

**Bear River ECC
Final Meeting Notes
June 21, 2017
Grace, Idaho**

ECC Members Present

Mark Stenberg, PacifiCorp
 Jim DeRito, Trout Unlimited
 Corey Lyman, U.S. Forest Service
 Cary Myler, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Teuscher’s proxy)
 Lynn Van Every, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality
 Ryan Beatty, Bureau of Land Management

Others Present

Matt Lucia, Sagebrush Steppe Land Trust
 Kelly Conde, Sagebrush Steppe Land Trust

This meeting was preceded by field review of the Bonneville cutthroat trout broodstock pond construction near Grace Power Plant. Site visits to Nounan Road bridge and the Bartschi property followed.

Commitments Made at the June 21, 2017 Meeting	
All	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • August 16 – Lower Gentile float trip
Stenberg	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investigate the possibility of drawing Kackley down periodically to encourage growth of cattails and other riparian vegetation. • Distribute table from today’s partnering presentation to the ECC. • Redline and distribute edit to project proposal form. • Set up Google doc/pages for Kackley. Post management plan. ECC members will need a gmail account. • Obtain further information on Wheelan Ditch when the opportunity arises. • Continue to work with Paris Relief on water swap.
Myler	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forward Fox draft conservation easement to the ECC for information purposes. • Keep Stenberg apprised of progress on Fox conservation easement closing. He will need about a one-month notice to obtain PacifiCorp approval.
Van Every	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check on status of Gilbert project
Lucia, M.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forward project application for SSLT annual funding to Stenberg.
Action items in blue have been carried over.	

Decisions Made By Email Since Last Meeting

None

Decisions Made at This Meeting

- Approved Sagebrush Steppe Land Trust's (SSLT) annual funding request in the amount of \$35,000 pending receipt of project application¹. Funding amount reflects a \$5,000 increase based on five-year review.

Previous Meeting Notes and Action Items

April meeting notes were approved without changes.

Action Item Review

Improvements at Kackley – Stenberg discussed that he was getting some pricing to plant black hawthorns and remove Russian olive trees. This is being scoped to proceed over several years with the project removing a group of Russian olive trees each year and replacing them with black hawthorn. Project will include exclusion fencing and irrigation water supply from Kackley Creek.

Dead Horse Spring - Stenberg said the spring looks good and lots of beaver are at work in the project area. He noted the presence of white top at the site.

Myler asked about drawing Kackley down occasionally to encourage growth of cattails, etc. He said he thinks they are being flooded out now. Stenberg said that may be possible. Removing the boards would take the level down about 6 inches.

Paris – Stenberg said the irrigation company is still interested in moving forward but has not found a time to meet for further discussion.

Cove Reconnect – Stenberg said this project was discussed during field review earlier in the morning.

Fox Conservation Easement– Myler said Fish and Wildlife Service has completed its draft conservation easement. He will forward it to ECC members for information.

Project Proposal Form – Stenberg is working on updates to the ECC's project proposal form. The updated form will be posted to the ECC's website when complete.

Project Updates

Stenberg noted that the planned LiDAR flight discussed at the April ECC meeting took place in May. Stenberg said he expects to see data from the flights in August.

Travis Gilbert – Mainstem fencing, etc. Van Every will check in on this project, which was an ECC habitat enhancement project a year or two back.

¹ See Land and Water Fund Updates

Working Culture and Decision Making – Stenberg

Stenberg shared a presentation on team relationships and negotiation with the ECC. He said he had professional training and experience in partnering, and is continuing to learn. The presentation included a table (see Attachment 1) describing team relationship levels, which he will distribute to the ECC.

Stenberg asked ECC members what level they think the ECC is. Lucia said he sees some level 3-4 components. Lyman said there is variability. Myler said fish screens are a good example of shared risk but some projects aren't at the highest level. Van Every said most people in this group are resource professionals, so we don't often see obstructionism. DeRito noted that the ECC started out as a Level 1 negotiation but has come a long way since then.

The ECC adjourned to closed session for land and water fund updates.

Lower Gentile Float: August 16, 2017

Next Regular ECC Meeting: September 20, 2017

Attachment 1: Table from Partnering Presentation

Team Relationships and Decision Making

1.1 Level of Formal Governance	1.2 Representation of Goals and Interests. 1.3	1.4 Communication Style and Culture	1.5 Problem Solving Approach	1.6 Outcomes
2. Competitive and Distributive Decision Making (Level 1)				
May be lacking.	Each Party works to further their own goals and interests. Little insight is offered between Parties.	Formal and guarded. Unspoken assumptions may rule discussions. Positional statements obscure true interests.	Distributive and often litigious. Can continue or create new disputes. Upper level management and legal is often needed for resolutions. Can result in "political" decisions.	One party may win this "round". Some or all Parties may be dissatisfied. Can create or perpetuate a climate of gamesmanship or severely hamper future discussions.
3. Collaborative Team (Level 2)				
Defined protocols, may include meeting notice, agendas, facilitation, what is needed for decisions (quorum etc.), what decisions the group can make, note taking and dispute resolution process.	Each party commits to being transparent about their interests. Larger Goals may not be known.	Significant energy is expended by all Parties to understand each other's interests.	Typically resolved with some degree of compromise. "I can live with it if you can".	Resources of all Parties are conserved and acceptable solutions are found. Door is open to working together in the future.
4. Interest Based Team (Level 3)				
Shared Goals are added to Governance. Could be a Plan.	The team has established a shared set of goals that support the stated interests of the Parties.	A culture of support and long-term relationships is adopted.	Merged insights from people with different perspectives work on interest based solutions.	Resources of all Parties are enhanced. Parties look forward to working together again.

5. True Partnership (Level 4)

<p>Shared risk is added to Governance or culture at this level (not necessarily monetary, may be accountability for outcomes).</p>	<p>In addition to the shared set of goals. The Goals and Interests of all Parties are known.</p>	<p>Extensive communication/listening, collaboration & commitment to the partnership. Accountability to outcomes and each other is collective among all Parties.</p>	<p>All Parties work creatively and openly in trusting environment. Novel interest based solutions can be explored. Members exhibit a high level of discipline and work ethic.</p>	<p>Benefits are beyond those thought possible for all Parties.</p>
--	--	---	---	--