

In cooperation with:



Idaho Water
Resource Board

&



Henry's Fork
Watershed Council

Henrys Fork Basin Study

Meeting Summary: Workgroup Meeting 3

October 25, 2010

Meeting date: October 19, 2010

Summary prepared by: John Petrovsky (JPA)

Attachments:

1. Meeting agenda (for the Henrys Fork Basin Study item included as part of the regular Henry's Fork Watershed Council (HFWC or Council) meeting agenda for October 19, 2010)
2. Reclamation PowerPoint presentation
3. Core Workgroup input form
4. Issues, opportunities, constraints and ideas identified by meeting participants

Introduction

As noted above, the discussion of the Henrys Fork Basin Study (Study) summarized herein was conducted as an agenda item during a regular meeting of HFWC. The HFWC has agreed to provide a forum for Stakeholders to participate in the Study. The Council and other interested stakeholders represent the Study Workgroup.

This meeting summary is organized according to the headings/topics listed in the Study meeting agenda (Attachment 1). Attendance at the meeting was recorded on the sign-in sheet prepared by the Council.

Reclamation began the meeting with a PowerPoint presentation by Bob Schattin. John Petrovsky then facilitated discussion aimed at identifying the list of issues, opportunities, constraints and ideas that should be considered in the Study. Mr. Petrovsky also provided the meeting wrap-up.

Status Review

Bob Schattin presented several slides reiterating the purpose and objectives of the Study, the commitment to and intent of the collaborative process being conducted with the HRWC. He also provided an overview of Study progress by Reclamation since last meeting with the Council. The substance of Bob's presentation is reflected in the slide presentation, included as Attachment 2.

Refined Study Process and Schedule

Bob presented additional detail related to the next steps in the Study process and schedule for accomplishing these steps. At present, Study process and schedule are defined through a preliminary identification of alternatives, selecting ~10 of these for reconnaissance-level study, and conducting the reconnaissance study itself. He also noted that a technical support team has now been assembled to provide data, interpretation of other relevant and related studies (both previous and ongoing), help define alternatives from a technical standpoint, and conduct the reconnaissance evaluation. As above, the substance of Bob's presentation is reflected in the slide presentation, included as Attachment 2.

Solidification of Workgroup Process

Bob Schattin and John Petrovsky presented a refined workgroup concept, centered on a core group of participants representing the full spectrum of stakeholders in the Study process. This core group would

still be under the auspices of the Council, but would be intended to ensure (as much as possible) that: [1] all key stakeholder groups participate in the process—per direct invitation by Reclamation (as compared with the more ad hoc attendance of groups at Council meetings under normal conditions), and [2] that there is continuity in stakeholder participation, with designated representatives committed to attend each meeting (thus participating in each step of the process and aware of all background as decisions and recommendations are made). Additional detail on the core group concept and process is provided in the slide presentation (Attachment 2) under the following headings:

- Reasons for a core group
- Core group composition (preliminary listing of involved agencies, districts, jurisdictions, and other organizations—for review and comment by the Council)
- Expectations, role, responsibilities
- Core group formation process
- Meeting schedule and content (core group meeting dates and the steps in the planning process that will be addressed at each meeting)

Bob and John requested that Council members in attendance review the preliminary listing of core group participants (as presented in the slide show and provided as a meeting handout), and provide input within the next week related to [1] the completeness of the list (are there any key stakeholders missing from the list) and [2] specific individuals suggested to represent each stakeholder/constituency (see Attachment 3). Reclamation will then finalize the core group list (in consultation with Council leadership) and send invitation letters. The intent is that the next meeting will be conducted using the core group model (i.e., starting with the next meeting, Study-related discussions will still be part of regular Council meetings and all interested parties will still be welcome to attend; however, the mode of participation will shift to a focus on core group discussions, with opportunities for comment by other attendees provided at the end of the agenda or at other appropriate points).

Discussion

John Petrovsky facilitated discussion to identify the issues, opportunities, constraints and ideas that should be considered in the Study. The results of this discussion are provided in Attachment 4. This listing will be the focus of the next meeting, at which discussion will center on [1] the completeness of the list, [2] translating this list into a set of goals and objectives for the Study, and [3] defining the criteria by which alternative actions will be judged and compared (i.e., how the relative success or failure of alternatives in achieving the goals and objectives will be judged).

Wrap-Up

John wrapped the meeting up by reiterating the request for input on core group participation, confirming that the next meeting will be on November 16, 2010 (same time and location), and reminding the group of the lines of communication available via Reclamation's website for the Study. Bob Schattin and Lesa Stark thanked Council members for their participation and commitment to continuing collaboration in this Study.