

# Steens Mountain Advisory Council

## Meeting Minutes

### April 4 and 5, 2002

#### **Members Present:**

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

#### **Members Absent:**

1<sup>st</sup> Day: Wanda Johnson, afternoon only  
2<sup>nd</sup> Day: Wanda Johnson, Burns Paiute Tribe, Burns, Oregon  
E. Ron Harding, Wild Horse Management, Burns, Oregon

#### **Designated Federal Official (DFO):**

Miles Brown, Andrews Resource Area Field Manager, Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Hines

#### **Designated Federal Official Assistants:**

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

#### **Presenters:**

Dean Bolstad, Wild Horse and Burro Specialist, BLM, Hines, Oregon  
Mark Sherbourne, Supervisory Natural Resource Specialist, BLM, Hines, Oregon  
George Nikas, Executive Director, Wilderness Watch, Missoula, MT  
Steve McCool, Professor, University of Montana, Missoula, MT  
Gary Foulkes, District Planning and Environmental Coordinator, BLM, Hines, Oregon

Mary Emerick, Wilderness Specialist, BLM, Hines, Oregon  
Andy Wiessner, Western Lands Group, Inc., Denver, CO

**Facilitator:**

Dale White

**Commenting Public:**

Susie Hammond, Hammond Ranches, Inc.  
Rob Corbett, Burns City Manager  
Dick Jenkins, Jenkins Ranches  
Cliff Volpe, Assistant Director, Steens Mountain Running Camp  
Brent Fenty, Steens Wildland Coordinator, Oregon Natural Desert Association

**Others Present: (Sign-in Sheet)**

Richard Day, Burns Hines CRT  
Rachel O=Dell Reporter Bend Bulletin  
W. Craig MacKinnen, Oregon State Office, BLM  
Skip Renschler, BLM  
Tom Dyer, BLM  
Ed Davis, Alvord Ranch  
Josh Warburton, Steens Mountain Resort  
Mike Sirrine, PRIDE  
Peter Green, OR Governor's Office  
Mike Golden  
B. Marie Jarreau-Danner, Burns Times Herald  
Paul Griffin, Congressman Greg Walden's Office  
Fred Otley  
Scott Silver, Wild Wilderness  
Manny Berain, BLM  
Tara Wilson, BLM  
Connie Deller, BLM  
Ramona Bishop, BLM  
Glen Patterson, BLM  
Scott Hamilton, BLM  
Stan Woodworth, BLM  
Joan Suther, BLM

**Welcome, Introductions, Housekeeping, Agenda review:**

Facilitator Dale White called the meeting to order, reviewed guidelines, and asked the group to introduce themselves.

Miles thanked SMAC members for their participation in the scoping meetings.

**Chairman Update:**

Tom Harris reported he received a phone call from the governor's office. The Governor is concerned about the perception of a lack of progress by the SMAC. Tom H. stated he believed the group is making progress, although it might be considered slow due to the nature of this process.

Tom H. expressed concern the corrections to the minutes were becoming too time-consuming and asked the group to reconsider recording them.

Jerry apologized for the concern he expressed at the last meeting about Rhonda writing up a list of SMAC recommendations to the DFO for the Chair to sign. After reading FACA he realized Rhonda had been doing exactly as required and thanked her for ensuring the Council was within the guidelines.

Miles discussed the current status of the LWCF monies and suggested changes to the draft letter.

Motion made, no discussion, no objection to consensus was made.

**Consensus Decision:** Approve the letter requesting additional LWCF funding for the Steens Mountain CMPA as corrected by the DFO. (Jerry moved, Tom Harris seconded)

Minutes: Council discussed the minutes, their size and detail as well as the suggestion to tape the meetings as a backup device to help resolve any perceived discrepancies.

Motion made.

Discussion: Members discussed the exact nature and role of the tapes. The minutes do not provide all the details (which they should not) and the tapes would be available for any necessary clarification.

Question was called for and no objection to consensus was heard.

