRELL: This is Jane Cottrell,
16 reviewing official.

17 So this afternoon I'm going to run this a little bit
18 differently than this morning. I want to remind folks, I have
19 your written objections. We've read every written objection.
20 And what we'd like to do this afternoon is two things.

21 Can we clarify anything in those objections? And
22 I'm going to share with you first my understanding of those
23 objections, the issues. And then I'm going to ask you to help
24 me. Did I miss anything? Can you help me clarify that? Is
25 there anything else I should be sure that is in both this

1 dialogue and that I will add into the written direction to the
2 deciding official?

3 The second piece this afternoon, which will be the
4 longer part of the conversation, is a dialogue amongst this
5 group -- you're not just talking to me -- in having that
6 discussion about the remedies, about the remedies that were
7 put forward and what are some potential remedies. And can we,
8 in fact, come forward with a remedy that would then be --
9 could be part of that written dialogue or that written
10 direction to the deciding official?

11 No decisions will be made today. I'm not going to
12 say, "Great idea. That's what I'm going to go with." I also
13 need to do some additional research, discussion, dialogue,
14 around, "Okay, they put this remedy on the table. There seems
15 to be some things here. Help me understand what the tradeoffs
16 of those are."

17 And I know this one has got a little complex piece
18 to it and a lot of different objectors in it. So what we plan
19 to do with all of these today, all of these issues,
20 discussions, is this adds to the review, and it adds to the
21 record for this plan.

22 So what you've already written, we have read and
23 reviewed. A team boiled it down to these four issues that
24 we're addressing specifically. And then later this afternoon
25 we've got a little bit of time for issues that we didn't bring

1 to the table.

2 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Thanks. Another
3 question?

4 HOWIE WOLKE: I have just a procedural
5 question. How did you pick -- how did you pick the people
6 that you had listed as primary objectors to be published on
7 these information sheets?

8 JANE COTTRELL: So the names that were on the
9 sheets were people who either objected individually, or by the
10 organization they determined that was their primary objector.

11 HOWIE WOLKE: Okay. I ask that question
12 because I objected in writing, including three paragraphs on
13 the Dunoir in my objection, and my name is not listed on the
14 Dunoir Special Management Unit primary objectors.

15 JODY SUTTON: Okay. I'll own that. Because
16 there are so many of you, it is possible, highly possible,
17 that we missed one or two of you. Okay? And because your
18 name's not there does not mean that you're not important to
19 us. So we will make sure that your name gets on there
20 eventually. Okay.

21 HOWIE WOLKE: And it's not going to affect my
22 ability to say my piece here?

23 JODY SUTTON: That's correct. What is your
24 name? I can't see it.

25 HOWIE WOLKE: Howie Wolke.

1 JODY SUTTON: Howie, you're on the list.
2 You're on the -- you're on the other issue. I know this
3 because I wrote your name.

4 HOWIE WOLKE: I figured.

5 JODY SUTTON: You and Cathy, Cathy Purves.
6 Anybody else? Did I miss somebody else?

7 No. Okay. I apologize, Howie.

8 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. So you can see that it's
9 not going to be possible for everybody to have your own mic.
10 And therefore, we're going to need you to signal. We have
11 three runners who will take the mic, and they will run it to
12 you. So we need for you to like raise your hand or signal or
13 something so that we can get a mic to you before you start
14 talking.

15 So there is one here. There will be one in the
16 middle, and one over here. So help us know that you want to
17 speak, and then we'll get a microphone to you.

18 JANE COTTRELL: Could I ask for one other
19 thing?

20 RHONDA SHIPP: Yes, ma'am.

21 JANE COTTRELL: One, we do want you to speak,
22 but this isn't church, so those of you in the back row, could
23 you fill up the front row?

24 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay.

25 JANE COTTRELL: If you are objectors.

1 RHONDA SHIPP: Let's make sure we get the
2 right people up here. If you recall from this morning, the
3 explanation of the regulation that controls this requires that
4 we -- requires that it is objectors that are sitting around
5 this circle. There is no rhyme nor reason, first row, second
6 row. Don't let that bother you. We just set up enough chairs
7 so that everybody would have one. But if you're so inclined,
8 please move forward.

9 Then, because we're controlled by regulation and
10 we're doing it slightly different, the group that I need
11 forward this time is the objectors. We're not going to
12 include the interested persons up here in this circle. Okay?
13 Does that make sense?

14 So I'm looking for that list, folks, if you get out
15 your Dunoir Special Management Unit, it is that list of
16 objectors. Melissa, Keith, Judi, Michael, Callie, David,
17 Marshall, Carole, William, Marya -- I don't know if I said
18 that correctly, so I apologize if I'm not saying these
19 correctly -- Laney, Mark, Robert.

20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Procedural question. Can I
21 cede my time on this topic to -- can I cede my time on this
22 topic to speak a little longer on the next topic?

23 JANE COTTRELL: This is all about dialogue. So
24 whatever time this topic takes and that topic takes, we don't
25 average them. So I guess the answer is no. I'd love you to

1 be part of both conversations.

2 RHONDA SHIPP: There we go. And you all might
3 not talk. Somebody else may make your point. And my goal is
4 not to have something to say and so we're good with that.

5 So let me continue down the list. Laney, Mark
6 Robert, Richard, Martha, Jazmyn, somebody from Governor Mead's
7 office.

8 Jessica, are you joining in?

9 JESSICA CROWDER: Yes, ma'am.

10 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Good. Welcome.

11 Lisa, Charles, John, Jon, Al, Howard, Land, Tory,
12 Kathleen, Laurence, Sarah, Connie, Thomas, Alex, George, Jim,
13 and Cathy.

14 JODY SUTTON: And Howie.

15 RHONDA SHIPP: Yes. Welcome. All right. So
16 if your name wasn't on that list, we'll need you to move to
17 the outer tables. Let's get that group of objectors up here,
18 everybody. And then those of you that want, please fill in
19 this first circle or wherever you're most comfortable.

20 JODY SUTTON: So we need to do this with the
21 phone now.

22 RHONDA SHIPP: All right.

23 JODY SUTTON: Find out who is on the phone and
24 write them down so that we can call on them if they want to
25 talk.

1 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. But don't you want them
2 to introduce themselves?

3 PHIL HOCKER: Rhonda, this is Bill. Excuse me.

4 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. And so we have some
5 people on the phone.

6 PHIL HOCKER: I'd prefer you to let us on the
7 phone know when you want us to speak.

8 JODY SUTTON: Yeah. Go over it now.

9 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. And so the way this has
10 worked is if you have a comment, you are welcome to jump in.
11 But there will be times when we will call upon you.

12 And the order of this will go like this. We want to
13 hear from objectors first. And then once that is done and
14 Jane is ready, she will ask for interested parties. Then, any
15 interested parties, and then any other objectors.

16 Okay. Does that make sense?

17 PHIL HOCKER: Yes. On our objectors. So if
18 you would identify when you want us to chime in so we're not
19 interrupting folks.

20 JANE COTTRELL: If you would ask the objectors
21 that are on the phone to first introduce themselves.

22 RHONDA SHIPP: Right. So we would like you to
23 introduce yourselves, those of you that are on the telephone.
24 So would somebody please start and give us your name, please.

25 MEREDITH TAYLOR: I would like to speak.

1 Meredith Taylor in Dubois.

2 RHONDA SHIPP: Thank you. Next?

3 KATHY TREANOR: Kathy Treanor. Dubois.

4 RHONDA SHIPP: Next?

5 PHIL HOCKER: Phil Hocker. I'm an objector.

6 At the moment I'm in San Francisco, but I was in Jackson Hole
7 when this was being worked out.

8 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. And who else? Anybody
9 else on the phone?

10 SARAH DOMEK: This is Sarah Domek.

11 LARRY TREANOR: Larry Treanor.

12 RHONDA SHIPP: All right. We're getting your
13 names down. Anybody else?

14 TORY TAYLOR: Tory Taylor, Dubois.

15 RHONDA SHIPP: Tory, okay. Great. Thank you.

16 SARAH DOMEK: This is Sarah Domek, Bend,
17 Oregon.

18 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Good. Is that it?
19 Wonderful.

20 Okay. And then we'd like to go around the circle
21 and just ask you each to tell us your names. One time around
22 for introductions so everybody knows who's here for this
23 conversation. But be sure to remember you're going to have to
24 repeat your names whenever you want to comment.

25 So, sir, would you please start.

1 JIM PRATT: Jim Pratt.
2 HOWARD SANDERS: Howard Sanders.
3 MARSHALL DOMINICK: Marshall Dominick.
4 AL SAMMONS: Al Sammons.
5 DICK INBERG: Dick Inberg.
6 SARAH WALKER: Sarah Walker.
7 LISA MCGEE: Lisa McGee.
8 CALLIE DOMEK: Callie Domek.
9 JAZMYN MCDONALD: Jazmyn McDonald.
10 MARK HINSCHBERGER: Mark Hinchberger.
11 BILL BASS: Bill Bass, acting deputy regional
12 forester.
13 JOHN OSGOOD: John Osgood.
14 CONNIE WILBERT: Connie Wilbert.
15 CHUCK NEAL: Chuck Neal.
16 CAROLE GENARO: Carole Genaro.
17 HOWIE WOLKE: Howie Wolke.
18 KEITH BECKER: Keith Becker.
19 LANEY HICKS: Laney Hicks.
20 DAVE CLARENDON: Dave Clarendon.
21 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Good. Thank you all.
22 JODY SUTTON: Let me just ask real quick. None
23 of you guys back there? So none of you are objectors for the
24 Dunoir issue?
25 Okay. All right.

1 RHONDA SHIPP: All right. Okay. I think we
2 are ready to start. Remember, end point first. Now, all
3 right. Here we go.

4 JANE COTTRELL: Okay. My name is Jane
5 Cottrell, and I'm the reviewing official.

6 Really quickly, I want you to understand kind of
7 roles and responsibilities between myself, Bill, and Joe
8 Alexander.

9 So Joe led the planning process, is obviously the
10 forest sup for the Shoshone.

11 As the reviewing official, I represent the chief of
12 the agency, Tom Tidwell, in reviewing the analysis that was
13 put together and the objections. It is my responsibility to
14 take all of the information that you put in writing, that you
15 have submitted so far, to look at what was in the plan, and
16 then the dialogue that we have today and remedies that we have
17 today, and to develop a written response to the deciding
18 official.

19 Bill is here today representing the deciding
20 official, Dan Jiron, who is the regional forester. Dan will
21 be the one who finally decides on the Record of Decision for
22 this plan.

23 Once that plan is done, the objection process, that
24 record is signed, the objection process is done, and then it's
25 just up to whether we go to litigation or not. But I know for

1 some of you it has been a long time that you have been
2 involved in this plan. But for today, that's how we want to
3 be able to use the information and the conversation we have
4 today. Today is about dialogue. There won't be decisions
5 made.

6 I'm going to share with you my understanding, and
7 I'm going to ask you to help me clarify that. You know, if I
8 don't get it accurate, I need to get it accurate.

9 In addition, I'm going to ask you to help me
10 understand the remedies that were put forward. And I'll share
11 what I understood them to be, and maybe there's some new
12 information. Maybe there's some clarification. And maybe
13 there's some new remedies. That's what our hour and a half
14 today is for.

15 And all of that goes into the review package that
16 goes to the regional forester. Okay?

17 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Jane, can I have you clarify
18 when the objection process ends? So you said with the signing
19 of the ROD, and it's actually your decision on responses. Can
20 you clarify that?

21 JANE COTTRELL: Sorry. I meant the planning
22 process stops with the signing of the ROD. But correct. The
23 objection process, once I issue the written response to the
24 regional forester, then the objection process is closed. And
25 then at that point there will be some time as they develop --

1 the regional forester and his staff develops the Record of
2 Decision for this. As well as I will tell you right now there
3 will be some instructions around procedural issues to the
4 Forest and to the regional forester that need to be addressed.

5 So today, I'm not -- I'm not concerned about us
6 spending our time on procedural. You know, did they, in fact,
7 do this correctly, or they didn't clarify this process
8 clearly. What I'd like us to talk about is the issues at
9 hand. And that's why we brought four major issues to the
10 table where there was either some questions or some ability to
11 find some resolution.

12 So, stepping into Dunoir, I'm going to share with
13 you my understanding of what the issues are. And -- and my
14 faithful companion is going to show you, I have actually been
15 to Dunoir. Came in early this week so I could spend some time
16 out on the forest.

17 *(Applause.)*

18 JANE COTTRELL: And just in case you wonder,
19 yes, I live in the East. I've only been there ten months. I
20 moved from Montana. So I am a westerner.

21 But I did want to spend some time up there. I
22 wanted to see the environment that we were talking about.

23 There's a reason why the area is a special
24 management unit. And quite frankly, I wanted to share with my
25 friends back east that I had a great day in the woods.

1 So I do want -- I want to share my understanding
2 first of what I think the issue is, or what I've picked up
3 from reading all of your objections. And the first thing I'm
4 going to ask you to do is clarify that. I want to spend just
5 a short time on that, because I think it's remedies that give
6 us the greatest avenue for some discussion.

7 So this is what I understand. Vehicular use. The
8 law establishing the Dunoir Special Management Unit states
9 that it will provide for non-vehicular access recreation. The
10 issue is within the interpretation of that law.

11 The Forest Service claims that the intent of the
12 word "vehicle" was meant to be motorized vehicles. Those
13 opposed to mountain bikes in the Dunoir claim that the intent
14 of the word "vehicle" meant any wheeled conveyance, motorized
15 or nonmotorized, that a vehicle carries a human.

16 The notice and opportunity to comment, I like this.
17 Bait and switch. Sorry, that took me a bit to think about
18 that. But basically, there is concern that as the NEPA
19 analysis came out and the draft came out, there was one
20 decision put forward, or it looked like that's the way the
21 Forest Service was going for the decision. And then when the
22 draft ROD and final EIS came out, it was a different direction
23 that was in the selected alternative.

24 The wilderness character -- and remember, this is a
25 dialogue, so don't get too upset at what I say.

1 The wilderness character and enforcement. The
2 objectors contend that the use of mountain bikes within the
3 Dunoir Special Management Unit will damage its wilderness
4 character to the point that it won't qualify for
5 recommendation of wilderness in the future, or that should
6 Congress take up have another Wilderness Act, that there would
7 be concern about degradation of those characters.

8 Safety concerns, that with mountain bikes, and we
9 know there is quite a bit of grizzly -- you can possibly put
10 up the prints that I took pictures of as well -- that there is
11 concern about additional human interaction between bicycles
12 and grizzly bears in the Dunoir Unit, as well as some concerns
13 about bicycles and horses, and where bicycles are quiet and
14 sometimes that can lead to startling the horses, et cetera.

15 And then lastly, the last issue is some context from
16 a letter from 2008 from Deputy Chief Joel Holtrop, that there
17 is concern that the 2008 letter from then-Deputy Chief Joel
18 Holtrop will be misunderstood as meaning that mountain
19 bikes -- mountain biking is allowed in all National Forest
20 System trails.

21 And the other thing that I want to lay on the table
22 for folks is that obviously that is not the case, that
23 mountain bikes are not allowed under any area protected under
24 the Wilderness Act.

25 In addition, as various forests have gone through

1 travel planning, looking at what uses are allocated where, in
2 some cases snowmobiles, mountain bikes, vehicles, et cetera,
3 it's determined whether they are allowed or not. And I just
4 want to point out that the Shoshone National Forest will soon
5 be going into its travel management process.

6 So the first thing I want to ask is: Did I, in fact
7 capture the issues as the objectors brought them forward?

8 HOWIE WOLKE: You didn't say anything about
9 resource damage associated with mountain bikes.

10 RHONDA SHIPP: Here's where we need you to
11 show a hand, if you don't mind, so we can get the microphone
12 to you.

13 HOWIE WOLKE: Howie Wolke. And one of the
14 things I brought up in my -- in a number of letters to the
15 Forest Service was resource damage being caused by mountain
16 bikes, damage to soil and vegetation.

17 JANE COTTRELL: Soil, water, vegetation.

18 LISA MCGEE: Lisa McGee.

19 And I guess I would like to clarify, Jane, your --
20 in the context of the Forest Service's definition of a
21 vehicle. We have the statutory language, and we actually have
22 a Forest Service definition. And the decision, I believe,
23 veers from both, veers away from both of those.

24 And so I think there's three levels. And I think
25 maybe you characterized it as two, your interpretation of

1 bikes not being a vehicle.

2 JANE COTTRELL: Of the Forest Service
3 interpretation of bikes not being a vehicle.

4 LISA MCGEE: Well, you said there was a
5 decision, this decision that bikes are not vehicles. But the
6 Forest Service's definition includes bicycles. So my concern
7 is that your decision goes against your own definition.

8 JANE COTTRELL: Thanks.

9 JIM PRATT: Jim Pratt.

10 Along those same lines, historically the Forest
11 Service has issued citations for mountain bikes in areas where
12 they weren't supposed to be.

13 RHONDA SHIPP: Anyone else?

14 CHUCK NEAL: Chuck Neal.

15 I may -- the main point is: I do not favor any kind
16 of mechanized intrusion in the Dunoir of any kind. I favor it
17 being recommended for formal wilderness protection by the
18 Forest Service.

19 My reason for this primarily is my background. I'm
20 a member of a professional organization of biologists called
21 the International Association for Bear Resource and
22 Management, acronym of IBA. As such, I get regular
23 literature, feedbacks through my office which show how
24 controversial and how damaging bikes can be in grizzly
25 country.

1 There's been research coming out of the Alberta
2 Rockies, close to Calgary, which is a city of a million or
3 more people, that a lot of people are on a bike. We find that
4 while ten times as many hikers use the trails along the parks
5 of our Rockies, three times as many aggressive bear-human
6 encounters take place with mountain bikes. Ten times as many
7 hikers -- I'll repeat that -- but three times as many
8 aggressive encounters with mountain bikes.

9 Keep bikes out of Dunoir.

10 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Thank you.

11 So again, we're clarifying to make sure that Jane
12 understands the issues as you've presented them.

13 Yes, ma'am.

14 LANEY HICKS: Laney Hicks.

15 I've felt throughout the whole process of this plan
16 that wildlife is we all need to look at in terms of what is
17 going to impact wildlife. Wildlife should be viewed as having
18 its own needs, and we should look at their needs as a separate
19 issue.

20 DICK INBERG: Okay. I'm Dick Inberg.

21 And maybe a very small point, but still the plan
22 calls for opening the Pinnacles Trail to mountain bike travel.
23 I have worked on the Pinnacles Trail through Backcountry
24 Horsemen, and the trail we're talking about is not the
25 Pinnacles Trail. I have 50 years' experience in the Dunoir

1 area. And actually, we're talking about 4.7 miles of the
2 Kissinger Lakes Trail and 2.1 miles of the Bonneville
3 Pass-Dunoir Trail.

4 It has nothing to do with the Pinnacles Trail.
5 Pinnacles Trail is not in the SMU. And this is a mistake on
6 the part of the Forest Service in naming their trails. Been
7 that way for years.

8 And also, I know Joe Alexander knows, everybody in
9 this room knows, you open up one trail -- which guts West
10 Dunoir, by the way -- you're opening up the whole area where
11 the bikes are now. Bikes are running through the whole area
12 now. And just because you're making it legal for one trail
13 doesn't mean they aren't going to be traveling clean through
14 the Dunoir.

15 That's -- and being in the Dunoir a lot, I've seen
16 them, and seen their tracks all through the area. So we
17 aren't talking one trail.

18 And it does ruin the wilderness characteristic for
19 any future development of wilderness in that area. The
20 wilderness characteristic is gone.

21 Also, now we have electric-powered mountain bikes.
22 So what we have now going through the Dunoir is actually
23 motorized vehicles. Mountain bikes are now motorized.

24 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Thank you.

25 So if we could just have you pass that next door.

1 Oh, okay.

2 MARK HINSCHBERGER: My name is Mark
3 Hinschberger.

4 My end point is that the language in the enabling
5 legislation says non-vehicular recreation access. It also
6 says that we provide for the safety of the users. Putting
7 mountain bike use on that trail is not really providing safety
8 for any of the users.

9 But as far as clarifying some of the things, I
10 believe that the statement that "no violation of law" is
11 incorrect in your response.

12 I also believe that the reference to the Inventoried
13 Roadless Areas is a moot point. When the Dunoir is a special
14 management unit, it's no longer Inventoried Roadless Area, and
15 it has enabling legislation for it.

