

**Northeastern Nevada Stewardship Group  
SAGE GROUSE POD MEETING  
Minutes for October 12th, 2005**

In Attendance: Gary Back, Doug Clarke, Ken Wilkinson, Shane DeForest, Larry Hyslop, Ken Gray, Larry Gilbertson, Dwayne Winslow, Michelle Caviness, Debra Howes

**SEPTEMBER MINUTES**

Gary began the meeting with a call to review the September minutes. The minutes were approved.

**MIDAS POTLUCK REVIEW**

Gary briefly reviewed the Midas potluck events and reported that the attending residents showed interest in the watershed and fire prevention with particular interest in the impact of the recent Esmaralda fire. Shane DeForest reported that Joe Freeland and Helen Hankins from the BLM would be getting back in touch with the area residents for conflict resolution regarding the fire.

**WATERSHED ASSESSMENT PROCESS**

**ELKO COUNTY SAGEBRUSH ECOSYSTEM CONSTRATEGY**

Ken Wilkinson expressed concern about how the process would affect private land owners. Gary Back explained that the process would not undo allotment evaluations or the multiple use process. The focus of the watershed is to consider whether the processes are functioning-and if not why? We need to be ahead of the process so recommendations can be included as well as tie private lands into the process. The Esmaralda fire may affect the process and add constraints.

Doug expressed concern about the need for the pod to produce results. The PMU plans were perhaps an interim approach. Despite his frustrations he still felt we could see improvements in the watershed.

Shane stated he felt it was important to connect everything (holistic look)-not single goal oriented. He questioned what is expected? The first step would be to gather information and then discuss/assess/evaluate. Doug felt that there is lots of data, however the group needed someone to assimilate the data (GSI based-although there is a system currently in place)

Larry Hyslop felt that there needs to be a consensus among the various groups or a plan on who is going to do what.

Dwayne stated that agencies will generally fund individual projects such as surveys or ground work so perhaps a memo of understanding needs to be presented to the upper level of the agencies.

Gary stated the first step was to get buy in for the strategy-get agreement about the process, and then look for other sources of funding. The group needs to get backing of local groups and community representatives.

Doug questioned whether agencies or mines could help fund part of the process. The group needs to write a strategy, present it to PLUAC, and then go to the county commissioners. We are not ready to start the process-we need funding first.

Ken reported that through the allotment evaluations we already have some information (ie. roads). The PMU write ups also have information that could be used.

Shane asked if the pod had already looked at a completed watershed plan. He recommended getting a couple representative copies to kick off the steps and the mechanics would follow. He previously had reviewed plans from Salmon, Idaho; Dillon, Montana; and Lakeview, Oregon. The plans were useful to provide an outline-something to start modeling. Shane volunteered to find a copy for the group to review.

Larry Hyslop questioned if the agencies were in line with this-were they committed to the watershed process? He would like to have an agreement written between the agencies. Gary stated that he thought an agreement had been drafted around 1999-2000. He recommended having Leta look up the draft, and then perhaps the board should meet with the powers that be and have a discussion about the level of commitment. He also stated that the group should focus on getting support from the county. The group continued to discuss the need for agreement between the agencies and finding funding sources. Larry volunteered to research funding sources. Shane felt it would be difficult to find funding to fund a plan. The group then briefly discussed the Great Basin initiative and its positive/negative aspects.

The group continued to discuss the need for agreement between the agencies and finding funding sources. Larry Gilbertson stated that NDOW was committed and felt that if the other agencies were committed then the group needed to find funding and an individual to spearhead the process. Gary stated that the initial concept was not to put an additional load on the agencies. He agreed that the pod needed an individual to ramrod the process and have access to agency data. The agencies would participate by coming to the table and review projects. Funding was a critical thing. Larry reviewed the idea to have an academic group review the data as previously discussed in the September meeting. The group continued to discuss the need for agreement between the agencies and finding funding sources.

#### TUSCARORA PMU/NORTH FORK PMU

Larry reported that Ken Wilkinson had developed maps and helped to fill in tables for the PMU draft. There is still a need for projects lists (any project to improve range land and help habitat conditions) for both PMU plans.. He hopes to have the Tuscarora plan finalized for the next meeting. In total there are 10 PUM plans to write. A copy of the draft was presented to the pod, and Ken reviewed his edits/additions to the plan.

Submitted: Debra Howes  
Administrative Assistant