**Consensus Decision:** Tape record the meetings. (Stacy moved, Jerry seconded)

Discussion: Members discussed the level of detail in the minutes and believed it was sufficient.

Motion made, no objection to consensus.

**Consensus Decision:** Continue minutes at the same level of detail, and if someone has a question as to what was said, it is their responsibility to look it up on the tape. (Stacy moved, Cindy seconded)

Burns District Manager Tom Dyer addressed the Council stating he wanted to ensure the group understood the BLM cannot support nor oppose new legislation.

Members talked about their responsibilities and role of making recommendations to the BLM and how best, within the parameters of the Council's Charter, to keep the Congressmen informed of the Council's progress, decisions and stance on different issues. One alternative is to provide position papers. The Council discussed means to remain involved in the draft legislation and still be within the bounds of their mandate. Members felt it was important to gather all pertinent information from as many sources as possible.

Miles felt there were two different issues here. If the SMAC makes a recommendation to the DFO concerning legislation, there is nothing Miles can do with it. However, SMAC can and should continue gathering information about all that is going on concerning the CMPA.

### **Wilderness Access/Cooperative Management Agreement:**

At the previous meeting, Miles agreed to look at alternatives to address motorized access into inholdings. Motorized access for private inholders has been an issue throughout the FS and BLM. Participants in a workshop held in Phoenix were charged with writing an Instruction Memorandum at the National level outlining a procedure to authorize access into wilderness inholdings. Most every wilderness was accomplished through a different designation mechanism, different language, and a different state, which makes a consistent approach near impossible. They did their best to work up an outline and have given it to the various states for review.

Last Monday members of the Burns staff met with the Acting Associate State Director, the BLM solicitor and other BLM Oregon State Office members to discuss the issues surrounding authorization of motorized access to inholdings. That group recommended coming back to the SMAC to obtain suggestions, recommendations and what might be utilized in this legislation. BLM would then take it and see how well it would work. One thing that has to be done is NEPA. This is the means to do an analysis of any impacts and necessary to ensure all management prescriptions are addressed. The issues vary with the different landowners; however, the timeframe as well as fee were of major concern to all.

Stacy pointed out several possibilities such as cherry stemming the roads (which are basically two roads), put it into the legislation, or complete a cooperative agreement, which allows private property owner access and protects wilderness. The details would be worked out in coordination with each owner. Also possible is through the RMP in the transportation plan. The names for the roads, ways, etc., could be redefined. One idea could be a private property access road and the information provided to the public would delineate it as such. Another possibility would be for the SMAC to make a recommendation to the Secretary to grant an easement.

Stacy stated before the legislation, property holders could access their land however, whenever, and by whatever means and that is what they want to continue. Some of those properties historically have been accessed with ATVs and heavy pieces of equipment to maintain improvements, and because it is now Wilderness, it creates a problem. In his opinion they have to allow them what they historically did. Stacy reviewed some of the issues attached to access such as topography and the landowner possibly having to bulldoze a road on his private land, which is not something anyone wants.

Miles talked of the concerns revolving around motorized access, the necessary documentation, how to authorize the access, and how to successfully balance the wilderness values and the need for access. He stated that NEPA is for building the analysis to show the balance.

Concern was expressed over the valuation of private inholdings as affected by access. Jerry noted the wilderness regulations allow the same type and extent of access that was done prior to enactment and land values had increased since the wilderness designation. If someone had been driving there once a year for vacation but now wants to drive in every day, there is no allowance for that in the regulations.

The Council discussed the types of maintenance and the mechanisms in place to accomplish this. Also discussed was how to define maintenance and to what level are roads maintained. If the road happened to be in bad shape when the law went into effect, but the road actually was normally maintained well, which would apply?

Members were concerned about how much effort to put into developing a cooperative agreement on inholder motorized access if environmentalists were likely to vote against it anyway. Alice suggested perhaps the environmental community could come up with sideboards they would like to see. The landowners will do the same.

