

**Land Uses Issue Team Meeting Minutes**  
**Upper Deschutes RMP**  
**December 10, 2001**

12:00PM - 3:00PM at Prineville BLM

**Attending:**

Steve Castillo  
Mollie Chaudet  
Bill Dean  
Tim DeBoodt  
Ed Faulkner  
Russ Frost  
Chad McMullen  
Terry Morton  
Stu Otto

Teal Purrington  
Wayne Singhose  
Susan Singhose  
Steve Storo  
Brigette Whipple  
Ron Wortman

**Not Present:**

Chuck Burley  
Randy Davis  
Ken Florey  
Didi Malarkey  
Bruce Thorn  
Bill McCaffrey  
Bill Zelenka

**Interests**

We discussed “OUR” interests

- ▶ Fulfill requirements set out in Taylor Grazing Act
- ▶ Protect livestock grazing (open gates and cut fences = economic losses) and wildlife from Off Highway Vehicles (OHV). Would like to see some limits on OHVs similar to limits on grazing (season and duration of use).
- ▶ Give wildlife more consideration than just “mitigation” (mitigation is consideration but only when a project is going to have some negative impacts)
- ▶ Conduct active forest management (thinning, harvesting, regeneration, fire prevention)
- ▶ Develop human/social resources.
- ▶ Preserve private landowner rights
- ▶ Keep public lands open for public use, and identify it as such (sign as public land, and remove illegal signs/gates).
- ▶ Avoid landlocked parcels (public land surrounded by private, with no public access).
- ▶ Maintain 1855 Treaty ceded rights of access to resources (water, fishing, hunting gathering, access) on private and public land. Communicate these rights. [Conf Tribes of Warm Springs Res has 10 million ceded acres].
- ▶ Pursue land acquisition/exchange to maintain/enhance treaty ceded rights.
- ▶ Provide aggregate sources for public projects.
- ▶ Provide sustainable economic viability (specifically mineral use).

The next few comments were E-mailed to Teal prior to the meeting by folks who couldn't attend):

- ▶ Provide framework for future conduct of activities within planning area
- ▶ Some areas with heavy recreational use close to population centers should not be open to mineral extraction.
- ▶ Separate incompatible recreation activities (set aside area for each activity)

We also discussed which interests might be missing from our team. For the most part, we felt missing pieces could be filled in by integrating with other teams (Team leaders can coordinate,

plus we could invite members of other teams to attend some of our meetings, and we could occasionally send representatives to their meetings). We identified that we were missing **other tribal interests** (only had a Conf Tribes of Warm Springs representative, so need Burns and Klamath). Mollie Chaudet said we had repeatedly invited them to join our process (and will continue to do so) but they had so far declined. Mollie and Brigitte Whipple planned to discuss this topic further, as team felt it was important to have these folks represented on our team. We also identified **law enforcement** as a missing resource, and decided that we would recruit someone to serve this need on a consultant basis. Environmental groups was another missing piece. Mollie again mentioned that they have been offered but declined seats on the Issue Teams. At this point, we decided we would direct them to our web site, keep them apprised of what we're doing, and continue to ask for their input.

**Ground Rules**

We didn't get to them at this meeting, but will put them on the agenda for next time.

**Issue Descriptions**

Mollie provided a handout, and explained what we need in an Issue Description for the EIS/RMP. She cautioned that we shouldn't get too caught up in the details.

We then discussed grazing, timber, and mineral issues to determine if the description in the AMS covered all aspects of these issues, or if there were parts we needed to add.

<b>Livestock Grazing Issues</b>	
<b>Issues identified in AMS (pages 161-162)</b>	<b>Discussion at 12/10/01 meeting</b>
Need to resolve conflicts between livestock grazing and other uses on public land	This includes conflicts with OHVs, also with tribal ceded land rights.
Need to resolve conflicts between livestock grazing and adjacent private land	
Need to update grazing management goals (listed on page 223)	
Need to consider voluntary permit relinquishment	Teal mentioned that we will factor in permit relinquishment when considering "retiring" allotments, but that there will need to be other factors, too.

<b>Issues NOT specifically identified in AMS</b>	
Cattle on creeks	Teal said BLM believes there is adequate existing guidance to allow us to resolve this issue, therefore it is not listed as an “Issue” in the AMS.
Impact on vegetation	Same discussion as above. Bill Dean and Teal briefly explained Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management (S&Gs), which is a large part of the existing guidance that BLM feels adequately addresses this issue.
Impact on fuels	Need to coordinate with Ecosystem Health team on this issue.
Priorities for completing S&Gs	Tim DeBoodt brought this up. Teal agreed this could probably be considered or mentioned in EIS/RMP.
Forage allocation	Teal said this is a site-specific decision, and we will not have the data (or time to collect or analyze it) for this process. Allocation decisions can only be made after completing S&Gs for the allotment.

## Commercial Forest Use Issues

<b>Issues identified in AMS (page 160)</b>	<b>Discussion at 12/10/01 meeting</b>
Fire Hazard	
Forest & Woodland Health	Steve said this includes wildlife habitat, insects and disease, thinning for target densities, planting, and special forest products.
<b>Issues NOT specifically identified in AMS</b>	
Haul access to private land across BLM	
Conflicts between commercial forest use and adjacent private land, and between other uses of public land	

<b>Minerals Issues</b>	
<b>Issues identified in AMS (page 161)</b>	<b>Discussion at 12/10/01 meeting</b>
Which areas are open or closed	This is probably an alternative
In open areas, what considerations are needed	What conditions would preclude mineral material development in certain areas
<b>Issues NOT specifically identified in AMS</b>	
Resources exist, but have not been developed	Steve Storo said, at this time BLM has no applications on file for mineral material site development within the planning area.
Conflicts with people's values	This is an issue, we need to pull this info in from the other issue teams, regarding where exactly the conflicts are.

We agreed to finish Minerals issue discussion at our next meeting, and start/finish discussion of the remaining issues: Use Authorizations, and Unauthorized Occupancy and Use.

Our next meeting is: **Monday, January 7<sup>th</sup>, 12:30 - 3:30 PM**  
at the Prineville BLM

Agenda: Establish Ground Rules  
Further refine Issue Descriptions (brainstorm changes, make recommendations)  
Analyze public comment on AMS