

Steens Mountain Advisory Council

Meeting Minutes

February 17, 18 and 19, 2004

Members Present:

Hoyt Wilson, Grazing Permittee, Princeton, Oregon
Jerry Sutherland, Vice Chair, Environmental Representative – Statewide,
Portland, Oregon
Tom Harris, Chair, Mechanized or Consumptive Recreation, Keno, Oregon
Alice Elshoff, Environmental Representative – Local, Frenchglen, Oregon
Wanda Johnson, Burns Paiute Tribe, Burns, Oregon
Stacy Davies, Grazing Permittee, Frenchglen, Oregon
Cynthia Witzel, Recreation Permit Holder, Frenchglen, Oregon
Steve Purchase, State Liaison, Salem, Oregon
Jason Miner, Fish and Recreation Fishing, Portland, Oregon
Richard Benner, No Financial Interest, Portland, Oregon
E. Ron Harding, Wild Horse and Burro, Burns, Oregon

Members Absent:

None

Designated Federal Official (DFO):

Karla Bird, Andrews Resource Area Field Manager, Burns District, Bureau of
Land Management (BLM), Hines, Oregon

Designated Federal Official Assistants:

Rhonda Karges, Management Support Specialist, BLM, Hines, Oregon
Liz Appelman, Budget Analyst, BLM, Hines, Oregon

Presenters:

Gary Foulkes, District Planning & Environmental Coordinator, BLM, Hines, Oregon
Mark Sherbourne, Natural Resource Specialist, BLM, Hines, Oregon
Evelyn Treiman, Outdoor Recreation Planner, BLM, Hines, Oregon
John Neeling, Wilderness Specialist, BLM, Hines, Oregon
Skip Renschler, Realty Specialist, BLM, Hines, Oregon
Darren Brumback, Fisheries Biologist, BLM, Hines, Oregon
Matt Obradovich, Wildlife Biologist, BLM, Hines, Oregon
Rick Hall, Natural Resource Specialist, BLM, Hines, Oregon

Facilitator:

Dale White

Commenting Public:

Bill Marlett, Oregon Natural Desert Association
Pam Hardy, University of Oregon
Jack Rinn, self
Stacy Davies, Roaring Springs Ranch
Harland Yriarte, Landowner
Susie Hammond, Hammond Ranches, Inc.
Don Renie, Landowner

Others Present:

Barb Cannady	Eric Haakenson, BLM
David Bilyeu	Bill Anderson, BLM
Walt Selisch	Erik Taylor, BLM
Josh Warburton	Mike Williams, BLM
B. Marie Jarreau-Danner, Burns Times Herald	Doug Linn, BLM
Wayne Kinney, Senator Wyden's Office	Bruce Hazen, BLM
Joe Glascock, BLM	Dave Toney, BLM
Jerry Magee, BLM, Oregon State Office	Tara Wilson, BLM
Richard Day, CRT	Jeff Rose, BLM
Darren Brumback	Kelly Hazen, BLM
Rich DeLong, Enviroscientist	Mark Armstrong, BLM
Will Sellers private	Glenn Patterson, BLM
Tom Seely, BLM	Connie Dellera, BLM
Joan Suther, BLM	Allison Linn

Welcome, Introductions, Housekeeping and Agenda

The meeting was called to order, self-introductions were made, and the agenda reviewed and amended as necessary.

Chairman Update:

None

DFO Update:

Karla welcomed the group and thanked Tom Dyer and Colby Marshall for helping get the Council members' appointments completed and noted the vice-Golden position is still being processed.

Karla hoped the SMAC could make recommendations on the information presented by her staff today so BLM could use the information while making decisions. She told the group of the large number of comments and the various types of comments received. She stated both she and her staff have read the RMP comment letters and will be presenting proposed changes to the Council today. She briefly touched on the recent newspaper articles concerning the RMP contract and the ensuing Inspector General investigation.

Karla informed members the Inholder Access Environmental Assessment is out for public comment with the comment period ending February 20 explaining it was late going public because there were still ongoing discussions with private inholders.

Followup Item: Mark Sherbourne was asked to get copies of the comment letters to SMAC.

Karla informed the Council the Public Lands Foundation presented Tom Dyer with the Manager of the Year Award. She stated the District Manager position hiring is currently being processed by the State Office.

Cindy Witzel raised a concern some of the RMP comment letters may have been intended for the SMAC and wanted to know whether or not they had been brought forward by the BLM. Karla did not know of any such letters.

RMP:

In an effort to clarify, Gary Foulkes reviewed the difference between planning decisions and implementing decisions.

Cindy Witzel reviewed the Act noting it directed development of a comprehensive land use plan and she did not feel this RMP was the type of document the Act had intended. Jerry reiterated the Andrews Management Unit did not have to be included with the CMPA (Cooperative Management and Protection Area), but BLM had decided to do it. Gary explained the reasons for it as well as the process for responding or not responding to comments. Gary also discussed the reasons the letters will not be scanned and printed with the document, which included the fact BLM received approximately 5500 letters and it was determined to be cost prohibitive to print them all. SMAC discussed the best means to have these available to those who wished to review them. Cindy again expressed concern that comments she felt to be substantive had not been addressed by the BLM. Jerry wanted to be clear that any vote he made in favor of a change meant that it was an improvement, not necessarily sufficient.

Note: In the following pages, when a reference is made to a block number and page number, it is referring to a 12- page 'Draft Changes to the Preferred (Sic) Alternative' spreadsheet used during the meeting.

RMP – Fish, Riparian, Water, and Special Status Species:

Redband Trout Reserve, Block 2, Page 1 of 12

Darren Brumback reviewed the proposed change for this subject and the background reasons for it.

Motion was made and seconded to support the change in language (Stacy moved, Jerry seconded).

Discussion: None

No objection to motion.

Consensus Decision: SMAC accept the proposed change to read: “Riparian and aquatic habitats would be managed for an advanced ecological status that provides a diversity of fish habitat

values including spawning, rearing, cover, forage, and cold-water refuge, and in accordance with the Wilderness Act and WSR Act, as appropriate.”

Karla asked if there were other issues surrounding this subject and Jerry raised the concern with the weir and how it is addressed in the RMP as “may be” removed. The answer is that much depends on discussions with other agencies – ODFW, USFWS.

Motion made and seconded to recommend BLM limit application of herbicides near perennial streams, especially those inhabited by Special Status Species, taking guidance from a recent court decision recommending aerial spraying no closer than 100 yards and 20 yards on the ground (Jerry moved, Richard seconded).

Discussion: Members discussed the various safe chemicals available and, depending on the need, which treatment would best fit and be allowable under the existing plans, regulations and guidelines. Members also raised the concerns with impacts or possible impacts on Special Status Species, Native American cultural plants, and water plants and whether or not the use of herbicides had been addressed in the Weed EIS.

Jerry withdrew the motion with Dick agreeing.

Motion made and seconded to recommend the two paragraphs on Page 2-101 in the draft starting with herbicides under 2.5.6.11 be repeated in the 2.7 Special Status Species Section (Jerry moved, Dick seconded).

Objection to the motion heard.

Roll call vote: Tom–No; Jerry–Yes; Wanda–No; Cindy–Yes; Jason–Yes; E. Ron–Yes; Dick–Yes; Alice–Yes; Hoyt - No; Harland - No; and Stacy – No

Motion failed

Motion made to recommend the same language that occurs under the Redband Trout change be used for the rest of the CMPA for fish and wildlife because part of the purpose of the CMPA is integrity (Jerry moved, Jason seconded).

Objection to the motion heard.

Motion failed due to objection.

Dick expressed concern a number of streams in the CMPA show on the chart as water quality limited and some contain Special Status Species. He felt there was not enough in the RMP to address the connection between Special Status fish and water quality limited streams.

Motion made and seconded to recommend that if one of the allotments involves land along a stream that has a Special Status fish species in it and it is on the chart and is water quality limited then that allotment be withdrawn and no further grazing take place on it (Richard moved, Jerry seconded).

Objection to the motion heard.

Motion failed due to objection.

Stacy raised a concern with the last paragraph under 3.7.3.5 on page 3-32. He felt it was extremely debatable.

Motion made and seconded to remove the last paragraph under 3.7.3.5 on page 3-32 which begins “diversions of creek flows for irrigation...” (Stacy moved, Harland seconded).

Objection to the motion heard.

Motion failed due to objection.

Motion made and seconded to recommend BLM provide for objective standards for definite triggers and responses to water quality problems. Total maximum daily loads should be developed to ensure that water quality is improved and impaired waters delisted within 10 years (Jerry moved, Richard seconded).

Objection to the motion heard.

Motion failed due to objection.

Motion made and seconded to recommend BLM manage big sagebrush community to meet life history requirement of sage-grouse and other sagebrush dependent Special Status Species (Jerry moved, Jason seconded).

Objection to the motion heard.

Motion failed due to objection.

At this time Jerry asked if we were going to continue hitting every issue every SMAC member wanted to in regards to each issue, which would take a lot of time. It was decided that if that this was would be allowed until the agenda time allocated ran out. Unfinished items would be reconsidered the last day.

