

# Steens Mountain Advisory Council

## Meeting Minutes

October 22 and 23, 2001

Hines, Oregon

### Members Present:

Wanda Johnson, Burns Paiute Tribe, Burns, Oregon  
Jerry Sutherland, Environmental Representative - Statewide, Portland, Oregon  
Alice Elshoff, Environmental Representative - Local, Frenchglen, Oregon  
Hoyt Wilson, Grazing Permittee, Princeton, Oregon  
Thomas Wendel, Dispersed Recreation, Burns, Oregon  
E. Ron Harding, Wild Horse Management, Burns, Oregon  
Jason Miner, Fish and Recreational Fishing, Portland, Oregon  
Cynthia Witzel, Recreational Permit Holder, Frenchglen, Oregon  
Tom Harris, Mechanized or Consumptive Recreation, Keno, Oregon  
Stacy Davies, Grazing Permittee, Frenchglen, Oregon  
Harland Yriarte, Private Landowner, Eugene, Oregon  
Steve Purchase, State Liaison, Salem, Oregon

### Members Absent:

Roger Alfred, No Financial Interest, Portland, Oregon

### Designated Federal Official (DFO):

Tim Smith, Acting Andrews Resource Area Field Manager, Bureau of Land Management  
(BLM), Hines, Oregon

### Designated Federal Official Assistants:

Rhonda Karges, Management Support Specialist, BLM, Hines, Oregon  
Kay Campbell, Records Manager, BLM, Hines, Oregon  
Patti Wilson, Management Support Specialist, BLM, Hines, Oregon  
Carolyn Chad, Range Conservationist, BLM, Hines, Oregon

### Presenters:

Brad Grenham, Department of Interior Solicitor, Portland, Oregon  
Tom Dyer, Burns District Manager, BLM, Hines, Oregon  
Mary Emerick, Wilderness Specialist, BLM, Hines, Oregon  
Skip Renschler, Realty Specialist, BLM, Hines, Oregon  
Matt Obradovich, Wildlife Biologist, BLM, Hines, Oregon  
Cam Swisher, Environmental Protection Specialist, BLM, Hines, Oregon  
Gary Foulkes, Environmental Planner, BLM, Hines, Oregon

### Facilitator:

Dale White

### Others Present (sign-in book):

Peter Green, Governor's Office  
John Huffman, self  
Brent Fenty, Oregon National Desert Association (ONDA)  
Leroy "Roy" Pruitt, self  
Susan Hammond, Hammond Ranches, Inc.  
B. Marie Jarreau-Danner, Burns Times-Herald  
Jennifer Thies, Environmental and Resource Management  
Mark Armstrong, BLM  
Sandy Berain, BLM  
Steve Grasty, Harney County Court  
Kelly Hazen, BLM  
Ray Hermit, BLM  
Mark Sherbourne, BLM  
Herb Hawley, self  
Terri Geisler, BLM  
Michael Weston, BLM  
Darren Brumback, BLM

## **Monday, October 22, 2001**

### Introductions:

Tim Smith, Acting for Miles Brown as Andrews Resource Area Field Manager, welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced himself by giving a brief biography. The Steens Mountain Advisory Council (SMAC) members introduced themselves with a short history, as well as what they hoped to see this group accomplish. Tim Smith reviewed the agenda for the next two days and discussed what some of his expectations were for the group. Today's agenda was fine, however, additions were made to tomorrow's schedule by adding: photo session of committee and possible election of chairperson.

Tim mentioned he heard from each SMAC member a common goal of doing what was best for Steens because we all cared about the Mountain.

### Housekeeping, meeting needs and lunch/dinner plans:

Rhonda Karges informed the group of the meal plans for the duration of the meeting.

### Meeting Guides/Ground Rules:

Sample meeting guides from the Southeast Oregon Resource Advisory Council were posted and distributed to each member.

The group initiated the following modifications to the ground rules as follows:

- To be recognized to speak, a member will raise his/her hand and be called upon by the facilitator or chair.
- Robert's Rules of Order will be used to conduct meetings.