Miles explained the reason for NEPA is to analyze impacts, the appropriate mitigation, and NEPA is a requirement, no matter what other method of authorization accompanies it.

*Action Followup: Jason agreed to gather minimum requirements the environmental community would want for a cooperative agreements on inholder access and pass them on to Stacy, who would then confer with inholders and decide whether to draw up a draft cooperative agreement for the next meeting*

## **Public Comments:**

Susie Hammond B gave up opportunity to speak.

Andy Wiessner, Western Land Group, Inc., suggested the SMAC send a copy of their letter concerning LWCF to the House and Senate subcommittees, along with some good pictures of

the area for which the funding is sought. Andy made several suggestions on how the SMAC, as a group and as individuals, could pass on information to the Congressmen.

Rob Corbett, City Manager of Burns, spoke for City of Burns as well as the Community Response Team (CRT) which is a citizens= group formed to address economic opportunities for the communities of Burns and Hines. The City of Burns and the CRT appreciate the work being done to preserve Steens, the people, and the livelihood of those individuals working the land. The City requests this process (the SMAC) recognize there are also benefits to the Burns and Hines communities. Rob specifically referred to tourism and recreation, which could spawn related developments within the towns benefiting the local communities.

Dick Jenkins, Jenkins Ranches, stated he is a permittee on the north end of the Wilderness area. He requested his allotment, the Burnt Flat Allotment, remain within the Three Rivers Resource Area because a management plan is already in place to deal with the issues within the allotment. He reminded the Council when dealing with the issue of access and improving access, they need to consider the BLM has to go in periodically and gather horses. Dick stated sometimes what is done within an area requires a change of access conditions. He felt the people on the Council are in a real difficult position and have to find the means to be innovative within the Steens Act even with the other legislation impacting the area. The Council needs to consider those people who have been on the land for so long.

Tom Harris read Christopher Johnson's letter. Mr. Johnson expressed concern about the possible interpretation of the Steens Mountain Act of 2000, which could prohibit some of the activities of the Steens Mountain High Altitude Running Camp. He believes the camp should be able to operate the same as it always has and detailed his reasons for this belief.

Tom Harris then read Dave Anderson's letter. Mr Anderson discussed Wilderness and the challenges the Council faces in implementation of the Steens Act. He recommended adaptive management of the High Steens and adopting a wait-and-see attitude before making significant changes to access the area. He believes the Loop Road presents a unique challenge to wilderness management but suggests leaving it, as well as the spurs out to the Wildhorse/East Rim overlooks, open. He included in the open roads those providing existing access to private inholdings. He suggested the Moon Hill Road and the Kiger Road need to be closed as soon as possible and increased law enforcement presence be accomplished.

### **Wild Horse Presentation:**

Ron Harding introduced the presentation with his background, which included running the Burns District Wild Horse Program for many years. Ron gave the Council a history of the various laws passed affecting wild horses and burros.

Ron introduced Dean Bolstad, Wild Horse Specialist for the Burns District. Dean described the three Herd Management Areas (HMAs) within the CMPA, their Appropriate Management

Levels and current populations. He then related the particulars of each unit, the types of horses they support, what management activities have taken place within the areas, and the affect of the various fences that have been installed.

## **Transportation**

Mark Sherbourne reviewed the Management Plan requirements calling for a Transportation Plan, which has been identified by this group as their top priority. Part of the Transportation Plan includes the Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) designations, which are determined in the land use planning process. Mark stated all Federal lands are classified as open, limited or closed to OHVs, and reviewed the various types of designations, the areas in which they occur, and the reasons for them. Mark identified several issues needing to be addressed when building a Transportation Plan such as the Alvord Desert, Moon Hill, and access to hunter camps.

Miles noted each special designation often adds a new layer of OHV designation. There are currently seven types of OHV designations and he would like to see these reduced by means of this planning process.

The Council brainstormed issues that should be addressed in the Transportation Plan.

