

Steens Mountain Advisory Council

Meeting Minutes

June 5 and 6, 2003

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
Cynthia Witzel, Recreation Permit Holder, Frenchglen, Oregon
Mike Golden, Dispersed Recreation, Redmond, Oregon
Stacy Davies, Grazing Permittee, Frenchglen, Oregon
Harland Yriarte, Private Landowner, Eugene Oregon
E Ron Harding, Wild Horse Management, Hines, Oregon
Richard Benner, No Financial Interest, Portland, Oregon
Steve Purchase, State Liaison, Salem, Oregon

Members Absent:

Jason Miner, Fish and Recreation Fishing, Portland, Oregon

Designated Federal Official (DFO):

Karla Bird, Andrews Resource Area Field Manager, 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
Tara Wilson, Public Affairs Specialist, BLM, Hines, Oregon

Presenters:

Richard DeLong, Enviroscientists, Inc., Reno, Nevada
John Neeling, Wilderness Specialist, BLM, Hines, Oregon
Evelyn Treiman, Recreation Specialist, BLM, Hines, Oregon
Gary Foulkes, District Planning & Environmental Coordinator, BLM, Hines,
Oregon
Richard Day, Community Response Team, Burns, Oregon
Steve Grasty, Harney County Court, Burns, Oregon
Robb Corbett, City of Burns, Burns, Oregon
Bill Wilbur, Harney County Chamber of Commerce, Burns, Oregon

Facilitator:

Dale White

Commenting Public:

Susan Hammond, Hammond Ranches, Inc.
Steven Hammond, Hammond Ranches, Inc.
Joshua Warburton, Steens Mountain Resort
David Blair, Former Congressman Wyden’s Aid
Richard Day, Community Response Team
Stacy Davies, SMAC

Others Present:

Nancy Story, Hammond Ranches, Inc.
Wayne Kinney, Senator Wyden’s Office
Colby Marshall, Representative Greg Walden’s Office
Larry Bartee, Senator Gordon Smith’s Office
Nancy Pustis, Department of State Lands
Randy Wiest, Department of State Lands
Sandy Berain, BLM
Mark Armstrong, BLM
Joan Suther, BLM
Jill Benefield, BLM
Matt Obradovich, BLM
Tom Dyer, BLM
Patti Wilson, BLM
Scott Thomas, BLM
Mike Williams, BLM
Carolyn Freeborn, BLM
Mark Sherbourne, BLM
Joe Glascock, BLM

Welcome, Introductions, Housekeeping and Agenda:

Welcome and introductions of those present, housekeeping, and agenda review.

Chairman Update:

Rhonda reported the Council positions have not been confirmed and the charter is on the Secretary’s desk in Washington.

Tom Harris raised the possibility of forming a subcommittee to help with gathering information for the Council to consider when dealing with inholder access. Karla emphasized the sensitivity of this particular issue and informed the Council the BLM had been asked by the Congressional delegation to consult with SMAC for alternatives. Jerry stated any stopping of the EA process would be unacceptable to his constituents.

Council tabled this issue until Friday and put it in place of Cooperative Management Agreements on the agenda.

Jerry asked for a copy of the letter from Congressman Walden and was informed the contact had been by phone.

DFO Update:

Karla informed the Council Joe Glascock was hired in the vice-Buchanan position. She updated the group on the progress of three land exchanges and projects/work within the CMPA.

Colby Marshall spoke briefly relaying Congressman Walden is still completely engaged in this process. Congressman Walden is working to get funds appropriated for the CMPA, and he needs the SMAC's help to do this. Colby said the Congressman will be sending to the BLM Oregon State Director asking that the BLM suspend any further actions on the EA (Ankle Creek) and work with SMAC to obtain their opinions and recommendations for a reasonable approach.

RMP Update:

Gary Foulkes reported work is progressing on incorporating the comments in the RMP and identified the locations of the various public meetings (Bend, Portland, Burns, and Frenchglen).

