

**John Day Snake  
Resource Advisory Council  
Pendleton, OR  
Meeting Minutes  
December 4, 2007- Business Meeting**

**Business Meeting RAC Attendees:** Frank Bird, Art Waugh, Adriane Borgias, Berta Youtie, John Tanaka, Mike Hayward, Terry Drever-Gee, Bill Lang, Dan Forsea, Phil Shephard, J. David Moryc,

**RAC members not present:** Dave Riley, Robert Parker

**QUORUM:** Yes

**RAC Federal Official Attendees:** Dave Henderson, Debbie Henderson-Norton, Kevin Martin, Mike Montgomery for Stan Benes, Debbie Hollen (for Steve Ellis)

**Federal officials not present or represented:** Jeff Walter,

**Presentors:** Chris Knauf, Tina Welch, Jerry Asher, Cindy Whitlock, Ken Anderson, Allison Kuehl, Nancy Lull, Dave Schmitt

**Visitors:** Todd Thompson, Judy Wing, Patrick Dunham, Mark Webb, Ayn Shlisky

**Designated Federal Official:** Dave Henderson

**RAC Chair:** John Tanaka

**Notetaker:** Pam Robbins

**Facilitator:** Mark Wilkening

\*\*\*\*\*

**Meeting Called to Order/Introductions-John Tanaka, Chairman**

**Travel voucher/Update Roster/Aug meeting minutes approved-Mark Wilkening**

*Need to sign travel authorizations & vouchers & return to Mark Wilkening or mail to:*

*Sally Hall*

*c/o Vale District BLM*

*100 Oregon Street Street*

*Vale, OR 97918*

**John Day Basin RMP -**

Project Overview, Intro of new project leader, and request specific help.

Ayn has done a matrix of the status of each part of the plan. Effort is to look at just the BLM portions of the John Day watershed, which is the eastern half of the Prineville District. Updating direction for planning in areas previously covered by the Grant County, Baker and Lower John Day plans.

Developing alternatives for conditions that have changed: OHV usage, including new science, newly acquired lands, etc.

Access and travel management

Vegetation management

Newly acquired lands

They've developed a grazing matrix to reveal what types and what levels of conflict of overlapping use. They must also consider wilderness characteristics, special areas, and route designations. RAC helped with criteria for designating off-highway use, subcommittee helped with other aspects of the alternatives. There is a great degree of intricacy to this landscape planning effort. The sense of place attributes of each portion of the planning area is part of what the alternatives are trying to keep or enhance.

RMP team lead comes from The Nature Conservancy, and has been in Prineville for six weeks. Past work on fire issues and with the Forest Service in California, Oregon and Washington. Draft EIS is on schedule for publication by the end of March 2008; 90 day public comment period, with final EIS and RMP set for November 2008. Public meetings between March & May next year. Will try to coordinate RAC meetings with best timeframe for the plan process.

*Q. Will this be a similar approach to the Wild & Scenic format used before?*

*A. Need to find out from the Solicitor's Office if that is legal. Preferred alternative presently is #2; #1 is the existing situation, #3 is more intensive off-road use.*

*Q. The lumped alternatives at the end makes that easier to consider. Could you briefly highlight the changes specific to the grazing and, fire topics?*

*A..That's part of the next portion of the program.*

*Q. Have any of these matrices taken global warming effects into account?*

*A..No. The scientific basis is not complete, but Prineville will check with the Solicitor about how this could be inserted into the mix.*

**Comments – Bill Lang:** *there is little acknowledgement of this issue in Federal planning, and this is something that could impact what we do and how we may need to adapt the targets and methods of current plans.*

**Mike Montgomery:** *Forest Service Chief has made this a priority topic, and elements will be included in all their deliberations.*

**Adrienne Borgias:** *Subcommittee has provided some information regarding evaluating all the possibilities, considering how it could impact, and deciding a response. The University of Washington has a center specifically focusing on doing the science in the climate arena.*

**Terry Drever-Gee:** *make sure that we have a solid foundation for any actions we take so we don't over-react – retain the flexibility to adjust if risks are not as great as they may seem.*