- Anything that has to do with mechanized transportation/vehicles
  - Motorized or not
- Question is whether or not trails part of this as well (non-mechanized)
- Maintenance
- Need
- Site **B** specific (loop road different than other trails how according to use )
- Long-term vision for dealing with increasing tourism
- Monitoring
- Campsites
- Signs
- Aircraft **B** helicopters landings **B** height
- Size of vehicles
- Number of trips
- Season of Use
- Terminology of designation
- Paving Road
- Emergency Issues
- Off-Road Travel
- Adaptive management
- Designating all routes within Andrews as well as the CMPA???
- What baseline information is going to be used **B** when photos taken etc **B**
- New Development **B** not necessarily new roads (perhaps park, turnaround,

interpretive)

- Equestrian trails
- Corrals
- New parking for access
- Where to put horses in wilderness
- Enforcement
- Defining the width/buffer of the roads
- Identifying the grade of road
- Easement/partnership aspect (easements private/easements public) **B**
- Administrative Travel/Facility Maintenance
- Implementation Plan Timing **B** when do you do what you are going to do/prioritizing
- Availability of Restroom facilities
- Road closure reclamation
- Private Property Access
- Expansion of existing developed camp facilities
- Cooperative Agreements/Stewardship

Rather than address each issue, it was decided to start by addressing issues concerning the Steens Loop Road.

Members discussed the pros and cons of buses (the size of school buses) being utilized on the Loop Road. Concerns included substantial infrastructure to accommodate them which in turn would impact visual aesthetics as well as many other resources, substantial maintenance for the road to support bus trips, drivers unfamiliar with the areas, and swiftly changing weather.

Members thought one way was to possibly limit the size of vehicles (weight restriction), with exclusions for administrative uses.

Council members discussed possible dust abatement measures for the Loop Road, timeliness of maintenance, monies available, safety issues and the extreme degradation of the road in the Rooster Comb area.

A subject of some discussion was the possible moving of the gates higher. More research would have to be done to determine wildlife impacts as well as whether or not the road has been improved enough to prevent the degradation that was partially responsible for the current location of the gates.

Alice suggested it might be a good idea to have part of the road closed around the Rooster Comb area and make it a trail only.

Miles understood there would not be consensus by the group, but much of the discussion has given him parameters for the spread of alternatives. He noted a couple of issues that have been raised a lot, i.e., turnaround areas for trailers, automobiles, and snow mobiles; increasing horse use from South Steens campground; and places to park when people venture afoot away from the road.

Miles said comparisons of some pre WSA aerial photos, maps reflecting what was captured in WSA inventory, and the completed maps of the current inventory will be made to determine when roads came into existence. Council members felt this was an important step in beginning the task.

Stacy noted part of the ground truthing would be to determine what roads should be closed due to environmental damage or maintenance needs.

Stacy, Tom Harris and Cindy want to be involved in the inventory process.

*Action Followup: BLM to meet with Stacy, Tom and Cindy to capture road information they have already gathered from the landowners.*

## **April 5, 2002**

Tom called the meeting back to order.

### **Questions from Thursday:**

The Council reviewed the minutes with the suggested changes, accepted and modified them as needed.

Motion made, no discussion, no objection to consensus heard.

**Consensus Decision:** Minutes be approved as corrected. (Stacy moved, Tom W. seconded)

Tom Harris and Jerry previously submitted corrections to the draft letter to the DFO from the February 28-March 1 meeting. The word Steens was added to the name of the brochure.

The LWCF letter in final form was approved.

Tom Harris urged members to do some homework between meetings and expressed concern it might be necessary to schedule another meeting to ensure the Council can accomplish what is necessary. Members want to wait before scheduling more meetings to try out the longer time between meetings.

## **Land Exchange:**

Andy Wiessner, Western Land Group, Inc., stated his firm's primary job is to try and get a land exchange completed. He reported Mr. Stroemple has just purchased the Blair properties and will try to convey those to BLM in exchange for some Forest Service land near Sisters. The only way to make that kind of exchange is through Congress. Andy reviewed the bill he drafted for legislation including the exchanges and proposals.