SMAC Framework:

Mike Golden and Dick Benner shared some of their concerns and frustrations with the way the Council has been proceeding and provided some possible means of obtaining focused discussions to arrive at solutions (i.e. stronger leadership in determining how to define and discuss issues and facilitator services). The entire group discussed this issue, how to proceed, and what was expected from the BLM (including helping the facilitator and chair with leadership and focused background information; provide professional facilitator if the Council wishes; to follow through on what is expected; and come back to SMAC and let them know what has been done.) Mike, Dick and Karla will bring a proposal to the meeting tomorrow.

Recreation (Follow-Up Proposed Management Action):

Council members read Objective 6 and discussed their concerns with the different types of special recreation permit (SRP) operations and how to accommodate as well as identify them.

Motion made and seconded that BLM give priority to create a Level A, B, and C. Give priority to historical, legally permitted operations (Level A), the historical less legal are a Level B, and all the rest are Level C. This is reflected in Alternative D throughout the plan any time decisions or allocations are to be taken that would affect SRPs (Special Recreation Permits) (Stacy moved, Harland seconded).

Discussion: Members reviewed historical use as far as permitted and non-permitted uses; what accommodations should be made if any allocation system is implemented; and the impact nonpermitted uses have on those entities that follow the regulations.

Objection was heard to the motion.

Roll Call Vote: Tom Harris – Yes; Wanda – No; Cindy – Yes; Mike – Yes; Ron – Yes; Dick – No; Alice – No; Hoyt – Yes; and Harland – Yes.

Motion failed due to lack of votes.

Cindy pointed out that Objective 6 must be removed from the recommendation letter.

Public Comment:

Susan Hammond, Hammond Ranches Incorporated, Diamond, Oregon, felt it was easy for those with nothing to lose to make the decisions to give things up. She expressed appreciation for the time the Council members are giving up and hopes they can get it focused. From a private landowner's standpoint no Cooperative Management Agreements have been proposed but rather it has been business as usual or further regulations as usual. She also believes it isn't that ranchers don't necessarily like to be told what to do, but rather they have worked a long hard life to create what they feel is the best most ecological, most environmental friendly area. The area these ranchers created is what this law now seeks to protect.

David Blair, worked with the Congressional staff who helped form this legislation and handed it off to this Advisory Council. The intention was the Advisory Council would begin to get to agreement on various issues. Once this diverse group did that, the Congressional delegation could move forward with more initiative. He stated that Congressmen had set the stage for this group, but was reliant upon the Council to find means to resolve issues. This is the best way to obtain political backing for what needs to be accomplished.

Fence Removal:

John Neeling reported FY04 will be the first real year of fence removal after all cows are out of the no livestock grazing area and Eusabio Fence is built. Council members discussed how to best get the fence out of the wilderness area using various methods. BLM estimated \$5,000 per mile to remove fence from the wilderness and has made a request for funding of \$175,000 per year, in FY04 to FY06. Jerry said that compared to other experts he had asked this cost per mile was high.

Motion made and seconded that BLM try to find \$25,000 to set out a contract for five miles of fence removal (Jerry moved, Ron seconded).

Discussion: Members talked of the need to verify the estimates and the means to accomplish this. Council members clarified that work would not include volunteer personnel and the dollar amount was an example only.

No objection to motion.

Consensus Decision: BLM try to find \$25,000 to set out a contract for five miles of fence removal

Members discussed means of using volunteer groups as well as Stacy's offer of transporting, when his staff is in the area, to best accommodate the necessary work. It was cautioned everyone who goes in on any volunteer projects this year should be made aware this is not yet a cow free wilderness, so cattle must be expected at this point.

Karla clarified the \$25,000 won't be available till FY04. If then, the window of season available to do this is July through October and when we get funding is what drives the means of accomplishing anything.

Wilderness Monitoring Plan:

John Neeling discussed this plan, advising the group it is a draft and asking them to send him comments on it. Council discussed budgetary concerns and how best to request and utilize any monies received. Currently BLM has some temporary help hired to do the monitoring required.

John Neeling offered anyone in the Council a chance to go with the staff when they monitor the wilderness. Call him or send an email.