**Mark Webb:** *monitoring will help to tell if the fisheries, fire and range health show signs of any distress.*

**Tina Welch:** *Plan group is working closely with USFWS and NOAA on this plan.*

**Dave Henderson:** *this is very much an emerging issue in federal land management*

Grazing & OHV – tracks with page 4; RMPs often look at AUMs and determine what works well. There are very few allotments in the plan area where things have gotten out of whack. Where permittees are following the rules, there is not a real problem. BLM parcels within existing ranches are an issue when a ranch sells; if the new owner does not want to graze those parcels and gives up the grazing lease, BLM is required to advertise that grazing lease, even if it cannot be accessed through the larger ranch property. The plan gives BLM elements to consider about the suitability of this land for grazing, considering several criteria. Alt 1 looks at the 221 allotments (with 27,100 AUM) as open; Alt 2 says 67 open, etc. Another outcome of the plan is the potential to sell or exchange in-holdings when a ranch sells. A diverse and balanced group was involved in developing the matrix of potential conflicts and outcomes. The matrix is weighted to protect fisheries and limit constant use.

OHV use is presently limited in much of this area, because large portions are in WSAs and riparian zones. Planners have been picking out pockets of rocky ground between Spray and Kimberly, and Rudio Mountain, plus Little Canyon Mountain, Golden Triangle and other appropriate spaces. It's important that agencies look together at the routes and limits. Alternatives reflect what the locals said, which include three different proposals. Preferred alternative is a mix of those.

*Q. Could income from sale of in-holdings be used for the grazing program?*

*A..No; it can be applied to the purchase of other lands for a two-year period after receipt of funds.*

**\*\*\*ACTION ITEM:** *Tina will contact Subcommittee members to look at the grazing and OHV areas again. Will discuss today and set up a meeting time.*

### ***Transportation Planning Update-Chris Knauf***

Overview of the handouts: Compare the comments of both RACs and how it is summarized for the strategy.

Values & Resource Uses – going from open to limited; from unmanaged to designated routes. Trends and demographics and how the lands are being used gave a broad spectrum of input for the strategy.

Uses to Consider – Looking at the array of local uses gives planners a wide spectrum of types of use that must be managed.

Methods of Inventory - There is about 1200 miles of shared boundary with USFS that affects what we do on the ground. Some electronic inventory with spot verification may be adequate. User information is another important input factor.

Resource considerations – Costs and conditions are important, as well as connectivity. This must be integrated fully with values section. Monitoring use could be done through self-registration and observation.

Seed transport – Limit travel into weed infested areas; provide methods to keep seeds out of pristine areas

Road Decommissioning – May want to keep obscure routes available for emergency or other uses, but must consider each aspect of risk/suitability.

General Comments – SEORAC did not want roads to be completely abolished, in case they're needed for administrative purposes. Differences between BLM & USFS could lead to BLM's land getting hammered because most land is open use until the strategy is in place. Important to identify play areas for off-road users, so activity is targeted to those areas most amenable to that type of use. Provide free maps to help channel use to desired areas and make designations clear to users.

*Q. Will the maps designate open and closed routes?*

*A..Not sure*

*Q. Where are we going next, and what do you expect the RACs to provide?*

*A..Requesting a recommendation from the RAC to move forward, and developing the areas where the plan should be applied and how soon. This will depend on use. Probably need more criteria teased out, and prioritize what areas are the most critical with limited funds. Try to get greatest impact with least cost. Much will likely correspond to boundary areas with the Forest Service.*

*Q. Weed prevention wording is important. Will the plan delineate the areas where we'll consciously keep weeds out as opposed to staging areas where weed spread is contained?*

*A..Thanks for pointing that out.*

*Q. If BLM will coordinate with the USFS, the philosophies seem different. Forest Service is planning all lands, while BLM is talking about the highest priority use decisions. Can it be made more clear?*  
*A. For BLM, it's a focus on what is most crucial to designate with limited funds, while USFS is complying with a national direction to have all of their lands designated by 2009. BLM might be able to use data that the Forest Service has developed. Most critical thing is to make sure the maps and connection routes match up so that the users aren't left in a void where they don't have information, or have a sudden change of allowed useage along a route.*

***Wallowa-Whitman Travel Management Scoping Results – Cindy Whitlock (Project Lead), Ken Anderson (Whitman District Ranger)***

They've just ended the 120 day comment period. RAC meeting was timed nicely, as they are sifting through the comments and can give a preliminary report. This is early in the process. For background, the process began in 2004, with Chief perspective that one threat to land health is unmanaged use. A rule was adopted in 2005 to designate trails, roads and other areas. Decisions are locally-based and influenced by local setting and situation. This effort encouraged local participation, and the Forest got a lot of that. Requires coordination with local governing bodies & Tribal government. Designation is governed by vehicle class and season of use where appropriate. Completed notice of proposed action, and held numerous public meetings with an extended public scoping period. They received more than 2500 substantive comments, with more than 6000 signatures including petitions. Site-specific comments received totaled more than 500.