- The 3 minute floor time may be adjusted at the chair's discretion.
- In the current guidelines, clarify focus of the SMAC to "focus on the SMAC issues and objectives."
- To replace the "Voice Your Opinion" on the current Meeting Guides, the chair will ensure everyone has the opportunity to voice their opinion.
- Replace Number 1 with "Do not interrupt others and no side conversations" which includes cell phones being turned off or calls being taken outside the room.
- The facilitator's role is only to control the flow of the meeting, he/she has no vote, maintains order in the meeting and follows the meeting guides, remaining neutral and helping the SMAC achieve its agenda.
- Add to the list of guidelines that "Leadership is responsibility of **ALL** members."
- No note passing.

*Action Followup Item: An amended listing of the Steens Mountain Advisory Council Meeting Guides will be provided prior to the end of today's meeting.*

### Consensus/Rules of Order:

The group discussed how they wished to reach a decision, whether by consensus or by vote (which would have to be a minimum of nine members agreeing). The driving factor in all decisions should be what is best for the Mountain and the group would strive toward consensus. Some very good reasons were given for coming to consensus rather than trying to just get the nine votes needed to pass on a recommendation. Specifically, that any minority would just work against the decision giving it less value, and that having consensus as the intent would make everyone respect the other's view.

**Consensus Decision:** In making decisions the SMAC will strive for consensus, but if that is not possible, they will accept a roll call vote of nine or more members.

A discussion took place on the need to elect a chair. Two suggestions were made - one was to wait until the next meeting, as it would give more time to get to know one another and the other was to elect a chair tomorrow because there will be assignments to be accomplished prior to the next meeting. The group will revisit this tomorrow.

### Facilitation Needs:

The group talked about the need for a facilitator to help keep the meetings on track, under control and prevent wasted time. However, it is important that the facilitator remain neutral and not have their own agenda.

The interrelationship of Chair, DFO, and Facilitator was described by Tim.

**Consensus Decision:** There is to be an impartial facilitator who works closely with the chair. The two will ensure there is order in the meetings and the meeting guidelines are followed.

### Public Comments:

Public comment procedures the SMAC came to consensus on follows:

- 5 minutes will be given to present each comment, written or oral.
- Written comments are to be read to the group.
- If lengthy written comments are received by the BLM and if time allows, a copy will be provided to the group.
- When the author is not present, the DFO will read any written comments up to 5 minutes.
- The Chair can extend allocated time if needed, based on the number of public wanting to address the SMAC or the complexity of the issues.
- Any committee member receiving a comment letter will forward it to the DFO for distribution to all members and for inclusion in the files.

Comments from People in Attendance:

Roy Pruitt stated he was speaking for himself, family, and friends, and that the area of his concern was the Wilderness use/transportation plan for the Mountain. He felt the road closure area decisions are to be made with advice of the SMAC and the public. He further stated that nowhere in this plan does it say anything about the exact footage in distance from the center of the road to the wilderness boundary. Mr. Pruitt would like the committee to address his concern. A copy of the letter was given to all SMAC members.

Peter Green, from the Governor's office, thanked Dale White for his facilitation for the group and expressed the appreciation of the Governor's office for the SMAC members' dedication. He reiterated that the main goal of the Governor is that solutions be reached collaboratively. The second goal of the Governor is to keep Steens Mountain the way it is. Mr. Green urged the SMAC to use the Governor's office when needed and that the Governor is very involved with this process.

Herb Hawley addressed the group, speaking for the Burns Paiute Tribe. Mr. Hawley requested a transcript of the meeting be sent to him as well as putting him on the SMAC mailing list.

*Action Followup Item: Rhonda Karges will provide a copy of the minutes to Herb Hawley, since no transcript of the meetings are being made.*

Tim Smith, DFO, read a letter from Joseph F. Higgins, which was distributed to the SMAC. Also distributed were letters from the Steens/Alvord Coalition and Wilderness Watch.

Travel:

Rhonda Karges explained the procedures, forms and coverage for any traveling that members do in association with the SMAC. The members were given copies of travel authorizations and voucher forms.