Wilderness Management Plan:

John Neeling and Rich DeLong worked with the Council to review more of this plan. They discussed what distance campsites must be from water sources; effects of catholes and how they are placed; differences between the gorges and the rest of the CMPA; and whether or not camping should occur in RNAs and which ones, if any, these would be.

Motion made and seconded to close Little Wildhorse RNA to camping (Stacy move, Ron seconded).

Discussion centered around the fact this is a very small, closed basin on top of the Mountain. The concern is about the impacts to it because there is very little soil, it is difficult to make catholes, and is in fairly pristine condition.

Consensus Decision: Close Little Wildhorse RNA to camping.

Motion made and seconded for Little Blitzen RNA and Rooster Comb RNA to be open for camping in historical camping areas consistent with wilderness plan (Stacy moved and Tom seconded).

Discussion: Jerry questioned how camping could be allowed when the existing plan says it isn't. He suggested a better route would be if the campsites are in the

part of RNA that does not contain whatever the RNA was designated for, then allow camping to continue in that area.

Stacy withdrew his motion and Tom agreed.

Motion made and seconded to allow camping within the Little Blitzen and Rooster Comb RNAs in historical areas consistent with the purposes of the RNA and the Wilderness Plan (Stacy moved, Tom Harris seconded)

Discussion: None

No objection heard.

Consensus Decision: Allow camping within the Little Blitzen and Rooster Comb RNAs in historical areas consistent with the purposes of the RNA and the Wilderness Plan

Motion made and seconded to allow overnight camping with no pack stock allowed at Wildhorse Lake (Stacy moved, Hoyt seconded).

Discussion: Members discussed if a valid concern existed, how it should be addressed, such as backpackers only or if any limit at all should be set.

Hoyt withdrew his second, Tom Harris seconded.

Stacy withdrew his motion and Tom agreed.

Motion made and seconded to allow camping at Wildhorse Lake in a defined area in designated camping areas and no pack stock overnight (Stacy moved, Tom and Jerry seconded).

Consensus decision: Allow camping at Wildhorse Lake in a defined area in designated camping areas and with no pack stock overnight.

Council discussed party size limits that might be included in an array under the alternatives, and whether or not heart beats should be included. Cindy reiterated the viable party size is also dependent on the requirements connected to picketing as well as packing feed in for the animals.

Stacy asked if the language could be changed to perhaps when stubble height is measured to a certain number of inches then grazing will be stopped and feed must be packed in or pack stock use will be stopped.

Stacy proposed to eliminate the sentence “The use of highlines or picketing of stock....; no grazing would be allowed within 150 feet of all water sources and tying of stock to trees would only be allowed for loading/unloading. “

Motion made and seconded to reword the paragraph to read: “No tying of stock to trees for overnight. Those stock picketed, tethered, or high lined will be done so at least 100 feet from water sources. Grazing of pack stock would be allowed consistent with standards and guides for grazing (Cindy moved, Hoyt seconded).

Discussion: Members discussed the facets of hobbling, types of animals it works with, how to determine appropriate party size, how to monitor to ensure meeting objectives, and the part permits play in determining carrying capacity.

No objection heard.

Consensus Decision: Reword the sentence to read: “No tying of stock to trees for overnight. Those stock picketed, tethered, or high lined will be done so at least 100 feet from water sources. Grazing of pack stock would be allowed consistent with standards and guides for grazing.”

Motion made and seconded to strike the sentence in Alternative D: “The use of highlines or picketing of stock would be required; no grazing would be allowed within 150 feet of all water sources and tying of stock to trees would only be allowed for loading/unloading” (Stacy moved, Ron seconded).

Discussion: None

No objection heard.

Consensus Decision: Strike the sentence in Alternative D: “The use of highlines or picketing of stock would be required; no grazing would be allowed within 150 feet of all water sources and tying of stock to trees would only be allowed for loading/unloading.”

Jerry pointed out the SMAC recommendation on group size had not been incorporated into this document, and if it isn't done here, it will revert to the prior table. He has a concern with it because he didn't go along with provisions of numbers, but rather believed it should go through an EA. This could be accomplished through adding “based on environmental assessment” to the sentence.