Preliminary issues that emerged include type and level of motorized/non-motorized recreation to provide; how to enforce and administer a travel plan decision; what level of motorized access to provide; how to manage motorized use to protect resource values; and effects on social and economic factors.

Next steps: scoping is underway, then they'll develop alternatives and analyze their effects, publish draft EIS and receive comments in Spring '09

*Q. Will there be a buffer for people for ingress and egress for game retrieval and other activities?*  
*A. The Regional Forester (RF) weighed-in on setting standards for game retrieval and dispersed camping. Not supporting game retrieval, and limit to 300 feet off road for dispersed camping. Firewood and other activities are within the RF prerogatives.*

*Q. It seems like each county took a different approach. Is there a way that these varied alternatives will be coordinated?*

*A. They will read all comments the same way, and take everything all counties provide to them to develop an alternative that meets the input from specific counties. They have a strategy to try to integrate the varied input from each county where it can be accommodated.*

***\*\*\*ACTION ITEM:*** *RAC to decide how they want to be updated and assist as the Forest develops alternatives. Forest to watch closely for those areas where the RAC's input would be helpful. Subgroup to work directly with the Forest, and try to coordinate timing for comments with RAC meetings.*

***Baker Resource Management Plan – Nancy Lull***

Baker got funded the by Continuing Resolution to begin the planning process. They hired an RMP team lead and a GIS specialist, but are still working on getting a writer-editor to get everything started.

The Analysis of Management Situation is due at the end of FY08. Some term appointments will allow specialists to move from regular work to the RMP. There will be a series of public meetings in six towns in this initial year, and meeting individually with the affected counties and tribes for a more formal cooperative relationship. Lands in the Baker RA are so scattered that it will be challenging at times. The plan is to issue an approved RMP in the fourth year.

Major issues will likely be travel management, special management areas, wilderness study areas, T&E species, and water quality. There is lots of interest in consolidating scattered tracts through exchange or disposition. District plans to bring the subgroup into the process by late summer, or early fall.

*Q. Adrienne appreciated the training session. Will the issues for Baker be much different from the John Day Basin?*

*A. OHV and grazing are very similar. Threatened & Endangered species and some others may be new focal points, but the plan will leave some flexibility for other issues that emerge.*

*Comment: Dave Henderson – all new planning starts require “E-planning,” which is a new effort. The District must decide what things have to be considered, so that plan issues that won’t be changing don’t have to be funneled through a newly-implemented program.*

*Q. Will the RAC be able to comment electronically, and access information online?*

*A. Yes. There are some new technology options that will be available through the system, and will have a better mechanism for consolidating a thorough administrative record. The program connects directly to the map for site-specific comments. It is a big impact initially, though.*

### ***Blue Mountain Forest Plan Revision Recommendations – Dave Schmitt***

Completed data modeling so they can run models on different species before end of the year.

*Q. Has the Forest coordinated with BLM to accomplish the goals of PACFISH?*

*A. Agencies are taking two different tracks to end up in the same place. The material in PACFISH will likely end up in the forest plans. The Forest will coordinate with BLM Prineville to make sure the final plans operate seamlessly. Forest has identified focal species for the aquatic and terrestrial species; about 20 different species to run through the logic model analysis. This will be done for each model species and for each watershed.*

*Q. Is everything on hold due to the California verdict?*

*A. No. The problem with the 2005 rule was related to the implementation, not the rule itself. The work underway is valid, and they plan to re-engage with counties as soon as a final planning rule is adopted and the injunction is lifted. Decision is due in late February.*

*Q. Can counties look at the assumptions made for the modeling structure?*

*A. Yes. They can explain what went into developing the model and how it works, but it cannot be changed at this point.*

*Comment: This plan is focused on desired conditions, so will not have specific plan outputs based on acres grazed and timber volume harvested, etc. Project planners will be responsible for accomplishing the desired condition by appropriate methods.*