Andy answered various questions from the Council on funding issues, development easements, and Dingle Creek. He asked for any guidance from the SMAC they would be willing to give. The Oregon Congressional delegation told his firm this was the appropriate forum for it.

Council members discussed what they should do to give guidance to Andy, since the SMAC's charge is to provide recommendations to the BLM. It was deemed important to provide Andy as much guidance as possible and to remain involved in all aspects of issues affecting the CMPA.

The Council agreed to provide Andy feedback on behalf of their constituents as long as it was not considered voting on a recommendation.

Sections 4, 5, 6, and 7 (Exchanges) of the draft legislation addressed the same general issue and they each would give their thoughts on it.

Jason supports exchanges, cooperative agreements, and easements that further the purposes of the Act and, as presented, these seem to do that. He is generally supportive.

Miles told the Council the Forest Service's District Ranger at Sisters is opposed to an exchange of Forest Service land in this instance. It would set a precedent as well as the land wanted is not on their list to be exchanged.

Tom Harris is not ~~un~~opposed to exchanges or nondevelopment easements and would go along with that. How the Forest Service works it out is up to them. He would agree with the Davis exchange.

Stacy doesn't have a lot to say about the exchanges. They are fine from his standpoint.

Alice is generally supportive because these seem to be in line with the Steens Act and they appear to further those aims.

Steve is generally in favor of what has been stated before about consolidated ownership. He does have a couple concerns. One of the Forest Service's reasons to oppose the exchange is the money. They have put money into fish improvement projects, and if the land goes to

private ownership, whether or not it will be followed through. He also has a concern about equal value, some going through FLPMA and some being mandated.

Dr. Wendel felt if these are consistent with the Steens Mountain Act, he has no problem with them.

Harland agrees with what has been said. He also thinks if there are other particular landowners who would want to come forward to join in this exchange legislation, he would be for that as well.

Cindy agrees as long as the land exchanges are consistent with the Act. She does have concern with the future of the Steens. If land speculation should begin to occur, it would cause the loss of the cultural integrity of the area. Cindy also expressed concern while this type of thing should go through the easiest way possible, people need to understand it is being done by those who were hired to do it. The SMAC is not the ones hired.

Hoyt can support all the exchanges. He wants to do an exchange, which will take more time than is available to be included in this legislation.

Jerry stated since Alice and Jason were representing ONDA and Oregon Trout, he would try to speak for the others in the coalition as well as those outside. He knows there are constituents in Oregon and outside that would be very concerned about the Forest Service side of the exchange. Even though it is not part of the SMAC's job to deal with it, there are local Sierra Club groups and the group in Seattle that would be very concerned about that particular exchange and whether or not it is a fair trade. He noted the acres have changed in the Forest Service exchange (Andy said it was because of the Blair property being done instead of Dingle). Constituents of his have been upset the exchanges were not going through NEPA and the EA process, however, some extensive work by Jill Workman got the groups to go along with the initial legislation, but this time might be even tougher. He stated a full appraisal should be done on all of them to decide if it is worth it. Jerry expressed concern that Dingle Creek is no longer part of it. Dingle Creek was originally part of the package and it was of great interest to his group. Because it has been dropped, it could detract from this proposal.

#### Section 8 - Boundary Adjustments

Tom Harris stated he does not know about all of these specifically, but is in favor of boundary adjustments as a general rule if they clarify things.

Stacy finds it very disheartening. When after the lengthy discussion over the water gap, this group would not support the legislation to make the boundary adjustments.

Alice, Steve, Tom Wendel, and Jason are in support of it. Jason asked Stacy to expound on his comments.

Stacy stated the group had agreed to support legislation to do this. Miles clarified although this group agreed and supported BLM to continue to have livestock in that area, it is still within the no grazing area and only through legislation can that be changed.

Harland, Cindy and Hoyt support it.