Rich talked of the need to analyze a range of alternatives allowing for some flexibility in order to accommodate exceptions but would still follow NEPA if needed. Council members discussed what ratio of people to animals allows a viable packing operation as well as what would fit within the alternatives and the resource impacts. It was made clear the limits would apply to all users, commercial or not.

Motion made and seconded to limit group size to 12 in Alternative D (Jerry moved, and Richard seconded).

No objection was heard

Consensus Decision: Limit group size to 12 in Alternative D.

Motion made and seconded to limit number of stock to 15 in Alternative D (Dick moved, Alice seconded).

Discussion: Jerry raised the concern of exceptions to the proposed number and how it would be handled. Gary and Karla both said at the time the exception is identified, BLM would determine through a review if it is reasonable and within the analysis in the RMP.

No objection to the motion was heard.

Consensus Decision: Limit number of stock to 15 in Alternative D.

Motion made and seconded: to include “except for historic use on a case-by-case basis subject to NEPA” (Stacy moved, Ron seconded).

Objection to the motion heard.

Discussion: Mike asked to ensure any applications not identified as historical are not precluded by this motion. Council members discussed the implementation of this motion and what ramifications it might have.

Mike withdrew his objection.

No other objections heard.

Consensus Decision: Include “except for historic use on a case-by-case basis subject to NEPA.”

Council members discussed how to deal with baseline that is not well known; what type of measurement should be used; and the use of percentage increases since they could adversely affect how some things are dealt with.

June 6, 2003

Introductions, Review and Approve May Minutes, Action Items:

Minutes: Council members reviewed the proposed changes.

Motion made and seconded to approve minutes as corrected (Jerry moved, Alice Seconded).

No objection heard.

Consensus Decision: Approve minutes as corrected.

Action Items: Only open item is the one for controlled hunt applicants, and nothing yet has been received.

Followup from Yesterday: Mike reiterated the Council had talked about wanting to use some sort of process to help focus the group on important issues. He and Dick agreed on the inholder access topic. Council members did discuss using a less contentious issue to begin with, but felt this was an extremely important one to tackle. Mike and Dick proposed the facilitator should be contracted or specifically trained, no affiliation, and the subcommittee formed would be separate although would work with the facilitator closely.

It was suggested BLM send out the EA draft sent to the SMAC as a kind of scoping document telling people BLM and SMAC are going to try to resolve this issue and allow people to send in their comments by a certain date.

Motion made and seconded to hire a facilitator to take one issue and go through the process (Jerry moved, Mike seconded).

No objection to motion heard.

Consensus Decision: Hire a facilitator to take one issue and go through the process.

Topic for facilitator: Council members discussed how the process would work and what topic would be most beneficial to use a facilitator's help. BLM is to work through the process to find the facilitator, and send out a list of those names that are obtained from the State organization. Council members also discussed concerns ranging from access being a property right; the devaluation of property if it is regulated; and whether or not the group can handle it if they don't reach consensus after a grueling process.

Motion made and seconded to use the wilderness inholder access as a topic for the facilitation (Stacy moved, Dick seconded).

Discussion: Jerry stated he would vote in favor of this being the topic for facilitation, but he wants it noted that BLM has been consulting with the SMAC about this since the first meeting in October 2001, and inholders had been provided the opportunity to come up with a cooperative agreement on their terms but did not. The EA should go public so the SMAC meeting in September can be focused on the comments and advising BLM on the final decision.

Consensus Decision: Use the wilderness inholder access as a topic for the facilitation.

Motion made and seconded that in preparation for the September facilitation BLM conduct some scoping that brings in views beyond the people sitting around the table to inform the facilitation (Dick moved and Tom Harris seconded).

Questions were raised whether or not the term “scoping” could be called public information gathering, or was “scoping” a technical term?

Karla stated we would probably call it scoping and let the people know the alternatives we are looking at now, but she thought it is more appropriate than sending an EA out fully knowing we are going to send out another EA.