Federal Advisory Committee Act and Charter:

Brad Grenham, solicitor for the Department of Interior explained the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), described what activities of an advisory committee are not subject to the notice and open meeting requirements of the Act; as well as the SMAC's responsibilities according to the Steens Act and FACA requirements for members serving on the SMAC. He provided handouts to the group (copies attached).

Two types of subcommittees are:

- Subcommittees that recommend, these have to be open for public comment period.
- Subcommittees that gather information, these do not have to be open for public comment period.

The area of direct and indirect conflict of interest was extensively discussed by the group. It was suggested that perhaps clarification of the wording in the Charter can be obtained from the Secretary since her office wrote it.

All the members have various types of conflicts of interest, including some with personal stakes on the mountain. The selection process did not eliminate conflicts of interest since it was not Congress' intent to keep these people off the SMAC.

*Action Item: Follow-up on direct and indirect conflict of interest. Tim stated the BLM will work with the SMAC to get clarification from Washington on the Charter language.*

The role of the SMAC and its relationship with the BLM was covered at great depth. The SMAC would not be micro-managing BLM's day-to-day management; but their task was advising on plans and decisions affecting everyone alike in management of Steens. Dale discussed the purpose and function of the SMAC at the start.

### Subcommittees:

Tom Dyer, Burns District Manager presented an overview of subcommittees and described the difference between the SEORAC and SMAC as being commodity, environmental, and recreation interests. The SMAC does not have interest breakouts like other Resource Advisory Councils (RACs). If a subcommittee is going to provide recommendations back to the main group, the time and place of that subcommittee's meeting will need to be identified and a *Federal Register* Notice published.

### Options:

1. Forming subcommittee(s) by:
  - Asking for volunteers.
  - Making sure subcommittees are balanced showing all different views.
  - Determining the size (number of members) of the subcommittee.
  - Defining the results required from that subcommittee.
2. Do not have subcommittees.
3. Have fact finding subcommittee only, to bring information back to the whole committee for decision or consideration.

**Consensus Decision:** Subcommittees may be formed and filled with volunteers and/or appointed at the discretion of the chair subject to the objection of SMAC member(s). Subcommittees will at most consist of eight members.

### **Act Overview:**

Tim Smith presented an overview of the Act followed by a question and answer period.

### **Website:**

Rhonda Karges, webmaster for the Steens Mountain website, discussed the site and the decision not to publish SMAC member's home phone numbers and addresses, only their name, interest, and where they reside. Rhonda will be responsible for all edits to the website. She distributed biographical sketches to each SMAC member asking each to review them and get any comments or corrections to her.

## **October 23, 2001**

Tim Smith talked of the status of some of the questions from the first day. He had requested clarification on the conflict of interest question from the Washington Office, but had not yet received a response.

The group reviewed the revised Steens Mountain Advisory Council Meeting Guides - (copy attached).

**Consensus Decision:** Steens Mountain Advisory Council Meeting Guides as revised are adopted.

*Action Follow-up Item: A request was made for a list of decisions to be drawn up for SMAC members to take with them. Tim Smith and Rhonda will complete this.*

### **Discretionary vs. nondiscretionary issues: (wilderness, OHV, land exchanges, etc.):**

Presenters: Mary Emerick, Tim Smith, and Skip Renchler

Mary Emerick referenced the Wilderness Act, 43 CFR Parts 6300 and 8560, BLM Manual H-8560-1, and the Discretionary and Nondiscretionary Actions in the Steens Act. Mary stated she looks forward to working with the SMAC to complete a high quality wilderness plan for the Steens. She would like to schedule a camp out for the group this summer in the wilderness.

The group was briefed concerning in what manner the BLM will allow access to inholdings. Landowners get reasonable access to inholdings, but BLM will only approve that combination of routes and modes of travel that existed at designation and will cause the least impact on wilderness character.

The frequency of access at different times of year, is also something that BLM can

determine. If an area was never accessed in the winter by motorized vehicle, that access would not be granted now. However, each case will be decided on a case-by-case, site-specific basis. A lease holder would have the same access as the owner had.