16 Also, I want to point out that the last issue that I
17 had was with the language in the ROD that stated, out of the
18 letter from Holtrop, that mountain bike use was a legitimate
19 use of National Forest System trails. All I was asking was
20 that they correct the statement.

21 You spent a page, almost two pages, defending the
22 language in there, when all I was trying to say was that a lot
23 of people read the ROD; I don't suspect everybody reads
24 everything in the plan. And I know that the plan
25 eliminates -- or Wilderness Act doesn't allow for mountain

1 bike, mechanized use in the wilderness.

2 All I was asking was that you make sure you clarify
3 that in the ROD. Even though the letter that Joe sent to the
4 regional foresters was not about wilderness, it -- you spent a
5 bunch of time writing about how to defend the language in the
6 ROD when all at that would take was a parentheses saying, "Oh,
7 we excluded that language in the wilderness. You can't use a
8 mountain bike in the wilderness." So that was just trying to
9 clarify that issue there.

10 RHONDA SHIPP: And I appreciate end point
11 first.

12 MARK HINSCHBERGER: And the last thing I have
13 to say is that you use two areas where mechanized use is
14 prohibited as examples, one of them is the wilderness area,
15 and you use the example of the Washakie Wilderness. The
16 second management area you list is the Glacier Addition to the
17 Fitzpatrick Wilderness. And in the plan, it does state that
18 that area does allow for occasional motorized activities to
19 provide for habitat management for bighorn sheep and trapping
20 and management of the population.

21 So there is mechanized use. It's not necessarily
22 prohibited in that area. So I think you use a poor example as
23 an area where mechanized use is prohibited when there is
24 language in that law, the '84 Wilderness Act, that allows for
25 habitat improvement using mechanized and motorized activities.

1 Just to clarify those.

2 RHONDA SHIPP: Thanks.

3 AL SAMMONS: Al Sammons.

4 I'd like to touch on that safety issue just a little
5 bit more. Jane, you mentioned the concern about grizzly bear
6 confrontations and those kind of things. I think even a
7 greater safety issue is the incompatibility between mountain
8 bikes and horses.

9 I've been a horseman for about 40 years and ridden
10 in that area for about that long. And this, to me, is a lot
11 graver danger. I'll take my chances with a bear or a moose
12 anytime rather than I would be hit with a surprise attack by a
13 motor bike or by a bicycle.

14 RHONDA SHIPP: Is there anybody on the
15 telephone who wants to add to the conversation? Anybody on
16 the phone, would you like to respond to this piece?

17 PHIL HOCKER: This is Phil. I would. There
18 are several other people on the phone who probably would, too.

19 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay.

20 PHIL HOCKER: I'm not sure how you want --

21 RHONDA SHIPP: So you go ahead and start.

22 PHIL HOCKER: Okay. Thank you.

23 Well, Associate Chief Cottrell, thank you for
24 holding this, and thank you for making it possible for some of
25 us who couldn't be there in person to participate. I'll

1 follow the very good instruction to try and make my points up
2 front.

3 First, as I stated in my objection, the 1972 law
4 establishing the special management unit requires the Forest
5 Service to prepare a legal description and a formal, publicly
6 available map of the boundary as soon as practicable. Quote,
7 "as soon as practicable," close quote, after the enactment of
8 that law, which was October 9th, 1972.

9 That has not been done yet. That objection was
10 recognized, that concern was recognized at the draft plan
11 level. And the Forest is now proposing, as I understand, to
12 get that done in five years. This is something which is 31
13 years overdue now. I think that's a bad idea.

14 The work that I've been doing with the Palisades
15 WSA, we've run into some practical forest management issues
16 where there's ignorance, frankly, about where the boundary
17 lies. And their failure to comply with other instruction has
18 caused management problems.

19 Second, I'd like to echo the point that's been made.
20 The 1972 law's intent was to keep the full wilderness
21 character of the Dunoir intact. In fact, Congressman Roncalio
22 did a personal tour with my employer at the time and dismissed
23 the Forest Service's arguments that the remains of the
24 tie-hack logging disqualified the area.

25 It certainly wasn't Congress' intent in 1972 that

1 you now, in 2014, newly admit a new activity that will
2 conflict with future wilderness designation. And the 1978
3 legislation which did not get enacted paralleled a
4 recommendation made by the United States Forest Service for
5 recommendation in favor of wilderness for the Dunoir.

6 In 1984, the delegation could not come to agreement,
7 and so the question of the Dunoir -- and I will say, I was
8 very closely involved in the '84 Wilderness Act, and I think
9 it was the kind of dialogue that, Chief Cottrell, you called
10 for today, that kind of dialogue did take place in 1984. The
11 1984 legislation did not change the legislative direction for
12 management of the Dunoir. In fact, in several places in the
13 United States House Floor language in the Congressional
14 Record, Congressman Seiberling specifically referred to the
15 fact the Dunoir would continue to be managed as directed in
16 1972.

17 The resources haven't changed. The resource concern
18 that led the Game and Fish to support wilderness in the '70s,
19 the decisions that were made in '72 and then accepted and not
20 changed in '84, are all still in place.

21 And I would recommend, as background, there's a
22 wonderful paper prepared by the United States Forest Service,
23 by Forest Service historian Dennis Roth, his history paper,
24 FS-391, published December 1984, which talks at length about
25 the history of the Dunoir and about, frankly, some of the

1 philosophical and trust problems that the Forest Service has
2 brought on itself by dragging its feet about this area for so
3 long and so hard.

4 And I would hope that you would return to the
5 direction it's quite clear to me that was enacted in 1972.
6 Also that you would show the Dunoir area on the Forest maps
7 once the proper legal mapping has been completed, and
8 recommend it for wilderness.

9 Thank you for your attention.

10 RHONDA SHIPP: Thank you very much. Is there
11 anybody else on the telephone who would like to weigh in?

12 MEREDITH TAYLOR: Yes. Meredith Taylor in
13 Dubois.

14 RHONDA SHIPP: Go ahead.

15 MEREDITH TAYLOR: Can you hear me?

16 RHONDA SHIPP: Yes.

17 MEREDITH TAYLOR: I'm Meredith Taylor. And my
18 concerns about this whole process are that the main objections
19 have already been brought up since the enabling legislation,
20 and as Bill just explained, since 1972.

21 I actively lobbied on the Wyoming Wilderness Bill in
22 the early '80s that was culminated with the 1984 Wilderness
23 Act. We lobbied and worked tightly with John Seiberling and
24 our Wyoming delegation who consistently opposed wilderness for
25 the Dunoir. That was unfortunate, because there was so much

1 strong support for the Dunoir, and there were no vehicles
2 allowed in there at that time, and there shouldn't be even
3 till today.

4 One of the things that really came to mind was that
5 last month I was in the Dunoir for a week on a pack trip, and
6 I could see the amount of rewilding that's happened in there.
7 At places where there were skid trails from the tie hacks,
8 way, way back, have all grown in. You can't even see what was
9 there at any kind of opening now. The vegetation has improved
10 dramatically and shown a true wilderness experience to people,
11 except for the mountain bikes that came through while I was
12 there.

13 And trust me, they were not just on the trails that
14 were identified by Dick Inberg. There were also tire tracks on
15 the West Dunoir going down to Wolf Creek past the Forest
16 Service cabin. So it's absolutely true that once any mountain
17 bike or vehicles at all are allowed in the Dunoir, that will
18 be opening Pandora's Box, and we'll never see the end of that.

19 The main thing that happens to me -- and this was a
20 couple years ago when we were outfitting in the Dunoir. We
21 had a horse group with children, and they were riding right up
22 front. And down the hill from Dundee Meadows came these
23 mountain bikers, barreling right into the horses, because they
24 came around the corner, we couldn't hear them. And I just
25 quickly ran out front so that I could block them from running

1 into the children's horses. It could have been a real wreck.

2 And these are the kinds of things that -- safety
3 measures that the Forest Service said that they wanted to
4 prevent from happening but have not. And so I think that
5 that's a major important point that we need to see addressed
6 by the Forest Service in this decision.

7 The main thing from this rewilding that I saw when I
8 was back in there last month is that there is now a seamless
9 transition between the Washakie Wilderness and the Teton
10 Wilderness through the Dunoir. And it makes a major portion
11 of the migration corridor out of Greater Yellowstone
12 Ecosystem, from the core of Yellowstone out to the southeast
13 and down the Wind River Valley. So it's important to keep
14 those wildlife concerns up front so that we're not only trying
15 to mitigate the impact, but trying to enhance their
16 opportunities to use habitat and migration corridors.

17 The main thing that I want to wrap up with is that
18 during that 1984 Wyoming Wilderness Bill work, I realized how
19 anti wilderness our Congressional delegation was, and I also
20 see it now continuing with the U.S. Forest Service here on the
21 Shoshone. It's unfortunate, because there's just been this
22 obstacle against the Dunoir becoming wilderness as it has been
23 recommended by so many people.

24 And now I understand that the Forest Service has
25 issued a gag order to their staff on the Shoshone Forest to

1 not discuss wilderness in the Dunoir. This is reprehensible
2 and demands a full investigation as to the opposition to any
3 wilderness additions to the Dunoir.

4 Thank you.

5 RHONDA SHIPP: Thank you very much.

6 Okay. Folks, in the interest of time, what I'm
7 looking for now is any new information or anything additional
8 that will enhance Jane's understanding of this issue. Is
9 there anybody else on the phone that has anything new or
10 additional?

11 JESSICA CROWDER: Hi. This is Jessica Crowder.
12 And I don't really have anything new. The governor on this
13 specific issue and the management of the Dunoir, in his letter
14 during the objection period, asked specifically for meaningful
15 conversation among stakeholders. I think this is a start to
16 that conversation. And so I appreciate this, but it sounds
17 like we have much more to talk about with this. So I'm ready
18 to hear what everybody else has to say and won't take up more
19 time.

20 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Thank you very much.

21 SARAH WALKER: I can offer a point of
22 clarification. This is Sarah Walker with the Wyoming
23 Wilderness Association.

24 We had a couple points of clarification, but you all
25 are hitting on most of them. But most importantly, that the

1 safety response from the Forest Service acted like this was
2 multiuse land. I know that horses and bikes can share some
3 trails, but another part of the enabling legislation we keep
4 ignoring is that it's especially to provide for non-vehicular
5 recreation. Especially.

6 That should be at the forefront of any management
7 decisions. When we're preserving 1972 character, we should be
8 thinking about the traditional recreation that was there,
9 hikers and horsemen. And so I think that should be a major
10 part of this decision.

11 And one quick clarification. The wilderness
12 character, we went out of our way to point out that we don't
13 think bikes are going to cause irreparable physical harm to
14 the environment as much as you're entrenching a user group
15 that's anti wilderness. I mean it was just 40 comments from
16 the bike groups that made the Forest Service reverse their
17 longstanding position on the law. So I think opening the area
18 up to bicycles is really kind of sealing the fate of the
19 Dunoir and whether or not it can get wilderness protection in
20 the future.

21 JANE COTTRELL: So let's do one more, and then
22 I'd like to actually talk about remedies, where we go with it.

23 AL SAMMONS: Al Sammons.

24 I don't think we've touched very much on
25 enforcement. Over the years we've had quite a bit of illegal

1 use into the Dunoir, snowmobiles, use of chainsaws, motor
2 bikes, motorized vehicles. And those concerns have been
3 reported on a number of occasions to the district ranger.
4 Those of us who use that area have witnessed those and talked
5 about them. Not much has been done.

6 To make a long story short, enforcement has been
7 little or none on the Dunoir. So my real concern is, if
8 mountain bikes are allowed in that area on just that specific
9 trail loop, how is it going to be enforced considering the
10 current history of what's happened there?

11 JANE COTTRELL: Excellent. Thank you. So I'm
12 going to share --

13 RHONDA SHIPP: One more.

14 JANE COTTRELL: Okay. Sorry about that.

15 JOHN OSGOOD: I'm John Osgood. I live in Cody.

16 Just in terms of the whole law that we're working
17 under, the Act which created the Washakie Wilderness, I think
18 one thing we should realize is there is a lot of paragraphs in
19 it, but the Dunoir area has received special attention from
20 Congress. It's a special management unit. It's not just part
21 of a generic wilderness. It's a special management issue.

22 And we do talk about non-vehicular access to
23 recreation, but in the same sentence, ahead of that, it says,
24 "The secretary shall administer this unit in accordance with
25 the laws, rules, and regulations of the agency." And a judge

1 is going to look at that very closely, congressional intent.

2 And I think you, in allowing or proposing to allow
3 mountain bikes in the Dunoir area, are contravening your own
4 laws and your own regulations, because your regulation is very
5 specific. Bicycle falls under your own definition, 2.61.2, of
6 a vehicle. There is no way around it. And you're setting
7 yourself up for instant injunction if you go through with
8 this.

9 JANE COTTRELL: So that's what I call getting
10 to the end point. Thank you, John.

11 So let me share with you, when I read the
12 objections, what I heard as remedies. One is, if the Forest
13 plans to go forward with this decision, then there needs to be
14 open, public, written comment period specifically on the
15 Dunoir area since it went back and forth between where it went
16 out with the draft and where it came to the final.

17 The preference was that the Forest Service should
18 comply with the enabling legislation for the special
19 management unit and prohibit all vehicular use, including
20 mountain bikes.

21 And then the third piece with this is there is --
22 that the Dunoir Special Management Area should be
23 recommended for wilderness designation in the plan.

24 And then the last part is, with that recommendation,
25 there should not be additional nonconforming wilderness uses

1 encouraged in the area, both due to the potential
2 recommendation for future designation and because of the
3 enforcement issues that have occurred in the past.

4 So that's what I heard. That's what I read through
5 the objections. As you might guess by what I just read, the
6 mountain bike community didn't object to the plan, so they're
7 not sitting in the circle. However, I want to ask you folks:
8 What remedy could be taken forward for the Forest on this?

9 SARAH WALKER: I think the overwhelming
10 agreement is the recommendation is necessary. Sarah Walker
11 with the Wyoming Wilderness Association.

12 Recommended wilderness is the only way that we're
13 going to get clear and consistent management. The entire
14 bike community in Jackson right now is under the impression
15 that that's an allowable use. We've had motorized
16 incursions over the past decade. There's got to be some kind
17 of significant management change to signal that permanent
18 protection.

19 CALLIE DOMEK: I'm Callie Domek. I've been
20 with the Forest Service as a seasonal employee for 14 seasons,
21 since 2009 as a wilderness ranger and working in the Dunoir
22 area. I've been able to see impacts there from biking.

23 I want to back up Sarah and other objectors who say
24 that the best solution -- and this would be the only new
25 remedy since other, quote, remedies, have been repeatedly

1 tried -- would be a recommendation for wilderness in the
2 Dunoir.

3 Being on the ground, I have tried to get direction
4 from my supervisors and people above them as to what we're
5 supposed to do when we encounter bikers, and it's always been
6 wishy-washy. We don't know how to manage this area. That's
7 been coming down from the top.

8 I don't know where that, you know, decision is made.
9 But on the ground, we haven't been able to directly manage it
10 as it's supposed to be managed, and that's to preserve the
11 character for future possible designation as wilderness. So I
12 strongly feel that a recommendation for wilderness is the only
13 and best procedure.

14 JANE COTTRELL: So, Callie, let me ask you a
15 clarification before we step on. Currently mountain bikes are
16 not to be in the Dunoir area, correct? Or it's just not been
17 enforced?

18 CALLIE DOMEK: It's not been enforced. And we
19 haven't been able to get that clarity ourselves as rangers on
20 the ground. So I think the only way that it can be clear,
21 made clear, is through a wilderness designation.

22 JANE COTTRELL: So let me -- I'm going to ask
23 for some special assistance from the Forest on this one to
24 help me clarify just today, not what's in the plan, but today,
25 what is the management direction for Dunoir?

1 MARK HINSCHBERGER: This is Mark Hirschberger.
2 They don't know.

3 JANE COTTRELL: I'm going to ask Joe.

4 MARK HINSCHBERGER: Well, let me tell you, I
5 worked for this Forest. And in the current plan that we're
6 operating under, there's two sections. One allows snowmobiles
7 in the Dunoir, one does not. In the same plan.

8 JANE COTTRELL: In the previous plan.

9 MARK HINSCHBERGER: In the previous plan. So
10 that's the direction we're currently following, correct? So
11 that means either we can snowmobile or we can't, because it
12 says one place you can and one place you can't. The enabling
13 legislation says non-vehicular recreational use. That should
14 be followed.

15 JANE COTTRELL: That's what I want to get a
16 little bit of clarification on.

17 JOE ALEXANDER: This is Joe Alexander, forest
18 supervisor.

19 There is some confusion about it. However, I have
20 talked at length with the district ranger and the staff down
21 there, and we have agreed that under what we currently have,
22 we don't have anything prohibiting mountain bikes right now.
23 That's why it was reevaluated under the forest plan.

24 JANE COTTRELL: Thank you. So this would be,
25 whatever comes out of this forest plan decision, would be the

1 standing direction definitively, one way or the other. Thank
2 you. Because what you introduced as new information was the
3 confusion.

4 Go ahead.

5 DICK INBERG: In the 41 years that the special
6 management unit has existed in the Dunoir, there have been
7 numerous violations. And lately with the advent of mountain
8 bikes, of course, it became real apparent.

9 And when this was brought up to the Forest Service,
10 they said, "Oh, yeah, we know that. It's definitely in
11 violation, but we'll handle that in the forest plan."

12 We were lied to, because we kind of backed off and
13 said, "Oh, well, they agree with us, and they're going to
14 handle it in the forest plan." Bologna. It was an
15 out-and-out lie, face to face.

16 JESSICA CROWDER: Hi. This is Jessica Crowder,
17 Governor Mead's policy office. I want to maybe throw out a
18 possible idea, just trying to think about middle ground here.

19 I do have some concerns that the bike community
20 isn't a part of this discussion. And I also have some concern
21 with discussions of, well, mountain bikes have been restricted
22 or they haven't. It sounds like Joe just cleared that up for
23 us.

24 I wonder if, knowing the uniqueness of the area and
25 knowing the number of mountain bikers that go to that unique

1 area -- I understand it's pretty extreme mountain biking. I
2 wonder if there is maybe more opportunity for education that
3 we haven't explored yet, and that might be a possible solution
4 to look into.

5 And then if that doesn't work, then, you know, if we
6 need to reevaluate, that's fine. I think that's perfectly
7 acceptable. But I feel like we're missing some of the
8 stakeholders in this conversation.

9 RHONDA SHIPP: Thank you very much. Okay.

10 JANE COTTRELL: One clarification real quick,
11 Jessica. When you say "education," you're meaning education
12 of the extreme mountain bikers of other areas that could be
13 for extreme mountain biking, or around the safety concerns, or
14 both?

15 JESSICA CROWDER: Both.

16 JANE COTTRELL: Thank you. That was Jane, by
17 the way.

18 KEITH BECKER: Keith Becker.

19 It seems to me that if you look back at the original
20 intent -- and I had extensive discussion with Teno Roncalio
21 when it was introduced. I had discussions with John
22 Seiberling.

23 The whole wilderness community and all of those who
24 love the Shoshone were extreme advocates for designating the
25 Dunoir area as wilderness. The special management unit came

1 as a result of resistance to that on the part of our
2 delegation. And so not only did we have the Forest Service
3 opposing wilderness for the Dunoir, we had our delegation at
4 the time opposing designation of the Dunoir as wilderness.

5 We've now been 41 years of frustration where the
6 Forest Service, in their desire to maintain the ultimate
7 flexibility in their management strategy, has opposed
8 wilderness. I think that it's time to recognize that the
9 overwhelming sentiment of the public is in favor of
10 wilderness. The resource management determinations all favor
11 wilderness. The wildlife considerations all favor wilderness.

12 It seems to me that with the clear vehicular
13 definition that we have that says vehicles are not allowed in
14 the special management area, let's clarify it. Let's clarify
15 it with one simple solution. Recommend the area for
16 wilderness as the Forest Service was essentially asked to do
17 many, many years ago. This has gone on far too long.

18 RHONDA SHIPP: Thank you.

19 KATHY TREANOR: This is Kathy Treanor in
20 Dubois.

21 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Go ahead.