*Q. Area counties hired a consultant to help them focus on impacts to counties. Previously the NEPA process got limited by the Categorical Exclusion decision. How do groups engage with this plan version; suite of alternatives?*

*A. The new rule emphasizes public involvement. This has been a learning process of having the public involved at a much earlier stage. NEPA process will probably start in January 2009. This plan has about three alternatives (options) for desired condition already out for the public to consider. Much of it is tentative until people understand what the effects will be.*

*Q. Can the “desired condition” be applied across the forest instead of just to a specific watershed? Not every watershed can meet a standard of every desired condition and meet all needs.*

*A. Goals of forest condition may be better accomplished by applying different prescriptions to watersheds so that overall scale is met and flexibility is allowed for more intensive management in some watersheds. Key watersheds will be identified, and work done to meet requirements for T&E species addressed; then decisions for other watersheds can follow.*

*Q. Is the model sophisticated enough to prevent “death by a thousand cuts” for some species?*

*A. The standard is to have sustainable populations of the species. Results of the viability will show up on the models, and decision-makers will use that as a guide. Standards and guidelines will have to be met. Overall forest health needs to be the focus.*

*Comments: Public awareness is important, so they see the balancing act of meeting resource and species needs. Subgroup responses to questions the Forest asked were: they found very little to attack; much progress has been made; the parties to the plan seem to have gotten the message of communication and public involvement; the plan is flexible enough that it may accommodate desired conditions with local input.*

### **SubCommittee Updates**

***OHV:** Nothing new to report currently. Will be working on the John Day Basin plan in Prineville on January 8. RAC members should provide their input to Art by the end of the year.*

***John Day Basin:** Subcommittee members will meet in Prineville on January 8. Comments to Ayn as soon as possible: Ayn Shlisky (541) 416-6727 ashlisky@blm.gov*

***BLM Travel Management taskforce to ID team:** Latest draft will be distributed to members in about 2 weeks*

***Blue Mountain Plan:** Nothing to report*

***Baker RMP:** Adrienne found training session valuable. Group may select a chair this afternoon.*

***Noxious Weed:** Nothing new to report. Update from Todd – National Herbicide decision was issued October 5, 2007. BLM is still limited to using four chemicals in Oregon and needs to complete additional NEPA to have the injunction lifted. Protests will likely come during the stepped-down NEPA process. This national document brings us current with the available tools that we can use (as of 2005). There is a difference in use between East and Westside vegetation needs. We will not likely address the needs of commodity production in the immediate plan documents. Statewide team will be briefing the State Director this week about implications and methods for implementing this Programmatic EIS. Product is due to the State Director with recommendations for the State Leadership Team by mid-January. This is not site-specific, so consultation on specific projects will be more interesting. Team needs help to make sense of this for the Districts on a landscape approach. A State-level step-down will be the first effort. There will be a Statewide EIS, and most likely will*

*require the districts to update their local Weed Treatment EA's. Standards and mitigation measures can be used from this PEIS. It will be three years and \$1.5 million at minimum for a simple, non-controversial action. The National Record of Decision gives a foundation for moving forward and we are working closely with the Solicitor and DOJ to develop a strategy for seeking relief from the injunction in Oregon.*

### **Public Comment Period**

**No public present**

### **Emerging Weed Issues; Saving Lands – Jerry Asher**

There is a briefing scheduled for the state Leadership Team, and he would like feedback from the RAC about the content of the presentation. Its purposes: to show that there are hundreds of watersheds in the west rapidly going into permanent decline. Changes can be made that can get us to a “no net loss” status to invasive species. Jerry wants to know how this presentation can be improved. Contact info (541) 996-9494 [jeasher@charter.net](mailto:jeasher@charter.net)

Saving land: forbs, shrubs, native ground cover. We may hear a lot about prevention and control of weeds, but the real purpose is saving land. Permanent **degradation** (irreversibility); the number of projects underway and completed is miniscule compared to the acreage being affected by **spread**.

**Impacts** to wildlife, recreation, and other values. **Solutions, Urgency**

Weed infestations violate the goals of the Wilderness Act; reduce grazing lands about 35%; diminish watershed function; promote greater runoff and sedimentation; interrupt needed plant/insect interaction required by fisheries; deplete available water in high desert terrain; destroy habitat for prairie birds; threaten grazing species and increase fire danger. Weeds promote a monoculture that precludes native vegetation in riparian areas, and the diverse plant community is destroyed. Weeds eliminate the capacity for interdependent species to thrive.