Skip also said that the terms of access had to be in writing and Brad clarified that friends of an owner had to be in the same vehicle as the owner. Jerry questioned why realtors were being given keys to take clients in to show property and was told they have the same rights as owners.

Stacy said he felt everything was discretionary.

Renewal of special use permits: Discretionary (see Steens Act) Sec. 115. Currently there are eight special use permittees in the area. These types of permits are decided on a case-by-case basis with the burden on the BLM to provide historic use to the permit holder.

A question was raised as to the guidelines for the number of people in a group. Currently there are no guidelines for numbers but rather the impact on the land. However, there are no current good indicators for the threshold of social type impacts. Some ways of handling the social impacts include appropriate size and appropriate distance between groups. It is hoped that the SMAC could help develop indicators and levels for indicators. When it approaches that level then, a plan would need to be in place on how to handle it.

Harland Yriarte stressed the value of educating the young people on wilderness uses.

Tom Wendel responded to some statements about historical use by pointing out that the legislation did not guarantee renewals of historical permits in the wilderness. If not compatible with wilderness values, the BLM just had to try to find alternative locations.

Road Closures: Congress made the determination of the roads that were to be closed (Reference (Steens Act) (Section 112c) Roads and Travel Access). Mary informed the group that the roads have been posted.

The group discussed the need to educate the public on the road closures. It is posted on the BLM's website and has been passed on to the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) (local).

*Action Followup Item: A process of implementing the new changes, grace period, etc., needs to be developed by this group.*

Tom Dyer reported that he has not received a lot of complaints from the public (hunters, etc.) on the closed roads. He said he got a few complaints about access, but got more calls from bow hunters who liked the new wilderness hunting experience (peace and quiet). Complaints from hunters were mostly about the prescribed burns.

*Action Followup Item: Jerry Sutherland requested to know the number of tickets given to the public on the Steens Mountain. Tim Smith will provide this.*

*Action Followup Item: Harland Yriarte requested road closure information since the wilderness inventory took place. A map showing this information would be beneficial. The groups would like the information by March.*

The question was raised as to what the policy is for setting up footage from boundaries like at the Nye Ranch. According to BLM Handbook H-8560-1 boundaries are 300 feet on high standard roads, 100 feet on low standard roads and 30 feet on two-track roads.

Skip Renschler, Realty Specialist for BLM, assigned to the land exchanges on the Steens Mountain, gave an information session on this assignment. He discussed Section 601 Land Exchanges, reporting that five land exchanges are involved with the Steens. Three have already been completed and the other two will be completed within a couple of months.

Skip explained the discretionary/nondiscretionary aspects of the land exchanges. Future acquisitions are discretionary (see Section 114) with the exception of acquisition of State of Oregon land and interest, which is nondiscretionary, assuming the State is a willing landowner (see Section 402).

Jerry Sutherland asked where the Fiscal Year 2002 Land & Water Conservation Fund money got cut. Tom Dyer stated BLM did not make the cut and it was beyond the Department of the Interior. Jerry asked if it would be helpful for the SMAC to give its support in the next budget requests. Tim said yes, suggesting that be covered early next year. Jerry also asked that the SMAC invite Bill Marlette and Andy Kerr to come speak to this issue at that meeting. This aspect of the legislation was critical to keeping the environmentalists at the table and we may need to have their input. Stacy Davies shared his knowledge of how it was dropped from the Interior Appropriations Bill. The Bill did not identify money for easements and there was not time to rewrite the Bill for Fiscal Year 2002; therefore, they were working with Congressionals to assure the 2003 appropriation of \$5 million would be available, half for acquisitions and half for easements and nondevelopment agreements.

Skip reviewed the phasing out of grazing on the acquired land. The phase-in period, although not specified in the Act, is necessary to allow the landowners adequate time to develop replacement forage and adjust their operations. The basis for the 2-year phase in is in the grazing regulations which provide a grazing permittee 2-year notification prior to cancelling any portion of a grazing permit based upon reduction of public land within the allotment.