22 KATHY TREANOR: Can you hear me?

23 RHONDA SHIPP: Yes, we can.

24 KATHY TREANOR: Thank you. I'm a new permanent
25 resident in Wyoming after having horse-packed out here for 22

1 years. I'm also a touring bicyclist. I'm too old to jump
2 stumps, so it's not mountain biking, but I understand the need
3 for biking. And it's just that it's inappropriate in this
4 area. It should be wilderness.

5 Right now in Dubois there is an initiative to do BLM
6 biking behind our rodeo grounds, and also an initiative that
7 would be up on Union Pass. So it's not like we're trying to
8 exclude a recreational opportunity. It's just not the right
9 area to do it. Thank you.

10 RHONDA SHIPP: And thank you.

11 CONNIE WILBERT: This is Connie Wilbert with
12 Sierra Club. And I just wanted to add a quick note that, not
13 surprisingly, I too agree that the only realistic remedy for
14 this intractable problem is to make it absolutely clear
15 through a wilderness recommendation what is and is not allowed
16 in this area.

17 I think that not making this explicitly clear at
18 this point when we have the chance to causes us to just have
19 increasing problems. We know that one trail leads to side
20 trails. It's not necessarily intentional bad behavior.
21 Sometimes people don't know. But that's the fact. We also
22 know that the Forest Service does not have the resources to
23 enforce or control that. That's apparent on the ground right
24 now.

25 Finally, one thing that no one has actually

1 mentioned up to this point is changing technology. We all
2 know it's real. We know that the bicycles of today are not
3 the bicycles of 15 years ago, and I don't have the slightest
4 idea what the bicycles of 15 years from now will be. But I do
5 know that people are now putting little tiny electric motors
6 on bicycles. You can't really see them unless you're right
7 with them. You can't really hear them unless you're right
8 there. And that's like a whole 'nother piece of this
9 Pandora's Box that is just waiting to spring open.

10 So I think strongly that the only realistic solution
11 to this problem in this particular area is a wilderness
12 recommendation.

13 RHONDA SHIPP: Thank you.

14 LISA MCGEE: Lisa McGee again.

15 I wanted to just give a little bit history. I know
16 Joe went through it this morning. I'm one of the ones in the
17 room that's been working on this plan since 2005 and have seen
18 it in -- throughout the various iterations of the rule.

19 This issue was one of the very few identified as a
20 need for change from the very beginning. And so from the
21 get-go, and this is almost ten years ago, the Forest
22 recognized that what was happening in the Dunoir, i.e.
23 mechanized use, was not consistent with the area's enabling
24 legislation.

25 And so it took, you know, great pains for most of

1 that nine years to look at alternatives that would get the
2 management back in line with the legislation. There were
3 those of us, many of us that are here in this circle today,
4 who wanted wilderness for three or four areas on the forest.

5 There was one iteration, one draft plan that only
6 named the Dunoir as a recommended wilderness. That was under
7 a different planning rule. And when we came back under the
8 1972 rule, the draft had no wilderness, but we were assured
9 that they were going -- the Forest Service was going to manage
10 it consistent with the legislation. It seemed not every -- it
11 was not what we wanted, but at least it would have addressed
12 the incursions and violations of the past decades.

13 So then when the final plan came out allowing bikes,
14 it was a real surprise. And as a lot of us have already said,
15 we believe it's inconsistent, and that the best way to resolve
16 this once and for all is wilderness.

17 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Thank you.

18 HOWIE WOLKE: Howie Wolke again, still.

19 I co-own Big Wild Adventures along with my wife,
20 Marilyn Olsen, who is not here, and whose name doesn't appear
21 here either, by the way.

22 But I have been -- I have a long history with the
23 Dunoir, starting with efforts to analyze the Forest Service
24 planning process for the Dunoir in 1975. Since then I've
25 snowshoed it, skied it, hunted it, backpacked through it. I

1 became one of the first people to ski to the top of Coffin
2 Butte in the mid to late '70s. I don't remember the exact
3 when.

4 I began outfitting and guiding backpack trips in the
5 Dunoir in 1978 when I started our guiding company. And except
6 for a few years when we sold a portion of our business and
7 then ended up getting it back because the people we sold it to
8 were not on the ball and we ended up repossessing all our old
9 permits, which I was grateful for, but for the most part I've
10 been guiding and outfitting in the Dunoir since the late
11 1970s.

12 In the last couple of years, we stopped running
13 trips in the Dunoir because in 2010 or 2011 we started running
14 into groups of mountain bikers on the Kissinger Lakes Trail,
15 in the middle of Dundee Meadows, on the Pinnacles Trail, which
16 is outside the SMU but in continuous roadless habitat, which
17 is a real shame.

18 I mean, it's kind of a selfish thing to be talking
19 about how it's affecting my business in bringing people into
20 the area, but that was a place where you could start a
21 backpacking trip at 8800 feet and be up in the alpine zone
22 with minimal effort, whereas with most of the Washakie
23 Wilderness, as most of you folks know, you have to climb 3- or
24 4,000 feet to get up into the high country.

25 This was a very unique area. And that's been taken

1 away from me as a guide and outfitter in the Dunoir. We also
2 have permits in the Washakie Wilderness and the Fitzpatrick as
3 far as our Shoshone operation is concerned.

4 I worked on the 1984 Wilderness Bill. And in a
5 conversation with Malcolm Wallop -- I don't remember the exact
6 year. I'm not even sure the exact time and place. It might
7 have been a hearing on the bill in Casper in '83 or early '84,
8 sometime during that time period. I brought up the Dunoir to
9 Senator Wallop, and he looked me in the eye and told me that
10 the special management unit designation preserves the
11 wilderness option for the future.

12 Now we're hearing some people revise history. But
13 that's right from the horse's mouth as far as Congress is
14 concerned. That's what we all understood. And allowing a
15 non-wilderness-compatible constituency to become firmly
16 established in the Dunoir against the tide of public opinion
17 is a violation of everything that went into the Dunoir Special
18 Management Unit designation, and it's a violation of the
19 public trust. It's unconscionable.

20 I've been rather, I have to say, disappointed with
21 the response from the Forest Service over the years, over the
22 last recent years. I've told people that the Forest Service
23 is changing. I've changed my mind on that.

24 I sent District Ranger Rick Metzger photographs of
25 mountain bike damage to the vegetation and soils on the knolls

1 overlooking the main of the Kissinger Lakes. Got no response
2 from District Ranger Metzger. When I finally got him on the
3 telephone, he told me, "Well, I didn't know you wanted a
4 response." You know, we're just talking about basic courtesy
5 here.

6 I also want to say that, with regard to what we
7 heard Meredith Taylor talk about wildlife migration corridors
8 between the Washakie and the Teton Wilderness Area, I saw a
9 wolverine in one of those corridor areas not too far from
10 Bonneville Pass in July of 19-- of 2000 -- dating myself
11 there -- July of 2011.

12 There is no place in the United States, arguably,
13 that more deserves wilderness protection than the Dunoir in
14 the Forest Service. I really appreciate this process, and I
15 trust that you're going to listen to the public and do the
16 right thing.

17 RHONDA SHIPP: Thank you.

18 Anybody else?

19 Okay. We've got a couple more here.

20 HOWARD SANDERS: Howard Sanders.

21 I have no history with the Dunoir. However, it
22 needs to have wilderness status. It looks to me, obviously,
23 from the original language of non-vehicular, you have to ask
24 yourself: How many mountain bikes were there in 1972? And I
25 think maybe that's part of the confusion is because of the way

1 history has changed and technology has changed, and now we
2 have this big issue.

3 I do not believe that illegal behavior should be
4 rewarded. And mountain bikes in the Dunoir, to me, is illegal
5 behavior. And I do not believe we should reward that by
6 saying, "Okay, everybody bring your bikes."

7 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Thank you, sir.

8 DICK INBERG: Dick Inberg again.

9 Just as a point to bring up, the Dunoir Drainage is
10 the only drainage left in the Wind River District of the
11 Forest Service that has not been clear-cut. The only one
12 left. So very important area to preserving some of what we
13 feel we should have left in the Shoshone Forest and in our
14 Wind River Drainage.

15 We keep hearing from the Forest Service, well, you
16 know, the Shoshone Forest is 50 percent wilderness now. Well,
17 what does that have to do with future wilderness?

18 We've got 745,000 acres that were identified as
19 having wilderness characteristics in 34 areas. We've
20 compromised this down to four areas and roughly 190,000 acres.
21 I fail to see what this statement of 50 percent wilderness
22 which the Forest Service holds over our head has anything to
23 do with it. When we're talking the Yellowstone Ecosystem and
24 the Shoshone Forest, should probably be 80 to 90 percent
25 wilderness.

1 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Thanks. We need to pull
2 in any interested persons on this particular issue.

3 JANE COTTRELL: Or other objectors.

4 RHONDA SHIPP: Or other objectors, yes. Okay.

5 LANEY HICKS: Laney Hicks. I'm addressing
6 Jessica on this.

7 I think you made a statement of, you know, that it's
8 too bad the bikers aren't here. And I don't think you
9 understand that those of us who have been working on the
10 forest plan were caught totally by surprise of this proposal
11 for a mountain bike trail. And in my opinion, the reason
12 they're not here is because they got what they wanted in the
13 plan. And I don't think -- I'm not sure there is any way to
14 sit down and talk with them about a solution when -- you know,
15 when they -- you know, they just don't seem part of the process.
16 It made me feel like the Forest Service had met with all these
17 people beforehand and just that they're not part of the
18 solution.

19 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Again, we want to pull
20 in interested persons as well as any other objectors who might
21 have a solution or an idea. So we're going to go back to you,
22 Dave.

23 DAVE BURKE: Thank you. Dave Burke.

24 I didn't object on the Dunoir. I did object to
25 motorized -- additional motorized use on the Shoshone, and

1 this rather parallels.

2 It's my observation over the years on forest
3 planning that finding a true solution is almost difficult --
4 it's difficult if not impossible. And the only true solution
5 I see on this one is to go ahead and recommend it for
6 wilderness. It has everything that's needed for wilderness.
7 Congress almost promised it, but they stepped back and said,
8 "We'll give it a special management unit." I would say the
9 true solution is recommend it for wilderness.

10 RHONDA SHIPP: Thank you.

11 JANE COTTRELL: And I want to remind folks
12 we're asking for any additional remedy here. I mean, I
13 understand you're passionate about this topic, but I don't
14 want us to get into a vote in the room. Okay?

15 RHONDA SHIPP: Additional, new information.

16 CAROLE GENARO: I'm Carole Genaro. I think all
17 my points have been made in this discussion. I agree with so
18 much of it. I love the Dunoir. And I've spent a lot of time
19 there, too.

20 I think the most important thing that happened to me
21 over this whole deal is the fact that I didn't even realize
22 that the mountain bikers were making this incursion into the
23 Dunoir until it came up at a discussion at a meeting I
24 attended. And I was horrified. And I just feel like they've
25 kind of snuck in the back door on it, and that the Forest

1 Service has allowed that. And I guess the solution is the
2 wilderness designation, and I would certainly be in favor of
3 that. But I hope the mountain bike issue is resolved. Thank
4 you.

5 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Thanks.

6 CHARLES DRIMAL: Charles Drimal, Greater
7 Yellowstone Coalition. Just a point of clarity.

8 Officer Cottrell, you mentioned in the beginning of
9 this discussion that the Forest Service interpretation of the
10 law is that vehicles apply to motorized use. I believe that
11 was your quote. And I don't think that is correct. And I
12 want to say that for the duration of the forest planning
13 process which began in 2005, and from 2005 through 2013, the
14 interpretation of the Shoshone National Forest and the Forest
15 Service as a whole was that motorized use and mechanized use
16 both did not belong in the Dunoir. We heard from the mouth of
17 Loren Poppert for years, who was the recreational manager here
18 on the Forest, and Bryan Armel -- is Bryan present today?

19 And Bryan, that the Dunoir would be managed
20 according to the enabling legislation, 1972. And both
21 snowmobile use, which had been permitted to some extent, and
22 mountain biking, under mechanized use, would no longer be
23 permitted or would not be permitted within the Dunoir.

24 What's more, when this plan began, when this
25 planning process began, as mentioned earlier, in the -- with

1 the wisdom of the forest planning process, people here
2 recognized that the Dunoir should be recommended wilderness,
3 and the Forest Service included it in their original plan.
4 That changed after the planning rule changed. But it is clear
5 that the -- that what the people would like to see, the people
6 that care most about this forest, that live in close proximity
7 to this forest, and what Americans would like to see who
8 weighed in through substantive comment, that this should be
9 recommended wilderness.

10 RHONDA SHIPP: Thank you.

11 Did I see another hand back there?

12 KEITH BECKER: Keith Becker.

13 I would like to comment that, you know, throughout
14 this process, there have been hard feelings. There have been
15 disagreements.

16 At this particular point, it seems to me that some
17 of the controversy has lead to some really hard feelings and
18 antagonism toward the agency. And I think the agency would go
19 a huge way toward redeeming the respect of its user community
20 by simply complying with the intent of the legislation going
21 way back and simply recommend the Dunoir area for wilderness.

22 Yes, there will be other areas and other issues, but
23 in this particular case, may I say that I think it would be a
24 real enhancement of the Forest Service's reputation were they
25 to be so kind as to implement the intent going back 40 years.

1 Thank you.

2 RHONDA SHIPP: And could we get you to pass
3 your microphone over here?

4 MEREDITH TAYLOR: This is Meredith Taylor. I
5 just had one more comment about a remedy, is that some people
6 have suggested that there's a lot more of the forest available
7 to the mountain bikers. And I think one of the points that
8 Jessica brought up is very good, and that providing mountain
9 bike areas by educational purposes would really be a good
10 compromise for the whole thing.

11 Designate wilderness for the Dunoir, and recommend
12 mountain bike trails in such areas as Sheridan Creek, Union
13 Pass, Lava Mountain, all of the areas that are available to
14 them now, but they may not know about it because they live in
15 Cody and Jackson. And I think it would behoove the whole
16 process for the Forest Service to step up to the plate and
17 actually have an education program.

18 That would be a good compromise for the vehicular
19 users as opposed to the wilderness users. And I bring that up
20 because we dealt with the same thing with snowmobiles on
21 cross-country ski trails that were to be non-motorized as
22 well. And only when we provided an alternative trail system
23 that was well-signed and marked for snowmobiles did we get
24 compliance.

25 And I think that that steps up the ante on all of

1 the users, is they can respect each other's areas much better
2 if they know that they have their own area in which to
3 recreate. Thank you.

4 RHONDA SHIPP: Thank you. Okay. We have time
5 for one more comment, and then Jane is going to wind down.

6 PHIL HOCKER: This is Phil Hocker.

7 JANE COTTRELL: Okay. I'll tell you what. I'm
8 going to -- we've got quite a few people. So I would -- I
9 would ask that we let Phil go ahead. I'm going to ask Callie,
10 and then Sarah, and then I would like to recap.

11 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. So, folks, remember, end
12 point first. We're running out of time.

13 So we'll start with Phil.

14 PHIL HOCKER: I'm sorry. I couldn't really
15 hear. Was that me?

16 RHONDA SHIPP: Yes, that's you.

17 PHIL HOCKER: Okay. Thank you. I would like
18 to echo what Keith Becker said, that the respect for the
19 agency would be -- of the Forest Service would be enhanced by
20 wilderness recommendation. And I urge you again to read this
21 Forest Service, internal, professionally prepared Forest
22 Service Agency History Paper FS-391.

23 As most of us who have been involved with this for
24 decades, almost half a century now, know, the original
25 controversy over the Dunoir was the availability of

1 merchantable timber. The Forest Service used the purity
2 argument to try to offset wilderness advocates in that first
3 round. That history of the purity argument has been laid out
4 at length in this paper. And at no point was the idea of
5 mechanized recreation a part of this controversy in the past.

6 So the Forest Service has used one now-discredited
7 argument to resist wilderness designation for the Dunoir, and
8 now it appears to be turning to another. The way to save the
9 agency's reputation would be to recommend the wilderness.

10 I will also repeat: Do the legally required mapping
11 that was called for in 1972 and move forward. Thank you.

12 RHONDA SHIPP: Thank you.

13 CALLIE DOMEK: This is Callie Domek. I've been
14 involved in solitude monitoring with the Forest Service in
15 wilderness areas, and I would like to mention that if the
16 Kissinger Lakes-Dunoir Trail was widely known as a place to
17 come and mountain bike, the solitude of that area for other
18 users also would be impacted irreversibly for future
19 wilderness designation.

20 RHONDA SHIPP: All right.

21 SARAH WALKER: Sarah Walker. Just in the
22 interests of -- I know you're looking for common ground and a
23 compromise here. And Jessica pointed out that the mountain
24 bike community isn't here. They are aware of this change.

25 And I want to make it clear that WWA has worked on

1 compromises: A trail on Union Pass, worked with Wyoming
2 Pathways for a path near Dubois for the mountain bike
3 community. But it was only about 30 bikes that live in
4 Jackson and recreate on the BT, where they have lots of bike
5 trails, that commented. And you have a room full of folks
6 that drove four hours from Dubois where they live and work and
7 recreate. And I think that speaks a lot to what the common
8 ground is.

9 JANE COTTRELL: Okay. So this has been a very
10 intriguing conversation. Unfortunately, not a new one across
11 the agency. But I want to clarify a few things up front.

12 So, one, I want to clarify: I do believe, because
13 the mountain bikers -- because the objection process is new,
14 and so they probably thought, "I got what I wanted," didn't
15 even think about putting in as an interested party or an
16 objector, because had you gotten -- I just wanted to clarify
17 this. Had the decision gone forward the way it was, would you
18 have objected to the plan? Probably not, right?

19 So I think -- you know, I don't want to make
20 assumptions about why they are or are not here, only because
21 this is such a new process, where I've learned a lot in the
22 last four.

23 However, I do think that there were some very
24 intriguing additions. You know, up front I shared with you my
25 understanding of objections that were laid on the table,

1 including how you view the Forest Service interpreting things
2 as well as what was in the document. And we often interpret
3 confusion -- you know, maybe that's where the "I don't really
4 know what to tell you" became this gag order on wilderness, or
5 the Forest Service doesn't have a role in actually creating
6 wilderness, designating it. We do in recommending it.

7 You know, maybe there is some confusion there. So I
8 allow for a lot of miscommunication and misunderstanding. And
9 quite frankly, if we don't communicate, people hallucinate.
10 That's just the world.

11 However, you guys left a very intriguing alternative
12 on the table. And what I heard was your -- from -- a remedy
13 for this is, no matter what we call the Dunoir area, it has a
14 designation, and that it needs to be managed consistent with
15 that designation. That in 1977 there weren't a lot of
16 mountain bikes, so whatever they thought a vehicle was, today
17 if it's -- if a human is conveyed on it, then it's a vehicle.
18 That's what I hear you say.

19 HOWIE WOLKE: Can I clarify something about
20 what you just said?

21 JANE COTTRELL: I'm actually asking you not to
22 at this point, unless I get it wrong.

23 You would like to see this area managed consistent
24 with the special management unit, that mountain bikes be
25 considered a mechanical device and a vehicle, and so no

1 mechanical vehicular devices be allowed in the Dunoir, that
2 basically it be used for those traditional uses and be managed
3 in accordance or consistent with a wilderness recommendation.
4 Whether it's recommended for wilderness or not, that it's
5 managed consistent with that. That's what I heard is the
6 remedy on the table.

7 And that is a piece of that. So am I correct so
8 far?

9 HOWIE WOLKE: That part was correct. You made
10 a misstatement before that, when you said there weren't many
11 mountain bikes in 1972. There were none.

12 JANE COTTRELL: Well, okay. I have to say I
13 can't verify that. There were people who took bikes into the
14 woods and maybe thought those were mountain bikes, but I'm not
15 even going into that. What happened way back when, I'm not --
16 you know, I don't -- the point is there was probably not a lot
17 of consideration at the point where the special management
18 unit went in for this use that has grown.

19 As someone pointed out, we have no idea what future
20 uses will be. People are adding electric motors today.
21 Snowmobiles are a whole lot more powerful than they were in
22 1972. And hovercrafts could be the next thing.

23 I mean, honestly, we don't know what will show up in
24 the woods. Scares you, doesn't it?

25 I also know motorized skateboards are now being used

1 in the forest, so that ought to scare you even more.

2 So what I'm hearing you say, though, is if the --
3 your preference, obviously, the remedy you prefer is recommend
4 it as a wilderness and manage it consistent with that. Short
5 of that, manage this consistent so that all of the
6 characteristics of wilderness are maintained in the Dunoir
7 area, be they wildlife production, be they reduction in
8 impacts between users and ensuring user safety as much as you
9 can, and preserving this area for future designation by
10 Congress as a wilderness area.