Estimated yearly spread now is 1.5 million acres, and we're only treating 33,000 acres. Spread rates are estimated to be 100% to 1200% depending on species and place. Exponential spread is being observed in the John Day basin. Effective herbicides are not legal for agencies to use at this time. Spread in Hells Canyon: there is a long-standing cooperative effort by BLM and Forest Service that has been effective. If we remain at status quo levels of treatment, there will be 27,000 more acres affected. Annual increase is about 10-15% yearly on western federal lands. Weed species **are** on the move.

Almost half the lands in the Hells Canyon NRA are highly susceptible to weed infestation. In Adams County, ID, Rush Skeletonweed is out of control. Recent dramatic increase in the NRA of Bugloss, Knotweed, Blackberry, Whitetop, Common Crupina, Sulfur cinquefoil, Tree of Heaven, Clary Sage, Meadow Hawkweed, Italian thistle, Houndstongue, Medusahead, and Bur chervil.

Approx 70 million acres of weed infected lands in all ownership, and the numbers are growing. It's not hopeless if we take advantage of great opportunities and implement integrated weed management. We need early detection and rapid response. The fire rehab efforts have been underway for many years, and what's needed is to take action **ahead** of fires for mapping and detection before it burns. Oregon Dept of Agriculture is a leader in bio-control efforts. All program areas are negatively impacted by weeds, so all disciplines should be deeply involved in the efforts to control them. Lots of good cooperation is taking place, and they don't get enough credit. There is still a lot more to be done. Weed infestations are an emergency deserving as much attention and urgency as a fire. Downward spiral as weed invasion degrades the land to a level that other weeds can take advantage of the compromised health of the landscape. The lag phase is complete, and each disturbance is cumulative,

so the window of opportunity is now. Nine new weed species, increased fire occurrence, and greater susceptibility.

The ways of addressing the problem need to be on a scale equal to the problem we face.

Suggestions:

**Berta:** We don't talk enough about managing the land in the first place, so it's not so susceptible., Managing the seed supply for native plants needs to be done so that seed is available when needed.

**Adrienne:** Why is this issue not viewed as an emergency; what barriers are there that keep people from believing the urgency? If people don't see it, they have a hard time comprehending it, and the urban population centers are not exposed to it. Within agencies, the budgets continue to decline while the priority accomplishments shift to other topics. Threat overload.

**Terry:** what if we tied the weed issue to something people HAVE been focused on, like endangered species? Maybe we can show the effect of invasives on wildlife and other endangered species, so people make the connection; or include the weed problem in part of the mandate to protect or recover a listed or proposed species. Legislators have heard the presentation, and their resource staff people show enthusiasm, but there is no pressure from their constituents to advance legislation.

**\*\*\*ACTION ITEM:** *Send comments on the weeds presentation to Jerry or call him with feedback.*

## **ROUNDTABLE**

**Kevin Martin** – *Umatilla noxious weed analysis draft is out, and comments completed. Hope to have the final ROD in January/February. New EIS will allow them to treat all acres on the Forest with new chemicals and aerial applications. Chemicals are approved for area-specific treatment to protect vulnerable species across the 25,000 acres. Recreation facilities analysis (campgrounds, trailheads, etc.) is completed, with public meetings held to discuss what amenities to maintain, where to charge fees, where the use is targeted, and what the public wants. They decided to stay on the traditional-use side of things with more rustic facilities. The next step is to publish a Federal Register notice, then present proposed changes to the Recreation RAC in February. The Forest will not be closing campgrounds, but will change use seasons on some. Jubilee Lake will be managed by the Forest again, not a concessionaire. Notices have been published for all affected areas, so the public is made aware of changes. The public seems to recognize the need for fees to reinvest in facilities. Analysis has been helpful in getting the needs defined and getting funding for some of the needed upgrades or replacement.*

*Their travel management plan is 1.4 million acres, and by the end of 2008, maps will be completed. Heppner RD should be completed by '09. Kevin will double-check that the district gets the information to Art Waugh for review. The Forest Service is looking at their maps program on a national level for issues that have to be ironed out.*