Matt Obradovich discussed ODFW's view of not using motorized vehicles to restock lakes or the counting of animals in wilderness land, since these have not been used in the past, it is not a problem now.

Mary recommended the group read Appendix A of House Report 101-405 of the 101st Congress.

### What We Have Done:

Interim Management Policy : Tim Smith discussed this policy. Nondiscretionary planning action due by 2004. Tim requested SMAC look at national guidance memorandum (IM 2002-008) and tweak the draft policy to go with national guidance.

*Action Followup Item: SMAC members review the policy and send comments, concerns, perceived problems and solutions to Rhonda by November 26.*

Even though the Steens is not a National Conservation Area (NCA) nor a National Monument this applies. It is important that the group review all guidance received to ensure it applies to policy and meets our needs.

Projects Environmental Assessment and Status: Matt presented the process the BLM went through right after the Act was signed and what was covered in the EA. He discussed where fences were proposed (12 miles), where fences were no longer needed (55 miles), the no grazing areas, pipelines with troughs, spring developments and water holes.

Jerry pointed out the fence removals had to be accomplished within 3 years of the cows being off. This was a very important condition of the environmentalists who negotiated at Burns on the terms of the EA. Stacy and Matt were both at that meeting. Also, the amount of fence to be removed is more than 55 miles. That is only the amount of fences within the no livestock grazing area.

Cam Swisher reviewed the projects and the contracts that are currently underway and those proposed up to the year 2003.

Fence boundaries, not covered in the plan, will be addressed as they come up. The affect of the 55 miles of removed fence will be addressed in the management plan. Harland was concerned that inholders will have to keep some livestock in order to continue qualifying for farm use zoning. (Livestock is just one factor in farm use zoning.) The projects EA did not deal with surrounding these inholdings with fences.

Preplan, Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Contract, Notice of Intent, Statement of Work, Analysis of the Management Situation (AMS) and Subbasin Review: Gary Foulkes, Project Manager, introduced himself and giving a summary of his experience, then briefed the council on the upcoming Resource Management Plan (RMP). The BLM is undertaking an RMP for the entire Andrews Resource Area with a high emphasis on public involvement. The foundation for an RMP is the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA). While NEPA mandates a systematic, interdisciplinary approach, FLPMA lays out what should be considered when developing a management plan. Further guidance comes from 43 CFR 1610 regulations and the BLM

land planning handbook. Where possible, Federal government should be in conformance with local land management plans. Gary reviewed the planning documents that had been completed on the District. After the signing of the Steens Act, and due to the mandates within the Act, the Andrews Resource Area was withdrawn from the Southeast Oregon RMP (SEORMP). Although the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Plan (ICBEMP) addresses only part of this area, it has not yet been approved. The Act requires a plan for the Cooperative Management and Protection Area (CMPA) and because it is hard to separate resource management in the CMPA from that in the Andrews Resource Area the plan will be combined with the Andrews RMP.

Gary Foulkes said there would be separate subsections for the Wilderness Plan, the Wild and Scenic River Plan, and the Transportation Plan, even though the Andrews RMP and CMPA RMP would be combined.

The group discussed that the CMPA is not an NCA nor a National Monument, yet is put in with these other designations under the National Lands Conservation System (NLCS). It was felt to be important that the emphasis continue to be placed on the fact that this is a legislated concept rather than an NCA or a National Monument.

*Followup: Jerry Sutherland suggested BLM could ask NLCS if they would at least put a footnote on the national website to clarify that the CMPA is not an NCA nor a National Monument.*

Because of the extensive number of new planning starts (48), Washington Office is concerned about consistency. To streamline the process and to alleviate the possibilities of inconsistencies some things within the plan may be nondiscretionary.

Some concerns of the group included a possible perception that the local publics were being told about the plans coming out rather than getting public input, and the need to handle OHV issues locally. Gary assured the group the process was still in the draft form.