11 So that's what I hear is the remedy on the table.

12 Also heard another step to that, and I would like to
13 thank Jessica, and I can't remember who else brought this to
14 the table. I did ask some questions after going out to the
15 Dunoir. How many miles on this forest of trails are open to
16 mountain bikes? It's 952 miles are outside of wilderness,
17 currently open to mountain bikes, and over 1100 miles of road.

18 So what kind of education needs to be a component of
19 this of where there might be other opportunities that are more
20 consistent with, you know, the management and, in this case,
21 the SMU designation?

22 So you know, at this point, I want to thank you all.
23 You put a lot of information on the table. You put a lot of
24 passion. And anyone who sticks around since 2005 with the
25 Forest in a planning process gets my respect. Anyone who's

1 been involved in an area since the 1970s gets my respect.
2 Because I got to tell you, I wish more people in this country
3 cared like what just came out of this room.

4 So if there's anything you'd like me to add, like I
5 said, I'm not going to come to a decision today. But I think
6 this was very fruitful conversation for me and for the Forest.

7 *(Applause.)*

8 JANE COTTRELL: You choked me up.

9 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay, folks. You're doing very
10 well. We appreciate that.

11 We have one more topic in the day, and then some
12 open time. We'll meet back at 3:00. So be sure to help
13 yourself to refreshments and rest rooms.

14 *(Break taken 2:33 p.m. until 3:01 p.m.)*

15 RHONDA SHIPP: All right. I'm going to go
16 ahead and get started. I know this is getting fairly
17 repetitious for those of you that have been here all day, but
18 I just need to remind you of a few things. We have new people
19 joining us, and so it's important that they understand how
20 we're working here, what we look like in here.

21 For the folks on the telephone, are you able to hear
22 us?

23 PHIL HOCKER: Yes, I can hear you.

24 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. All right. So one
25 confirmation, if there's any issue with your connection, we

1 need you to either just speak up or to please call in with the
2 a text message. The number is (307)272-1696. And thank you
3 very much for joining us by telephone.

4 This is the one where we have like a lot of people
5 around our circle. This becomes even more critical to use
6 that ground rule called end point first.

7 We have an hour and a half on this issue as well.
8 We'll be following the same format. Please remember the --
9 and this is controlled by regulation. So I need for the
10 people who are around the room here to be objectors on this
11 issue. Okay? And that is who the conversation is among, is
12 among all of you objectors.

13 At a certain point in time, we will ask for other --
14 for input from the rest of the people, interested persons, as
15 well as other objectors. And so that's kind of the process
16 that we will follow for involving folks.

17 The general public, again, are those who are here to
18 listen and to observe.

19 All right. We're going to do some introductions
20 again. What I'd like to begin with are those people on the
21 telephone, and then we'll just start here and go around the
22 circle one way and then back the other way.

23 So those of you on the phone, could you please
24 quickly introduce yourself.

25 JESSICA CROWDER: This is Jessica Crowder in

1 Governor Mead's office.

2 DAVID COURTIS: David Curtis, individual, in
3 Bellingham, Washington.

4 RHONDA SHIPP: Anyone else?

5 JOY BANNON: This is Joy Bannon with Wyoming
6 Wildlife Federation.

7 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Next?

8 CHRIS SPORL: This is Chris Sporl in the
9 regional office in Denver with the Forest Service.

10 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Anybody else?

11 Okay. Thank you very much. And then we're going to
12 pass the mic again, folks. So if you wouldn't mind starting
13 us off.

14 JIM PRATT: Jim Pratt.

15 HOWARD SANDERS: Howard Sanders, Shoshone
16 Backcountry Horsemen.

17 MARSHALL DOMINICK: Marshall Dominick.

18 DAVID DOMINICK: David Dominick.

19 CATHY PURVES: Cathy Purves, Trout Unlimited.

20 DAVE BURKE: Dave Burke.

21 LISA MCGEE: Lisa McGee, Wyoming Outdoor
22 Council.

23 CALLIE DOMEK: Callie Domek.

24 JAZMYN MCDONALD: Jazmyn McDonald.

25 LINDA RAYNOLDS: Linda Raynolds.

1 BILL BLASS: Bill Bass, acting deputy regional
2 forester.

3 KIM WILBERT: Kim Wilbert.

4 JERRY LONGOBARDI: Jerry Longobardi.

5 CONNIE WILBERT: Connie Wilbert, Sierra Club.

6 CHUCK NEAL: Chuck Neal.

7 BONNIE RICE: Bonnie Rice, Sierra Club.

8 JOHN OSGOOD: John Osgood.

9 DICK INBERG: Dick Inberg, Wyoming Backcountry
10 Horsemen and Wyoming Wilderness Association.

11 JANE COTTRELL: Jane Cottrell, the reviewing
12 official.

13 STEFFEN CORNELL: Steffen Cornell, Meeteetse
14 Conservation District.

15 STEVE JONES: Steve Jones, elected supervisor,
16 Meeteetse Conservation District.

17 LOREN GROSSKOPF: Loren Grosskopf, Shoshone
18 Cooperating Agency Coalition.

19 REG PHILLIPS: Reg Phillips, Dubois
20 Conservation District.

21 JOE TILDEN: Joe Tilden, SCAC.

22 DAVE CLARENDON: Dave Clarendon.

23 KEN LICHTENDAHL: Ken Lichtendahl.

24 HELEN HOUSE: Helen House with the Wyoming
25 Outdoor people.

1 BERT MILLER: Burt Miller, Wyoming State
2 Snowmobile Association.

3 MARK HINSCHBERGER: Mark Hinchberger.

4 SARAH WALKER: Sarah Walker, Wyoming
5 Wilderness.

6 HOWIE WOLKE: Howie Wolke, Big Wild Adventures.

7 HAP RIDGWAY: Hap Ridgway.

8 BRUCE FAUSKEE: Bruce Fauskee.

9 RICK ADAIR: Rick Adair.

10 MIKE BLYMEYER: Mike Blymeyer.

11 JUDI BLYMEYER: Judi Blymeyer.

12 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I abstain. I'm not on the
13 list.

14 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. All right. Then it
15 looks to me like you're getting the hang of this and how we
16 are proceeding through each of the topics. I would just ask
17 that you continue with the same courtesy and respect that
18 you've shown up to this point. It's just been great.

19 And again, reminder of that ground rule, end point
20 first. We've got an even bigger crowd now for this issue.

21 Okay. It sounds like we don't have any other
22 announcements. We can go ahead and get started. I'll turn it
23 over to Jane.

24 JANE COTTRELL: Okay. So we're going to do
25 this session just like the last one. And who knows where

1 we'll end on this.

2 So what I'd like to do first is I'll share with you
3 my understanding of the issue. And then let's work on helping
4 me understand that. Do I have it right? If you'd like to
5 clarify, add some additional information to that.

6 After we spend a little time with that, then let's
7 move to talking about: So what would be some potential
8 remedies on this?

9 And I have to -- I have to tell you, I'm quite
10 impressed with this issue. I have two pages of potential
11 remedies that objectors put forward. And yet I -- when I went
12 through this, I saw three major issues that were associated
13 with it. So it tells me there's a lot of folks with interests
14 in: How do we move forward with this?

15 So most people have to put their glasses on to see.
16 I have to take them off to see close.

17 So the three issues that I heard: It's around
18 motorized travel in roadless. And quite frankly, there's both
19 sides of the issue on this.

20 There's concern that the motorized use will damage
21 the unique character of roadless areas and could result in
22 resource damage. At the same time, there were a lot of
23 objections and concerns about the reduction of snowmobiling
24 across the Shoshone National Forest, mostly due to the change
25 where, in winter range, there would not be snowmobile use

1 allowed. So there's both sides of the issue about where in
2 roadless areas it was allowed and where it wasn't allowed.

3 In addition, there were some objections about the
4 enforcement concerns. And we heard a bit about that in the
5 last discussion, but concerns that the enforcement of
6 winterized motorized use would be very difficult, that we
7 already have some illegal use resulting in adverse impacts and
8 encroachments, that there's some concern to the forest
9 resources as well as some incursions in potential wilderness
10 areas that might result in enough damage or effect to the
11 character that would eliminate them from future consideration
12 for wilderness.

13 And then the third issue that I heard was motorized
14 travel's impact on wildlife. And across the board, objectors
15 were concerned about the effects in grizzly bear habitat, to
16 lynx, to bighorn sheep, and winter range for elk,
17 specifically.

18 So on those issues, is there some issue that I
19 didn't capture around the motorized use?

20 So you can bring new things to the table. We have a
21 few in here. So let's start -- yes, right back here. And
22 then we're going to come forward with that mic and move right
23 on down the row.

24 So go ahead, sir.

25 HOWIE WOLKE: Howie Wolke. I'm concerned that

1 I'm not hearing anything about the wilderness issue. I think
2 a lot of us are here for the afternoon's session because we
3 objected to the Forest Service's lack of wilderness
4 recommendations for roadless areas and, of course, lack of
5 wilderness recommendations and allowing motorized and
6 mechanized. And I want to emphasize that travel in roadless
7 areas is a real primary concern. I'm a little taken aback by
8 not hearing about that.

9 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Thanks. Let's see.
10 Would you just move that forward right here?

11 CATHY PURVES: Cathy Purves, Trout Unlimited.
12 I'd just like to add to your impacts on wildlife.
13 Fisheries is not mentioned.

14 RHONDA SHIPP: Thank you. Very good.

15 DAVE BURKE: Dave Burke. I'm a former Park
16 County commissioner from 2009 to 2012, so I had the
17 opportunity to help work on both of the last two forest plans,
18 the 2008 and 2010 plan.

19 And I am opposed to additional motorized use on the
20 forest, and for what I feel are good reasons. One of it, as
21 we know, it's volcanic formations. It's very fragile
22 formations. It's very rough, and it's very rugged. Shoshone
23 Forest is considered a wild forest, and for good reason. It's
24 extremely rich in wildlife, fauna. It's second to none,
25 really.

1 I believe there's numerous studies that's been
2 documented that shows the impact on wildlife by motorized use.
3 And I won't get into all of that, but I know of no study out
4 there that's been documented that says that motorized use
5 doesn't impact negatively the wildlife.

6 These studies you can find with the Wyoming Game and
7 Fish, *Journal of Wildlife Management*, University of Alaska,
8 University of Wyoming, Oregon State -- I mean, it goes on and
9 on, these studies that document the negative impact on
10 wildlife.

11 Also, as the legal use increases, the illegal use
12 will increase. That's the nature of the beast, folks. It's
13 going to happen. But enforcement won't increase.
14 Unfortunately, Joe doesn't have the budget to increase his
15 enforcement.

16 There's considerable -- what I would call
17 considerable illegal use out there already. And there's
18 probably only five percent of the ATV users, but those
19 five percent, they're up there on the Upper Sunlight,
20 throughout the McCullough Peaks, the Wood River, Carter
21 Mountain. Anyone who spends any time in these areas will
22 validate my concern there.

23 Some of these little ghost trails are being made
24 permanent by ATVers running through them when, in the back of
25 their mind, they know it's not legal because it's not marked

1 as a road. There are 1141 miles of system roads in the
2 forest. Considerable amount of those legal roads are
3 two-track roads that can be used by the ATVers. They're
4 there. They're available for their use. And I'm not
5 objecting to legal, motorized use as it currently stands.

6 There's a study of preferences and values, public
7 preferences and values, put out -- commissioned by the
8 Governor's Office of Wyoming dated 2008 that's the most
9 comprehensive and up-to-date survey that shows public
10 preferences. The public overall is opposed to additional
11 motorized use according to this study.

12 My other concern on this motorized use in Wood River
13 and Francs Peak is that it was a last-minute change after the
14 draft was put to bed. We did not discuss it in the public
15 meetings that I attended, which was dozens of public meetings.
16 And I'm not a lawyer. I can't say if it's illegal for sure.
17 But I can certainly say it certainly runs against the public
18 opinion. It runs against the ethics of it all when you don't
19 include the public in the comments and in the discussion on
20 formulating Alternative G.

21 So if you want my recommended solution --

22 RHONDA SHIPP: I don't think we're there yet.

23 JANE COTTRELL: Not yet.

24 RHONDA SHIPP: And let me just remind you,
25 folks, we're looking for new, additional information to add to

1 Jane's understanding of this particular issue. Okay? Next.

2 JAZMYN MCDONALD: Hi. I'm Jazmyn McDonald,
3 and I do have new information. And I also would like to add
4 to your summary of the points that were made by objectors,
5 because I didn't hear birds mentioned as a very prominent
6 species on the forest.

7 The new information I would like to bring to
8 everyone's attention is the latest report by the Audubon
9 Society analyzing the life expectancy of our native North
10 American bird species. And according to that report, almost
11 half of our native North American bird species are threatened
12 by loss of habitat in not the next 60 years, but in the next
13 35 years.

14 In other words, by 2050, which is just as far away
15 as my first days on the Shoshone National Forest are for me --
16 you know, 35 years is not that long -- half of our species
17 will be threatened with extinction due to loss of habitat of
18 both breeding territory, and wintering grounds.

19 So I conduct breeding bird surveys for the USGS.
20 I've been, in particular, on the Shoshone National Forest for
21 the last seven years up at the top of the East Fork. And I
22 can tell you from my own observations that a quarter of those
23 threatened species are on the Shoshone National Forest.

24 And we're not talking about, oh, the cute,
25 charismatic birds like rufous hummingbird. We're also talking

1 about mallards and golden eagles and Clark's nutcrackers and
2 some of our favorite birds, the black-billed magpies.

3 So this is a pretty dramatic contribution to our
4 knowledge and also to the importance of the Shoshone Forest in
5 our breeding bird population, some of which are also protected
6 by international treaty.

7 Thank you.

8 RHONDA SHIPP: Thanks. And remember, I'm
9 looking for official objectors, folks.

10 LINDA RAYNOLDS: Linda Raynolds.

11 The one thing I wanted to say is that in the draft
12 plan, one of the primary stated objectives of the plan is to
13 enhance and maintain the backcountry, nonmotorized character
14 of the forest. And that can be in quotes. I mean, that's
15 right out of the introduction. And so increasing motorized
16 use does not conform with that stated objective.

17 RHONDA SHIPP: Thank you. And there is a
18 gentleman right behind you that will get into the loop here.

19 DAVE CLARENDON: Thank you. Okay. I'm Dave
20 Clarendon, and I want to say I appreciate you having me over
21 here to talk. But from an outfitter's standpoint, it's the
22 absolute worst time to be doing this.

23 So my rhetorical question is: How many times do we
24 have to keep coming back? I sheep hunt up in the Wood River
25 and Francs Peak area. And I always figured it was off limits.

1 And now it's, you know, over and over again.

2 Like a lot of these people, I've been involved with
3 wilderness stuff since the '80s or even before. And it just
4 seems we fight sort of constant rear-guard action.

5 I get a lot of clientele who really like off-road
6 hunting. I mean way off road. And this is going to -- your
7 proposal doesn't make any sense to me. I employ quite a few
8 people, and it would have a significant impact.

9 One little point I want to make, and that's -- it's
10 just a point of detail in your multiple abuse or multiple use
11 deal you do. When you put horses and ATVs on the same road --
12 I shoe all my horses because of rocks. But what I can't do
13 for them, I can't prevent shin splints on hard-packed roads.
14 And that's what ATVs do to those trails, they hard-pack them.
15 Just like any athlete jogging down a paved road, they get shin
16 splints. And so the result is those animals want to get off
17 the trail, and they start braiding the trail, and that's just
18 not right.

19 And finally I'll just end with this. And that's,
20 you know, you make these policy decisions at this point, but
21 20 or 30 or 50 or 100 years from now, what's the next
22 generation going to be saying?

23 So you know, I think this is just the wrong place to
24 be doing this. There are other places that have motorized
25 use. This is not the place to do it. Thank you.

1 RHONDA SHIPP: Thank you.

2 JANE COTTRELL: Are you specifically referring
3 to Francs Peak and Wood River, or is it just any of the
4 motorized areas?

5 DAVE CLARENDON: Well, the one that caught my
6 eye was Wood Rivers and Francs Peak. And they're pristine. I
7 have clients from around the world who come for places like
8 this, and they are disappearing fast.

9 JANE COTTRELL: Thanks for clarifying that.

10 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. I just need to pause
11 here a moment.

12 For those of you that are on the phone, could we
13 have you mute your phones while you're listening and then
14 un-mute them when you would like to speak? We're picking up
15 some background noise.

16 So thank you. We appreciate that.

17 All right. I saw a hand over here. Okay.

18 KIM WILBERT: Right here. I have the
19 microphone, so it's my turn. I'm Kim Wilbert.

20 A couple of new things that I'd like to bring up
21 that I don't think that you mentioned, Jane. And one is, in
22 addition to lack of enforcement of motorized action on illegal
23 areas or areas that aren't on the road inventory, there's also
24 a problem with the agency's ability to repair and maintain the
25 existing roads that are on -- and trails. Particularly, I

1 think they're called Class 2 trails. Somebody can correct me,
2 but the two-track-type Jeep trails are in poor safety
3 condition.

4 I've seen some this summer that are eroded to
5 tremendous amounts, which then, of course, means there's
6 another trail built right beside it. But that, I think, is
7 another issue that needs to be part of this discussion.

8 The other thing I'd like to mention is the -- on
9 the -- you mentioned winter motorized access, snowmobile
10 access to crucial winter ranges, particularly on the south
11 part of the forest, on the Washakie District and the Wind
12 River Districts. The Alternate G, the proposed plan as it
13 stands, opens those areas to snowmobiling. And the rationale
14 is that the Wyoming Game and Fish department has said that
15 there is no problem with that, that current level use does not
16 create any damage to the wintering big game animals there.

17 The thing about that is -- and this is new
18 information -- conversations with Rick Huber, who is a Game
19 and Fish biologist in Cheyenne and has been an active
20 cooperator throughout this whole process with the State Game
21 and Fish Department, and with Stan Harder, the Lander, south
22 area biologist, saying, "Absolutely not. We goofed on that."

23 But the Forest Service -- I brought this up when the
24 plan was introduced at the open house in Lander in my public
25 comments there. I was called by Mr. Huber a couple days

1 later, back in March, saying, "Boy, "I'm glad you brought it
2 up. Are you going to object about it?"

3 I said yes, and he said, "Great. Because we can't
4 object about it, but this will put it on the table. We can
5 have a discussion with the Forest Service and get this fixed."

6 They want to get it fixed. We want to get it fixed.
7 I see it hasn't been addressed. The only address in the
8 documents we have today state that it will be looked at for
9 further rationalization, which doesn't solve this problem.

10 And the problem is largely that there's a new type
11 of vehicle that's becoming predominant, especially in that
12 south part of the forest for winter use: Track vehicles. And
13 the definition between what's an over-the-snow vehicle, track
14 driven, ski-steered -- all that stuff I've heard some about,
15 but that is not preventing damage or harassment to these big
16 game herds on their winter range. And it needs to be
17 addressed before this Record of Decision comes out.

18 RHONDA SHIPP: Thank you. All right.

19 JERRY LONGOBARDI: I couldn't have said it
20 better about those track vehicles.

21 I'm Jerry Longobardi, and I just retired from 30
22 years as a game warden with the Game and Fish, the last 23 in
23 Meeteetse and Jackson.

24 And the technology -- again, you think mountain
25 bikes have seen technology. I saw track vehicles in Meeteetse

1 this year in April. When you get elk antlers worth \$10 or \$12
2 a pound, all bets are off, and these guys can go to places
3 that they never could go years ago except by walking. And
4 even walking has a lot of disturbance.

5 But something else I haven't seen -- I could talk
6 forever about the wildlife values in the Wood River and the
7 Francs Peak and the spectacular moth site for grizzlies up on
8 Francs Peak. This year they counted 43 grizzly bears on the
9 Francs Peak complex. That should be an area of national
10 importance.

11 And everything should be -- anything that can be
12 done to prevent disturbance to those bears up there. They're
13 at 11-, 12-, 13,000 feet on talus slopes, not getting in
14 trouble. And everything should be done to protect that.

15 You know, right now we have the Phelps Mountain Road
16 that goes right to the base of Francs Peak, and that actually
17 is a security concern for the bears right there. And to
18 encourage an increased motorized vehicle use up here, I think,
19 is just not a very good thing to do.