Jerry wanted to ensure the group understood the issues he was bringing up were ones his constituents had raised.

Jerry stated, to address Stacy's concern, what SMAC had agreed to do on Stacy's concern was just like with the lawsuit, the groups outside SMAC would work directly with the legislators to make it happen.

Jerry believes most of the focus would be to solve the problem, so it would not have to be dealt with later; however, there may be some concern about removing any land for personal water supply, and the smaller the amount of land the better it would be.

Section 8 - Steens Mountain Running Camp: Harland abstains. Tom Harris is in favor, and Steve, Stacy, Alice, Jason and Hoyt qualified support.

Stacy's qualification is based on his belief the Act protects the historical use and when individuals are separated out for protection, the Act is weakened as well as weakening the position of the other permit holders.

Tom Wendel is in favor.

Cindy fully supports Harland and wants him to operate, but she has a major concern with only the Running Camp being in the legislation rather than all the permit holders.

Jerry felt there was room for negotiation on the Running Camp. None of his constituents have said they don't want the camp to operate.

Tom Harris fully supports the inclusion of the Running Camp because he believes it to be unique and should stand alone.

Section 8 - Fire Control Motorized Access for Inholders and Ranchers:

Jerry believes there will be some strong reactions to these since it appears it is an attempt to change the Wilderness regulations and to not go through NEPA, which some of his constituents believe should not be done.

Tom Harris is in support of the language. Stacy is in support of the language although he wishes it did not need to be written.

Alice is okay with motorized access for livestock grazing and fire control, but has some concern over motorized access for inholders.

Steve is okay with it from the extent that it has to be there. He believes the protection is in the original Act.

Tom Wendel qualified support.

Jason agrees these items are adequately dealt with in original Act but recognizes the concern that drives including it in this legislation and is willing to support some kind of language like this. His preference is for the SMAC to help work out solutions to these concerns administratively.

Harland agrees with what has been said.

Cindy has some major concerns with the access to private lands in that it could make it worse.

Hoyt supports fire control, but not livestock and access as they would create more problems.

Some of the concern again lies with the singling out of one entity when there are a number that have this issue.

### **Recreation Use Monitoring:**

Mary Emerick introduced the two speakers, Steve McCool, professor at the University of Missoula, and George Nikas, Executive Director of Wilderness Watch based in Montana. These gentlemen will be talking to the Council about the different ways to manage wilderness and writing a wilderness plan.

Steve McCool, after giving his background, gave a PowerPoint presentation to discuss some of the principles and concepts one can use in laying the foundation for a plan to manage visitor use in the wilderness. Mr. McCool reviewed the background on Limits of Acceptable Change (LAC) and its adaptability as a framework for planning. He gave the group the basics of how LAC is used and what it entails. He reviewed the various

aspects that must be considered such as types of visitors, current biodiversity and how to balance the relationships within these to create a good plan.

George Nickas represents an organization and an interest in the National Wilderness Preservation System as a whole. He spoke of how Steens Mountain fits into the Wilderness System and the overlying principles of wilderness stewardship. He gave the group the benefit of his experience of having worked on various management planning efforts over the years and the pitfalls he has encountered. One of the key points he stressed is Steens Mountain Wilderness is part of a national system of wilderness and should be administered as such. He also stressed the fundamental charge in the Wilderness Act is found in Section IV, b ... Aprevent degradation of wilderness character.@ All users need to be held to the same standards.

### Public Comment:

Cliff Volpe asked the Council's permission to speak last and to have additional time if it is available.

Motion made, no discussion, no objection to consensus was heard.

**Consensus Decision:** Cliff Volpe to speak last with additional time. (Jason moved, Cindy seconded)

Susan Hammond, Hammond Ranches, Inc., was really happy with the progress made yesterday on access issues. She thinks the people who drafted the legislation would be impressed with yesterday's meeting over and above the last four meetings. She does believe there were two areas in the access issue that were not covered. When the Council discusses the Loop Road and possible weight restrictions, she asked them to remember it is also a primary access road for a lot of businesses. When discussing the Moon Hill Road and any closure of it, the Council needs to take into consideration that would divert all of the traffic to roads not graded for heavy public use. Susie did inform the Council last week it was announced by Oregon Cattlemen Harney County has the largest mother-cow herd in Oregon.