Stacy pointed out that the SMAC was spending a lot of time discussing changes he and others were bound to vote against regardless of any information provided, suggesting that it would be more efficient to take a quick vote immediately at each motion, to see how many members were in this category and thus move on. All members concurred in this.

RMP–Special Status Species, Wildlife, and Wild Horse & Burros:

Where are the new sheep and goat permits in the planning area?

Block 3, Page 1 of 12

Motion made and seconded to accept the proposed changes (Richard moved, Stacy seconded).

Discussion: SMAC members reviewed the current text and the proposed changes and discussed the dangers of domestic and wild sheep mixing; what was a safe distance; how the 9-mile buffer came about and how effective it was: how to help prevent the mixing; and what can be done to prevent it.

No objection, see next motion.

Motion made and seconded to modify proposal (Stacy moved, Hoyt seconded).

No objections heard.

Consensus Decision: Recommend accepting the proposed changes with modifications as follows:

Change to read: All new grazing applications for domestic sheep and goat permits or proposed conversions of class of livestock from cattle to sheep or goats will be evaluated for consistency with the BLM “1998 Revised Guidelines for Management of Domestic Sheep and Goats in Native Wild Sheep Habitats.” These guidelines will be implemented where new permits or conversions could occur within wild sheep habitats.

Modification to be - add the following sentence:

Cooperative efforts will be made with private landowners and current sheep and goat permittees to reduce the mixing of domestic and wild sheep.” Attach this to the bottom of the change just approved

Cindy raised a question about the wild horse viewing being a part of recreation permit holder stipulations. Should it be included in the RMP as it applies to the general public? Cindy asked Matt or whoever is in charge of wild horses to decide where it needs to be placed.

Public Comment:

Bill Marlett, ONDA, wanted to pass on the information concerning the bighorn sheep pictures and to answer any questions about it. He stated one of his board members happened to be on the Mountain when the “rescue” operation for the domestic sheep was occurring. He took several pictures and Bill forwarded them to Karla Bird. Bill said the board member observed some bighorns close to the domestics which would have been a disaster. Bill cited a recent incident where there was contact made and disease was passed on causing a major die off in that wild bighorn herd. He thinks SMAC should be very concerned about it and believes it is in BLM’s prevue to be an advocate to solve the problem.

Pam Hardy, Oregon State University stated as a member of the public she is a pretty involved person and has attended numerous SMAC meetings. She would like to see the actual public comment letters to see what was originally written. She would like to see a few of those that are identical as well as the ones people actually wrote specific

comments. She thought although she didn't address her letter directly to the SMAC, the comment letters would be forwarded to them. Had she known they needed to be specifically addressed to the SMAC she would have done that. She knows she got heard as a public because of some great discussion with BLM staff as well as with Karla. She also recognizes she would not know if she hadn't come here and those particular individuals called her. She knows most people aren't going to get that kind of treatment, but would like to see that opportunity available to them as well. Although she knows she was heard, she's not sure how it got put into the document and how it was interpreted through the process. Pam requested some of the information given to SMAC for these meetings also be given the public, with reasonable limitations. This would help to make things more clear during discussions. Pam expressed curiosity about the RMP contract and asked, if possible, the discussion be held today since she can only attend for the one day.

Because there was time available members posed some questions to the speakers.

Stacy asked Bill Marlett the name of the disease or parasite Bill thought was responsible for the diseases and what percentage of domestic sheep or goats have those diseases. Stacy felt, based on conversations with people in WallaWalla, these animals mix all the time and it's not the recipe for disaster Bill has painted and it is unfair to make it such a drastic one. Bill responded that the devastation that can occur when the diseases are transferred is so great that agencies should manage in such a way that the risk is negligible. Stacy felt it would take a cooperating landowner to resolve this and the legislation does allow for Cooperative Management Conservation Easements, and wondered if this was an option to allow BLM to be more proactive on Steens and wildlife issues.

Cindy asked if it is possible for BLM to do the scanning of letters and have them available to the public. Karla made it clear the letters were available here in the BLM office to read or copy for anyone who wished to stop by. It was suggested BLM explore other means of making the comments available.

Several people expressed concerns on how to know if their comments were incorporated into the RMP. Susie Hammond asked if any notes were made as to where comments were addressed and how. Cindy asked this to be put on the agenda for tomorrow, to address how to let the public know the BLM has heard their comments.

Gary said most comments were opinions rather than substantive recommendations, so not of much value to the RMP team. Karla pointed out that opposite opinions leave BLM with no direction.

Alice felt since people had shown they care by taking the time to send a letter, she wanted to ensure these people were heard. These documents aren't public friendly and this is the only way for them to let BLM and SMAC know they care.

Jerry said that the opinions of the majority of public commenters stating support for the Steens-Alvord Coalition's Citizen's Alternative should matter, especially if overwhelming in numbers. Gary said the Citizen's Alternative was not specific, just pushing buttons.

RMP - Recreation:

Evelyn Treiman began the Recreation discussion. The group expressed concern that all the previous discussions and recommendations not be lost in the work done today.

Recreation – Block 5, 1st Recreation Block, Page 1 of 12

Motion made that the change read: BLM will develop and implement a Recreation project plan (Jerry moved).

Jerry withdrew his motion.

Cindy asked BLM if they were going to create an overall recreation plan, so the various recreation needs could be addressed in one place. She also raised the concern if a different plan was made for each project, the level of public involvement would be very much reduced because of the time.

Motion made and seconded SMAC recommend BLM make the proposed changes in each insistence under the heading of Recreation where the rationale is ‘Not an RMP level decision’. Also if the old text flowed from a SMAC recommendation at the time of the project plan, BLM give due consideration to that SMAC recommendation (Dick moved, Jerry seconded).

Discussion: Members talked of the various means of accomplishing the projects as well as the necessary documentation. Cindy pointed out the need for consistency and an overall recreation plan would be the best approach. Stacy expressed dismay by what is happening because SMAC went through days and days to get specific recommendations to allow certain activities, etc. Cindy also expressed concern only those changes in this ‘Draft Changes to the Preferred (sic) Alternative’ document would be included in this motion where she would rather see the entire recreation program be addressed as one unit.

Objection to motion heard.

Roll Call Vote: Tom - Yes, Jerry - Yes, Wanda – No, Cindy – No, Stacy – No, Jason - No, E. Ron – No, Dick – Yes, Alice – Yes, Hoyt – No, Harland – No.

Motion failed.

Motion made that SMAC recommend adding the words “A site-specific project analysis would be performed prior to construction and following all priorities of NEPA” (Stacy moved).

Motion died due to lack of a second.

Motion made and seconded for SMAC to recommend BLM revert to the old language which implies site-specific analysis would be done on everything (Jerry moved, Stacy seconded).

Discussion: Members reviewed what had been originally agreed to and where it fits with what is presented here.

Motion withdrawn (Jerry withdrew, Stacy agreed)

Motion made and seconded to accept the changes so it becomes an EA (Jerry moved, Tom seconded).

Discussion: It was felt to be important to recognize what people had input so far and to take it into consideration when developing an overarching recreation plan.

No objection to motion.

Consensus Decision: Accept the changes as presented and to read: “Develop and implement a Recreation Project Plan to address trailheads, connector trails, health and safety, and other facilities in the South Steens Campground area.”

Recreation: Blocks 1 and 2 top of Page 2 of 12:

Members discussed the need for a group campsite, how it could be utilized and where it would best be placed. Cindy raised the concern that not having a group campsite could push a lot of the public use on private lands, even though the private landowners had been allowing it. It seems like there should be a place on public land that could accommodate the need.

Motion made and seconded to have BLM use SMAC’s original recommendation for the blocks under discussion (Jerry moved, Cindy seconded).

Discussion: None

No objection.

Consensus Decision: Recommend BLM use SMAC’s original recommendation to address changes in the first and second blocks on Page 2 of 12 in the Draft Changes to the Preferred (sic) Alternative document.

Recreation: Block 3, Page 2 of 12

Evelyn explained the proposed changes as shown in Block 3 on Page 2 of 12, which would mean if there is demonstrated public interest, to go ahead and explore the option.

Motion made and seconded that all the SMAC recommendations regarding recreation be rolled over into a comprehensive recreation plan and developed from there as a separate document, a recreation plan not project plan for the Mountain” (Cindy moved, Jerry seconded).

Discussion: Cindy expressed her concern these changes were only addressing bits and pieces of the program rather than an overarching view of it. Jerry Magee clarified some of the ramifications of the proposed choices as well as the fact the Recreation Plan would not be completed along with the RMP but would be done after that document. Cindy stated her motion means she was intending to use the recommendations SMAC has made as a starting point to a recreation plan separate from the RMP.

Gary pointed out some of it needed to be included in the RMP to cover the time period between now and when the recreation plan is completed. Concern was raised with the existing motion because some things were deemed necessary to be complete in the near future.

Objection to the motion heard

Roll call vote: Tom – No, Jerry –Yes, Wanda –Yes, Cindy –Yes, Stacy – Yes, Jason –Yes, E. Ron –Yes, Dick – No, Alice – Yes, Hoyt – No, Harland - Yes

Motion failed.

Dick explained he would support a motion distinguishing those things listed which should happen as soon as possible from those that need more work. Some possible language was discussed.