BLM sent out a Notice Of Intent (NOI) to prepare the RMP which will be published in the *Federal Register*. Public scoping for this plan is expected to occur in February with notification of meeting dates being issued in news releases. Public will be involved extensively in the formulation of alternatives and planning criteria. Contractors are in the processing of writing the Analysis of the Management Situation (AMS) which is the current management of the area and Subbasin Review (SBR), which is driven by ICBEMP. Completion of this is expected by the end of December. BLM will request that the local government, USFWS, Burns Paiute Tribe and ODFW be cooperating agencies. The process for distribution of the AMS/SBR, which is a precursor of the Affected Environment of the EIS, is not yet determined. Timeframes on the AMS/SBR are tight, but the SMAC needs to review it and provide feedback to the BLM. There will various public meetings to acquire feedback, as the process evolves.

The BLM decided to contract the RMP/EIS to expedite its completion as well as ensure on-

the-ground work continues. After a review of the bids, Environmental Resource Management (ERM) was chosen as the contractor. The Andrews/Steens RMP is the first case in Oregon where an EIS has been contracted. Although the contract people will function as BLM employees, the contractor will make no decisions, this will still be the prerogative of the BLM. Eight people will serve on the core team and an interdisciplinary team of approximately 15 people will be established including a representative from cooperating agencies. The Core Team will deal with contractor and will oversee the Interdisciplinary Team.

The Preplan was required by the Washington Office (WO), and written this year to specify for both the WO and the NLCS Office how the BLM is going to write the RMP. This is an internal document and was not circulated. Gary reviewed parts of the document with the group including a look at what could be some preliminary issues, alternatives, public involvement timetable, and an overall schedule. This entire process is on a tight timeframe with a final deadline of October 2004. Although this is a preliminary plan, it is hoped that it will be fairly accurate. The Statement of Work (copy supplied to members) outlines exactly what steps the contractor has to do to write the RMP/EIS. The first two tasks have already been completed. Although the BLM has 1-year to complete the implementation schedule, after the writing of the RMP/EIS, it is hoped to complete it in the 3-year schedule.

Members were provided a copy of an agenda and invited to attend the training the BLM has scheduled November 27-29 "Planning Concepts," an overview of the planning process. There would be no cost for the course which is to be held at the Casino, starting at 1:00 p.m.

### Fire Update:

Tom Dyer gave a PowerPoint presentation on fire. There were 203 fires throughout the zone with 15 of them on Steens Mountain.

Tom emphasized the importance of prescribed fire as not only a component of the National Plan but for this District as well. Prescribed fire is a tool to help ensure the best situations not only for the environment but for human use as well. Firefighters encountered a lot of different types of fire suppression requirements due to fire frequency, different vegetative complexes, and various elevational effects.

Concerns are associated with the fire program including prescribed fire are:

- Life and public safety:
- Noxious weeds
- Improve habitat for sensitive species such as redband trout, sage grouse/sagebrush obligates and plant species.

Having prescribed fire as a tool requires extensive planning and developing prescriptions to ensure improved management. SMAC will be involved in developing these tools. Tom Dyer, introduced Ray Hermit Fire Management Officer (FMO) who discussed that the current prescriptions are coming from an old Management Framework Plan which needs an update, but must be used until a new plan is written. Tom reported that the prescribed fire at Stonehouse is only partially complete.

Five fires occurred in the wilderness area this year, BLM used a lot of aerial support to control the fires. BLM's response to wilderness fires is based on existing plans which may require an update. Jerry Sutherland asked for a report on the fires and how they were controlled.

Tom Dyer answered the question of why the BLM cannot just let wild fires go even if they are in an area planned for a prescribed burn. Prescribed burns are done in a very controlled manner to achieve specific goals, to control the impacts, and to limit risks to life and property.

*Action Followup Item: The Fire Organization will work with Jerry to supply the information he requested.*

Some discussion was held on the Stonehouse fire that occurred some time ago and the affect the wind patterns of the mountain have on fires.

## Issues:

### Short-term issues:

The group revisited Mr. Pruitt's letter received during public comments yesterday. Tim stated that Mr. Pruitt's situation is in the courts and that is where the decision will be made. Dale White cautioned the group not to get into operations, that is BLM's duty.