20 Something that I hadn't seen mentioned is elk
21 management and hunting are big issues in Park County. And I
22 see we have our two commissioners here. Joe Tilden's been
23 active in sportsman issues for a long time. And I think Loren
24 Grosskopf is a member of the Elk Foundation.

25 My own personal experience in study after study has

1 shown that motorized vehicle use is almost always detrimental
2 to wildlife. And this is the point I want to make: The more
3 access you have, the less hunter opportunity you have.

4 Instead of having a three-week general season, you have a
5 two-week general season. And then you have a ten-day general
6 season. Then you have a five-day general season. And then
7 you go to limited quota.

8 And the more access you have, the less hunter
9 opportunity you have. And hunting is very important to the
10 people in the Cody Country. And anything that discourages
11 hunting opportunity or decreases hunting opportunity, I think,
12 should be discouraged.

13 Elk management and the transmission of brucellosis
14 to cattle is a big issue in Park County. The Game and Fish is
15 working hard trying to keep the two separate.

16 Increased motorized vehicle access, especially up
17 into the Dick Creek, Timber Creek, Phelps Mountain areas will
18 lead to more elk being displaced off of national forest lands
19 where they can be hunted by sportsmen, to private lands on
20 Dick Creek and the Wood River, where they either can't be
21 hunted or you're going to have to pay a fee to hunt for them.
22 Also, on private land they have a greater opportunity to
23 commingle with cattle, which leads to brucellosis problems
24 again.

25 So in closing, I just would like to say, I own a

1 four-wheeler, and I think there's plenty of opportunity
2 already on BLM lands, the Bighorns, the Black Hills, the
3 Sierra Madres, for the ORV enthusiast. Anybody who's been in
4 Meeteetse knows this is not good snow machine country by any
5 means. It's wind blown, rocky, steep. Yeah, you can snow
6 machine up the Wood River Road and not hurt a lot, but most
7 years you can't go anywhere else. It's not Union Pass or the
8 Bighorns or the Beartooths. It's just not good snow machine
9 country.

10 And I guess, in closing, I just want to say, once a
11 motorized trail or road is put in, the country will never be
12 the same. It will forever lose its wild character. And I
13 hope you take that into consideration.

14 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. So we'll go over there
15 and then, ma'am, were you wanting in as well?

16 Okay. So let's start over here.

17 BRUCE FAUSKEE: I'm Bruce Fauskee. And I guess
18 you were asking about things to consider that weren't
19 mentioned earlier, and one of them I'd say is user conflict
20 both from safety, a safety point of view from ATVs and horses,
21 and also from quiet recreation users, how they are affected by
22 ATVs and motorized use.

23 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Thank you. And this
24 lady here has been trying to get in.

25 BONNIE RICE: Bonnie Rice with Sierra Club. A

1 couple points that I wanted to make.

2 One is an overarching point in terms of some things
3 that I saw in the conclusions which was, it sounded like, for
4 a lot of the concerns here about motorized, that decisions
5 would be deferred to the travel management planning process.
6 So I'd just like to say that I think, from our perspective,
7 that would be a real mistake, because there are a lot of
8 concerns, and the forest plan seems to be the place to really
9 look at those with the management area prescriptions.

10 That's what a lot of the concerns that have been
11 brought up have been dealing with, in terms of the change that
12 the -- the changes that are proposed from backcountry
13 non-motorized to back country motorized. So that's one issue.
14 I think that a lot of us here share that concern.

15 And the second one I'd like to bring up has to do
16 with -- I didn't really hear it specifically in terms of the
17 summarization of points that you had, Jane. There is an
18 overall issue of impacts to wildlife. But I think one of the
19 things that was brought up again by several of us, including
20 the Sierra Club, is that with these recent changes that were
21 proposed, that we just really saw in the final, in terms of
22 allowing motorized use in certain inventoried roadless areas
23 like Francs Peak, Wood River, Telephone Draw, Castle Rock, is
24 that there wasn't any analysis on the impacts to wildlife that
25 came along with that.

1 In particular, there wasn't any rationale about how
2 these changes would or would not meet the requirements to
3 minimize impacts to wildlife that the Forest Service is
4 required to comply with under various executive orders. And
5 so I think that is a real concern, and I think it's been cited
6 by some other people here.

7 Certainly there is a lot of literature in terms of,
8 when you allow motorized use into these kind of areas, what
9 happens to wildlife and what those impacts are. I'd
10 specifically like to mention grizzly bears, a huge body of
11 literature with motorized use impacts on grizzly bears and
12 that being really the biggest factor as far as grizzly bear
13 mortality.

14 So that's a concern that we really want to bring
15 forward, because I don't think you could say that, to this
16 point, the Forest Service has really made any kind of argument
17 in terms of, you know, how allowing motorized use would
18 actually be minimizing impacts to wildlife in these areas. We
19 clearly feel that it would not be.

20 RHONDA SHIPP: Thank you.

21 CONNIE WILBERT: I'm just waiting for Jane to
22 catch up.

23 JANE COTTRELL: I'm writing as fast as I can.

24 CONNIE WILBERT: That's okay. I can wait.

25 JANE COTTRELL: Really, there are only three.

1 Ha. This is why we have this recorded, because I can't be as
2 accurate as I need to be.

3 CONNIE WILBERT: Thank you. So I'm Connie
4 Wilbert, and I just wanted to mention a couple of other
5 points.

6 First, going back to something that Bonnie just
7 referred to, I was really pleased when you opened this
8 meeting, that I wrote down exactly what you said. And what
9 that was, was this forest plan will set the course for what
10 happens on this landscape for the next several years, maybe
11 ten, maybe 15, we don't really know. Maybe 25.

12 That is, in fact, the appropriate role that this
13 plan plays; it's to set that broad framework. You also say
14 right in the documents that were given, the Shoshone National
15 Forest correctly states a forest plan provides the framework
16 to guide the day-to-day land and resource management
17 operations of a national forest. That does not seem
18 consistent with the fallback position that's outlined in some
19 of the proposed remedies, instructions to just wait, we don't
20 have to deal with that now, we can deal with that in the
21 travel management planning process.

22 In fact, the forest plan is the place to make the
23 big decisions. What's appropriate where? And if a particular
24 use or set of uses is not appropriate because it conflicts
25 with other values, the forest plan is the place to set out

1 those kind of decisions. And that's one of the things that
2 we're asking you to do.

3 If an area, a big area, is not appropriate for
4 motorized use, then the forest plan is the place to identify
5 that so that we don't have to have this battle again over the
6 specifics of where the roads are going to go. I think that I
7 would really hope that we would actually see some of those
8 large decisions in this forest plan at this stage.

9 Secondly, I just wanted to -- this is kind of an end
10 point first. I wanted to talk for a minute about the
11 concentration of the areas that would be made available for
12 motorized use in what's called the Southern Zone of the
13 forest, that is the Wind River and Washakie Districts, down
14 around Dubois and down by Lander. It's really striking when
15 you actually look at the numbers, not on the forest-wide
16 basis, but looking at those two districts. And I'd just like
17 to share with you a couple of really quick numbers.

18 On the Washakie District, which is down by Lander,
19 there are about 140,000 acres, 139,818 acres, that are
20 available right now for management decisions, kind of the
21 front country. Out of that 140,000 acres, there are 9,431
22 that are closed to both summer and winter motorized use.
23 That's tiny. Okay? That means that 130,000 acres are open to
24 either summer motorized or winter motorized or both.

25 On the Wind River District, out of 229,000 acres

1 that are available for management decisions, 228,000 acres are
2 open for motorized use, summer, winter, or both. 844 acres
3 are not available for motorized use. That is in the areas
4 where decision can be made now.

5 And that disproportionate concentration of opening
6 these areas to motorized use and not keeping any of those
7 front-country areas available for folks who like non-motorized
8 recreation, family camping and hiking and fishing, horseback
9 riding, solitude, peace and quiet in readily accessible area,
10 not the wilderness areas, but in a place that they can drive
11 an hour or two from town and get to, to go with their
12 families, that is so out of balance when you look at the
13 Southern Zone and those two districts separately. We would
14 really like to see a more even and balanced approach taken in
15 that Southern Zone.

16 The third quick comment that I wanted to make was
17 related to the public comment that was received on this forest
18 plan throughout this whole process. And a number of people
19 have mentioned this before, so I don't want to belabor the
20 point, but I do want to say that we've heard many times that
21 the Forest Service has said that the final plan was -- did
22 this go out on me?

23 So you know, we've heard many times that the final
24 plan was arrived at as a result of public participation and
25 public comment. And frankly, I don't get that, because the

1 public comment that was received on this plan that's part of
2 the public record was overwhelmingly in favor of not expanding
3 motorized use into some of the remaining areas that aren't
4 open to motorized use now.

5 I know this is not a vote. We always hear that.
6 This is not a voting process. But how do you measure what the
7 public wants if you disregard the public comment? I mean, if
8 you have 98 percent of the public comment who says they do not
9 support further development on the undeveloped parts of the
10 Shoshone National Forest, whoa. That should be something.
11 That should weigh into this decision.

12 If you don't like form letters, which I know the
13 agencies don't -- I disagree with that, because I think people
14 in New York City have just as much right to have their opinion
15 registered on this as anybody else. They own these lands.

16 Nevertheless, if you back out and only look at the
17 written letters, and if you even back out from that and
18 restrict it to Wyoming residents only, I think it was
19 75 percent of those comment letters opposed expanding
20 motorized use into areas where it's not allowed now and that
21 are currently unroaded.

22 So I don't know what else to say except that I think
23 that it's really difficult for me to see how public opinion is
24 coming into play here when those numbers are as they are.

25 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Thank you.

1 I'm going to take one more comment here from Chuck,
2 and then I just need to make sure that our phone people
3 have an opportunity, and then I'll get back to the circle.

4 So, Chuck, if you could grab that microphone there.

5 CHUCK NEAL: My name is Chuck Neal. I'll get
6 to the bottom line.

7 I support no more motorized access on any roadless
8 areas in the Shoshone National Forest. This is the greatest
9 gift Shoshone can give to the nation and the world in the
10 coming century. This is a period when we need to protect all
11 our remaining roadless areas in order to have full complement
12 ecosystem processes and functions taking place.

13 As an ecologist I know how destructive roads can be.
14 They not only displace or habituate wildlife, they serve as
15 invasion corridors for noxious weeds, they fragment wildlife
16 habitat, and they serve to facilitate poaching, none of which
17 are desirable.

18 So we want to protect all remaining roadless areas
19 for reasons the last two speakers both mentioned and to keep
20 any more development to take place in the future.

21 RHONDA SHIPP: Thank you. Okay.

22 Objectors on the phone, do you have anything you would
23 like to add at this point?

24 If you do, if you'd un-mute, we aren't hearing you.

1 JOY BANNON: This is Joy Bannon with Wyoming
2 Wildlife Federation. I don't have anything else to add.

3 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Thank you. We
4 appreciate that.

5 All right. Back to the circle. I saw hands over
6 here, so we're going to start passing the mic again. We'll
7 get that to everybody, I promise. So we'll start over here
8 with you.

9 RICK ADAIR: Rick Adair.

10 We've already heard that the equine and ATV is not
11 always compatible. And to get right to the point: Is this not
12 going to reduce the trails that's been in existence for years
13 for the equine? And maybe a lot of us have taken it for
14 granted that they would always be there. But I can tell you
15 for sure that the two are not compatible.

16 Over the Labor Day weekend, my wife was thrown from
17 a mule, not from anything that the ATV riders did or she did.
18 The two are not compatible .

19 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Thank you. And forward,
20 to the front row. Thank you.

21 MARSHALL DOMINICK: Marshall Dominick, from
22 Cody.

23 First of all, I commend you, the Forest Service, for
24 having this open meeting. It's remarkable that nobody here
25 has been hauled away for civil disobedience and probably won't

1 be.

2 It could happen.

3 It's wonderful to live in this country. And we are
4 all privileged to do so.

5 One thing that has not been mentioned, or it was
6 just touched on by Dave Burke, was the soils and the
7 corresponding water that comes out of the Shoshone. There are
8 three major rivers at the apex of the nation here. The
9 Mississippi, the Columbia, and the Green all come out of here.
10 And if you degrade those rivers, which you do with motorized
11 use, then that is a no-no.

12 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Thanks. And need to
13 jump over here to Lisa.

14 LISA MCGEE: Lisa McGee, Wyoming Outdoor
15 Council.

16 I wanted to just talk about how all roadless areas
17 aren't created equal. And on the Shoshone, the Shoshone is a
18 place with world class roadless areas, potential wilderness
19 areas. The Forest Service's own evaluation found that there
20 were 34 areas on the Shoshone that had wilderness potential.
21 It's kind of like the bighorn sheep this morning. The great
22 sheep, the great sheep herd in the country lives here. And
23 some of the last best wild places are also found here.

24 And so of those 34, there are a lot of people who
25 knew, even though they might all be deserving, they're not all

1 going to be. And so we were asked the question, "Which are
2 the most important to you?" Which is always hard. But we
3 chose, many of us, chose four: The Dunoir, Francs Peak, Wood
4 River, and Trout Creek.

5 And the Forest Service, as I said before, when we
6 were talking about the Dunoir, did recommend the Dunoir at one
7 point. In the most recent draft there were no wilderness
8 recommendations for a forest whose self-identified niche is a
9 wild, backcountry forest.

10 And so what we were told is that, "Okay. Don't
11 worry. For your four most special areas that we agree are the
12 most pristine, we're going to manage those as backcountry,
13 non-motorized, 1.3." And then between the draft and the
14 final, Francs Peak and Wood River now have winter and
15 motorized use written all over them.

16 So I think many of us were taken aback. Many of us
17 think they are places still deserving of wilderness and that
18 it's hard to trust now the Forest's promise, "Don't worry,
19 we'll manage these to protect their wilderness
20 characteristics," when in this case, after almost ten years
21 of, "We're not going to go to wilderness, but we're going to
22 manage these as backcountry, non-motorized year-round," that
23 was basically gutted in the final days.

24 Thank you.

25 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Thanks.

1 HOWIE WOLKE: Thank you. Howie Wolke.

2 I sure hope you guys are listening, because as Keith
3 Becker said a little bit earlier in the day, this is a great
4 chance for the Forest Service to step back from its proposed
5 forest plan revisions and regain the public trust.

6 Getting back to the point I made earlier that the
7 flip-side of the motorized issue in roadless areas is that
8 there were no wilderness recommendations for those roadless
9 areas, I want to remind everybody, and particularly you folks
10 in the Forest Service, that there are 750,000 acres of
11 inventoried roadless land on the Shoshone National Forest, and
12 quite a bit more, actually, that's not inventoried for various
13 reasons.

14 And unlike most other forests, almost every acre of
15 that is roadless land that's contiguous with existing
16 designated wilderness, which means that since we're dealing
17 with an area in the heart of the Greater Yellowstone
18 Ecosystem -- and there is only one of those on this planet --
19 any of those areas that are open to mechanized and motorized
20 use is going to represent dewilding of this irreplaceable
21 ecosystem and the dewilding of some of our most iconic,
22 flagship chunks of designated wilderness in the United States.

23 And I think that it's time to recognize the big
24 picture instead of just breaking it down into debating whether
25 or not there should be snowmobiles or mountain bikes in a

1 particular roadless area. This is part of something that's
2 much bigger than that, and I think that needs to be
3 recognized.

4 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Thank you. We're going
5 to take two more comments here, and over here, or is that --
6 or this gentleman right here. And then we need to move into
7 the next subject because of time.

8 So, Bert.

9 BERT MILLER: Bert Miller, Wyoming State
10 Snowmobile Association. I'm the president. Thank you for
11 having us in this meeting.

12 Also would like to, before I get started, thank Joe
13 Alexander and his staff up here for doing such a great job in
14 trying to work with the snowmobiling community.

15 You know, we are opposed to the increase of the big
16 game winter range because of the -- because of the factor we
17 feel it's too much. If you look at some of the areas that --
18 around, say, this area, if you go up Crandall area where we
19 own property, that whole community snowmobiles up top at the
20 Island Lakes. If this goes through, there won't be any -
21 we'll trailer. One of these days we were hoping to have a trail
22 to connect with that.

23 North Fork, a lot of the folks that own cabins up
24 there, there might be grandpas and grandmas that don't own
these real aggressive sleds, but they get them out of the shed

1 and they go back in the little hill there and take their
2 grandkids around. This is going to impact them.

3 Also, as I listen, we all have different opinions on
4 things. And if you look back two years ago, I'm not sure that
5 you're familiar with the study that University of Wyoming did
6 for snowmobiling. Snowmobiling brings in close to
7 \$175 million of revenue in the State of Wyoming. You can go
8 back, look that up. It's there. 49 percent of that is
9 tourism. So it's a fragile economy that we want to get right.

10 I also sit on the Wyoming State Trails Council. And
11 part of my job in that council is to see that everybody is
12 recognized: Snowmobilers, ORVs, bicycles, foot traffic,
13 horsemen, things like that. With that council, there's a lot
14 of money that gets given out in grants, and it's due to the
15 Highway Transportation Bill and the ORV community, which would
16 be snowmobiles and ATVs.

17 But the biggest thing that we would like to see is
18 that looked at. We look at the Shoshone Forest as a wonderful
19 place. We also look at it as basically being 84 percent,
20 maybe 85 percent non-motorized. We're trying to figure out:
21 How much more do you need?

22 We just want to be good stewards of the land. Your
23 snowmobiling communities, the clubs across the state of
24 Wyoming, they generate money. They give back to scholarships.
25 They clean your highways, things like this.

1 We don't have any intentions of being bad stewards.
2 We do realize there is a few percentage out there, as of every
3 sport. So we appreciate being here.

4 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Thank you very much.

5 I'm skipping to this gentleman over here, and then
6 we need to transition into the next topic. So we'll continue
7 after you.

8 KEN LICHTENDAHL: Okay. My name is Ken
9 Lichtendahl. Been in the area for many a year and spent many
10 days and nights into the Shoshone and some of the other
11 national forests, as well as spending 12 years on Park County
12 Search and Rescue.

13 So I think we all agree it's a very special place,
14 incredibly special, and especially when we talk about that
15 area near Meeteetse, the Wood River area and the Francs Peak
16 area. But it's a fragile, fragile area.

17 We have consistent management over the years that
18 has allowed that area to be an incredible wildlife corridor.
19 I don't understand the complexities, but I see what's going on
20 from many trips into the area, many trailheads that are packed
21 with horse trailers and people going in to hunt, people going
22 in to fish, people going into to recreate. And it's a matter
23 of compatibility.

24 We have an area that is state land and tons of acres
25 of state land in the riparian area. We have private land in

1 that area. We have BLM, and we have Forest Service. I know
2 we're only talking about the Shoshone here, but that
3 consistent management plays a big role in this overarching --
4 are we going to lose an intact ecosystem? And that's really
5 the key.

6 Right now the BLM, when they asked Fish and Game to
7 analyze the perimeter, which is contiguous with the Shoshone,
8 that area was deemed very important. I don't know the exact
9 term. It might have been no surface-to-surface occupancy.
10 But that area right across the line was deemed incredibly
11 important to wildlife. So I ask, how couldn't it be important
12 on the other side?

13 And we know the compatibility -- and there's a place
14 for snowmobiles, and there's a place for ATVs, but this is not
15 the spot. So I'm in favor of Alternative D and making this
16 decision now and doing it in a way where we preserve an intact
17 ecosystem.

18 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Thanks.

19 All right, Jane, when you're ready, you can move us
20 on.

21 JANE COTTRELL: And I have to apologize. These
22 chairs are killing me.

23 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I don't need to say what I
24 wanted to, so where would I send my comments to? I've sat
25 here for two hours, and you don't have time.

1 JODY SUTTON: We'll make sure that Christine
2 here at the back table takes your name, and you can give her
3 some --

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I think you're very much on
5 one side in this group, so I don't think you'd probably want
6 to hear what I had to say, anyway.

7 But we love to four-wheel, and I have seen trails
8 closed that people don't go off, they don't drive off of them.
9 And they worked on trails. They worked on them and fixed them
10 all up and then got them closed to them afterwards. So there
11 is a whole 'nother story there that you're not going to hear
12 at all.

13 JODY SUTTON: All right. Well, thank you. And
14 leave your name with Christine, and we'll get your stuff, too.

15 JANE COTTRELL: So I hope that piece, that we
16 don't hear the other side of the story, is not true, as this
17 is important, that we come to talk about remedies as we think
18 about both sides of the dialogue.