*A fuel and fires career camp for high-schoolers was held; 16 students attended and there was some genuine interest. It was a good event and there are potential good rewards for the effort. The plan is to conduct another one next year.*

**\*\*\*ACTION ITEM:** *Kevin will share some of the applications with other agencies.*

**Berta Youtie** – *New herbicide chemicals are a lot more specific than ones used in the past. They target specific plant groups more effectively, without blanket destruction.*

**John Tanaka** – *The social science study is back in BLM's Washington Office, getting clearance for acquiring RAC contact information. Part of the survey has already been completed (BLM non-administrative employees).*

**Dave Henderson** – *On the night before the next meeting, there will be an orientation for new members, and all folks are welcome to attend.*

**\*\*\* ACTION ITEM:** John, Dave, and Mark will conduct the orientation session. Veteran members could help in answering questions.

**David Moryc** – October 2008 is the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. American Rivers is working with DC and other leaders to find ways to observe the occasion – Oregon is unique in the number and quality of rivers, and American Rivers is interested in developing partnerships for events. Unfortunately, we are also leaders in lack of funding, and so are looking for avenues to increase funding.

**Phil Shephard** – Nothing

**Tina Welch** – Nothing

**Judy Wing** – Nothing

**Debbie Hollen** – Timeline on public comment period for their weed EIS is mid-February, so they expect to issue the ROD in late May. Steve is in court today, and apologizes for missing this meeting. The Forest met their timber sale targets for the third year in a row. New DFS (Betty Matthews) will come on board from the Colville on Feb 1<sup>st</sup>.

**Debbie Henderson-Norton** – Part of John Day River study is “limits of acceptable change.” It’s almost ready to release. A mandatory permit system for the John Day River is being considered. The District must present it to the Recreation RAC after six-months of publication in the Federal Register. Implementation may be possible in float season 2009. The Division of State Lands (DSL) has designated it as a “Navigable River” which brings up new questions.

Last Friday they got notification of a lawsuit on Little Canyon Mountain OHV access from local residents; have also had some appeals on Newberry geothermal exploration. Travel management issues in the Cline Buttes decision will get lots of attention – expect that in March 2008. Deschutes permit system changes: due to useage levels above limits. Fees will be implemented on an additional river segment

**\*\*\* ACTION ITEM:** Request that DSL come in to address the RAC about their determination and its impacts. Dave will work with the Prineville managers to see how it connects with work BLM is doing.

**Art Waugh** –. Lane County has found patch of star thistle, and the OHV community has been alerted. Art withdrew his application for the state allocation committee because of job demand changes. He responded to a request for comment on Virtue Flat activity. Requests that RAC members forward your comments on the John Day Basin materials to him by the end of the month.

**Terri Drever-Gee** – Energized by the career camp topic. How can we get the youth involved with the RAC through science clubs or whatever?

**Mike Hayward** – The Grand Ronde Watershed Council is meeting to fund projects. Weed eradication will be part of that. Local people are very heavily involved, because agency partners look at things through their own biases. Need to broaden the perspective. Red Timber Sale went “no-bid” because there’s no sawmill. Mike just started working with Wallowa Resources on small wood solutions, managing campgrounds, community forest, and other activities to spark stewardship & economic development.

**Frank Bird** – Recreation RAC postponed the October meeting because there were no projects to consider. Have heard that two biomass entities want to become involved with using biomass on the Malheur NF. There is a lot of unused capacity in Burns and would like to see utilization of that. Dismantling the Hines mill plant is occurring right now. The purchaser wanted the big beam timbers for another use.

**Adrienne Borgias** – Ghandi quote says something about not being able to please everyone all the time. The earlier discussion about climate change prompted the idea that the RAC should provide some guidance for how to look at this and what to consider. Proposed discussing a subcommittee to focus on the topic and how to get a handle on it in our planning processes. There are international

guidelines available that could be a starting point, and the Pacific Northwest has abundant scientific data about what this means for ecosystem health, etc. Specific objectives could be lined out for how we assure that this is addressed in our planning efforts. John Tanaka suggests that, rather than a subgroup, the RAC write a letter similar to the weed effort early on. Dave wants to be sure that the RAC has a specific way to tie the topic in a directly-relatable way to what the agencies are working on. There may be a clear way to link the topic in with “desired future condition,” because the historic range of variability might be changed by the impacts.