Brent Fenty, Oregon Natural Desert Association, wanted to provide clarification he was not certain as to the issues with moving the gate, but felt it had to do with mule deer winter range and wanted to follow up with a wildlife biologist to ensure that was correct. He wanted to ensure the Council understood George Stroemple has been going to the Mountain for 40 years and not to put him in with the group of land speculation. Brent asked the group again to think about holding meetings outside of the Burns area in order to give a lot of people who have an interest in the Mountain a chance to be heard.

Stacy asked Brent if there was any objection about moving the gate beyond the deer winter range issue. Brent deferred any answer about the road to someone from his organization who is more knowledgeable on road issues.

Cindy assured Brent she did not intend to include Mr Stroemple in that category, but rather she was worried about the precedent this exchange might set.

Cliff Volpe asked the Council to recommend to BLM to issue a permit to the Steens Running Camp to allow The Big Day and Cross Canyon. He believes it does not violate the Steens Act or the Wilderness Act of 1964. He has attended the camp for 15 years and this camp instills good values in young adults using nature to emphasize how to respect the natural world we live in.

Tom Harris introduced Paul Griffin, aide to Representative Walden. Mr. Griffin stated he was attending the meeting on behalf of Congressman Walden who is very concerned about the activities going on with the CMPA and SMAC and how it is contributing to land use issues. It is a precedent setting endeavor. Council members had a copy of a letter written by Walden and Smith to the Director. Representative Walden has met with Kathleen Clark specifically on Steens issues to relay concerns he had heard.

## **DFO Update:**

Planning Update: Gary Foulkes reported the scoping period ends on April 15 and the brochures were sent to over 1200 names and/or organizations. One concern that has arisen is the small number of cards returned concerning addresses. Gary is aware many of those are from people who would normally wish to remain on a mailing list, so he acknowledges those names cannot just be dropped. Gary stated the BLM fax machines have been flooded with form letters coming from the Wilderness Society Home page. Individuals typed in their name and address, and then it was automatically faxed to BLM.

Jerry said to keep in mind when that mechanism was established, there was no email access for the BLM, and if people found that site and took the effort to send it, their voice should be heard. Gary stated the letters are not being discounted but one should realize managing the health of the land is not up to a vote and constructive suggestions on how to do the RMP or management of the land is what is being sought.

Gary clarified some of the concerns raised through a letter sent out that had some misinformation. BLM is going to address recreation as solitude, ORV designations and how grazing fits. The next steps for the letters are to assemble the comments and categorize them and, in relation to those comments, work on the alternatives.

As far as cooperating agencies, the Tribal council is considering it, the County, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, and the Fish and Wildlife Service are all interested in working in this capacity.

Gary asked the Council to review the handout that showed the RMP format to see if there were any omissions or corrections. Washington Office is trying to standardize the format, but the local staff altered it slightly. The contractors are working on the document and hopefully will have draft alternatives by the end of June and start writing RMP/EIS in July. The target date for internal review is March of next year.

Legislated Land Exchanges: Miles reported that right at the moment the final signatures are being placed on the Fred Otley exchange. All the land exchanges contained in the Steens Act are complete. Much of the credit goes to Skip Renchler.

SMAC Vacancies: The Federal Register notice requesting nominations for the SMAC has been in the Executive Secretary's Office for 2 weeks, which is the last step before it goes to print. Miles will notify Council Members as soon as it has been published.