Jerry asked if the information basically in this scoping letter would be everything the SMAC already has (this draft) and was told pretty much.

Discussion: Jerry stated he sees no reason to delay the EA and will object to the motion.

Objection heard.

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

Motion is approved due to sufficient votes.

Council members discussed if a subcommittee were formed, how it would interact with the facilitator and whether or not the rolls would conflict.

Motion made and seconded to have Tom Harris establish a subcommittee on this issue to work with the facilitator (Cindy moved, Dick seconded).

Discussion: None

No objection heard.

Consensus Decision: Tom Harris establish a subcommittee on this issue to work with the facilitator.

Social and Economic Values:

Gary Foulkes discussed the difficulty in obtaining valid information for this topic in the RMP. Gary also informed the Council how this topic is being discussed and applied within the RMP. The lack of information available also causes problems in evaluating the data and applying the effects within each alternative.

Council members talked of the different methods available to possibly acquire more data such as ORCA documentation, Columbia Gorge information, and Harney County data such as the Frenchglen hotel visitor statistics. The differences in the recreating public were also discussed and the impacts they have on the local economies (i.e. coming with their food vs. buying it here); and the impacts of what all the new regulations have on both private and business communities. Stacy offered to help calculate some of the livestock industry statistics.

Speakers:

Richard Day representing Community Response Team of Harney County
See attached letter.

Robb Corbett, Burns City Manager
See attached letter.

Bill Wilbur, representing Harney County Chamber of Commerce, is a fourth generation resident of Harney County. He came back to live here and the changes were quite astonishing. He talked of the past history of the infrastructure of Harney County and how it has dwindled. He recalled the days of Edward Hines, and the days of open range from Riverside to Drewsey. Then came allotments and fencing, which would create enemies out of what used to be neighbors, that is cultural/historical, even that is gone and it is sad. Recalls grass and cows and wildlife. Dad talked about how the people took care of the mountain. He taught us then about the value of taking care of your land and the public land. It is well understood that if you don't take care of the land, you will be out of business. He stated he came here to talk about the value of tourism. He wondered who could possibly read the RMP because of its size and complexity. Two things have a huge impact on the viability of a community, which are the school system and the health care system. He stated fiddling with the private property ownership and taking away tax base has the potential to destroy the community. As a private citizen as well as the vice-president of the Chamber of Commerce, he doesn't want to see this happen. The community is already suffering and if it gets much worse, we will lose more of the business. He urged the Council to collaborate, but do the right thing for the citizens who live here not for those who live elsewhere.

Steve Grasty, Harney County Judge, complimented the Council on the work they have been doing. He stated he didn't have a big insight on social and economic issues, but does know the agency is trying to apply social and economic analysis when they are not trained to do it. He believes it is the first thing that should be addressed rather than the last as is being done with the RMP. He stated the BLM had asked for guidance from the SMAC and he challenges the SMAC to lay it out and quit arguing about process. He cautioned the Council on getting too specific which results in more impacts to the local economy. He has heard a lot of conversation on the dollars, but he feels that you can't fragment it. He said to tell the Basque folks or the Tribe they can't go there, the impacts would be horrific. He has said several times he thinks there is a concerted effort to do rural cleansing and it is happening. Every job in Harney County equates to 144 in Multnomah County. How do you quantify the fact the next place to find a job is 130 miles away? Social and economic things have been the driving force to keep the Mountain in good shape.

Public Comment:

Stacy Davies, Roaring Springs Ranch, stated as the SMAC is discussing the private property access issue, one of the things to go back to is the whole purpose of Cooperative Management Agreements in the Act. There was the realization there is a lot of intermingled private and public lands on the Mountain. These lands are reliant on one another and if separation of management occurs, it will be to the negative on almost any issue. He put forth the example that if BLM is too restrictive on private landowners, they could rebel and stop public access on private land to access public land. All issues concerning the Mountain are tied to each other and the only thing that will keep the Mountain anything like it is, is to find ways to really work together. One part of the Act says the Agency has to consult with private landowners throughout the process. The way he reads it, this gives the private landowners participating status. They have invited BLM to be in meetings but yet has BLM invited private landowners to come to a meeting. He stressed this might be advisable.