19 So that chair is killing me.

20 Here is what I heard about some potential
21 remedies -- sorry about that -- and this is just a hodgepodge.
22 So think about this hodgepodge, and let's see if in the
23 next -- I think it's another half hour or 35 minutes, if we
24 can move forward. Is there something here? There's a lot of
25 pieces, but what would folks lay on the table here?

1 When it comes to motorized travel, I heard a lot
2 about Woods Peak -- I'm sorry, Wood River and Francs Peak, and
3 about allowing any -- well, the remedy on the first one is
4 keeping non-motorized -- there are several of those that
5 repeat over and over -- as well as providing some
6 opportunities for motorized use.

7 I did hear, and what came out in the remedies, was
8 again, you know, what you had in the draft and what came out
9 in the final were two different things, and the opportunity
10 for public comment or to go back to what was originally in the
11 draft.

12 Asking the Forest Service to reclassify Castle Rock
13 and Telephone Draw for wilderness evaluation areas, preferably
14 including the area north of Telephone Draw.

15 The Wiggins Fork, through Bear Creek east, the Wind
16 River Indian Reservation boundary is the largest area where no
17 further motorized use should be allowed. And there's a lot in
18 this area where people pick specific areas.

19 The Forest Service should not apply winter motorized
20 land allocation in areas designated as crucial winter range,
21 bighorn sheep winter range, elk calving, within lynx critical
22 habitat, or grizzly bear corridors.

23 Forest plan should be changed to entirely eliminate
24 snowmobile use off designated routes in winter.

25 The Forest Service should reclassify Castle Rock and

1 Telephone Draw -- looks like those two are the same.

2 So the question -- or there weren't a lot of
3 remedies that said, "Okay, here is where we could have
4 motorized use, and here is where we couldn't." So I guess the
5 question I have for you today is: What might be some
6 potential remedies?

7 And I do hear just, you know, keep it like it is as
8 far as not allowing in roadless areas any motorized, any
9 additional motorized use as one remedy. So let's go from
10 there.

11 RHONDA SHIPP: All right. We've got a hand
12 over here. So microphone. There you go.

13 We'll go Loren or Steve, and then we'll get to you.

14 STEVE JONES: Steve Jones with the Meeteetse
15 Conservation District.

16 This is a different and difficult place to be, but
17 the bottom line is the remedy is actually contained in
18 Alternative G. This is an objection process where the people
19 here are the objectors, not seeing the big picture that
20 Alternative G actually does provide, by taking the final
21 decisions on motorized use to Travel, to be able to answer and
22 address these individual concerns that keep coming out.

23 As a member of an elected government authorized
24 under statute, the forest supervisor and I have talked about
25 the plan considerably during our meetings. But resource plans

1 guide the direction of the elected bodies, and the Meeteetse
2 Conservation District, in its comments, has restricted its
3 objection to some degree and its own comments separate from
4 the Shoshone Cooperating Agency Coalition to address its
5 objections with what happens within its jurisdiction.

6 There's no tallying of the persons agreeing with the
7 plan in this forum. And the elected officials have to stand
8 up and say the people who we represent are everybody. And the
9 Meeteetse Conservation District plan was developed through
10 public process under Wyoming Statute.

11 We had no objections to the Meeteetse Conservation
12 District support of trying to find the broadest array of
13 multiple use opportunities for the constituents that we had
14 without permanent resource damage. That is a caveat. And we
15 can go down a road, so to speak, on resource damage.

16 But I hear about dewilding. Well, 70 years ago, the
17 snapshot might make a lot of our viewshed appear to be
18 rewilded now. All of the timber that was being harvested
19 decades ago, other things going on. We are really healthy.

20 And elected officials do not get reelected if they
21 don't represent their constituency and retain the support of
22 the constituency. And so that is why I am making this
23 comment, is that Alternative G actually is the closest thing
24 that the Forest Service has that can address the needs of
25 everyone.

1 And I'd like to yield my floor now to Commissioner
2 Grosskopf.

3 LOREN GROSSKOPF: Thank you, Steve. Loren
4 Grosskopf, Park County Commissioner, representing the SCAC.

5 When we talk about remedies, I think -- I guess I
6 want to segue in what Steve has been saying that I think we
7 all acknowledge that 85 percent of the Shoshone Forest is
8 already roadless or wilderness. We're talking about
9 95 percent of all the users of the forest use that 15 percent.
10 Less than 5 percent use the wilderness areas of Shoshone.

11 But to segue what he just said about Alternative D,
12 in a lot of respects the people that want to have less or no
13 motorized use in the forest, motorized trails over the last 30
14 years have decreased 237 miles already. The summer -- and
15 Alternative G compared to present condition, if you look at
16 summer motorized travel, we've lost 41 -- the present
17 condition is 41,000 acres' difference from the current
18 condition to the proposed. So that's not an increase, folks,
19 of summer motorized.

20 For winter motorized, from the current condition to
21 the preferred alternative, the difference is 275,000 acres of
22 lost area to snowmobile. So we can't say that we have a -- an
23 increase in motorized use. I mean, those are really important
24 numbers to remember.

25 Now, it may not be specifically where you want, but

1 to address the Francs Peak and the Wood River areas
2 specifically, there is a polygon where the Forest Service,
3 they proposed to expand a polygon. Now, please note, it's not
4 the entire amount; it's only a small polygon of that.

5 Now, I'm familiar with that area. And I have a map
6 in my hand from 1979, a Forest Service travel map, that shows
7 a motorized trail right through the middle -- traverses right
8 through the middle of this polygon. So we can't hardly say
9 that this area is untrampled by man, it's wilderness,
10 pristine. It isn't. It's been roaded. The roads were closed
11 in the 1980s. There are still roads there, other roads, in
12 that whole section.

13 The proposed polygon that we're talking about is not
14 the entire area. It's not the alpine area of Phelps Mountain
15 and Francs Peak. I think everybody needs to look at that
16 polygon and to see what's actually proposed. You know, it
17 isn't all the moth sites.

18 And I guess the last thing I would like to talk
19 about before I go, the increase in motorized use and the
20 detrimental impact of wildlife, I don't believe that's been
21 proven or true. There may be areas of that, but if you look
22 at the elk numbers, they're over -- their habitat numbers.
23 The grizzlies have increased, all that during the use that
24 we're having motorized right now. And this plan actually
25 would propose even less use.

1 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Thanks.

2 So could we have you pass your microphone over?

3 KIM WILBERT: Kim Wilbert again.

4 The solution I propose: That the Record of Decision
5 should change the management prescriptions of the areas of
6 forest that are just not appropriate for motorized use,
7 whether that's because of erosion problems or because of
8 wildlife security issues, or because other recreational needs
9 need to be met.

10 Also, back to the management prescription of MA 1.3,
11 specifically the areas that I think fit those criteria are
12 Telephone Draw and Castle Rock in the Wind River District. Or
13 a broader spectrum might be lands between Wiggins Fork and the
14 East Fork, Wind River Indian Reservation boundary, and the
15 Wood River, Francs Peak areas out to the edge of the BLM land,
16 on those areas, to change those areas that have been
17 wilderness evaluation areas at least back to being
18 non-motorized prescription of 1.3.

19 I think, like Connie said, kicking this can down the
20 road to travel management phase is just being irresponsible
21 when we know these areas are not appropriate for motorized
22 use. We're just making it another problem for more meetings
23 and more wasted resources on everybody's part. So I think we
24 need to have the courage right now to do the right thing by
25 these areas and make that decision in the final Record of

1 Decision.

2 JESSICA CROWDER: This is Jessica Crowder. And
3 I guess I have Game and Fish on the phone with me here today.
4 I think Tim Woolley from there in Cody is on the phone, as
5 well as Rick Huber from the Game and Fish. And I guess I'm
6 wondering if Tim and then maybe Rick could address the process
7 that Game and Fish has already gone through a little bit on
8 this in some of those crucial winter range areas. And then
9 possible solutions at least for the South Zone area.

10 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. So can we hear from
11 those individuals?

12 JESSICA CROWDER: Do we have time for that real
13 quick?

14 RHONDA SHIPP: Yes. Let's hear from them.

15 RICK HUBER: This is Rick Huber with Wyoming
16 Game and Fish Department. And I just wanted -- possible
17 solution for the south end, especially on the Lander slope
18 area.

19 As Kim has referenced, this is something that I
20 think both the Forest Service and our department, we fully
21 take responsibility. We missed something down there on some
22 of the crucial winter range. When the draft EIS came out, was
23 going to offer those areas up for snow machine use, and it is
24 in crucial winter range, and we missed it.

25 As other parties of the forest, we work closely with

1 the Forest Service, with the counties, with the snow machine
2 clubs that are in the area. And we recognize there are
3 probably some areas on crucial winter range that some snow
4 machine use could occur. And there's other areas and some new
5 areas that we have the data, we have collaring data saying we
6 do not support continued use for the use of snow machines.

7 So the solution for the Lander area, particularly,
8 is we would like to work with the Forest Service, we would
9 like to work with the counties, we would like to work with the
10 snow machine users to see if we can come up with some areas
11 that we would continue to allow snow machine use, but at the
12 same time close some areas down that are extremely important
13 crucial winter range for several species of big game.

14 And I think there is an opportunity. The ROD has not
15 been signed, and that this could occur. And if we can't come
16 to any kind of agreement, then we -- we don't like it, but we
17 could wait until the travel management plan to occur to maybe
18 then rectify this problem that is occurring down there.

19 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Thanks.

20 Anybody else on the phone?

21 TIM WOOLLEY: Yeah. Tim Woolley, Wyoming Game
22 and Fish Department, Cody Region.

23 Just a quick comment on the North Zone of the
24 forest. Our biologist, Doug McWhirter and myself sat down
25 with Mr. Grosskopf, and we looked at snow machine

1 opportunities in crucial big game winter range, and we worked
2 closely with the Forest Service to be able to allow some snow
3 machine use in places that we thought that it was not
4 detrimental to wildlife.

5 So we worked through that process in the North Zone,
6 and there were some areas we did not want to see snow machine
7 use, and there was others that we did allow. And we
8 communicated that back to the Forest Service.

9 Thank you.

10 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay.

11 DAVE COURTIS: This is Dave Courtis, and I'd
12 like to make a comment.

13 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Go ahead.

14 DAVE COURTIS: Okay. A lot of the discussion
15 has been concern about, I think, users of motorized vehicles
16 going places where they should not go. And there's only three
17 enforcement officers on the forest. And obviously, it's
18 impossible for them to be everywhere.

19 I think it's important for the Forest to get serious
20 about enforcement. And what I propose is publicize that if
21 somebody is caught where they're not supposed to be, the first
22 time they're caught, they get a big fine. The second time
23 they get caught, they forfeit their vehicle.

24 And I think another consistent management to expand
25 the enforcement opportunities would be leveraging today's

1 technology. There are motion-sensitive cameras. And if you
2 place a camera or cameras at locations where there is obvious
3 misuse of the resource because of people going where they
4 shouldn't, that's a way to get a record, and that's a way to
5 catch people.

6 I hope that the enforcement aspect and compliance is
7 increased. And I realize that most off-road vehicle users
8 are -- you know, do what they're supposed to do. It's a small
9 minority. But let's get together and get rid of the small
10 minority by having severe penalties. And if you publicize it,
11 then people may think, "Well, I don't want to do that."

12 Thank you.

13 RHONDA SHIPP: Thank you. Okay.

14 So I saw a hand, somebody over here. All right.
15 We'll go with Connie, and then back to you, and then to Joe.

16 CONNIE WILBERT: Thank you again. Connie
17 Wilbert.

18 And I would like to propose a couple of remedies
19 which I think might help move us forward here. One of them is
20 that we've heard quite a bit about some really key, top
21 priority areas: Wood River, Francis Peak, we've already talked
22 about the Dunoir. And those are the three right there that I
23 want to focus on.

24 Recommending those areas for wilderness now would
25 provide the same solution. In other words, extending that

1 recommendation to Wood River and Francs Peak, as we have
2 already discussed earlier today about the Dunoir, it would
3 make it absolutely clear what is and is not allowed in those
4 areas, and it would preserve their wilderness characteristics
5 for the potential of wilderness designation at some point in
6 the future. That seems like a good suggestion.

7 We have had this problem that Lisa and some of the
8 others referred to where we've been assured time and again
9 over the years that these areas would be managed to preserve
10 their wilderness characteristics, and yet here we are having
11 this discussion. And it's clearly not happening under the
12 current proposal. So we believe that the most sensible
13 solution for those particular areas is a wilderness
14 recommendation going forward.

15 Secondly, coming back to the point that I made in my
16 earlier comments of the disproportionate underrepresentation
17 of non-motorized front-country availability in the South Zone,
18 I would like to propose -- or second the proposal that's
19 already been made as a potential remedy in the Wind River
20 District -- to classify the area roughly from -- there are so
21 many different ways to describe this, but I think the easiest
22 way is from the Double Cabin Road outside of the travel
23 corridor east to the Wind River Indian Reservation boundary.
24 That encompasses Wiggins Fork, Bear Creek, East Fork. Those
25 are the big drainages we're talking about.

1 The reason that we're focused on that area as a
2 potential remedy is that is the largest unroaded area that
3 remains on the Wind River District. That leaves open for
4 motorized use all the area on both sides of the highway above
5 Dubois and everything basically south of the highway right up
6 to the wilderness boundary. That's a lot of land that's
7 available for motorized use, both summer and winter.

8 The Southern Zone down in the Washakie District,
9 frankly, doesn't have any big pieces that size left that
10 aren't already roaded. And so that's why we're focusing on
11 that Double Cabin to Wind River Indian Reservation boundary.
12 It depends on exactly where you put the boundary, but that's
13 about maybe 35,000 acres. And that is a chunk of land that
14 is -- except for the access roads, which, of course, would be
15 unaffected by this, but around those existing access roads
16 it's currently unroaded.

17 It's secure grizzly bear habitat outside of those
18 access roads. It contains crucial elk winter range, contains
19 crucial bighorn winter range. It contains extremely important
20 moose habitat that is affected by winter motorized use. It
21 contains critical lynx habitat. It's a big chunk. And so we
22 would really like to see that and classify it as year-round
23 non-motorized.

24 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Thank you very much.
25 We're going to move back here to this gentleman with the

1 microphone.

2 REG PHILLIPS: Thank you. My name is Reg
3 Phillips. I'm going with Preferred Alternative G as a remedy.
4 But to address some of the issues here about some of these
5 wilderness evaluation areas, I would hope we are all beyond
6 that, because -- I mean, we would have to open up the whole
7 process again to look at some of those areas like Telephone
8 Draw and Castle Rock and some of those that I thought we were
9 way beyond that. And I just cannot see us going through that
10 without going back through a public process.

11 And some of the facts that haven't coming out is
12 that there are system roads through some of these areas.
13 They're roadless on both sides to the corridors, but there's
14 cow camps above some of these areas, these wilderness
15 evaluated areas. That would have severe impact if the
16 ranchers couldn't get to them as far as managing their
17 livestock. And it would ultimately hurt them down on their
18 lower ranges which provide a lot of winter forage for
19 wintering wildlife.

20 As far as the impacts of wildlife and off-road
21 vehicles, as one living in Dubois, I can say this: That our
22 elk herds are increasing. Our wolf herds are increasing and
23 will certainly increase some more here in the next year. Our
24 grizzly bear herd is increasing. And I know that because
25 we're seeing all these down next to town. The roads aren't

1 bothering the wolves or the bears. The elk numbers are
2 increasing to the point that they are starting to use ranches
3 for security cover from big predators.

4 So I have not -- and the Game and Fish can back me
5 up on this, because they are the ones increasing the number of
6 licenses for elk in the area. So we're not having a big
7 issue with off-road vehicles and wildlife, winter or summer,
8 on the north side of the river in the Dubois area.

9 Thank you.

10 RHONDA SHIPP: Thank you. Joe?

11 JOE TILDEN: Thank you. Okay. Thank you.

12 There's not a lot --

13 RHONDA SHIPP: Your name?

14 JOE TILDEN: Joe Tilden, Park County
15 Commissioner.

16 There's not a lot I can add to what Steve and Loren
17 and Reg have already said as a member of the SCAC, but I would
18 like to just highlight a couple points real quick.

19 Number one, I think, as remedy is concerned, which
20 is what we're talking about now, remedy to the winter and
21 summer motorized use in the Shoshone plan, I think Alternative
22 G is the alternative remedy that we should be looking at. And
23 the decision in particular on Francs Peak, Wood River area
24 should be at the planning level and not in the EIS itself.
25 And I think our comments point that out.

1 I guess the other thing I'd like to say, just in
2 closing, is the fact that my name was mentioned earlier as
3 being involved in wildlife issues for a number of years. And
4 yes, I have been. I am involved with a number of sporting
5 organizations, been the president of a few here in the state.

6 And my observations are: The blame for wildlife
7 displacement today has been placed in many respects on
8 off-road vehicle use. And my experience is that wildlife
9 displacement, in particular during the hunter season, is
10 caused by people. It doesn't make a difference how they get
11 there, whether they drive there in a truck or four-wheeler, or
12 ride a horse, snowshoe, its people that displace the game
13 animals. So anyway, I'd like to disburse that idea.

14 The last thing I'd like to touch on is the
15 wilderness issue that was just brought up as being a remedy.
16 And as Mr. Grosskopf touched on earlier, 85 percent is either
17 wilderness or roadless. And I consider roadless to be
18 de facto wilderness. And 95 percent of the people are looking
19 for their recreational opportunities on that very small
20 percentage, and I think the Forest Service is addressing that
21 need in Alternative G.

22 Thank you.

23 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Thanks. Folks, in the
24 interests of time we need to go ahead and open this up to
25 other interested -- to the interested persons and other

1 official objectors. So if there is anybody out beyond the
2 circle who is an interested person or official objector,
3 please come forward or give us a high sign.

4 JODY SUTTON: And if not, we'll continue with
5 what we have.

6 JANE COTTRELL: Actually, I'm going to ask a
7 question here. From anybody I haven't heard from that's
8 around this circle is where I'd -- you know, there's a few
9 people I've heard from a couple of times, and I would love to
10 hear from folks that have been sitting there and haven't said
11 anything.

12 HOWIE WOLKE: But you've changed the parameters
13 of what you're asking us to address. You've heard from some
14 of us on your previous question.

15 JANE COTTRELL: Okay. So if you haven't
16 discussed on the remedies, if you haven't talked on the
17 remedies. But I really would like to go to folks that haven't
18 said anything yet.

19 AUDIENCE MEMBER: We've been waiting a long
20 time.

21 JANE COTTRELL: Yeah, and he's been waiting,
22 and then I'd like to -- I mean, I want to get some voices in
23 the room a share.

24 HOWARD SANDERS: Howard Sanders.

25 In regards to the Wood River and Francs Peak, I have

1 a four-wheeler, and I've ridden snowmobiles for 45 years.
2 Today's technology, what those really are is like a magic
3 carpet ride. You can go over here, or you can go over there.
4 And in five minutes you can affect more country than I can
5 from horseback in two or three hours. And I've got some
6 horses that can travel.

7 You have to be careful, because once you make that
8 track, it never goes away. I mean, Loren just talked about a
9 road in Francs Peak that's been there since the '80s. They
10 never go away. And everybody keeps bringing them back up,
11 "Well, we traveled there once before, why can't we go do it
12 again?" So you have to be careful about making that track,
13 because it never goes away.

14 I know there's been a little talk about
15 self-policing because we don't have enough law enforcement. I
16 can tell you who you can self-police, and that is yourself.

17 A good example: I ride out in The Peaks a lot, and
18 I was out there a while back, and there's a hill that had a
19 little track over it from years ago. And I was parked on the
20 other side of that, and some folks showed up on some
21 four-wheelers, Dad, Mom, and a couple of kids, each on their
22 own.

23 Dad and Mom took the two-track, went around the hill
24 because that's where they were supposed to be. Two kids went
25 over the hill. Well, they stopped when they got where I was.

1 I happened to know them. We visited a bit.

2 So Dad thought everybody followed him around the
3 hill. He had no idea that his two kids went where they
4 shouldn't have been. Of course, they weren't going to say
5 anything about how much fun that was.

6 But my whole point is: You have to be careful where
7 you open up. And to me Alternative G has some real potential
8 to open up some wrong areas, because it's just too easy to be
9 where you're not supposed to be. So I'm an Alternative D kind
10 of person.