RMP - OHV

OHV, Block 3, 1st OHV block, Page 4 of 12

Evelyn reviewed the proposed change and the reasons for them. Members discussed some of the ramifications. Stacy raised the question since about 3 miles are proposed for closure, which 3 miles would be opened in exchange for those closed.

Motion made and seconded to accept the change as proposed (Jerry moved, Dick seconded).

Discussion: BLM staff informed the group of the various efforts, including signing and placing boulders, undertaken to try and control the infringements. It was explained where the road is currently closed, no matter what is done as a means of closure in the roadway, it is still possible for people to get around the barrier. BLM is asking for a recommendation to close it where the topography best allows which may mean closing part of the boundary road.

Objection to the motion heard.

Roll call vote: Tom – No, Harland – No, Hoyt – No, Alice – Yes, Dick – Yes, E. Ron – No, Jason – Yes, Stacy – No, Cindy – No, Wanda – No, Jerry – Yes

Motion failed.

OHV: Block 4, 2nd OHV block, Page 4 of 12:

Evelyn reviewed the proposed changes, history and reasons for them.

Cindy felt the Moon Hill Road wasn't adequately addressed in the RMP since it is a private land access route, and it needs to be clear on the access allowed. Council was informed the gates were based on an Otley request to keep the roads from being torn up during poor weather conditions. People needing access would be given keys.

Cindy felt if that is the intent, then it should be stated in the document - "intent is not to keep private landowners from going to their land." She reiterated clarification had been requested concerning private landholder access and it has not occurred in this document.

Jerry noted by taking no position the SMAC allows BLM to do what they want.

RMP - Transportation:

Maintenance of Fence Creek Routes Block 1, Page 4 of 12

Mark Sherbourne explained the issues for wanting to change the level of maintenance which would not affect private property access. The access to the Fir Grove was discussed at some length. Members questioned why any trail would be designated to the Fir Grove since it is on private land as well as the SMAC's desire for people to come and explore the Mountain rather than being pointed to any specific places.

Motion made and seconded to approve change of language of maintenance level 3 to 2 on just the northern Y portion in Little Fir Creek (Richard moved, Jerry seconded).

Members agreed to have Susie Hammond speak to the concern since Hammond Ranches, Inc., is the private landowner involved.

Susie said the ranch currently does not often use the route, but needs to on occasion. However, she expressed a great deal of concern that if it is a public access road, it is going to encourage public to go in there and Hammonds Ranch, Inc., will not be able to deal with it without a whole bunch of public control. She noted some encounters between recreationists and ranch workers could occur and it was possible this type of meeting would not enhance the experience, because they may not enjoy the ranching lifestyle.

No objection to the motion:

Consensus Decision: Approve the change of language of maintenance level 3 to 2 on just the northern Y portion in Little Fir Creek.

Members discussed the second half of the proposed change ('that are being considered for a hiking trail and/or an ACEC.') Currently people can hike down there without a problem.

Motion made and seconded to allow that road to default to a Category 2 and recognize that is a private property permittee access and from time to time they will use that road.

The private property owner and committee have a concern with having it as a signed marked trail to the Fir Groves (Stacy moved and Tom seconded).

Discussion: None

No objection to the motion.

Consensus Decision: Allow the road to default to a Category 2 and recognize it is a private property and permittee access route and from time to time they will use the road. The private property owner and SMAC have a concern with having it as a signed marked trail to the Fir Groves.

Cold Springs Road – Second block from to top on Page 4 of 12

Mark reviewed the comments that brought this up which was to allow permitted use of the route even the part through the ranch that is closed. If it is allowed, only those issued a key would be able to use the route, which would help in accountability.

Motion made and seconded to support the proposed change regarding Cold Springs Road and permitted use through Riddle Ranch (Stacy moved, Cindy seconded).

Discussion: Jerry had concern because there are a lot of little roads that connect to this route, and he has a major concern with anyone going down those roads. There is more to the issue than just giving key access to the route. Tom expressed support for the change and noted it would assign responsibility as well.

Objection to motion.

Roll Call Vote: Jason – Yes, E. Ron – Yes, Dick – No, Alice – No, Hoyt – Yes, Harland – Yes, Stacy –Yes, Cindy – Yes, Wanda –Yes, Jerry –No, Tom - Yes

Motion failed.

RMP – Socio Economic

Socioeconomic section – Transportation:

Block 5, 1st block under Socioeconomic on page 4 of 12.

Gary reviewed the proposed change, the reasons and the associated background.

Members discussed surveys and inventories are currently being done on the area and should be completed in the CMPA by December 2005 and outside the CMPA in the fall of 2008. Mark Sherbourne stated close coordination with the SMAC would occur as things progressed. Members also expressed various points of view concerning the need for site specific analysis for any change in status from that at the time of legislation.

Motion made and seconded that SMAC recommend “Some roads which are considered not essential or not meeting management objectives may be closed pursuant to the Transportation Plan and process for consultation in Section 112 of the Act.”

Discussion: Jerry pointed out this motion assumes when a route is discovered, it is now a legal route until we close and he doesn't believe this to be correct. Also pointed out was some existing roads may be closed when the inventory is completed, and BLM isn't saying we are going to continue maintaining all existing roads.

Dick suggested an amendment to the motion since he also believed SMAC should not be voting on illegal routes. He suggested amending it to read - "as it applies to the legal roads." Stacy felt the Act was very specific and addressed these concerns.

Objection heard.

Roll Call Vote: Cindy – No; Wanda – No; Jerry – Abstain; Tom – Yes; Jason – Yes; Harland – No; Dick –Yes; Alice – Yes; Hoy – Yes; E. Ron – No; Stacy –No.

Motion failed.

Discussion: Members discussed their concerns with how the wording currently exists and how it could be changed to alleviate some of those issues.

Motion made and seconded it be changed to read "Existing roads that help achieve cultural, economic, ecological, and social values should be maintained pursuant to the Transportation plan and process for consultation in Section 112 of the Act" (Dick moved, Tom Harris seconded).

Discussion: Cindy stated it had been her experience BLM can't handle the workload associated with all the maintenance but are reluctant to allow others to do it. Yet it is necessary as one of the goals to support the economics as noted in the Act. She would rather add an exception to the statement that says it is regarding non-essential roads.

Objection to motion:

Roll Call: E. Ron – No; Cindy –No; Wanda – No; Alice –Yes; Hoyt – No; Dick – Yes; Harland – No; Jason – No; Tom – No; Jerry – Yes; Stacy – No

Motion failed.

February 18, 2004

Introductions, Questions from Tuesday, Approve November Minutes, Update Action Items, Chair/Vice-Chair Elections:

No questions were raised from yesterday.

Harland pointed out he should have been listed under absent members.

Motion made and seconded to approve the minutes as amended (Stacy moved, Jerry seconded).

No objection.

Consensus Decision: Approve minutes as amended.

Update Action Items: The last item could be removed as it is no longer applicable.

Cindy asked for clarification of where the SMAC was concerning having agreed to acknowledge in writing comments received. Tom Harris stated he would be doing that.

Election of Vice-Chair and Chair:

Motion made and seconded to postpone the topic until tomorrow morning (Stacy moved, Richard seconded).

Consensus Decision: Postpone Chair and Vice-Chair elections to tomorrow.

RMP – Cultural, Paleontological, Native American Practices

Cultural: Number of Acres of Section 110:

Block 7, 1st Cultural Block, Page 4 of 12.

Scott Thomas reviewed the proposed changes to the number of acres that would be accomplished of Section 110, the reasons for considering the change, and the implications.

Motion made and seconded to have the section read “BLM cultural program would inventory a minimum of 500 acres per year” (Stacy moved, Richard seconded).

Discussion: Karla pointed out the change was in part to a response to some of the comments made. Stacy felt it was important to have a commitment, but one the BLM would be capable of meeting with the budgets of the future.

No Objection:

Consensus Decision: Section will read: BLM cultural program would inventory a minimum of 500 acres per year.

Cultural Section: Interpretive panel locations in CMPA:

Block 8, last block on Page 4 of 12.

Scott explained the proposed change, background and implications of it. Alice inquired as to the Tribe’s involvement and Scott assured her there is close coordination with the Tribe. Scott explained how the process with various colleges works. Scott explained he wanted to add some interpretive signing showing the research Pete Mehringer had accomplished on pollen which would be information of interest for the public.

Motion made and seconded to approve the addition of the Fish Lake Interpretive display location (Jerry made, Alice seconded).

No objection.

Consensus Decision: Add Fish Lake Campground as an interpretive display location.

RMP – Lands and Realty:

Ensure current land exchange proposal conforms with the land tenure zones.

Block 1, Page 5 of 12.

Skip Renchler reviewed concerns raised by comments which included land exchanges and how they were impacted by the various zones. Skip also clarified what the various zones meant.

All lands adjacent to Malheur Wildlife Refuge should be identified for retention.

Block 2, Page 5 of 12

Skip discussed this briefly but it is not within the CMPA.

Members discussed the possibility of adding verbiage to the “Common to All Alternatives” to clarify the intentions.