## Agenda Items for Next Meeting:

Members discussed that a *Federal Register* Notice must be published each time the SMAC meets to announce meetings times and agenda. The agenda can be adjusted, even after the publication is made.

The group brainstormed possible issues to be addressed, reviewed them and consolidated them into the following list, recognizing that SMAC recommendations will have a direct impact on private as well as public lands.

### **Recreation/Public Use (General Public, Private and Commercial)**

- access
- hunting
- fishing

- summer use
- winter recreation
- wilderness (impacts all other uses)
- OHV
- trail maintenance/construction, nonmotorized permits

**Special Designated Areas**

- redband trout
- juniper management areas
- Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs)
- Wild and Scenic Rivers
- Areas of Critical Environmental Concern
- Wild Horse Herd Management

**Education**

- public
- SMAC - new and unique ways to look at things
- public safety - fire/winter/summer recreation signs
- weeds
- cultural resources

**Transportation Plan**

- ways and trails
- road maintenance
- access
- road inventory
- history of road closures
- road closures
- identification of allowable use roads

**Cultural Resources**

- historic structures
- tribal concerns/uses
- Basque history
- human history

**Watershed**

- water quality
- riparian
- water rights
- juniper
- fire

**Projects**

- fencing
- construction/removal
- water development

- no grazing boundary
- riparian
- fire
- weeds

**Wildlife**

- T&E Species
- aquatic
- redband trout
- big game
- birds

**Partnerships/Programs**

- cooperative agreements
- cooperative partners/landowners
- easements/purchases
- permits
- grazing
- economic uses
- commercial developments (commercial site leases)

**SMAC**

- volunteer base information
- adaptive management
- RMP process
- science committee/consultants
- 17 issues from Preplan

Topics Selected for the Next Meeting

- AMS and Subbasin review
- IMP review
- SRP policy review
- Revisit FACA - conflict of interest
- Discussion and Education
  - electing a chair
  - cooperative agreements
  - incentives
  - winter recreation
  - signs - public education
  - facilitation needs

Schedule for Future Meetings:

After much discussion on a schedule of meetings and the need to proceed as rapidly as possible and still meet the 6-week period for the *Federal Register* they set the following schedule.

**Consensus Decision:** One *Federal Register* Notice will be published to cover the entire year setting the schedule for the meetings as close as possible.

December 17-18, 2001

January 24-25, 2002

February 28 - March 1, 2002

April 4-5, 2002

June 13-14, 2002

August 15-16, 2002

October 21-22, 2002

December 2-3, 2002

February scoping meeting at Burns

Public comment is all of March

All meetings will be held in Burns except the August 15-16 meeting which will be at Frenchglen.

**Consensus Decision:** A generic agenda will be used for the Federal Register Notice and a more detailed agenda for the SMAC.

*Action Followup Item: Tim Smith will prepare the generic and detailed agenda.*

Tim distributed a very general draft on the Interim Special Recreation Permit Handbook for the BLM, Burns District and the Steens Mountain CMPA.

*Action Followup Item: SMAC members to review the Interim Special Recreation Permit Handbook before the next meeting.*

**Consensus Decision:** Election of a chair will occur at the next meeting, first item on the agenda.

### Meeting Summary, Assignments, Feedback:

The members talked of how they could help currently and determined that giving advice on the issues would be the best way. Also as another area, Dale White quoted Section 132 of the Act regarding the use of sound science, existing plans for the management of Federal land within the CMPA, and other tools to formulate recommendations for the Secretary regarding new and unique approaches and cooperative programs that improve and help to develop the management plan.

Members expressed concern on separating their personal roles and their role as SMAC members.

Tom Wendel in respect to the Act, said we could say the categories are (1) new and unique approaches, and (2) cooperative programs that improve and help to develop the management plan.

Adjourned

Minutes recorded and submitted by Kay Campbell, edited by Liz Appelman

The Steens Mountain Advisory Council approved the minutes, as amended, on December 18, 2001

Certified by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Tom Harris, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date