11 Thanks.

12 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Thanks. Let's move to
13 the back row and get some folks back there.

14 HAP RIDGWAY: My name is Hap Ridgway. I want
15 to join Marshall in thanking the Forest Service for doing
16 this. I've learned a lot today. And it's gratifying to see a
17 process like this at work.

18 Also, I've worked with the Forest Service for
19 50-plus years up in Sunlight. And all I can tell you is
20 things are better in that valley, as far as grazing and
21 habitat and the winter feed for horses -- for horses -- for
22 elk, than it was 40 years ago. So there's a lot of good stuff
23 going on. And we seem to be having them in the crosshairs
24 now, but I just want to express that appreciation.

25 I thought that this morning, on the bighorn sheep,

1 the right tone was struck. And this is where I'm a little
2 disappointed with the Forest Service. But the idea was if
3 there's -- it's really conservation. If there is any risk, if
4 there is any risk to the sheep, we are going to go out of our
5 way to protect the sheep.

6 And I think that's what's going on with the
7 cut-through we're living in, the country we're living in. If
8 there is any risk to it, let's not take that risk. Let's
9 preserve it. It may be most of the Shoshone. And that's
10 great. But most of those people, the 95 percent, are driving
11 down roads and highways. And that's great. That's a great
12 way for them to see the country. But we've got to preserve
13 the back country.

14 And I just want to tell you -- I'm sorry I'm taking
15 a long time, but I just want to tell you a story, because I
16 don't have facts and figures, but just a quick story.

17 When I was growing up, and Marshall and Dave and a
18 number of people here, Copper Lakes was sacred ground. It was
19 a long hike up there. It was tough. It was a tough go. But
20 you got up there, and you were in God's country, pure and
21 simple.

22 A few weeks ago, a few friends and I rode up Sulfur
23 Creek, which borders -- goes around Copper Lakes, up into
24 Sunlight Basin, Sunlight Peak Basin. And we were stunned when
25 we got up there toward the top to see the two tracks that

1 Howard was talking about running -- and there's a mining road
2 up there quite a ways, but then it stops. And here are two
3 tracks running right up the side of these peaks, right up to
4 the pass that looks into Copper Lakes. And those tracks will
5 be there. If they weren't touched again, they'll be there for
6 50 years scarring that mountain.

7 Sacred ground any more? Hard to say. But that's --
8 we've got to take every effort we can to conserve. Let's not
9 take the risk of soiling that sacred ground.

10 Thank you.

11 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay, folks. So we need to
12 wind down so Jane can do her summary. Remember, end point
13 first. We'll take a couple more comments.

14 Okay. So we'll go end point first.

15 HOWIE WOLKE: Howie Wolke still.

16 The remedy is a wilderness recommendation from the
17 Forest Service not just for Francs Peak and Wood River
18 roadless areas, the Dunoir, but for just about all the
19 remaining roadless areas on the Shoshone Forest.

20 It's tempting to get into a debate with some of the
21 statements that are made about the effect of off-road vehicles
22 on wildlife. Maybe you should have another forum on that at
23 some point in the future, so I won't touch that one right now.

24 I do want to say that over the years I've guided
25 probably about 600 week-long wilderness backpack trips from

1 northern Alaska to the Mexican border, but the majority of
2 them in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. And I could tell
3 you without a doubt that the healthiest wildland areas with
4 the healthiest wildlife populations, including
5 wilderness-dependent species, not just big game and their
6 winter range, are wilderness areas.

7 And the second healthiest habitats are roadless
8 areas, places that are contiguous with the Popo Agie
9 Wilderness. You've got Francs Peak, Wood River, Trout Creek,
10 roadless lands in the Sunlight Basin, the eastern half of the
11 Wyoming High Lakes. Dozens of roadless areas deserve
12 wilderness designation.

13 And I think if the Forest Service makes that
14 recommendation, let's remind ourselves that that doesn't make
15 it a wilderness. That just gives direction to Congress. And
16 if there really is a severe conflict that argues against
17 designating one of these areas as wilderness, that will come
18 up in the debates when the congressional bill is introduced.

19 But I do believe that since we have a tradition in
20 this country that human beings are considered innocent until
21 proven guilty, I think we should give that same courtesy to
22 unprotected wild lands. Recommend them for wilderness, and
23 then put the burden on other interests to prove why the areas
24 shouldn't designated wilderness.

25 Let's give future generations the gift of a Greater

1 Yellowstone Ecosystem that's not just as wild or wilder than
2 it is today, but that is the premier wildland ecosystem on
3 Earth. We still have that chance. Let's not blow it.

4 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Two more. Gentleman
5 next to him with the microphone. The blue shirt.

6 JESSICA CROWDER: Will we have another
7 opportunity on the phone?

8 RHONDA SHIPP: Don't know yet.

9 Go ahead. End point first, folks. We've got to
10 move on. So Marshall.

11 DAVID DOMINICK: This is David Dominick.

12 RHONDA SHIPP: Oh, I'm sorry, David.

13 DAVID DOMINICK: For perspective, our family
14 has had the ranch up there in Sunlight through three
15 generations, fourth one coming along, since the 1950s. We
16 have seen the Forest Service as a partner.

17 Randy Herzberg was the ranger up there. He was
18 able to be a ranger for Sunlight, Crandall. As the Forest
19 Service personnel and budgets have been cut, it shrinks. We
20 now have a ranger who is coming from Powell. And we still see
21 shrinkage in the Forest Service itself.

22 And so the tensions between use or nonuse or
23 preservation have increased with the shrinkage. And it's a
24 factor that we should be aware of and be sensitive to and be
25 good neighbors about.

1 Thank you.

2 RHONDA SHIPP: If you could pass that
3 microphone next door. There you go.

4 CATHY PURVES: Cathy Purves, Trout Unlimited.

5 Alternative G, in our comments, we actually did
6 think had a number of good attributes. However, we do still
7 feel that removing Francs Peak and Wood River from Alternative
8 G's suggestions would serve the plan and the forest
9 significantly better.

10 But as I said before, there are many good options.
11 And those options, including working the Travel Management
12 Plan and the Oil and Gas Leasing Plan and other plans. Those
13 certainly will be tiered to this plan.

14 Once you make an irretrievable commitment, which is
15 what we're doing by opening these areas, particularly these
16 very wilderness-like settings, it's something you can't take
17 back. And so the bigger picture, we are looking at landscape
18 views, to me, would be something that would include not making
19 that irretrievable commitment.

20 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. And one more back here.

21 CHARLES DRIMAL: Charles Drimal, Greater
22 Yellowstone Coalition.

23 I think it's important for the Forest Service to
24 accurately frame the roadless piece, and recognizing that fact
25 that according to the 2001 Roadless Rule, motorized use is

1 permitted on roadless lands. So when we talk about the
2 Shoshone National Forest and people say that roughly 56
3 percent of it is designated wilderness and 31 percent is
4 roadless, that 31 percent roadless land can be open for
5 motorized travel.

6 Now, the Francs Peak and Wood River Roadless Areas
7 fit into that 31 percent. And that's certainly an interest
8 for the conservation community.

9 Alternative G does not work, and here is one reason.
10 Or actually, here's two reasons why it does not work in the
11 Francs Peak and Wood River area. For winter motorized use, a
12 polygon has been drawn on the south side of the Kirwin Road to
13 open it up for winter motorized use all the way up to the
14 headwaters near Dunrud Peak and Dollar Peak.

15 Now, ironically, on the north side of this drainage,
16 which is separated by a road up to Kirwin and then a creek for
17 the rest of the ten to 12 miles up to the headwaters of the
18 Wood River, you have a non-motorized, year-round management
19 area as drawn by both Alternative B and Alternative G.

20 Can you imagine, for those of us who have been up
21 there -- many of us in this room have because we care about
22 this place -- how could the Forest Service possibly manage and
23 enforce winter motorized use when half the watershed and half
24 of a very beautiful, wide basin is open for motorized use and
25 the other half is closed? It makes no sense on the ground.

1 It is a strategy created on a computer screen to create
2 acreage available for the winter motorized community. It
3 doesn't make sense. You can't manage it.

4 And many of us -- and there is examples of this
5 strategy employed in Montana where half a watershed is open
6 for winter motorized use and half is not. But those are
7 places where you have really steep terrain and you have a very
8 defined drainage. It also clearly impacts the wilderness
9 potential for those areas.

10 The Wood River is not a steep drainage. In its
11 headwaters, walking up from Kerwin to Dunrud and Dollar Peak,
12 it is a shallow and beautiful, wide basin. It's also all
13 winter range.

14 Now, the Forest Service and Game and Fish, when they
15 worked through their planning, recognized that roughly 80 to
16 85 percent of the forest is winter range. So clearly, that
17 was not an easy litmus test to use for managing winter
18 motorized use. And the agencies both decided to go with
19 crucial winter range as areas for taking out or managing
20 winter motorized use. So that's one reason.

21 Another thing that happens on the summer motorized
22 piece for both the Francs Peak and Wood River Roadless Areas
23 is that the wildlife values that we've talked about in this
24 room, grizzly bears and the numbers of 40 or 43 on Francs Peak
25 proper, they don't stay up on those high, talus peaks for the

1 whole summer. They are back and forth and move diurnally from
2 the low elevation to the high elevation.

3 There is plenty of scientific research out there
4 that's been peer reviewed in all the major universities across
5 this country that show a negative relationship between
6 motorized use and wildlife, whether it's bighorn sheep, elk,
7 or grizzly bear. And these are some of the -- these are the
8 prime, iconic species of the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem.
9 And they are all concentrated right in this area.

10 It's a remarkable place. All of us who have spent
11 time there recognize this. And for that reason, we need to
12 elevate the conversation and elevate the importance of this
13 place and recommend it for wilderness.

14 There is no other place in this world, arguably,
15 where you can find 40 grizzly bears in a terrestrial
16 environment, not an aquatic environment, all congregated in
17 one place at one time.

18 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Folks, we're out of
19 time, but we're going to go ahead and take one more comment
20 from Jessica. I think that was you on the phone. We'll take
21 that comment. And then Jane is going to share with you what
22 she has heard from you to this point.

23 So, Jessica, please.

24 JESSICA CROWDER: Thank you. Jessica Crowder
25 of Governor Mead's policy office. I just wanted to make a

1 couple of comments.

2 The first is to clarify on the South Zone of the
3 forest, Rick Huber spoke to you of a possible process for
4 that. And I just wanted to make a quick clarification on
5 that, that that process that he was talking about could
6 include more than just local elected officials. It could be a
7 larger conversation with others of the public as well.

8 And then I wanted to talk a little bit about
9 wilderness. I'm sure several of you know and have seen the
10 governor's letters. Repeatedly, the governor has said that he
11 does not support designation of additional wilderness on the
12 Shoshone National Forest through this process. But that
13 doesn't mean that the governor is not interested in coming to
14 some compromises, particularly in areas like Francis Peak and
15 the Wood River area. I know there's some interest in how we
16 make sure that trails are in the right places and that back
17 country continues to exist in that area.

18 So I just wanted to reiterate what is already said
19 in the letters, and then let the group know a little bit about
20 some of the governor's thoughts about how we might reach some
21 compromise in these areas.

22 RHONDA SHIPP: Thank you, Jessica.

23 And we'll turn it over to you, Jane, for conclusion
24 on this one.

25 JANE COTTRELL: Okay. Well, when I asked you

1 for more information, you've definitely provided it. I'm not
2 going to hit every single point, so I'm going to try to do
3 this very high-level. I think I'm at like ten pages on this
4 topic. So, yeah. There is a lot of passion in this room.

5 I heard a lot about Wood River, Francs Peak, and
6 really some questions about what specifically are under
7 management of those. I heard the four priority areas that
8 were laid out. That included Trout Creek and Telephone
9 Draw -- I'm sorry -- Castle Rock and Telephone Draw in
10 addition to those two.

11 One thing that really stands out for me through this
12 conversation is that there is, if you will, an error, some
13 discussion that has to happen with Wyoming Fish and Game about
14 that South Zone, about what really -- you know, what got
15 missed as crucial winter range.

16 And I appreciate you, Jessica, laying it out that
17 it's more than just the counties and Forest Service and
18 snowmobilers, but all the users interested in those areas. So
19 it does sound like there is some additional follow-up in that
20 area.

21 I've heard a range of -- even if it's -- if it's not
22 recommending wilderness, then back to MA 1.3 for those four
23 priority areas, to recommending wilderness.

24 And I did definitely pick up on: What about
25 recommendation of wilderness in this plan? That had not been

1 part of my -- what I picked up around the motorized use
2 earlier.

3 All of you brought quite a bit of information. It's
4 not just about the iconic species. You know, it's more. It's
5 soil, water, the bird species, the aquatic species, the
6 ecosystem itself. And I don't think there's a single person
7 in this room that would say, you know, this isn't an iconic
8 landscape in this entire country. Because clearly it is.

9 I want to also, in some ways, welcome you to the
10 dilemma of managing this landscape, and that there are so many
11 interests in what happens with this landscape and what the
12 future of this landscape is. At the same time, we often wish
13 that youth would unplug and plug into nature, and then we
14 start to go, wow, can we manage more people plugging into
15 nature?

16 And all of you brought perspectives to the table. I
17 clearly heard, you know, Alternative G and maybe even
18 Alternative G.1 with, well, what about G with some
19 modifications around Francs Peak and Wood River.

20 This is a tough one. You know, how do you allocate
21 or zone, perhaps, different uses across this landscape? What
22 are the highest and best uses into the future?

23 And I got to tell you, this is one I don't think
24 there is an easy remedy on. But there is definitely a couple
25 of areas where it warrants a little closer look before we go

1 to that final decision.

2 And I did hear, you know, there is a role for the
3 forest plan in the zones. In other words, what are those
4 appropriate uses? And there is a role for travel planning.
5 And specifically within that landscape, then, where do you
6 allow what kind of uses? If it's allowed in the forest plan,
7 then where do you allow it within that landscape? Because it
8 isn't every acre.

9 And so I've got to tell you, I think that there is
10 still a tough row to hoe with travel planning. It's probably
11 the most difficult, way more difficult than forest planning.
12 And I know you guys have hung in there for ten years, but it's
13 way more difficult when we step into travel planning.

14 So I don't have any answers for you today. You gave
15 me a lot of things to think about, to look closer into. I
16 appreciate the folks who brought the statistics, who brought
17 the overview. And I also appreciate the people who brought
18 the stories, the memories, and the heart.

19 So if there is -- you know, I guess, at this point,
20 you know, I've got a lot of notes, a lot of things to think
21 about, a lot of things to work with my advisory team on in
22 that recommendation or in those -- to the deciding official.
23 And I don't have a specific answer for you, but I appreciate
24 it.

25 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. As we sunset this

1 particular topic, I want to thank all of you for hanging in
2 there with us. It's been kind of a long day. So we really
3 appreciate your attention and alertness and participation on
4 this particular issue.

5 The next thing on our agenda is an open time, taking
6 your additional remedies for other objection topics. And,
7 Jane, if you would, could you just set the stage on this one
8 for what you're looking for? Because we only have 45 or so
9 minutes to do this one, and we've also got some folks joining
10 us, I think, on the telephone.

11 JANE COTTRELL: So when I released the letter
12 that said, "These are the four issues that I want to talk
13 about, that I want to get some more information on," there
14 were a couple people that had responded and said, "You know, I
15 think there are some options with where our concerns are, and
16 they're not with these four topics."

17 And so I said, "I'll tell you what. What if we just
18 added a few minutes to get those into the room so they could
19 be sure that I had their issue clear?" And that's what I'm
20 offering here.

21 I'd like, first of all, objectors that had -- any of
22 the other objections, topics. And there were a lot of them.

23 JODY SUTTON: 60 of them.

24 JANE COTTRELL: Yeah, like 60. That they would
25 like -- is there something there that you want to be able to

1 clarify what your issue was?

2 And I'm going to give first stab to Continental
3 Divide Trail, who's on the phone, because they're the ones who
4 came to me and said, "I'm not going to be in the room, but I'd
5 like to clarify something." And then I'd like to pass the mic
6 in the room.

7 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. So we're going to start
8 with Continental Divide folks that are on the phone. If you
9 could introduce yourself, give us your name first, and then
10 your comment, we would appreciate that. Our court reporter is
11 taking all that information down. So we'll turn it over to
12 you.

13 JIM WOLF: This is Jim Wolf, director of the
14 Continental Divide Trail Society. I'm on the phone. There
15 may be somebody else on the phone, so let me wait and see if
16 there is.

17 GREG WARREN: This is Greg Warren.

18 RHONDA SHIPP: I'm sorry. We are really
19 having a hard time understanding you, sir. Could you start
20 again?

21 JODY SUTTON: Mr. Wolf, can you hear us okay?

22 JIM WOLF: Yes, I can hear you okay.

23 JODY SUTTON: That's perfect. Okay. This is
24 Jody. Let's see if we can hear you better.

25 JIM PRATT: Would you like me to start, or

1 Mr. Warren? Mr. Warren wanted to make sure you had his name.

2 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Let's start with
3 Mr. Warren, and we just need you to speak clearly so that we
4 can all hear you in this room.

5 GREG WARREN: This is Greg Warren. My
6 objection was filed. I have two additional. And you know, at
7 this point I will just defer to Jim Wolf, Continental Divide
8 Trail Society.

9 JIM WOLF: Okay. Let me start then. And it's
10 good to have this opportunity to engage in a dialogue
11 regarding the Shoshone Forest Plan, and particularly how it
12 affects the Continental Divide Trail, of course.

13 As you mentioned, this issue wasn't listed as one of
14 the four major topics. And we didn't know why. There seem to
15 be several possibilities.

16 From the letter, maybe it's because you hadn't
17 finalized your work. Maybe they were matters that were still
18 being fact-checked. Or maybe even you decided that everything
19 we said was well-grounded and you were just going to do
20 everything we asked for.

21 So we don't know exactly what the status is. We'd
22 like to know where we stand here. And then, with that
23 information, I think we can respond more directly to whatever
24 your understandings are, your needs are, and also if there are
25 any other things that we referred to that you're thinking

1 about raising in the decision, we would like to have a chance
2 to respond to them as well.

3 But mostly we have some thoughts on the plan that
4 we'd like to present that were not the subject of the hearing,
5 what the status is, and what your current understanding is.
6 So having a chance to bring us up to date.

7 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. So we're having a hard
8 time understanding. What is it you want from this group?

9 JIM WOLF: Well, what do you think about the
10 Continental Divide Trail, and what course of action do you
11 have in mind? So that we can -- this is a dialogue, so I'd
12 like to know why this issue was not listed as one of the four
13 major topics.

14 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Thank you.

15 JANE COTTRELL: So you're asking that we
16 clarify for you or respond to you, A, why this didn't come up
17 as one of our four major topics, and B, what the plans are
18 around the Continental Divide Trail.

19 And so I'm going to address the first one. It more
20 had to do about where there were some clarifications that I
21 was looking for in the issues that people raised. And B,
22 where there might be some potential remedies if the group of
23 objectors came together and talked about it.

24 With the Continental Divide Trail, I'm not sure that
25 that had, I would say, a large group of objectors or interests

1 about, you know, what the future of that was. So it didn't,
2 let's just say, raise to the elevation of over 70 issues that
3 we would bring to this short period of time for conversation.

4 Now, if there is some specifics that you'd like to
5 put forward about your issue with the Continental Divide
6 Trail, then I offer you to put that in the room. And if not,
7 you're asking for us to clarify what our plans are in the plan
8 for the Continental Divide Trail, we can respond to that back
9 to you later.

10 JIM PRATT: Okay. Well, let me just tell you,
11 then. And I would -- I do look forward to having the
12 opportunity to clarify for you, and I'll be available, and
13 please feel free to do that. You have my contact information.

14 At the beginning, this morning, we were all
15 objectors, you requested to start off saying just what the --
16 what the issue is, the bottom line, I might call it. So
17 that's what I'll try to do.

18 Our objection asks the Forest Service to prepare a
19 supplemental environment impact statement, and that statement
20 would cover the location and management of the Continental
21 Divide Trail.

22 Where we are today is somewhat different, as we
23 think that this procedure, the supplemental environment impact
24 statement, we can understand why that might be problematic for
25 the Forest Service. And we tried to think about dealing

1 with -- as I say, it might be problematic, because I think
2 that you're quite anxious -- and I appreciate it -- to get a
3 wise forest plan finished, done, and out and ready for the
4 next steps. A supplemental environment impact statement might
5 make that difficult to do.