Motion made and seconded to amend the second sentence in the paragraph on page 2-150 under Alternative D from “. . .that furthers the purpose and objectives of the Steens Act . . .” to read “. . . that furthers the purpose and objectives of the CMPA” (Richard moved, Alice seconded).

Discussion: Some members expressed concern this motion would narrow down the abilities to deal with land acquisition within the CMPA. The different ramifications of the wording were discussed as well as the interpretation of them.

Objection heard.

Roll Call: Harland – No; Hoyt – No; Alice – Yes; Dick – Yes; E. Ron – No; Jason – Yes; Stacy – No; Cindy – No; Wanda – No; Jerry – Yes; Tom – No;

Motion failed.

Members moved to Page 6 of 12, 2nd block on page, entitled ‘Land Acquisition Priorities,’ as the others were not within the CMPA and therefore not the SMAC’s responsibility to decide.

Land Acquisition Priorities:

Block 2, Page 6 of 12

Skip explained nowhere in the plan did BLM describe what they wished to acquire and proposed the change to “Management Common to all Alternatives.”

Motion made and seconded to approve the change as “Add the following to the text in Management Common to all Alternatives: Acquisition opportunities within or adjacent to special management areas would be considered higher priority than acquisition of non-public lands elsewhere in the planning area” (Stacy moved, Cindy seconded).

Discussion: Members agreed the need to acquire lands within the CMPA was a high priority.

No objection:

Consensus Decision: SMAC recommend to add the following to the text in Management Common to all Alternatives: Acquisition opportunities within or adjacent to special management areas would be considered higher priority than acquisition of non-public lands elsewhere in the planning area.

The SRMA identification for retention block was bypassed since it did not apply specifically to the CMPA.

Riddle Brothers Ranch identified for retention:
Block 4, Page 6 of 12

Skip related after reviewing the Draft, Riddle Brothers should have been identified as land we would never consider exchanging and therefore should be Zone 1A.

Motion made and seconded to approve the proposed changes which are that Riddle Brothers Ranch NHD was moved to Zone 1 A in the preferred alternative, adding text including the ranch in the definition of Zone 1A, and change the land tenure map.

Discussion: None

No objection

Consensus Decision: SMAC approves the proposed changes which are that Riddle Brothers Ranch NHD was moved to Zone 1 A in the preferred alternative, adding text including the ranch in the definition of Zone 1A, and change the land tenure map

ROW/Realty Use avoidance areas for SRMAs and parcels with wilderness characteristic: Last block on Page 6 of 12:

Skip explained the guidelines and regulations governing ROWs and realty avoidance activities. Council members discussed avoidance areas and how they apply to the CMPA.

Motion made and seconded NOT to accept the changes (Stacy moved, Cindy seconded).

Discussion: Members discussed the proposed new language would mean a higher level of analysis would have to be undertaken. Skip explained the differences between exclusion and avoidance and their application on the lands. Cindy expressed concern this

might have a large impact to the smaller entity who wants to accomplish something that would have low impact. This motion was viewed by some members as one more layer of bureaucratic paperwork to work through.

Objection to the motion.

Roll Call - Tom – No; Jerry – No; Wanda – No; Cindy – Yes; Stacy – Yes; Jason – No; E. Ron – Yes; Dick – No; Alice – No; Hoyt –Yes; Harland -Yes

Motion failed.

RMP - Wilderness:

Wilderness Section: Block 1, Page 7 of 12

John Neeling identified the changes proposed, their ramifications and the reasons for the proposal.

Motion made and seconded to approve the change to read “During 2005, 2006 and 2007, evaluate monitoring data as outlined in the Wilderness Plan. Continue to review monitoring data every 3 years thereafter. Change management actions as needed if not within acceptable limits” (Jerry moved, Alice seconded).

No objection to motion

Consensus Decision: SMAC approve proposed change to read “During 2005, 2006 and 2007, evaluate monitoring data as outlined in the Wilderness Plan. Continue to review monitoring data every 3 years thereafter. Change management actions as needed if not within acceptable limits.”

Manage entire Wilderness as one “zone” Block 2, Page 7 of 12:

John explained this proposal was in response to some public comments received that thought the different zones might allow degradation in some. Members discussed different points of view of agreeing with the comments to the total opposite. Jerry expressed concern some of the comment letters may have been misinterpreted and discussed a means of rectifying this issue. Members recalled spending a lot of time discussing the zoning issues and which would be the best approach since the Mountain had many variables in it.

Motion made and seconded to NOT approve new language and to keep it to read “Wilderness would be classified into two “Management Areas”; the Gorges and the Uplands” (Stacy moved, Ron seconded) .

Discussion: Jerry raised the concern if zoning would help BLM/SMAC achieve the mandate of wilderness. Some of his concerns related to how heavy the burden was on the user to know exactly where they were in an area that would have no signs and how difficult management would be in that area. Some members felt the zones had been set up as more of a monitoring tool to judge what impacts, if any, were occurring to the resource values.

No objection.

Consensus Decision: Reject proposed changes, with language to remain “Wilderness would be classified into two “Management Areas”; the Gorges and the Uplands.

Expand the language for Goal 1, Objective 1 to include management of ‘primitive and confined recreation’ and ‘naturalness’ : Block 3 on Page 7 of 12.

John Neeling reviewed the proposed change which would include those items listed in the “Rationale” section of that block

Discussion: Members discussed the impacts of these changes and a modification of the verbiage might better suit what is wanted to ensure all aspects are considered as well as being within standards and guidelines applicable to the area.

Motion made and seconded to reject the proposed changes (Stacy moved, Hoyt seconded).

Discussion: Members discussed what could be done to manage the area as wilderness and to meet its requirements while still ensuring other issues are addressed. There are other uses within wilderness that must be met.

Objection heard:

Stacy withdrew the motion, Hoyt agreed.

Motion made and seconded to approve a change and modification to read “Manage public visitation in the wilderness to provide outstanding opportunity for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation and for naturalness and other features including ecological, geological, scientific, educational, scenic and historic.” The acceptance does NOT include the rationale block of the table for this topic (Jason moved, Jerry seconded).

Discussion: Cindy raised the issues of different levels of use and the fact they need to be recognized.

No objection.

Consensus Decision: Approve a change to read: “Manage public visitation in the wilderness to provide outstanding opportunity for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation and for naturalness and other features including ecological, geological, scientific, educational, scenic and historic.” The acceptance does NOT include the rationale block of the table for this topic.

Add a management action for ‘minimum tool’
Block 4, Page 7 of 12

John Neeling explained this proposed change came about in an effort to meet public comments.

Motion made and seconded to reject the proposed change (Richard made, Cindy seconded).

Discussion: Jerry reviewed the statements BLM made throughout the RMP talking about minimum tool analysis where they should be using the “minimum requirement decision guide”. He clarified if an agency wishes to take an action in wilderness, then they should first address the question of whether or not it is the minimum necessary action to maintain wilderness characteristics.

Objection heard.

Roll Call: E. Ron – Yes; Wanda –Yes; Cindy – Yes; Dick –Yes; Hoyt –No; Tom –Yes; Jason – Yes; Jerry – No; Stacy – Yes; Alice – Yes; Harland -Yes

Motion passed: SMAC does not accept the proposed change to add a management action for ‘minimum tool’.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Susie Hammond stated, because of the discussion she heard yesterday, she was distributing a copy of her comments on the RMP to SMAC members. Susie expressed her appreciation for the decisions the Council made yesterday concerning Fir Creek and the trail. Any other decision would have been very difficult for the ranch to deal with on the ground with the amount of public who would have been there. She felt the dates for comment were intentionally very confusing and it was hard to determine what day the period closed. She stated she was one of the landowners who was guilty of the last day realizing it was the day to have comments in and had asked if comments would still be accepted. She stated she was told they would be looked at and to go ahead and send them in, so she did. Due to the discussion yesterday, she is skeptical whether or not the comments will be taken into consideration. She also thinks, after talking to the County Judge and seeing the opportunity the County still has more time to comment on the plan and believing the other cooperating agencies still have this opportunity, she is concerned private property owners are not being considered by the agency as cooperators which they should be. Susie would hope her comments would be accepted and the comments of other private property owners that were sent in be considered outside of the general public comment period. She thinks with all of the discussion in the last 2 days the Act of Congress is being violated by the interpretation of the agency. In her written comments she said she had identified the convoluted boundary between Steens area and the Andrews Management Planning Area continuing to be more confusing and not conducive to cooperative management. She thinks issues have been manipulated through the agency prioritization. She understands how BLM needs to consolidate these comments and if there was a way to do it and make everyone at this table happy, she would say do it, but she doesn't think that's happening. But since there are so many different points of view, even among agency employees, she believes there is either purposefully or matter of course manipulation through the agency's editing of comments. Susie stated private property owners have never been invited to the table as cooperators, other than private landowners have a seat at the table but so does everyone else. She felt the fact the private landowners have a seat at the table is wonderful but she thinks the cooperation part of the

Act should go beyond that. Susie believes the access to private property and uses of private property are being put in jeopardy by the agency. She can't believe we are reconsidering Ankle Creek and mandated to do that in order to protect the private landowners rights. The legislators' intent for the Act should be explored while evidence is still available. Her final comment concerned how the public friendliness of the process had been skipped over and how this particular meeting is totally negative to the public. She felt if the audience had copies of what the SMAC was working from in order to take notes and follow along, it would have been much better. She said some of the things that were skipped over were critical to Hammond Ranches (such as the Malheur National Wildlife Refuge bordering lands). She hoped BLM would look at that recommendation and reevaluate it to possibly change.