Fuels Treatment Summary and Stonehouse EA: Miles reviewed the handout for the fuels and vegetative treatments. He talked about the one page summary for the Stonehouse allotment, which in no way covers all the issues. We do have livestock grazing as a causal factor in not meeting rangeland standards and guides and need to do something about that. The EA and AMP need to be completed this next year so after the rest period Ed Davis will know where he stands as far as grazing. Miles asked who would be interested in a field trip to the area, all SMAC members responded affirmatively. He will also invite ODFW and other interested people to attend. The date of August 14 was set for the field trip to depart about 7 am.

Draft IMP: Miles distributed a copy of the IMP with draft stamped on it. Members are to get any concerns to Miles within 2 weeks.

Hoyt would like to see how private landowners could work in cooperation with the BLM to have the BLM crews help with fire on private land. He explained if a private landowner happens to lose the fire onto public land, the liability is such that it usually stops the landowner from burning. He would like to see the BLM crews help with the private lands to ensure a landscape approach as well as allowing the private landowners to accomplish what needs to be done.

*Action Item: Miles to determine the criteria by which BLM could be involved in burning solely on private land and cooperatively.*

## **Recreation Monitoring Panel Discussion:**

Mary moderated a panel discussion with Steve McCool and George Nikas answering questions and outlining their thoughts on various aspects of the management of the Wilderness Area. Steve McCool is more involved in the technical aspect of the process and George Nikas holds the agencies accountable. Council members asked questions of the individuals including, how to determine the best way to obtain visitor data, how to determine key issues, the importance of monitoring, placement of self-issued permit information, private access issues, carrying capacity, funding issues, and unconfined recreation.

## **October Meeting in Bend**

Tom Wendel moved the next SMAC meeting be held in Bend.

Motion ruled out of order due to procedural reason - cannot get a Federal Register Notice issued in time.

Discussion: It was suggested perhaps a hearing sort of meeting might be held in Bend rather than a full-blown SMAC meeting.

Motion made to hold the meeting in October in Bend (Tom Wendel moved, Jason seconded), no discussion, several objections heard to consensus.

Roll Call Vote (simple majority needed to pass)

Jerry - Yes  
Hoyt - No  
Cindy - No  
Harland - Yes  
Jason - Yes  
Tom - Yes  
Alice - Yes  
Stacy - No  
Tom - Yes

Motion passed.

*Action Item: Miles complete Federal Register Notice.*

### Agenda:

Explanation of Visitor Day Numbers - Evelyn  
Transportation  
Inholder Wilderness Access Cooperative Agreements – Stacy and Jason  
Cultural and Tribal concerns presentation

Recreation Monitoring System  
Update on Legislation

The Council reviewed and updated the Action Item List.

Critique of meeting:

- productive meeting
- enjoyed the LAC presentation
- get critique of minutes done early and out of way
- exchanges are completed
- it is wonderful all can sit and talk over the issues
- great forum to discuss issues
- get frustrated at the progress
- make ground rule when you speak if it is not solution oriented and positive, leave the room.
- suggest stick to Roberts Rule of Order
- excellent meeting because we did accomplish some things
- committee beginning to look at the problem solving
- pick a couple of issues and let BLM put the boiler plate stuff together and bring it back for review.
- go back to common ground and as a committee talk about vision for Steens
- council should step forward and have enough confidence in itself to give the BLM advice in what we think the standards should be, then tell the BLM to monitor the hell out of it and call us back when they think we are needed.
- the last 2 days were productive
- focus on one or two issues and complete them
- get tied up in meeting minutes
- happy not to spend 2 day on process.
- like the idea of solution-oriented discussion
- glad to have Miles here twice in a row
- thanks to Rhonda, Liz, and Patti
- like recreation thing
- liked when we got down to the specific issue of transportation. We were able to start hacking some things out.
- when talking about generalities, philosophies and attitudes then got bogged down
- avoid getting side tracked, think things out ahead of time
- individuals can talk between meetings to try and scope out the problems
- Roberts Rules of Order can be good and bad

Adjourned

Submitted by Liz Appelman

The SMAC approved the meeting minutes as amended on June 14, 2002

Certified by:

---

Jerry Sutherland, Vice Chair

---

Date