\*\*\* **ACTION ITEM:** Adrienne to put a proposal together for future meeting, in cooperation with Berta Youtie, David Moryc, and Bill Lang.

**Mike Montgomery** – Stan regrets not being able to attend. The current planning decisions are similar to those on the Umatilla and Wallowa Whitman Forests on the travel and weed work. Good technologies going into the fisheries program right now. They have eight major collaborative efforts to accomplish shared goals. Groups are reviewing old timber sale projects and refining them to the standards of the involved groups, so Forests can avoid litigation. Salvage sales and fire rehab efforts are fairly intensive right now; the Forest wants to get materials out in best way to protect health and limit loss of value of salvageable timber. Planning efforts are focused on large landscape projects, largely driven by joint efforts with involved counties. These are above and beyond the regular program of work. Malheur travel management effort is an update of the existing plan. Forest is close to finalizing that in January/February. They hope to complete the map within this FY. There’s lots of support in Grant and Harney County.

**Mark Webb** – Grant County has no option but to be a resource county. One mill closed, and rumor has another one potentially going too. Job loss impacts translate to the equivalent of 26,000 layoffs in the Portland metro area. ONDA is threatening to sue the Malheur over grazing permits, where all T&E and steelhead and bull trout habitat areas. This could be a huge impact to Grant County. Collaboration, while it is painful and grueling, may be the only way forward. It looks like the county is transitioning, and building good working relationships with the Forest and others. Mark’s outlook is basically optimistic.

**Bill Lang** – Nothing

**Dan Forsea** – Interested in the orientation session. He liked the session on weeds, as a property owner and permittee that has to deal with them. Ranchers are seeing whitetop & skeletonweed, and it’s depressing to see how easily it is spread. Appreciates the career camp and sees value in getting the progressive ranchers and other land stewards on the agenda, so students can learn effective ways that the ranching community cares for the resource. The issue of “absentee ranch owners” has an impact on the health of their neighbors’ land. Dan continues to work with the **Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife** to allow hunting and have responsible people on the land.

**Pat Dunham** – Without a lot of background, is impressed with the amount and complexity of what the RAC considers. Maybe a broader public awareness would help accomplish goals. Topics before the RAC affect his land holdings, and make the issues real. Looking forward to participating and getting to know everyone.

## **ACTION SUMMARY**

\*\*\***ACTION ITEM:** RAC will decide who will head the Baker RMP subgroup.

\*\*\***ACTION ITEM:** RAC to decide how they want to be updated and used as the process for developing alternatives for the Blue Mountain Plan Revision moves forward. Forest to watch closely for those areas where the RAC’s input would be helpful. Subgroup to work directly with the Forest, and try to coordinate timing for comments to mesh with RAC meetings.

**\*\*\*ACTION ITEM:** Members to send any comments on the weeds presentation to Jerry or call him with feedback.

**\*\*\* ACTION ITEM:** Kevin will share some of the career camp applications with other agencies.

**\*\*\* ACTION ITEM:** Kevin will double-check that the Heppner District gets the travel management plan information to Art Waugh for review.

**\*\*\* ACTION ITEM:** John, Dave, and Mark will conduct the new member orientation session ahead of the next meeting. Veteran members could help in answering questions.

**\*\*\* ACTION ITEM:** Request that the Division of State Lands address the RAC about the “Navigable River” determination and its impacts. Dave will work with the Prineville managers to see how it connects with work we’re doing.

**\*\*\* ACTION ITEM:** Adrienne to draft a proposal letter to forward to John about how the RAC wants to address global warming at a future meeting. Berta, David, and Bill will participate in developing the proposal.

**Future meetings:**

***April 3-4 Pendleton (Oxford) Orientation on 3<sup>rd</sup>***

***June 4-5 Enterprise Field trip to Zumwalt***

***September 15-16 Prineville or John Day (TBD)***

***December 2 Pendleton***

**Agenda items:**

***Youth involvement***

***Climate change – issues to address and the science behind the topic – speaker from Corvallis (Kevin can contact)***

***Wild & Scenic Rivers '08 observance – potential rafting issues***

***W/W Weed EIS comment period***

***John Day River issues with DSL***

***Baker RMP***

***Collaboration projects***

***ADJOURN BUSINESS MEETING at 3:25 pm***

*Approved as written:*

---

*RAC Chair*

---

*Designated Federal Officer*