Jack Rinn also submitted a typed letter apologizing for the length, not the content, but would not restate all of it during his time now. Jack requested the minutes show even those motions that don't pass. He understands the supermajority vote but he doesn't think the Act precludes the DFO and others from BLM noting who voted and the discussion that should be captured. Jack stated he had been having ongoing dialogue with groups whose memberships are disabled and how the Steens access affects them; how the plan does not address their needs; and the ramifications of that. He felt his request for a copy of the RMP had fallen through the cracks and was sure the BLM would get him one.

Harland Yriarte, private citizen and SMAC member, stated he wished to talk about something that has nothing to do with today but has a lot to do with tomorrow and the future and some revisiting of yesterday, so enjoy the moment. He said that tricky with the truth, right information wrong implication, flirting with falsehood, stretching the truth, spinning the yarn - that's politics. Harland said sometimes we forget that one of the 10 commandments has become one of the suggestions in most peoples minds; it is called don't lie. He said everything he read right there is a lie, that we've figured out a way to engineer it to best suit our wants and needs. It is a personal responsibility that somehow one of those 10 commandments is a suggestion. Harland said if you look real close at the picture in the Oregonian on December 3, it is of Steens Mountain - an unbelievable picture of Steens Mountain that somehow attracted a lot of people in Eugene. It even attracted him wondering... 'are we really going to mine that?' - right picture, wrong information. It is very misleading, a lie that allows someone to further an agenda, but he's not going to get into what the motives are or what the purpose of it was. He felt it was within each individual's means, but neither is he saying it is anyone here. He thought it reflected badly with trust, especially in situations like this one which is hard to know if you are painting a picture that is somewhat misleading. Harland acknowledged there was some response to it by Elaine Brong out of the BLM's Oregon State Office in a letter to the Oregonian. You end up with a picture then you have editorials saying this was a poor choice for the Steens, not only the picture but journalistic picture that is written. The Act took months of painstakingly careful negotiation between Congressmen and public. He pointed out that way down further in the article it says no mining will be allowed on Steens Mountain. This news spread throughout the state. Then you have guest viewpoints from Les Aucoin that Steens shows Bush's pattern of discussion which is designed to get a few votes less for Bush. Harland's point is if you are tricky with the truth, you paint a picture that is not quite right, it is a lie. Can we agree to that? If we can agree to that, we can accomplish great things in that room. The truth eventually comes

out somewhere in the article, Harland felt it is not as a moral issue but also thinks it reminds us to get back on right road at times. It does spring out of selfishness.

Don Renie distributed copies of his letter to SMAC members. Don talked that he had made some assumptions that the RMP comment period was still open since the copy he received stated he would be notified of the closing date. Being an absentee landowner, he was not privy to the local advertisement of the closing date. He said the comments here would be on the Cold Springs Road. Don sees the closure at the north end of Riddle Ranch as a real safety issue because of the inability to get turned around at that point. He brought the issue up a year and a half ago. He reiterated his concern that someone will get stuck at that point and not be able to get out. Don thought the group had probably heard plenty of this landowner's access issue, and wasn't quite sure where to begin. He sat in on a lot of formative meetings when talking about the Act and access to private property was not to be an issue, period. Now it has become a big issue. He believes it can be addressed through cooperative management because he doesn't think there would be a landowner on the Mountain who wouldn't be cooperative to get in and out of their property. He stated when access to private property is denied, it is almost like a person's residential place. Telling them, "We are only going to let you go to your house on Tuesday and Saturday for a couple of hours"; you wouldn't settle for that. But you are driving over public land to get there. Just because it is in a remote area, it is still private land that a private person is paying for. Somehow it needs to be realized we live in a free country and we can come and go to the property as seen fit. He felt by telling someone you can't go in or regulate ingress/egress he thinks we are stepping way over the boundary and it will become a court case and everyone loses.

Wilderness (Con't):

Change language in a management action regarding 'historic' structures:
1st Block on Page 8 of 12.

Motion made and seconded to approve the proposed change (Jerry moved, Tom seconded).

Discussion: Stacy felt the change was more than just verbiage because it had been agreed upon the recreational facilities would be at trailhead not up the trail and those things that were not needed would be allowed to go away.

Scott Thomas explained that on anything being National Register eligible BLM would be required to evaluate to decide whether or not it would be maintained. If BLM decides it would be destroyed or allowed to deteriorate, there is still a process that must be followed. A discussion was held concerning what process applies to eligible and non-eligible structures, what would be considered an historic structure, and what kind of maintenance might be required. Stacy felt the group had already made agreements on what should be done and he believes this to be a significant change to those agreements.

Objection heard.

Roll Call: Stacy – No; Hoyt – No; Cindy – Abstaining; Alice – No; Wanda – No; Dick – No; Jerry- Yes; E Ron – No; Tom – Yes; Jason – No; Harland – No.

Motion failed

Add language to a management action: Block 2 page 8 of 12.

Motion made and seconded to approve the change but to modify it to read “if needed to maintain **OR** restore the natural condition” (Stacy moved, Jason seconded).

Discussion: Cindy pointed out how confusing this section is because it has “same as” under several alternatives. Members described the definitions of fires; how the types of fires could be used; and in what circumstances. Council members believed the wording should be clarified and not just in the last sentence in 2 B but all of it. Yes vote would approve change with addition

No Objection

Consensus decision: Approve the change but modify it to read “if needed to maintain OR restore the natural condition.”

Motion made and seconded that the appropriate person rewrite goal 2 objection 1, Action 2. B, C, and D to where they are much more understandable by the general public and to include similar language for the general public (Stacy moved, Richard seconded).

Discussion: None

No objection:

Consensus Decision: SMAC recommend the appropriate person rewrite Goal 2, Objective 1, Action 2.B, C, and D to where they are much more understandable by the general public and to include similar language for the general public.

Add language to a management action as required by CFRs .
Block 3 of page 8 of 12

John Neeling explained the proposed changes. Cindy asked if permanent caches would be allowed for general public and if there was a need to address that possibility. Stacy expressed concern bits and pieces were being pulled from the law and there wasn't any consistency in application of it.

Motion made and seconded to approve these changes and similar language be included as it applies to the general public (Stacy moved, Richard seconded).

Discussion: Jerry reiterated the needs assessment process needs to be completed for all outfitters, as specified in the regulations. He stated the needs assessment process is a means of determining if there is a need and whether or not the use can be allowed. He believes this assessment is wilderness wide rather than on an individual basis. He noted the Steens Act would come into play and say there is an emphasis on historic outfitters.

No objection to motion.

Consensus Decision: SMAC approve the proposed changes and similar language be included as it applies to the general public.

Add a management action under Goal 3, Objective 2. Block 4 on page 8 of 12.

John explained this proposed change as a means to coordinate scheduling of use in the wilderness, etc. Concern was expressed on how the BLM would prioritize people going into the area. John explained it was more to be able to let people know there will be someone in the area, and they can modify their route if they wish, but it is not a means to say someone cannot be there.

Motion made and seconded to approve the change with the addition after user conflicts the words inserted: “by informing each of the other’s plans” and replace prevent with avoid (Richard moved, Jerry seconded).

Discussion: Members discussed various means of keeping communication open as to what group was where and expressed concern about the logistics of such an undertaking. Just because a group is there, doesn’t mean there will be conflict. Members expressed concern how this is written up because it can generate the wrong implications. This is not the way to tell people they can’t be in a certain place.

Dick withdrew his motion, Jerry agreed.

Motion made and seconded that the wording read, “Avoid crowding and user conflicts by informing large groups and outfitter/guides of each other’s plans” (Richard moved, Stacy Second).

Discussion: None.

No Objection.

Consensus Decision: SMAC approve changes to read “BLM will try to avoid crowding and user conflicts by informing large groups and outfitter/guides of each other’s plans.”

Change group size limit in Wilderness. Block 5 Page 8 of 12

Motion made and seconded to approve the proposed change. To be “Group size limits are to be 12 people and 18 head of stock, except for historic permitted and Native American use” (Stacy moved, Tom seconded).

Discussion: Jerry noted these numbers did not agree with the SMAC recommendation which was 15 head of stock. Karla explained the change was due in part to talking to Backcountry Horsemen who stated 15 was not sufficient for that size party. She also explained the requirements of NEPA in relation to this proposal.

Objection heard.

Roll call vote: Hoyt – Yes; Stacy – Yes; Alice – No; Cindy – Yes; Dick – Yes; Wanda – Yes; Harland – Abstain; E Ron – Yes; Jerry – No; Tom – Yes; Jason - Yes

Motion failed

Wilderness Study Areas:

Evelyn Treiman introduced the proposed changes on page 10

Motion made and seconded to approve the language change that says to delete the sentence “Incorporate the acquired 40- and 80-acre parcels into the Mahogany Ridge WSA. Incorporate the acquired 40-acre parcel on the southern boundary into the Bridge Creek WSA” (Stacy moved, Ron seconded).