6 So the way we feel right now is maybe we should
7 follow a different approach than was mentioned in our
8 objection, that would meet our substantive concerns but would
9 allow the revision to go forward without significant delay.
10 Instead of the supplemental EIS, we ask instead that both the
11 location and management issues be left for resolution in the
12 interim plan. As you recall, that's part of the Forest
13 Service Manual at 2353.44b.

14 Under that direction, a revised plan would need to
15 include appropriate statements of desired conditions,
16 objectives and standards associated with the preparation and
17 content of the plan. The decisions that are to be made in the
18 unit plan itself should not be prejudged in the revised plan
19 so as to avoid inconsistency in the Forest Service
20 regulations. What I'm talking about here is if you'll take a
21 look at 36 C.F.R. 219.15(d), that's the point I'm raising.

22 And according to much of the language in the plan's
23 description in Management Area 3.6A, the table on Page 121 of
24 the plan should be removed. These areas should be addressed
25 within the unit plan itself.

1 I'll just mention very, very briefly what our --
2 some highlights of the conditions, objectives, and standards
3 that we think ought to be part of the unit -- part of plan
4 itself. The desired condition is adherence to the nature and
5 purposes of procedure as set out in the comprehensive plan.
6 And actually, your goal MA 3.6A, Goal 1, would do this as a
7 desired condition.

8 Now, let me get to the main point. The key
9 objective would be along these lines. I'd like to read this
10 to you. And any of those -- I have other objections and
11 standards which I could provide the exact proposals to you so
12 if you miss them, I've got them.

13 JANE COTTRELL: You've written most of this to
14 us. What I'm asking you to do is clarify any additional that
15 wasn't in your written comments. Okay?

16 JIM WOLF: Okay. Well, this is something
17 that's not in our written comment.

18 JANE COTTRELL: Okay.

19 JIM WOLF: The objective would be something
20 like this: Within a period of three years from the adoption
21 of this revised plan, develop a unit plan conforming to CDNST
22 planning direction. As part of the unit plan, establish a
23 management area for the segments of the CDNST that traverse
24 the Shoshone National Forest. Rotate a CDNST segment on the
25 road only where it is primitive and offers recreational

1 opportunities comparable to those provided by a trail of the
2 designed use of pack and saddle stock. That language comes
3 directly from both the comprehensive plan and the Forest
4 Service management.

5 Now, the standards also, I will just mention one
6 standard here because it's the most critical one. Others I
7 can provide to you.

8 Until the unit plan has been developed and a
9 management area has been established thereunder, apply these
10 standards to all of the proposed reroutes depicted on Map 41
11 of the environmental impact statement for this revised plan.

12 I can stop here if you would like, but I would like
13 to emphasize that the reasons justifying the 1998
14 Environmental Assessment are no longer applicable. I won't
15 repeat that. You know what it is. It's well discussed in my
16 objection.

17 But it's time, I believe, to review roads and move
18 forward to get the Continental Divide Trail off roads, and
19 that would be a cheaper resolution that would accomplish that,
20 and I hope will be successful in doing that.

21 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Thank you very much. We
22 appreciate that.

23 The rest of you all, objectors, any other issues
24 here that you have a remedy for?

25 LOREN GROSSKOPF: Real quick, 30 seconds. One

1 suggestion, probably more than a remedy.

2 When the Forest Service planning, when it's finally
3 done, hopefully soon, can you find a way the Forest Service
4 could divert the funds they are using for the planning effort
5 and divert it to enforcement and on-the-ground work? You
6 know, we've heard a lot of conversation today about
7 enforcement issues and the lack of on-the-ground maintenance
8 of trails and roads. So I guess we would hope that that
9 funding level that's going on right now with planning could be
10 diverted to this side of the Forest Service.

11 JANE COTTRELL: You know, I love your thoughts.
12 And then I get to tell you about my friends called Congress.

13 Money in the Forest Service isn't great. It comes
14 in types of money. Congress is very specific in the types of
15 money. And unfortunately, the type of money that we use for
16 planning goes somewhere else to do that planning, because we
17 have lots of forests that need to go through forest plan
18 revisions. And sadly, they don't let us change the color of
19 that money to where we would like to use it.

20 But I do hear your concern that there isn't enough
21 funding towards enforcement. We don't have adequate staff for
22 even the educational purposes that go with that. And you, as
23 voting officials, all of you, can talk to your friends on the
24 Hill.

25 LOREN GROSSKOPF: Who would you recommend that

1 we lobby in Washington, D.C.?

2 JANE COTTRELL: I'm not going to ask you to
3 lobby anybody, because I'm not allowed to do that. But I
4 think it's sharing with your elected officials what your
5 concerns are in the State of Wyoming. How does that impact
6 the resources in the place you live? How does it support your
7 community? And those are what you know. That's why all of us
8 have elected officials in the states we live in.

9 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Other remedies?

10 *(Several people speaking at once.)*

11 JANE COTTRELL: Wait, wait, wait. We have
12 three conversations going on.

13 RHONDA SHIPP: So, Mike, we'll have you. And
14 then, Jessica, we'll come back to you.

15 So, Mike?

16 MIKE BLYMEYER: Just very quickly. Mike
17 Blymeyer.

18 Loren, in answer to your question: Cynthia.

19 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. And was that you,
20 Jessica?

21 JESSICA CROWDER: Yes, ma'am. I just wanted to
22 see if the Wyoming Department of Ag was still on the phone. I
23 think they've been hanging in there all day. So is anyone on
24 the phone from Department of Ag?

25 JOE BUDD: Yeah, this is Joe.

1 JESSICA CROWDER: Hi, Joe.

2 Joe Budd is with Department of Ag. So Joe, I think,
3 has a couple questions, won't take too much time.

4 RHONDA SHIPP: Go ahead, Joe.

5 JOE BUDD: And I'll keep it quick. One of our
6 main concerns was the suitability and capability analysis.
7 And maybe more than anything, we'd just like an update on that
8 and kind of find out -- we did provide written comment on it,
9 but we'd like a little information on that and where you guys
10 are at, if you could.

11 JANE COTTRELL: And I'm assuming for range.

12 JOE BUDD: Yes.

13 JODY SUTTON: I can answer that one if you
14 want.

15 JANE COTTRELL: Do you want to take a shot at
16 that?

17 JODY SUTTON: Joe, this is Jody. I'm your
18 objection coordinator. And we have been looking at your range
19 issues. And we have been talking to the range cons in the
20 Washington office. And they looked at everything, and then we
21 brought them back to the regional office to the range people
22 there, and then back to the Forest. And then we're going to
23 circle back one more time, because we're having a lively
24 debate over what to do about your issues.

25 So that's where we're at. And I've got another

1 couple weeks of discussions with all the cowboys, if you will.

2 JOE BUDD: Will there --

3 JODY SUTTON: So basically, hang on.

4 I'm sorry. What?

5 JOE BUDD: Will there be an additional meeting,
6 or is this --

7 JODY SUTTON: This is all an internal debate on
8 how we need to respond to your suitability, capability issues.

9 JANE COTTRELL: But we will be responding.

10 JODY SUTTON: But we will be responding. But
11 you brought up some really interesting things.

12 JOE BUDD: Thanks. Well, I guess -- yeah,
13 we'll just wait to hear from you then.

14 JODY SUTTON: Yeah. If you could hang in there
15 another 20 minutes, Jane is going to explain what's next and
16 how this is going to play out and when you'll see a response.

17 JOE BUDD: Okay.

18 RHONDA SHIPP: Could you tell us your last
19 name, Joe?

20 JOE BUDD: Budd, B-u-d-d.

21 RHONDA SHIPP: B-u-d-d. Okay. We've got it.
22 Thanks so much.

23 Have we got mics here for these two gentlemen?

24 Okay. Steve, you can go with that one. And we'll
25 get you a mic.

1 STEVE JONES: Sure. The question has come up
2 during the planning process that may tie into Loren's concerns
3 about funding, but we've repeatedly been told that the Forest
4 really can't accept outside funds and contributions, but it
5 seems like maybe you should know that we are concerned, as
6 that is a way to assist in maintaining the infrastructure and
7 maintaining and developing the policing that needs to be done.

8 JANE COTTRELL: So I think that would warrant
9 some additional conversation, because we have, across the
10 country, participating agreements with law enforcement, other
11 law enforcement agencies, including county and state. And so
12 there might be some opportunities there.

13 I'm not sure, you know, what was -- what was first
14 proposed, but I think that may not be part of the forest
15 planning process, but continued as this forest plan gets
16 implemented.

17 CATHY PURVES: Cathy Purves, Trout Unlimited.

18 Regarding your comment, Trout Unlimited contributes
19 significant financial and volunteer investments in the work
20 that they do. And we also have a Sportsmen Ride Right program
21 across the forests across other states in the United States,
22 and that might be an option. It's a policing, licensing --
23 I'm not sure. I don't work under that program. But it might
24 be an option to consider.

25 RICHARD KROGER: My name is Richard Kroger.

1 I'm a private citizen.

2 The Forest Service's EIS is totally inadequate in
3 its addressing of the wetlands on the Shoshone National
4 Forest. And the Forest Service is mandated under Executive
5 Order 11990 with the protection of wetlands.

6 And I might add that executive orders carry the
7 weight of law for federal agencies. And under that executive
8 order, it requires that all wetlands on the forest be
9 inventoried and their condition and trend be determined and
10 documented before the EIS should have even been written or
11 started to write.

12 Now, this executive order was issued in 1977.
13 They've had 37 years to do those inventories and determine a
14 condition and trend of that habitat, and they failed. The
15 only way I can see this EIS and land management plan going
16 forward, because they haven't done this, is to lay out a
17 specific process in the EIS and the land management plan about
18 how they're going to conduct these inventories, determine the
19 condition and the trend on all their wetlands in a timely
20 manner. That means on schedule.

21 And during the interim, while they're doing that,
22 they shouldn't be allowed to carry out any actions on the
23 ground until they inventory the wetlands in the area where the
24 actions take place and determine the condition and trend.

25 Now, they are in violation of the executive order.

1 I made the comments in the draft EIS. They totally ignored
2 them. And I'm willing to go to court over it, and I have an
3 agency with lawyers to do it.

4 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Thank you.

5 JOHN OSGOOD: Who do you represent?

6 RICHARD KROGER: I represent myself. I've been
7 a biologist for 50 years. I'm a certified wildlife biologist,
8 fishery scientist. And my specialty has been wetlands
9 protections for those 50 years.

10 RHONDA SHIPP: Thank you.

11 MIKE HILLIS: Mike Hillis, ERG.

12 I love wilderness. Some more than others. So I
13 understand the zeal that's been demonstrated here today.

14 Correlating wilderness to wildlife or roads or
15 motorized trails is a little stickier. And I guess, by way of
16 saying that -- Dave Burke is right. There's hundreds of papers
17 published on the effects of roads or motorized uses on
18 wildlife. They mean squat until you can zoom out and look at
19 the context of those effects at a large scale.

20 So in other words, it doesn't really matter if you
21 have a road going by a goshawk nest during breeding season if
22 you can demonstrate that goshawks at 90 percent of the
23 landscapes are doing fine and breeding successfully. So the
24 real issue when you make a determination as to wildlife
25 effects of roads or motorized trails is to take that broad

1 look.

2 I'm going to ask you today to kind of trust a lot of
3 the work that's been done. And believe me, there's no greater
4 critic of the wildlife analysis done on this forest than me.
5 I spent a lot of years doing that. But if you think about --
6 Wyoming Game and Fish spent an enormous amount of time looking
7 at every winter range, every sheep range, every motorized
8 trail. And so the analysis that went into that, it's pretty
9 solid. Doesn't mean there aren't a few tweaks that need to be
10 made, as you guys have pointed out. But trust me, they are
11 going to be tweaks rather than major shifts.

12 If you look at the grizzly bear strategy, you know,
13 the cooperation between Game and Fish, Fish and Wildlife
14 Service, and the Forest Service in terms of those strategies
15 that involve PCAs, grazing strategies, road travel planning,
16 sanitation measures, even sanitation measures on private land,
17 it's pretty guaranteed that you're going to get to a
18 non-jeopardy strategy, mostly because, as Joe Alexander knows,
19 there's nothing that's probably more vulnerable or suit-prone
20 than that issue.

21 If you look at wolverine strategies, we might -- I
22 think most of us are aware that it's a species at high risk of
23 federal listing. We might hope that we can demonstrate that
24 it's not, but most of those native den habitats are outside
25 winter motorized areas. Native den habitat is probably going

1 to be a critical part of either the recovery plan, if the
2 species gets listed, or demonstrating that it doesn't warrant
3 federal protection.

4 So anyway, I would ask those people that are
5 concerned about wildlife that -- yeah, there are site-specific
6 impacts all over the place. But on this forest, the magnitude
7 at a big scale, pretty moderate. And that explains a lot of
8 really healthy populations that you guys are privy to on this
9 forest.

10 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Thank you. Other
11 remedies?

12 GREGORY KENNETT: So thanks for holding the
13 meeting today. I've worked on the Shoshone Plan for the last
14 nine years. And I personally think there's so many -- there's
15 so many opinions and perspectives. I applaud having a cadre
16 of professionals that manage our lands, that take -- you know,
17 referees between snowmobiles and roadless, wilderness,
18 wildlife, all those perspectives. You have a very difficult
19 job.

20 I think one of the remedies to focus on the "so
21 what" that I've heard for years from the Forest Service is one
22 of the stories we saw today is a frustrated woman that got up
23 and couldn't feel like she was in a comfortable place to say
24 her piece. And I think, for a remedy, I would cultivate an
25 arena that was safe and comfortable for other people who

1 aren't so focused on one or two issues. And I think that's
2 really important to a long-term, sustainable plan that's
3 beneficial to the communities, because those resilient
4 communities include all those people.

5 So thank you.

6 RHONDA SHIPP: Sir, your name?

7 GREGORY KENNETT: My name is Gregory Kennett.

8 RHONDA SHIPP: Okay. Thank you.

9 CALLIE DOMEK: I'm Callie Domek. And I would
10 like to raise my concern with the wilderness settings in the
11 southern Fitzpatrick Wilderness Area.

12 Right now it is -- it is supposed to be managed as a
13 pristine setting. And I, in reading the forest plan, I
14 noticed for one thing that maps were not provided for the
15 settings, pristine, primitive, and semi-primitive, for the
16 public to comment on. And this drew my attention to be kind
17 of concerned as to why.

18 I'm concerned that some pristine acreage from the
19 southern Fitzpatrick has been allocated to other places
20 outside of pristine wilderness areas to make it look like the
21 acreage has actually been raised for pristine management when,
22 in fact, in the southern Fitz, I think it has been diminished.
23 And I believe this is due to lack of personnel being on the
24 ground to manage it in such a way that's pristine.

25 And I'm concerned that there is specific interest in

1 allowing a high number of permitted user days in the
2 Fitzpatrick. And this may be why this is going on as far as
3 my observations have led me to believe.

4 So I guess the remedy for this would be to not
5 diminish the number of pristine acreage in the southern Fitz.
6 And in addition to that, actually uphold the level of pristine
7 management in that area, to not degrade, as the Wilderness Act
8 states, the non-degradation policy, to keep it at that level.

9 RHONDA SHIPP: Thank you. There we go.

10 On the phone?

11 JIM WOLF: This is Jim Wolf again. Before we
12 leave, I wanted to ask whether -- on the initial comments, I
13 was told that there were some items in which the authorities
14 desired to have additional clarifications. I thought I heard
15 that. And of course, I would be happy to respond, but I'm not
16 sure I got it right, and I would appreciate a response.

17 JANE COTTRELL: So I was asking if there was
18 further clarification that the objectors would like to provide
19 to me. So I'm a little confused what -- I'm not sure what
20 you're asking for there.

21 JIM WOLF: Well, I started off asking where the
22 Forest stands, basically, and I thought -- I thought I had
23 heard that there was some issues in which you would like to
24 have more input from us. And I would be happy to do that.

25 JANE COTTRELL: Yeah. And at this point, what

1 I'm offering is if there was, from the objectors, any of the
2 additional issues that we didn't lay on the table today that
3 they wanted to provide some clarification around. So you
4 know, I wasn't going to open a whole bunch of them. I was
5 going to leave it up to the group who showed up today.

6 JIM WOLF: All right. I'll certainly send you,
7 as I mentioned before, the standards and so forth that we feel
8 are appropriate. We'll flesh out the comments that I made
9 before. I won't go over them now, but I'll send them for your
10 consideration.

11 JANE COTTRELL: And when I had started the
12 meeting, I wanted to be clear with folks, we have the written
13 comments that came, and that's why I'm asking folks -- this
14 whole day is about in addition to that.

15 So I want to ask on the phone and in the room, are
16 there any additional clarifications? I know I have tortured
17 you this entire day with these chairs, because I know I'm
18 feeling pretty painful at this moment.

19 And I guess what I wanted to close with is a couple
20 of things. The first one is: So what's next? And where are
21 my notes on what's next? I keep flipping things. Because I'm
22 sure all of you are going, okay, you told me what the process
23 was.

24 We are -- I and my advisory team are going to sit
25 down and process all of this, the transcripts, the

1 conversation, the potential remedies and develop that written
2 response to the regional forester about this plan.

3 In addition, I told you there would be some other
4 instructions that were procedural that are going to be in
5 there as well.

6 I anticipate having a draft of that response to the
7 deciding official in November. I plan to -- you know, we
8 don't want to make this last any longer than it has. And you
9 know, I assume it's going to take us a little while to get it
10 final as we go back and forth and they say, "What do you mean
11 by this?" Or, "What will meet that that you're asking us to
12 do?"

13 I'm hoping then that the regional forester -- right
14 now we are anticipating that the regional forester will draft
15 that final Record of Decision, ROD, and make it available. I
16 don't quite have a date when that will be, but I'm going to
17 guess right around the first of the year or right after the
18 first of the year. It does take a little while for them to
19 make the modifications that we're going to be directing as
20 well as developing that ROD and the responses to all of those
21 other issues.

22 You've seen the draft for these four. We have
23 another 60-some to develop that response to. And as I told
24 you, you would get -- you know, we will respond to every one
25 of these issues.

1 There was a few things that people said, "Could I
2 still send that in?" You know, "Could I give you what I meant
3 by this," or, "If I said this in my objection, and I'm
4 willing, as a remedy --" you know, like the last example,
5 instead of doing an SEIS, an example of, within three years,
6 you know, the site-specific plan, the unit-specific plan.

7 I would like any of those back or sent in -- and
8 we'll tell you where -- in the next -- within the next two
9 weeks. Is that October 18th?

10 JODY SUTTON: Yeah. No later than.

11 JANE COTTRELL: Yeah. And so that we can put
12 any of that in what we've got. I know somebody's back there
13 calculating, and all I know is it's my 28th anniversary. I
14 don't really know if that's two weeks or not, but that's how
15 you measure life, is by those memories and moments.

16 So that's the next steps. That's where we're going.

17 The last thing that I want to do today is I really
18 want to thank you for the time, energy, some of you years of
19 devotion to this unit, to your concern and care for the
20 natural resources. And anybody who gives up a beautiful fall
21 day to sit in a room or on the phone, that shows how much you
22 care.

23 And I just -- you know, I have to tell you, that to
24 me, personally, that means a lot. And I know it does to the
25 Shoshone National Forest, to the regional forester, and quite

1 frankly, to the Forest Service. Because we wouldn't matter,
2 we wouldn't be here if it wasn't for providing those resources
3 to the citizens.

4 So we need your ideas, your thoughts, your
5 involvement. The plan is the first step. The implementation
6 is going to take that same kind of energy, involvement and
7 commitment. And like I said, I hope you have the same energy
8 for the Travel Plan, because you have a very special resource
9 in your backyard.

10 So thank you.

11 *(Proceedings concluded at 5:20 p.m.)*
12 _____
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 STATE OF WYOMING)
2) SS:
3 COUNTY OF PARK)
4

5 I, Mary Meyers Barrows, Registered Merit Reporter,
6 residing in the State of Wyoming, County of Park, do hereby
7 certify:

8 That I did appear and act as reporter for the above
9 entitled matter, and that the foregoing transcript, containing
10 249 pages, is true and correct, and contains all matters
11 offered at said meeting.

12 Dated this 23rd day of October, 2014.
13
14
15

16
17 _____
18 Mary Meyers Barrows, RMR
19 Registry No. 808368
20
21
22
23
24
25