Susan Hammond, Hammond Ranches, agreed with what Stacy said, and she has said it every time she has risen to speak at these meetings. She cited the scenario of going up the Steens Loop Road. You must pass through their ranch. They have not put up signs, but the possibility of fencing both sides of the road and putting up no trespassing, etc., signs is great and for that reason she sees the need to work cooperatively. It is not something they wish to do, but if forced to, they do have the option. She expressed concern the public does not have a chance to verify that what is included in the minutes is true prior to them being approved. Susie felt private cooperative management agreements need to be priority because private economies cannot compete with the government entities. She reiterated private landowners had asked time and again during the legislation process how it would affect private property and the attached rights. They were told over and over again

that it didn't. Yet now is the attempt to take private property rights and this is not what was intended. Private property rights have to be protected over and above cooperative management of the Mountain and also private property rights and access to them are protected by constitution.

Josh Warburton, Steens Mountain Resort, thanked Karla for her decisive action resolving access to Steens Mountain through the North Loop Gate and getting it open. He felt it was a simple policy matter which should be integrated into this plan. He believes this is the kind of thing the Council can assist with. He believes the Council's job is clear and they don't need a lot of statistics to accomplish it. Two of the most important concerns are livestock and associated activities and the other is tourism. All the information has been documented for 30 or 40 years now. It is up to the Council to get down to what can be done to assist the BLM to manage public lands for the next 5 to 15 years. There should be proposed policies to enhance tourism and livestock but not at the expense of the basic resources. This policy he believes should include access to the Mountain as soon as it is feasible. This would probably not be a date and time but rather just a statement that as soon as possible the road be opened. He suggested brainstorming between now and the finalization of the plan on how to enhance and support the local economic concerns of this county. This includes not only Frenchglen, but also Burns and Hines as the primary service areas.

Steve Hammond, local rancher, stated it was his understanding the Council had already approved the minutes for the last meeting. He pointed out to the Council the comments attributed to him were incorrect and asked for them to be revised. He stated the letters he was referring to had been sent to Tom Dyer from the Frenchglen Community and the Oregon State Farm Bureau. Under the second set of comments he stated he had made it very clear when he used the analogy, that he was representing himself and no one else. He asked if there would be any response to the letters received, at a minimum acknowledgement they had been received. He stated cooperative management is what the plan is about. There has to be a certain level of communication and currently he doesn't know what to expect from the Council. He stated the Council is working in a vacuum and wanted to know if there was a level on which the Council would respond back to these particular clubs and organizations.

Council members discussed how best to address the concern of responding to people, whether just a form letter acknowledging receipt or something more detailed. It was left to Tom to respond.

Dick Day, Community Response Team, told the Council there is software available that will help in determining current economics and impacts of different management actions as well as futuring. The software cannot determine the impacts to people though (the social and value of people being able to hold reunions, Tribal visits, or the running camp, etc, etc.) Small towns are the ones feeling the impacts of the decisions of the government, over and over. Dick

didn't know how you present in a plan that if one more thing is lost, a way of life could be lost. He stated the private people such as Susie Hammond will be here long after the people writing the plan are gone.

Minutes:

Tom Harris raised the concern the meeting minutes are not available to the public shortly after each meeting. Since the Council doesn't meet sometimes for 30 or 60 days, it can be a long time in between. He asked the Council to think about making the minutes available in draft form as has been requested. He stated it would take a majority vote to countermand the original decision. Members discussed various options.

Motion made and seconded to make the draft minutes available on the web site until they are approved (Mike moved, Alice seconded).

No objection to motion heard.

Consensus Decision: Make the draft minutes available on the web site.

Tom Harris advised the Council to review any statistical information that is obtained to ensure the validity in application to this area.