Discussion: None

No objection.

Consensus Decision: SMAC approve deletion of sentence: “Incorporate the acquired 40- and 80-acre parcels into the Mahogany Ridge WSA. Incorporate the acquired 40-acre parcel on the southern boundary into the Bridge Creek WSA.”

Motion made and seconded to use the old language and not approve the changes on the next block (2nd WSA block, but third block on Page 10 of 12) (Stacy moved, Tom seconded).

Discussion: Members discussed wilderness characteristics, WSAs, management of new parcels, and the ramifications of the lawsuit in Utah. Jerry felt all the work the conservation community had done needed not only to be analyzed but should be addressed somewhere in the document so they can see the results. Karla noted all the work the conservation community completed was important and had been reviewed by her staff, who determined suitability. Alice wondered if BLM had delayed the transportation plan because of a lack of on-the-ground information; then shouldn't this be delayed as well. Members discussed the proposed changes in relation to the on-the-ground knowledge. Alice believes the environmental community's work had not been given a fair review and it should be written up somewhere and responded to. That is why she suggested putting it with the transportation plan.

Objection to motion.

Roll call vote: E. Ron – Yes; Jason – No; Stacy Yes; Wanda – No; Harland – Yes; Tom – Yes; Jerry – No; Dick – No; Alice – No; Cindy – Yes; Hoyt -Yes

Motion failed.

Special Status Species:

SSS Management in Alt D: Block 4 Page 10 of 12.

Rick Hall explained the change is an addition of new language to present an array of alternatives to analyze.

Motion made and seconded to approve the language as proposed (Jerry moved, Alice seconded).

Discussion: Stacy expressed concern over the word “intensive”, but would not object to the motion. Ron mentioned in some cases habitat does not need to be restored.

No objection heard.

Consensus Decision: SMAC accept the proposed additional language to read: “Special status plant species would be intensively managed to maintain or restore habitats or populations where needed. Conservation Agreements and management plans would be completed for species considered to be at the highest risk for listing. Recovery Plans would be developed for T&E species. Monitoring and inventory data would be collected for all special status plant species to assess the potential threats to habitat or individual populations.”

It was noted the RNA proposals are outside the CMPA and, therefore, won’t be discussed here.

RMP - Grazing

Grazing Utilization levels

(1st block of Grazing section, block 5 on Page 11 of 12)

Rick explained Alt D in the Draft didn’t have anything that talked about utilization levels, so the proposal is to add this verbiage to it. It is a range BLM does its assessments from. Members asked where the numbers came from. Rick explained they were a part of normal range science. Stacy questioned why the BLM was putting these numbers in the RMP since they usually show up in AMPs. He expressed concern the statement limits management flexibility in utilizing grazing as a tool under some circumstances.

Motion made and seconded to accept the proposed change with the addition of “unless specifically needed as a vegetation management tool” placed in front of the proposed wording.”

No objection heard:

Consensus Decision: SMAC approve changes with addition wording so the approved statement reads, “Unless specifically needed as a vegetation management tool, the utilization level would not exceed 60 percent on nonnative seedings and 50 percent on native, herbaceous forage plants on a pasture-average basis”

Areas Closed to livestock grazing, 2nd block of grazing, Block 6 on Page 11 of 12.

Rick explained the area under discussion is half in the CMPA and half outside these limits. Stacy expressed some concern about including these in the RMP rather than in an AMP. Karla and Rick explained the reasons for the areas proposed.

Motion made and seconded to accept the changes as proposed (Richard moved, Alice seconded).

Discussion: Karla described how trespass would be handled, which would be like a good neighbor, letting someone know they are trespassing and go from there to do whatever it takes to rectify the problem. Stacy stated he was supportive of most of the areas with the exception of Mann Lake and Highway 205 pasture of Lavoy table.

Richard proposed modifying the motion to which Alice (the second) agreed.

Modification to motion made and agreed to by second to accept the change with the addition of “Unless specifically needed as a vegetation management tool” at the beginning of the sentence and to exclude any enclosure not within the CMPA.

Discussion: Members noted the motion does not apply to those areas listed outside the CMPA.

No objection to motion.

Consensus Decision: SMAC approve proposed with the modification to the beginning of the sentence to read: “Unless specifically needed as a vegetation management tool” and excluding all those not within the CMPA.

RMP – Rangelands

Rangeland Improvement Projects, 1st Block on Page 12 of 12.

Rick explained the reasons for the proposed changes. Jerry wanted to clarify this could mean more cows in some areas, fewer cows in other areas and was not an overall raise in numbers, but more a management tool. Stacy pointed out this was not limited to livestock, it also applied to wildlife and wild horses and any action would be subject to NEPA review. He suggested adding “other uses” to clarify it.

Alice was uncomfortable with the entire concept since she believes what others consider underutilization might be the only hope for restoration. She expressed concern with moving cattle to an area where they hadn’t been before.

Ron stated the areas wild horses could use were determined by the law and they can’t be moved to other areas that were not identified, nor can they be moved totally out of areas identified in that law.

Jerry said within CMPA there are 325,000 acres grazed and it bothers him BLM is saying they are going to find more places to put cattle. The RMP should be saying within a 5-year period reevaluate the entire grazing program and then decide. It should be a Mountain-wide evaluation of all the allotments.

Rick explained how Allotment Evaluations are typically done and the timeframes under which they are completed. Jerry said part of Steens Act talks about ecological integrity and BLM should be assessing all that is happening across the CMPA as one unit.

Hoyt pointed out it would be more efficient to change some of the allotment boundaries, but to do that a fence might have to be built and that would be in a whole evaluation if the language is not in the RMP allowing it. Then we are precluding it and he doesn't want that.

Motion made and seconded that within a 5-year period of the plan, BLM complete a Grazing EIS to assess all the allotments in the CMPA and come out of it with whatever recommendation is appropriate (Jerry moved, Alice seconded).

Discussion: Members discussed the possibilities if they look at the Mountain as a whole, perhaps things could be moved around to serve the Mountain and the permittees better. Jerry explained a Grazing EIS had been done previously and it is being replaced by this RMP. They discussed they could look at it as a whole as the Act talks about grazing being sustainable and there is question of what happens today.

Objection to motion

Roll Call Vote: Jason – Yes; Tom - No; E Ron – No; Jerry – Yes; Dick – Yes; Wanda – Yes; Alice – Yes; Cindy – No; Hoyt – No; Stacy – No; Harland - No

Motion failed.

Motion made and seconded that the change read: “New rangeland improvement projects could be implemented to open underutilized areas to grazing to relieve grazing on other areas so long as the projects would be consistent with the purpose and objectives of the CMPA (Richard moved, Hoyt seconded).

Discussion: Council members discussed whether or not this motion would meet the needs.

Objection heard.

Roll Call Vote: Harland – Yes; Hoyt – Yes; Alice – Yes; Dick – Yes; E. Ron – Yes; Jason – No.; Tom Harris – Yes; Jerry – No; Wanda – Yes; Cindy – Yes; Stacy – Yes.

Motion passed: SMAC recommend changes to the first sentence in Block 1, Page 12 of 12 to be “New rangeland improvement projects could be implemented to open underutilized areas to grazing to relieve grazing on other areas so long as the projects would be consistent with the purpose and objective of Steens Act.”

Motion made and seconded to approve the following wording rather than that in the table: “Existing projects would be maintained or modified if they continue to support livestock grazing, or removed if a alternative project accomplishes the needs or other uses. Projects that do not function to support grazing or other uses or are damaging would be abandoned and the sites rehabilitation. Projects that are not consistent with the purpose and objectives of the CMPA will be mitigated” (Stacy moved, Jason seconded).

Discussion: Members were not sure if this would meet what was intended.

Stacy withdrew the motion with Jason's agreement.

Motion made and seconded that the 2nd part of the block read "Existing projects would be maintained if they support livestock grazing or other uses. Projects that do not function to support grazing or other uses or promote the purpose or the objectives of the CMPA would be modified or abandoned and the sites rehabilitated."

Discussion: None.

No objection to motion.

Consensus Decision: SMAC recommend 2nd sentence in Block 1, Page 12 of 12 read "Existing projects would be maintained if they support livestock grazing or other uses. Projects that do not function to support grazing or other uses or promote the purpose or the objectives of the CMPA would be modified or abandoned and the sites rehabilitated."

Monitoring:

Carolyn Freeborn distributed copies of Appendix P covering some of the monitoring suggestions. She explained monitoring will be how we determine the effectiveness of the management actions. Rather than having it sprinkled throughout the plan, she extracted and put in an appendix. It is easy to use for a reference and to respond to public comments to help better understand the monitoring strategies. Carolyn explained the monitoring that will be taking place, personnel available, available training, and funding constraints. Members gave Carolyn several suggestions on the document as well as the monitoring to be completed.

Ron suggested the same person should be doing the horse monitoring if possible. This would help in the consistency. Carolyn informed SMAC the biggest constraints on accomplishing monitoring is both lack of personnel and budget.

