

Notes from June 16-17, 2004 IWG meeting in Buffalo

Action items from flip chart:

- IWG to meet for outyear budget planning once summaries are completed.
- Meet with ICC to brief on progress and funding needs.

Water Task Group presentation

Tasks to complete:

- Need to come to a consensus on metals and suspended sediment.
- Need to summarize costs
 - By priority
 - What's currently funded by agency?
 - What's needed?

Suggestion - Include someone from Montana to participate on the WY state shallow groundwater group.

Suggestion – Use the outcome of the WY state group as the monitoring plan for shallow groundwater.

Suggestion – Look at developing real time reporting capability for data to allow for quick response for adaptive management.

Air Task Group presentation

Little progress has been made. Need to have agencies (Forest Service and Park Service) provide information that TG asked for in the questionnaire that was circulated.

There was some discussion about modeling and where it fell in the list of priorities. Consensus was that completion of the monitoring work was most important at this point.

Decision – Write a letter from ICC or State BLM Directors asking the Forest Service, Park Service and tribes to participate.

Include particulates in MT. (Didn't capture the full nature of this. Please help if you can fill in the blanks)

BLM MT needs to designate an air representative.

Wildlife Task Group presentation

Presentations made by Tom Bills and Dale Tribby

Tasks to complete:

- Need to Summarize costs
 - What is currently being funded by agency and what are costs of additional needs also need to prioritize the program.

Aquatics Task Group presentation

Presentation made by Bob McDowell

- (1) Are any of the research projects funded and how will they be funded?
- (2) Has the team looked into the EMAP program?
- (3) Water group monitoring stations may not be good for aquatic monitoring because of access problems.
- (4) NRCS may be able to use current water quality stations for aquatic life monitoring.
- (5) Did we prioritize watersheds?
- (6) Where will we get the funding for the monitoring?
- (7) EPA still has money available for funding.
- (8) The aquatic task force may have to make presentations to potential funding partners.
- (9) The Aquatic task Force may need to adjust the budget.
- (10) The IWG indicated that they will proceed with the monitoring plan as is and will present the costs to ICC at their next meeting.

Carol Campbell will check on possibility for funding of aquatic research proposals.

Decision – Take the full aquatic monitoring plan proposal to the ICC.

TG needs to look at prioritizing proposed elements.

Other Business

Vegetation/Reclamation Task Group

Presented by Bruce West

Talked about the need to establish a Task Force Group for veg. monitoring and reclamation. Several mitigation/monitoring elements were identified in the ROD.

USGS is currently doing some veg. work. Hope to utilize some of the outcome from their work to incorporate into a monitoring plan. BLM BFO will be developing a monitoring plan. Asked other agencies if they were interested in being a part of. No interest other than that from USGS was expressed.

Sheridan Co. Proposal

Presentation by Mickey Steward on behalf of Sheridan Co. to have the IWG sanction an Infrastructure Task Group.

Decision – table until Mickey checks with all four counties to see if all are in support of such a group. Mickey was to get back to Paul by the end of the month to let us know. IWG will then decide how to proceed.

Decision each task group needs to provide a summary of their monitoring plan so that they can be used for a presentation to the ICC.

Suggestion from Jill Morrison with Powder River Basin Resource Council –

Each task group should outline the flow mechanics when a threshold is reached. In other words how will the initiation of adaptive management occur? What steps will be taken.

Decision: For all task groups, need to summarize costs. What is currently funded and by which agency. Show what is from base funding. What is not funded? Need to prioritize monitoring tasks. If XX amount of money becomes available, what should be completed? What could be done if additional money becomes available in FY 2004? What are needs for 2005, 2006 etc?

Once identified refinements by the task groups are made to the monitoring plans, Paul will combine the plans and post on the web site. The refinements consist primarily of:

- cost break down,
- identifying priorities
- better describing thresholds and actions scenarios when reach thresholds

Notes taken during the meeting:

Water Task Group presentation presented by Andy Bobst, BLM Miles City and Melanie Clark, USGS

Additonal constituents 2per year at high and low flow. Only two new sites. Most are being done with existing money. USGS money is base funding. \$800,000 dollars was add on for the Tongue.

Shallow ground water and deep well monitoring will now be completed.

Suggestion – Use the work the WY DEQ shallow GW group will produce as at least a start for the portion of the monitoring plan.

PAW had 38 sites. Most of those now have been picked up by WY DEQ.

NPDES data on constituents is not the same as that recommended for the monitoring plan. There is not the full suite of metals for NPDES so, data will not be comparable.

Air Task Group presentation – Presented by Dave Klemp and Cara Casten

Group only working on task number 1 of work plan. There were several sub-tasks under task #1. The Group is way behind schedule. Not all members responded to the questionnaire on historical monitoring and active monitoring sites.

Group is having difficulty with participation. No tribal participation.

Only two or three people attending task group conf. calls or meetings.

Wildlife Task Group presentation: Presented by Tom Bills, BLM Buffalo and Dale Tribby, BLM Miles City

Action item - Need to consolidate MT and WY plan.

Triggers may need more definition.

Question on take – cause and effect on mortalities.

Aqautics Task Group presentation:

Published developed protocol. Is it necessary?

Water quality sites may not be the best for habitat. The access agreement that GS has may not be applicable for biotic work. There may be issues with landowner and data being made public.