Socio Economic Values (Continued):

Gary Foulkes emphasized to the Council that in this process the socio economic factors may be the most important, but they are the last thing that can be analyzed because consequences from the actions and other resources have to be identified in order to know what the impacts would be. Members discussed the different cooperating agencies and the reasons for them; why people who live here are also considered; the lack of information in order to be able to proceed; obtaining information from National Monuments; concern with exploitation of the natural resources; solicitation of information from various businesses; and how to make the RMP more easily accessible and readable.

Bill Wilbur agreed to contact various businesses to obtain information about impacts on local businesses.

Council members discussed the wish to keep the Mountain as it is, rather than to promote it or change the uses; and the need to protect the Mountain and maintain the social and economic uses of it as well as the way of life that exists within these parameters. The group also discussed the need to keep flexibility within the plan in order to meet new issues as they arise. Community members stressed they weren't here to ask for economic opportunity. They realize they have to develop that themselves. What they are asking for, however, is the opportunity not to be shut off by anything this council does.

Wilderness Continued:

Council members began discussion of the management options. The pros and cons of specific numbers or percentages in assessing limits of acceptable change were discussed at length. Concern was raised the current numbers are not accurate; how to quantify what is already on-the-ground; and how usable will the numbers be in a management application.

Motion made and seconded to designate Section 2.21.1 Wilderness Management Framework are guidelines (Hoyt moved, Cindy second).

Discussion: Council members discussed the impacts that guidelines have and the risk of court actions; the letter of the law and the requirements of it; and how to work with flexibility yet have specific outcomes.

Objection to the motion heard, and since the council is operating under the same rules as set up with the other actions, the motion fails.

Concern was expressed the Council is using standards and percentages from another area and their applicability to this area is not yet proven; the need to have accurate baseline data and how to determine the accuracy of it; what numbers are viable; and how to write language to allow monitoring and the flexibility to adjust the guidelines if the monitoring shows it is necessary.

Motion made and seconded the numbers in the guidelines of the wilderness management framework all be made percentages and that the range of alternatives be wide. In alternative B it is a small percentage and in E it is a large percentage (Stacy moved, Cindy seconded).

Discussion: None.

No objection heard.

Consensus Decision: The numbers in the guidelines of the wilderness management framework all be made percentages and that the range of alternatives be wide. In alternative B it is a small percentage and in E it is a large percentage

Motion made and seconded that, if possible, adaptive management flexibility or interim be used as appropriate to allow change of the guidelines after the baseline is established (Stacy moved, Cindy seconded).

Discussion: Members discussed the location of the baseline also has an impact on what type of guidelines should be established. Some areas require very small increases to affect them. Want to ensure the numbers used are modified for the specific areas, such as the gorges being a lower percentage of increase than the plateaus.

Objection heard to the motion.

Motion failed under established rules for this type of item.

Motion made and seconded to recommend BLM establish a carrying capacity which is used as a maximum for each of the standards. If the baseline data shows any exceeding those carrying capacities, that Level three immediately is engaged (Jerry moved, Dick second).

Discussion: For clarification, saying establish a minimum and maximum doesn't mean to replace all the other stuff they are doing, there will still be percentages.

Objection to the motion heard.

Motion failed under the guidelines the Council had established for this type of action.

Discussion: Counsel discussed carrying capacity and how it fits within the regulations as well as the resources and how to implement any restrictions that might be required; when the levels might be applied; and which ones would be most appropriate. Staff and contractor will be looking at this to make changes for this section on the draft.

Cindy raised a concern with text in Alternative D, page 17, "selected road in wilderness would be reclaimed." She expressed concern that any selection process needs to go through an EA and the public is not served by reclaiming any roads. It just makes it easier for the BLM to have only one road to walk down to monitor the area.

Council members discussed ways to help obtain monies for the necessary work on the Mountain. Council members gave permission for Dick Day to speak and he reported the Community Response Team wrote a letter asking for \$5 million and is more than willing to continue their work in this vein.

Topics for the September agenda were identified.

Submitted by Liz Appelman.

The SMAC approved the June 2003 meeting minutes as amended on September 16, 2003.

Certified by:

Tom Harris, SMAC Chair

Date