Dick suggested the results of monitoring might be published every other year or so. This would show what is being accomplished and how well it is working. Carolyn reported some of the information is already published but the Annual Planning Update might be a good vehicle for distributing this information.

RMP General

Gary stated in everything so far the Implementation schedule was to be completed by October 2004, but now it doesn't look like it will be completed until after the ROD is signed.

Cindy asked for copies of the map Don and Sandy Renie submitted with their comment letter.

Followup Item: Karla will get copy of map.

Motion made and seconded that the new information submitted by ONDA as contained on the BLM map, be carried forward in conjunction with the transportation plan (Alice moved, Jerry seconded).

Discussion: Members discussed how the transportation plan fits with the RMP; whether or not the data is adequate to complete one; if not, how to obtain accurate data; and the timeframes under which they should be completed.

Objection to motion.

Roll Call: Jerry – Yes; Jason – Yes; Alice – Yes; Cindy – No; E Ron – No; Tom – Yes; Harland – No; Stacy – No; Hoyt – No; Dick – Yes; Wanda - No

Motion failed

RMP - E. Kiger Plateau ACEC

Rick Hall explained this proposal was due to an oversight in the RMP of the wrong management action on East Kiger ACEC. He explained all but about 40 acres of this ACEC is outside the no livestock grazing area. Hoyt explained there is no practical way to put a fence in to keep the cattle out of the small portion. Rick stated he had seen no conflict with the resource for which the ACEC was established. Grazing has been occurring in that area prior.

Motion made and seconded to approve the ACEC for continued grazing which is what has been happening to date (Stacy moved, Ron seconded).

No objection was heard.

Consensus Decision: Approve the ACEC for continued grazing which is what has been happening to date.

Dick suggested where the goals are laid out for the document, it is important to include the purpose of the CMPA as well.

| Members reviewed the agenda for tomorrow's meeting.

February 19, 2004

Members Absent:

Cindy Witzel

Chair/Vice Chair Elections:

Members stated Tom Harris had agreed to stay in the Chair position until certain issues could be resolved.

Jerry suggested at the next meeting everyone should come prepared to look at themselves; what the Council is doing; and where it is going. Dale will facilitate the meeting. Members decided to have the first day of the April meeting be a team building type of session for Council members and Dale only.

Rangeland/Grazing:

Rick Hall described the proposed changes, the background for them, and what they would entail. Stacy thought rangelands pretty much encompassed everything on the ground and wondered why the section was here and what it meant. He felt it needed a production goal or objective. He suggested something like 'rangeland would produce forage for wildlife, livestock, and wild horse grazing.'

Council discussed they had previously made a recommendation to remove some of the numbers in the text and wondered why they were still there. Rick explained why the numbers had been left in which was due to comments received from the public.

Text on 2-143, Stacy 2-43 in table (check reference) Stacy expressed concern with the last sentence under Alternative D which contains the words "in vacant allotments....." Previously in the document it said low resource conflict. In this case it says high. Rick explained how an allotment becomes vacant, the difference between relinquished and vacant, and how resource conflict interplays.

Karla emphasized it was not a foregone conclusion. If an allotment is vacant or relinquished, it is dependent upon the resource conflicts and the outcome of the allotment evaluation and process required. Stacy expressed concern about various aspects of what is included in the document. He felt this needed to be a public process and it didn't assure that in the current language. The problems of a "grass bank" were also discussed. Members also discussed the possibility of having an outside entity that could help with the review, what retirement of an allotment could mean, and how it could or should be handled. Stacy felt the language in the bill was for BLM to promote viable and sustainable grazing and any grazing in the rest of the CMPA was basically protected. Changes would be made of course, but not large scale discontinuation of grazing beyond what has already been done. Exclusions would be necessary to meet resource goals but should be the smallest size and smallest number necessary to achieve those. Members discussed the ramifications of allotments being retired or relinquished and taken out of grazing without input by all sides of the issues. It should be dealt with in a plan or by an advisory group. Members also discussed how private entities would not be able to compete with organizations or public entities when it came to any kind of permit sold. It could cause family ranches to disappear.

Jerry suggested for now the Council move to other issues, since this one is not going to be resolved in a short time. The meeting is pressed for time, but it should be discussed at another time.

Council members expressed the concerns about how the issues need to be resolved; how to keep personal relationships out of it as well as maintaining them; how best to accomplish this; how to look at the Mountain as a whole; and deal with the issues on that level.

Gary brought up one of the things that has become clear is people don't agree on what the Act means. Council members discussed various means of approaching the next meeting including developing a vision for the Mountain; what they see it as being in the future.

Recreation:

Evelyn distributed a partial list of projects and possible groupings explaining this was one of the options being explored for the necessary NEPA documentation.

Members discussed how to address the subject of Recreation; what needed to be accomplished immediately; and what could be addressed in an overall Recreation Plan.

Motion was made and seconded that all the SMAC recommendations regarding recreation be rolled over into a comprehensive recreation plan and developed as a recreation plan, not project plan, for the Mountain in a separate document. This is to exclude 3D (but making the proposed change), 4D (on page 2-61 of the RMP) and 8D (on page 2-62 of the RMP (Richard moved, Jerry seconded)).

Discussion: Council members did not wish to have a myriad of plans to address the various aspects of recreation, but rather find a means of doing an overarching plan while addressing those things that need to be done immediately. Cindy wanted to ensure all aspects of the Recreation program would be addressed, not just those in the "Draft Changes to the Preferred (sic) Alternative" document.

Objection heard.

Roll call vote: Tom – Yes, Jerry – Yes, Wanda – Yes, Stacy – No, Jason – Yes, E. Ron – Yes, Dick – Yes, Alice – Yes, Hoyt – Yes, Harland - Yes

Motion passes: All the SMAC recommendations regarding recreation be rolled over into a comprehensive recreation plan and developed as a recreation plan, not project plan, for the Mountain in a separate document. This is to exclude 3D (but making the proposed change), 4D (on page 2-61 of the RMP) and 8D (on page 2-62 of the RMP).

SMAC members noted this motion supercedes all other decisions for the Recreation section made earlier in this document and this move sweeps in all those that have 'not an RMP level decision' in the Rationale column except those listed as exceptions in the consensus decision. Karla clarified that with the exception of the three items mentioned in Dick's motion all recreation actions will be postponed until a comprehensive recreation plan can be built.

WSR/Wilderness :

Jerry stated he was very disappointed that Wild and Scenic Rivers (WSR) had not been put on the agenda and he as well as many of his constituents do not believe the WSR eligibility or suitability has been adequately addressed in 1997 or in this RMP.

Motion made and seconded that SMAC direct BLM to do a reinventory of all perennial streams within the CMPA and complete a full evaluation to be started within 4 years (Jerry moved, Jason seconded).

Discussion: Members discussed the validity of previous evaluations, and the designations that apply to the area, as well as the eligibility levels.

Objection heard.

Roll call vote: Harland – No; Hoyt – No; Alice – Yes; Dick – Yes; E Ron –No; Jason – Yes; Stacy – No; Wanda – No; Jerry – Yes; Tom – No;

Motion failed

WSR page 2-74 Goal 1 2D “recommend to Congress to change designation of ...”

Stacy raised some concerns with whether or not all the roads SMAC had discussed were included in this as a means of changing the designation. Specifically he was thinking of Ankle Creek and Tabor Cabin. Jerry reminded the group they had covered Newton cabin by deciding to leave it wild.

Motion made and seconded SMAC recommend to Congress to change wild classification of Tabor Cabin area on Donner und Blitzen and Newton Cabin Road where it crosses Ankle, Mud and Indian Creek, from wild classification to scenic consistent with the width of the easement and if the lands in Ankle basin become public lands then that classification on those streams would revert to wild (Stacy moved, Tom seconded).

Discussion: Jerry Magee noted there is some discussion on whether or not a change in designation can be recommended by BLM. Jason noted when the water gap agreement was made, the recommendation included changing the cow-free wilderness boundary and redband trout boundary as well. Ron identified his wish that the water gap continue to exist because of the wild horses. He would like to see the wild designation removed from that area, which would make him feel more comfortable the gap would continue to exist. Members discussed how to identify just the specific area that might be proposed.

Objection heard.

Roll Call Vote: Jason – No; Tom – Yes; E. Ron – Yes; Jerry – No; Dick – No; Wanda – Yes; Alice – No; Hoyt – Yes; Stacy – Yes; Harland –Yes.

Motion failed

Public Comment:

Stacy Davies believed it important to emphasize the purpose of the Act which is essentially ecological integrity and underneath that purpose are six objectives. His main point is there is no way to achieve that purpose on the entire Mountain without accomplishing those objectives. He stated anytime you take human and economic elements and make it totally on an ecological basis, it will fail. Stacy felt grazing is over restricted on certain places on the Mountain. That grazing will shift to private land where a high percentage is fish and wildlife habitat. He believes a more holistic approach has to happen. He constantly fights against more restrictive language but he is seeing more

restriction on public land being shortsighted on the overall impact on the Mountain. The basic philosophy of the Act was to keep the Mountain like it is and that means different things to different people. His main point is there is no way that can be achieved without a holistic viewpoint. The private person can be driven off. We can restrain recreation uses to specific places in a smaller area; and think we will achieve overall objectives. There will be negative consequences to every decision we make and we have to look long term to see what those will be. Family businesses operating on the Mountain need to be sustainable and viable to keep it like it is. If we allow grazing to be retired in large scale on the Mountain, especially with the direction headed nationally with the big buyout programs, there will be two entities - the big cooperation against the environmentalists. Family business will be gone. Private land percentage on the Mountain will change. It won't be like we've known it. He hopes everyone, as we make our decisions, can look at long range holistic, economic and human elements as well as ecological.

Wilderness – RMP:

Change the language of the noxious weeds management action.

Last block, Page 8 of 12

Motion made and seconded to approve the proposed change (Jerry moved, Dick seconded).

Discussion: John Neeling explained the reason for the proposed change.

No objection.

Consensus Decision. SMAC approve the proposed change to read “The ‘ minimum requirement decision guide’ (minimum tool analysis) will be completed to determine the method of control and range of equipment needed to control noxious weeds in the Wilderness.”

Change the language regarding recreation stock grazing management action.

1st block, Page 9 of 12

Discussion: John explained the need to have the language in there that allows movement of recreation stock, rather than to be tied to one spot. Jerry stated he believed part of the SMAC's previous recommendation was that any use of highlines and tethers would be restricted to 100 feet from water and this needs to be included in the discussion.

Motion made and seconded to accept the changes proposed with the addition that pack goats would be high lined (Stacy moved, Richard seconded).

Discussion: None

No Objection:

Consensus Decision. SMAC accept the proposed change which reads “No tying of recreation stock to trees overnight. Grazing and recreation stock would be allowed consistent with Standards and Guidelines for grazing. Recreational stock may graze freely in the ‘no livestock

grazing area' of the Wilderness, except Little Blitzen RNA where such use will be monitored.”
As well as the addition of “pack goats will be high lined”

Change 'length of stay' in wilderness
2nd block Page 9 of 12

Motion made and seconded to accept the proposed change (Stacy moved, Tom seconded).

Discussion: Fourteen days is the standard length of stay on most Federal lands.
Monitoring will determine the affect.

Discussion: Jerry asked that this block and the last block on page 9 of 12 “Change the ‘percentage of change’ guidelines used in Alternative D to trigger management activities to the lower percentages shown in Alternative C” should be tied together. John explained the change was in an effort to meet public comment as well as developing a compromise.

Motion made to amend to the motion to accept change on bottom block on page 9 of 12 (Stacy moved, Hoyt seconded).

Discussion: Members discussed how the percentages would be adjusted and the monitoring that would be necessary.

No objection.

Consensus decision: SMAC approve: The proposed change to Change ‘length of stay’ in Wilderness’ Block 2 Page 9 of 12, to be “Recommended ‘length of stay’ limited to 14 days.”

And

The proposed change to “Change the ‘percentage of change’ guidelines used in Alternative D to trigger management activities to the lower percentages shown in Alternative C” Block 4, Page 9 of 12, which would lower the percentages in the guidelines which will trigger management actions.

“Add a management action covering wilderness activities”
Block 3, Page 9 of 12

Motion made and seconded to accept the proposed change (Stacy moved, Jerry seconded)

Discussion: John Neeling explained there was a need to cover a myriad of uses.

No objection.

Consensus Decision: SMAC accept the proposed change to read “Wilderness management activities not specifically covered in other management actions will be managed in accordance with wilderness management goals. Such activities would include, but not be limited to, predator control, horse gathers, search and rescue, etc.”

Change the language for ‘catholes’ management actions”
Block 1, Page 10 of 12

John related there had been several comments requiring clarification of the guidelines.

Motion made and seconded to accept the proposed change (Stacy moved, Tom seconded)

Discussion: Members discussed the need for this as well as the possible need for wording concerning dog waste as well.

No objection.

Consensus Decision: SMAC accept the proposed changes for Block 1 Page 10 of 12, to read “Require catholes for human waste and require them to be a minimum of 150 feet (60 footsteps) from all water sources, campsites and trails. Require all toilet paper to be packed out. Packing out of human waste is strongly encouraged and may be required under certain permitted activities.

Other Wilderness Issues:

Page 2-198 center of the section with bullets and a list.

Stacy brought up a concern with “accept as specifically stated in Wilderness Act “then it lists a number of things. His concern is if it is under a Federal regulation already, then is it being put in the plan. If it is going to be put in the plan, then use the specific wording because by paraphrasing he believes essentially the CFR is being changed.

Motion made and seconded to insert “the following activities are **currently** prohibited” (Stacy moved, Richard seconded)

No objection.

Consensus Decision: SMAC recommend inserting “The following activities are currently prohibited.”

Page 3-56 – 3.17.4 - Access

Stacy raised some concerns needing clarification as to when access EAs will be done, and the difference between CMPA inholdings and wilderness inholdings.

Page 3-57 Transportation and Roads

“In 2000, as part of the Steens Act, Congress closed wilderness to motorized or mechanized vehicles,” There are numerous places in this plan that limit things, but exceptions occur under Appendix A (grazing) and Appendix B (wildlife) and the other exceptions in Steens. It was felt important to reference Appendix A and B occasionally.

Riparian:

Objective 3 new action item under page 2-91

Jerry raised a concern about a SMAC recommendation he had not found in the document concerning the reviewing of springs within the CMPA to see which ones can be prioritized and which could be considered for restoration. Members discussed what was meant by the motion and Darren thought he had covered it in Objectives 1 and 2 (2-90 and 2-91). Jerry suggested adding an action item to proactively survey springs.

Alice questioned with all the burning projects planned it will displace cattle and is there a necessity to provide someplace for them. Karla explained BLM works with the permittees closely, but is not responsible for supplying other feed. It is a cooperative effort.

Special Status Species, Page 2-23 Action Item 4 under Objective 5

Jerry reminded BLM all requirements of IMP have to be addressed.

Update:

Karla reported comments received as of today (noting the comments were not all in yet) on the Ankle Creek EA appear to be problematic issues to be resolved. Two of the bigger issues are snowmobile use and Berrington Trail. Karla asked if SMAC members wanted to make a quick recommendation to say these were covered by the SMAC recommendation on the EA. The SMAC declined to do so. There will be a further update coming on this.

Public Comment Availability:

Stacy asked if the comments received by SMAC, both orally and written, could be considered RMP comments. Gary stated he believed they had been considered and the council discussed what impact that has. Stacy urged BLM to do so if they had not yet. It was suggested that different people have different expectations of what they are accomplishing and maybe that should be something clarified as to what SMAC or BLM is doing. Jerry Magee explained the ramifications under the FOIA, and how best to make any comments available for public review; and said that Oregon state policy was to send out copies of comments on RMPs without charging to do so.

RMP contract, etc.:

Stacy stated there were people on both sides of the issue and it was contentious for some of them and unsure if SMAC could or should make recommendations.

Members decided to skip this discussion.

Stacy identified the unfortunateness of not having had a specific public comment closing date on the cover when the RMP was issued. It created confusion and late comments because of those who didn't get notification. Gary said that was because they did not know the exact date when the document was sent to the printer.

Motion made and seconded to send a copy of ‘Notification of Opportunity to Comment on the Draft RMP/EIS’ to Don Renie with a simple note in response to his public comment (Stacy made, Jerry seconded).

Discussion: Jerry Magee discussed the means whereby people are notified of public comment periods and the closing dates, how it was done in the past and how it is accomplished now. Both ways have pit falls in them.

No objection.

Consensus decision: SMAC send a ‘Notification of Opportunity to Comment on the Draft RMP/EIS’ to Don Renie with a simple note in response to his public comment.

Social Economic – RMP:

Stacy wondered why on Page 2-123 it lists all the regulations and laws except for the Steens Act and since one of its objectives is socio economic health, it should be mentioned at minimum in this section. Gary explained since it was identified in the first chapter as being overarching, he hadn’t repeated it throughout. Stacy felt the Act should be consistently referred to throughout the document, rather than the hit and miss that currently exists. Gary explained the information for this section is difficult to obtain and sometimes done as an overview of a huge area and not necessarily directly applicable to the Steens.

Gary agreed it could be added.

Stacy suggested to put this on the April Agenda to perhaps be able to discuss it further and develop possibilities. It was also suggested the state labor economist may have some information that would help in the discussion.

April Agenda:

Socio Economic
Fire Management Plan
Noxious weeds
Range/forage

Members discussed what approach they wanted to take the first day of their gathering, what questions they would like answered, who should attend and what might be the outcome. Members decided to have the first day in a group meeting to explore certain aspects of SMAC itself. Karla will ensure a public announcement is made the meeting open to the public will only be one day, the second of the two days.

The following questions were those the members were to come prepared to discuss on the first day.

1. What is impeding me from functioning as more of team player on SMAC?
2. What is stopping me from finding consensus on issues or working toward consensus on issues?
3. What can be done to overcome that which is stopping me from finding consensus?
4. What do I want SMAC to consider?
5. What are my worst fears?

Submitted by Liz Appelman

The SMAC approved the February 2004 meeting minutes as amended on April 13, 2004.

Certified by:

Tom Harris, SMAC Chair

April 16, 2004
Date